



Dissolution Authority

300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut 06114

Telephone (860) 757-7700 Fax (860) 757-7725

MEMORANDUM

TO: South Meadows Transition Committee
FROM: William P. Beccaro, Committee Chairperson
DATE: February 29, 2024
RE: Notice of Regular Meeting

There will be a **regular meeting** of the **South Meadows Transition Committee** of the MIRA Dissolution Authority's Board of Directors on *Tuesday, March 5, 2024 at 11:00 a.m. in the Board Room at 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, CT. Members of the public may also attend the meeting telephonically by calling (929) 205-6099, entering Meeting ID: 858 1861 1943 and Passcode: 661934# when prompted. (NOTE - there is very limited physical space in the Board Room - consequently, virtual public attendance is encouraged).* The meeting is scheduled to conclude at 12:30 p.m. The purpose of this meeting will be:

1. Call to Order; Chair's Welcome
2. Public Comment (3 minutes per speaker)
3. Approval of Minutes of the February 6, 2024 Regular Committee Meeting (*Attachment 1*).
4. Update on Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study.
5. Update on Area 3-3 Remediation and Revised Verification Report for South Meadows Remediation under the Exit StrategyTM Contract.
6. Correspondence Regarding Resource Recovery Facility Closure Plan (*Attachment 2*).
 - a. Second Request for Additional Information (RFAI-2) from CT-DEEP dated 1/17/2024 (*Attachment 2a*).
 - b. Authority Response to RFAI-2 dated 2/16/2024 (*Attachment 2b*).
7. Such other items that may properly come before the Committee.

Cc: Bert Hunter
Mark Daley
Christopher Shepard
Raymond Frigon (CT-DEEP)
Claire Quinn (CT-DEEP)
Jade Barber (CT-DEEP)
Carl Stopper (TRC)

Attachment 1

South Meadows Transition Committee
February 6, 2024
Meeting Minutes

A Regular Meeting of the South Meadows Transition Committee of the MIRA Dissolution Authority was held on February 6, 2024. Present either in-person or via video or audio conferencing were:

Committee Members: Director William Beccaro (Committee Chairperson)
 Director Bert Hunter (Ex Officio)
 Director Matthew Dayton
 Director Rachel Taylor
 Director David Steuber
 Member Frank Dellaripa
 Member Sarah McCoy

Other Directors Present: John Fonfara
 Joseph DeNicola
 Theodore Bromley

Other Members Present: Thomas Swarr

MIRA Staff Present: Mark Daley, President and CFO
 Thomas Gaffey, Director of Recycling and Enforcement
 Christopher Shepard, Environmental Compliance Manager
 Roger Guzowski, Supply Chain Manager
 David Bodendorf, Mgr. of Engineering, Construction & Power Assets
 Cheryl Kaminsky, Comptroller
 Ann Catino (Halloran & Sage), General Counsel

CT-DEEP Staff Present: Jade Barber
 David McKeegan

TRC Environmental Corp. Staff Present: Carl Stopper

Others Present: (860) 573-5203 (call-in via Zoom)

This meeting was recorded via ZOOM conferencing and is posted on the Authority's website at: <https://www.ctmira.org/mira-dissolution-authority-south-meadows-transition-committee>

1. Call to Order; Chair's Welcome

Committee Chairman Beccaro called the meeting to order at 11:06 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

2. Public Comment (3 minutes per speaker)

Committee Chairman Beccaro invited members of the public to address the Committee. There were no public comments, and Chairman Beccaro proceeded with the next agenda item.

3. Approval of Minutes of the January 10, 2024 Regular Committee Meeting

Chairperson Beccaro requested a motion to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2024 Regular Committee Meeting. The motion was made by Director Fonfara and seconded by Director Taylor.

Chairperson Beccaro asked if there were any discussion, changes or modifications requested. Hearing none, Chairperson Beccaro requested a voice vote on adoption of the minutes.

The motion was approved via voice vote, with no dissenting votes.

4. Update on Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study

Chairperson Beccaro requested that Mr. Daley provide an update regarding the RFP. Mr. Daley noted that the RFP has been published, and that the mandatory site tours will be tomorrow (2/7/2024). We are expecting approximately 20 or so people for each of the two tours.

Mr. Daley requested that Mr. Guzowski provide a summary of the Authority's outreach efforts in advertising the availability of the RFP. Mr. Guzowski stated that the 300+ Licensed Environmental Professionals (LEPs) on the LEP roster posted on the CT-DEEP web-site were sent email notices regarding the RFP availability, as were the 15 engineering firms with which the Authority currently has on-call engineering services agreements. Email "blasts" were also sent out to members of the Environmental Business Council (EBC) of New England, and to the members of the Environmental Professionals Organization of Connecticut (EPOC). Three of the top 6 environmental firms in the Engineering News Record that perform the requested services have formally expressed interest in the RFP. A total of 19 firms have registered to participate in one of tomorrow's mandatory site tours.

Mr. Daley noted that Addendum No. 1 to the RFP was issued to provide additional information regarding the mandatory site tours. Mr. Shepard provided an overview of the expected tour route, noting that we intend to "peek into" a number of doors along the tour, but that we do not intend to walk through the buildings, except for the Turbine Hall. Mr. Shepard also stated that Addendum No. 1 summarizes the minimum personal protective equipment that tour attendees were expected to wear on the tour, noting that the Authority has a limited number of hard hats, safety glasses and safety vests that will be available for use by tour attendees, if needed.

Director Fonfara asked what type of review of the respondents' work would be performed by the Authority as part of selecting the firm to conduct the Study, with an eye toward ensuring that the selected firm does not have any historical or pre-conceived bias about

the outcomes. Mr. Daley stated that each firm's response to the RFP will need to include a discussion of its approach to the Study, as well as discussions regarding its experience with similar projects. Mr. Daley also stated that the proposals and evaluation summaries will be brought to this Committee, and that no decisions regarding the selection of the firm to conduct the study would be made in a vacuum.

5. Update on Area 3-3 Remediation and Revised Verification Report for the South Meadows Remediation under the Exit Strategy™ Contract

Chairperson Beccaro requested that Mr. Daley provide an update on this matter. Mr. Daley noted that the remediation work in the "Contractor Lot" (Area 3-3) has been completed, and that all removed, contaminated soil has been shipped off-site; and that TRC is currently drafting revisions to the Verification Report for the remediation work that was agreed to back in 2000 due to triggering the Transfer Act. Mr. Shepard added that the goal is for the Area 3-3 remedial action report to be completed by the end of March, and that there is still an environmental use restriction (EUR) for Area 3-3 that has to be recorded on the land records.

Mr. Shepard asked Mr. Stopper if he had any additional information to convey. Mr. Stopper clarified that the EUR for Area 3-3 must first be submitted to DEEP for review and approval, and then recorded on the land records following DEEP approval, before the Verification Report can ultimately be finalized. Mr. Stopper also noted that a draft of the revised Verification Report has been provided to the Authority and to the third party LEP that is reviewing TRC's work on this project, and that TRC will work to incorporate any comments by the reviewers into the final Verification Report.

6. Discussion Regarding Correspondence from CT-DEEP Regarding Resource Recovery Facility Closure Plan – Request for Additional Information (RFAI)

Chairperson Beccaro requested that Mr. Daley provide an update on this matter. Mr. Daley noted that the Closure Plan applies to the closed resource recovery facility (RRF), and that some aspects of the MIRA Dissolution Authority's mission and the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study align with information or work that DEEP is now requesting in the RFAI. For example, DEEP's RFAI calls for all RRF equipment to be removed from the site, which Mr. Daley noted is consistent with the Authority's plan to issue an RFP for sale and/or scrapping of the RRF equipment. Mr. Daley also stated that testing requirements included in the DEEP RFAI require additional evaluation, and that we may need to work with an outside consultant to ultimately address on-going questions regarding sampling methods and acceptable "clean" standards for those tests. Mr. Daley also noted that the response to DEEP's RFAI is due by the end of February.

Mr. Daley asked Mr. Shepard if he had any additional points to discuss regarding the RFAI. Mr. Shepard stated that the RFAI also calls for removal of the coal barge unloader on the river, even though the coal barge unloader was not part of the RRF's permitted solid waste management activities. Mr. Shepard also expressed concern that the RFAI calls for testing of PCBs in any RRF locations where ash is present, which does not seem to be based on regulations or science because the RRF did not manage PCB waste, so there would be no reason

to tie the presence of ash to PCBs. Mr. Shepard noted that the Authority's predecessors would have probably pushed back against both of these demands, at least while the RRF was still operating; however, the upcoming South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study will provide information that will better inform these matters.

Director Beccaro recommended that the Authority's response highlight how the RFP for the Study dovetails with DEEP's requests in the RFAI. Mr. Daley noted that the assessment of the coal barge unloader is certainly included in the RFP for the Study, and Mr. Shepard noted that the hazardous building materials survey was specifically included in the RFP for the Study to address the first round of comments on the Closure Plan that MIRA received from DEEP. Director Taylor noted that the RFP for the Study provides additional details on closure activities, which DEEP has requested in the RFAI.

Member Swarr noted that it would be ideal if DEEP approved the closure plan as soon as possible, so that the Study could be better focused. Mr. Daley agreed, but noted that the RFAI states that additional questions/comments from certain divisions within DEEP may still be forthcoming.

Director Hunter asked Mr. Daley how the closure plan reserve that was funded by MIRA would be impacted by the work DEEP is requesting in the RFAI (i.e., what work that has been requested would not be covered by the closure plan reserve?). Mr. Daley noted that the \$3.3 million closure cost estimate does not include, for example, the costs associated with scrapping all of the equipment, which may or may not be covered by the value of the scrap metal. Director Steuber asked if the Authority could conserve funds by not performing wipe sampling of building surfaces, recognizing that the buildings will likely be demolished anyway. Member Dellaripa noted that PCBs were found in the building materials of a school in Hartford, and that the demolition costs were less than the remediation costs would have been.

Director Beccaro stated that there is likely an integrated solution between the closure plan and the RFP Study that is better and less expensive than doing each of them separately.

Mr. Daley indicated that Authority staff will draft a response to DEEP's RFAI that incorporates the matters discussed during today's Committee meeting.

7. Other Items Brought Before Committee

Committee Chairman Beccaro inquired if there were additional items to be brought before the Committee. There were none.

8. Adjournment

Committee Chairman Beccaro requested a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Director Steuber and seconded by Director Beccaro, and the meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m.

Attachment 2

Attachment 2a



Transmitted Via E-mail

January 17, 2024

Mr. Christopher Shepard
MIRA Dissolution Authority
300 Maxim Road
Hartford, CT 06114
CShepard@ctmira.org

Subject: Connecticut Solid Waste System (“CSWS”) Resource Recovery Facility,
100 Reserve Road and 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut
Closure Plan – 2nd Request for Additional Information

Dear Mr. Shepard:

Staff of the Bureau of Materials Management and Compliance Assurance (i.e., Engineering and Enforcement Division, Permitting and Enforcement Division, and Emergency Response and Spill Division); the Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse (i.e., Remediation Division); and the Bureau of Air Management (i.e., Radiation Division) within the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (the “Department”) have completed a review of the Material Innovation and Recycling Authority’s (MIRA) letter dated January 5, 2023, which was submitted in response to the Department’s letter dated October 14, 2022 requesting additional information pertaining to the proposed closure plan for the subject facility.

Based upon the review of internal emails, staff of the Emergency Response and Spill Division, the Remediation Division, and the Radiation Division do not have additional comments/questions regarding the proposed closure plan. Staff of the Permitting and Enforcement Division will provide a separate letter if they have additional comments.

Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Sections 22a-6, 22a-208, Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) Section 22a-209-13(b), the Department’s *Draft RCRA Closure Guidance for Generators who Store Less than 90 Days Container Storage Areas and Tank Systems* and the May 1, 2013 *Guidance for Implementing and Documenting Closure for Indoor RCRA Hazardous Waste Container Storage Areas*, the Department requires that all non-structural equipment historically used at the CSWS facility be removed and that the MIRA Dissolution Authority provide additional detail in the closure plan pertaining to:

- (1) Closure actions for the Waste Processing Facility (WPF) and the Power Block Facility (PBF) and associated PBF buildings, which shall include dismantling, waste characterization and off-site removal of all waste handling equipment, combustion and post-combustion equipment and ancillary equipment that is not an integral structural component of the respective building(s) and decontamination of the remaining structure(s). Said equipment includes but is not limited to conveyors (including the overhead conveyors used to transport the refused derived fuel from the WPF to the PBF), shredders, trommels, packers, cyclone separators, boilers, traveling grates, mixer room, truck scales etc. Waste characterization shall include analysis for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs);
- (2) Verification (i.e., confirmation sampling) of the completion and effectiveness of cleaning activities of all non-porous surfaces (e.g., on steel, fiberglass, structural steel, etc.) and porous surfaces (e.g., concrete, wood, etc.) for all interior building surfaces including but not limited to walls, floors, beams, ceiling, etc., as well as any areas in the PBF and associated buildings (e.g., trenches) where ash may have been present. Such sampling shall include an analysis for PCBs and utilize wipe test methods as appropriate;

- (3) The decontamination and decommissioning of the neutralization basin and the equalization basin; and
- (4) The removal of the coal unloading crane and the decontamination/cleaning/confirmatory sampling of the associated coal transfer structures.

Please submit the requested information within forty-five (45) days from the date of this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at frank.p.gagliardo@ct.gov or David McKeegan at david.mckeegan@ct.gov.

Sincerely,



Frank Gagliardo, Supervising Environmental Analyst
Waste Engineering and Enforcement Division
Bureau of Materials Management and Compliance Assurance

FG/dm

c: Mark Daley, MIRA Dissolution Authority MDaley@ctmira.org
Gabrielle Frigon, DEEP, MMCA gabrielle.frigon@ct.gov

Attachment 2b



Dissolution Authority

300 Maxim Road • Hartford • Connecticut • 06114 • Telephone (860) 757-7700 • Fax (860) 757-7725

**Hand Delivered
and PDF via email (frank.p.gagliardo@ct.gov)**

February 16, 2024

Mr. Frank Gagliardo, Supervising Environmental Analyst
WEED, Bureau of Materials Management and Compliance Assurance
CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“DEEP”)
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106

RECEIVED
CT DEEP

FEB 16 2024

BMMCA
WASTE ENG. AND ENF. DIV.

**Re: Response to 2nd Request for Additional Information Regarding Closure Plan
Connecticut Solid Waste System (“CSWS”) Resource Recovery Facility
100 Reserve Road and 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut**

Dear Mr. Gagliardo:

The MIRA Dissolution Authority (“the Authority”) is in receipt of the January 17, 2024 2nd Request for Additional Information (“RFAI-2”) regarding the Closure Plan for the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (“MIRA”) CSWS Resource Recovery Facility in Hartford.

Reference is also made to the documents previously submitted regarding this matter, which include the Closure Plan dated May 2022; the previous DEEP RFAI dated October 14, 2022, and the RFAI response letter from MIRA to DEEP dated January 5, 2023.

Enclosed please find the Authority’s response to DEEP RFAI-2. For the sake of clarity and ease of understanding, each of DEEP’s comments is repeated, followed by the Authority’s response. The enclosed response also provides background information regarding the Authority’s succession of MIRA under Public Act 23-170, and regarding the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study that the Authority will be undertaking later this spring.

Please note that the Authority has not revised the closure cost estimate. We will revise the closure cost estimate once DEEP is in agreement with the narrative sections of the Closure Plan.

Please also note that the Authority will post this response on its website in the same section where it has posted the Closure Plan, the previous RFAI and response, and the comment letter from the Greater Hartford Flood Commission, here:

<https://www.ctmira.org/records-reports/additional-communications/closure-plan/>

I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this document and all attachments hereto, and I certify, based on reasonable investigation, including my inquiry of those individuals responsible for obtaining the information, that the submitted information is true,

Frank Gagliardo
February 16, 2024
Page 2 of 2

accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that any false statement made in the submitted information may be punishable as a criminal offense under §53a-157b of the Connecticut General Statutes and any other applicable law.

Please contact Christopher Shepard at 806-757-7706 (office), 860-716-2431 (cell phone), or cshepard@ctmira.org if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,



Mark T. Daley
President & CFO

Enclosure (two copies of MIRA's response to the RFAI)

Electronic Copy via Email:

David McKeegan, DEEP
Brent Madho, DEEP
Gabrielle Frigon, DEEP
Edith Pestana, DEEP
Chris Shepard, MIRA Dissolution Authority
David Bodendorf, MIRA Dissolution Authority
Carl Stopper, TRC
Steve Farrick, TRC
MIRA Dissolution Authority Board of Directors



Dissolution Authority

**Response to
2nd Request for Additional Information**

**Closure Plan
CSWS Resource Recovery Facility
MIRA Dissolution Authority
Hartford, CT**

Table of Contents **Page**

MIRA Dissolution Authority as Successor to MIRA 3

South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study 3

Response to 2nd Request for Additional Information 4

Attachments Following Response:

Attachment (1) - August 8, 2023 Letter to Commissioner Dykes
RE: MIRA Dissolution Authority as Successor to MIRA

Attachment (2) - Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct the
South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study
(RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)

MIRA Dissolution Authority as Successor to MIRA

On June 29, 2023 Governor Lamont signed Public Act 23-170, which establishes the MIRA Dissolution Authority (“the Authority”) as the successor authority to the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (“MIRA”). Effective July 1, 2023, the Authority assumed control over all of MIRA’s assets, rights, duties and obligations including the subject Resource Recovery Facility, and was authorized to complete any contract, right of action or matter commenced by MIRA including the subject Closure Plan.

The Authority is tasked by the referenced legislation, in part, to continue the solid waste management services that were provided by MIRA, including those services for which associated activities were previously permitted by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“DEEP”). It should be noted that the referenced, on-going “solid waste management services” are being performed at other Authority-permitted facilities, and that there have been no “solid waste management services” conducted at the shuttered CSWS Resource Recovery Facility (“RRF”) since the RRF ceased operation in July 2022.

The Authority submitted a letter to the DEEP Commissioner dated August 8, 2023, requesting that the Permittee name on all effective environmental permits that were issued to MIRA by DEEP be updated to reflect the MIRA Dissolution Authority as the Permittee (see Attachment (1) of this response for a copy of the Authority’s letter to DEEP).

South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study

The May 2022 Closure Plan for the RRF, as well as MIRA’s January 5, 2023 response to the first RFAI from DEEP, were both assembled to address removal and proper off-site disposal of any and all wastes and residues that may remain in on-site structures and equipment, and that were associated with the DEEP-permitted municipal solid waste management activities at the RRF. MIRA did not assemble the Closure Plan to address other potential environmental questions regarding conditions that pre-existed the development of the RRF in the mid-1980s, such as the potential presence of hazardous building materials (i.e., asbestos, lead-based paint, and/or PCBs) in facility buildings that were constructed before the use of such materials was banned by the Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”). Additionally, the Closure Plan was not developed to address questions regarding the encroachment of site infrastructure on the Flood Protection System that borders the eastern boundary of the property, since the Greater Hartford Flood Commission (“GHFC”) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“USACE”) are the permitting authorities for such encroachments.

While the Authority believes that the RRF Closure Plan is not the appropriate vehicle for addressing the matters discussed in the paragraph above, the legislation that established the Authority as the successor to MIRA includes certain mandates which the Authority believes will appropriately address those concerns. Specifically, Section 9(a)(1) of Public Act 23-170 requires that the Authority “identify the immediate environmental needs and knowledge necessary for future redevelopment of the authority’s properties located at 300 Maxim Road in Hartford and 100 Reserve Road in Hartford.” The referenced property locations include the location of the shuttered CSWS Resource Recovery Facility for which the Closure Plan has been prepared.

In order to meet the requirements of Section 9(a)(1) of Public Act 23-170, on January 18, 2024, the Authority issued a *Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study (RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)*. For your convenience, a copy of the RFP with its associated Attachments A through C, inclusive, has been included as Attachment (2) of this response. A full copy of the RFP, including all Addenda and related contract documents, can be found on the Business Links page of the Authority web-site at: <https://www.ctmira.org/business-links/current-bids-rfp-rfq>.

The RFP includes a number of work tasks and project deliverables that will be undertaken to address the matters discussed above that have been previously raised by DEEP in its review of the Closure Plan. For example, the scope of the RFP includes completion of a Hazardous Building Materials survey for all on-site buildings, to include but not necessarily be limited to asbestos, lead-based paint and PCBs in building materials. The project deliverables also include three documents specific to the Flood Protection System, to address a Technical Memorandum from the Greater Hartford Flood Commission (GHFC) to MIRA dated May 10, 2022; and the Closure Plan comment letter from the GHFC to Mr. David McKeegan of DEEP dated August 5, 2022 (which comment letter was provided to MIRA by DEEP in the first RFAI dated October 14, 2022 for the Closure Plan).

Response to 2nd Request for Additional Information

For the sake of clarity and ease of understanding, each of DEEP's comments is repeated below, followed by the [Authority's response in blue type font](#).

DEEP Comment: Staff of the Permitting and Enforcement Division will provide a separate letter if they have additional comments.

Response: [Is there a specific timeline for the Permitting and Enforcement Division to provide additional comments; and/or are there specific questions or concerns that it is continuing to evaluate?](#)

DEEP Comment: Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Sections 22a-6, 22a-208, Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) Section 22a-209-13(b), the Department's *Draft RCRA Closure Guidance for Generators who Store Less than 90 Days Container Storage Areas and Tank Systems* and the May 1, 2013 *Guidance for Implementing and Documenting Closure for Indoor RCRA Hazardous Waste Container Storage Areas*, the Department requires that all non-structural equipment historically used at the CSWS facility be removed and that the MIRA Dissolution Authority provide additional detail in the closure plan pertaining to:

- (1) Closure actions for the Waste Processing Facility (WPF) and the Power Block Facility (PBF) and associated PBF buildings, which shall include dismantling, waste characterization and off-site removal of all waste handling equipment, combustion and post-combustion equipment and ancillary equipment that is not an integral structural component of the respective building(s) and decontamination of the remaining structure(s). Said equipment includes but is not limited to conveyors (including the overhead conveyors used to transport the refused derived fuel from the WPF to the PBF), shredders, trommels, packers, cyclone

separators, boilers, traveling grates, mixer room, truck scales etc. Waste characterization shall include analysis for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs);

Response: The Authority generally agrees that the PBF and WPF equipment noted in the comment above will be dismantled and removed from the site for proper disposition. This path forward is a substantial change from the activities that MIRA proposed in the original submittal of the Closure Plan. Note that this change in activities is also driven in part by Section 9(a)(1) of Public Act 23-170, as discussed above, and Section 9(a)(4) which directs the Authority to “wind down the authority’s operations and activities in an orderly and responsible manner, that may include, but is not limited to, the marketing and sale of the authority’s surplus real and personal property.”

Consistent with the legislative mandates and with generally recognized resource conservation strategies, the Authority will first attempt to sell any of the noted equipment that has sufficient value for reuse by a third party. Examples of equipment that might have sufficient value for other (non-waste related) industrial uses include electric motors that powered RRF shredders, conveyors and fans; electromagnets used in the recovery of ferrous metals; and air compressors that were used to supply plant-wide compressed air. It is also possible that equipment such as the hydraulic picking stations, shredders, trommels and packers might have value to another entity that processes waste materials. Any of the equipment that is sold for reuse will be cleaned on-site to the extent required by the purchasing party, and any residues that result from the cleaning will be subject to waste characterization for determination of proper off-site disposal.

The Authority anticipates that much of the remaining equipment on-site (that does not have value for reuse) will offer sufficient value as scrap metal, and that it will therefore be recycled and not disposed of in a landfill. Examples of such equipment may include, but are not necessarily limited to, conveyor frames and rollers, the waterwall tubes of the municipal waste combustors (boilers), all duct work for process air movement at the RRF, and the air pollution control equipment (acid gas scrubbers and baghouses) associated with each boiler. Similar to equipment that is sold, any of the equipment that is recycled will be cleaned on-site to the extent required by the permitted receiving facility; and any residues that result from the cleaning will be subject to waste characterization for determination of proper off-site disposal.

The equipment that does not have value for reuse or recycling will be properly disposed of at a permitted off-site disposal facility. Such equipment subject to disposal might include, but not be limited to, rubberized conveyor belts and insulation installed around the boilers and steam piping. Each individual waste stream will be subject to waste characterization for determination of proper off-site disposal.

Regarding waste characterization, it is possible that waste residues from the RRF processing equipment could present a corrosivity hazard (i.e., high or low pH), and could contain the 8 RCRA toxicity characteristic metals (arsenic, barium,

cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, selenium and silver). Waste characterization will therefore include analytical testing for these constituents. It is important to recognize that the RRF did not process PCB materials, so there is no reason to believe that PCBs would be present in any of the waste or ash residues that remain on the RRF processing equipment.

As noted previously, the Authority will be undertaking a Hazardous Building Materials survey for all on-site buildings, to include but not necessarily be limited to asbestos, lead-based paint and PCBs in building materials. Waste characterization for any building materials that are disposed off-site will therefore include testing of PCBs as a constituent of concern.

In addition to the Hazardous Building Materials survey, the Authority is working to contract a structural engineer to complete a structural assessment of the Power Block Facility, to ensure the safety of all personnel who will ultimately be involved in the dismantling and removal of all PBF equipment. Completion of the structural assessment will be followed by development of an RFP for a contractor or contractors to perform the equipment dismantling and removal work.

- (2) Verification (i.e., confirmation sampling) of the completion and effectiveness of cleaning activities of all non-porous surfaces (e.g., on steel, fiberglass, structural steel, etc.) and porous surfaces (e.g., concrete, wood, etc.) for all interior building surfaces including but not limited to walls, floors, beams, ceiling, etc., as well as any areas in the PBF and associated buildings (e.g., trenches) where ash may have been present. Such sampling shall include an analysis for PCBs and utilize wipe test methods as appropriate;

Response: As was noted previously, the Authority has issued a RFP to *Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study*, which RFP includes a Hazardous Building Materials survey for all on-site buildings, to include but not necessarily be limited to asbestos, lead-based paint and PCBs in building materials. It is anticipated that the Hazardous Building Materials survey will inform future decisions regarding whether to demolish some and/or all on-site structures. The Authority therefore believes that it would be prudent for decisions about building demolitions to be made before commitments are made for the collection of verification/confirmatory samples. The Authority requests that cleaning of building surfaces to a visual clean standard be acceptable until demolition decisions are made. If a decision to demolish a structure is made prior to cleaning, the Authority requests that cleaning be performed to a standard acceptable to the permitted receiving facility. The Authority acknowledges that verification/confirmatory sampling of interior building surfaces after cleaning is merited for any buildings that will ultimately not be demolished.

Regarding constituents of concern for confirmatory sampling, the Authority believes that the waste characterization parameters (i.e., the 8 RCRA toxicity characteristic metals), as well as all chemical parameters listed in the RRF's wastewater discharge permits (NPDES and Pretreatment Permits) would be appropriate analytical parameters for confirmatory sampling. The Authority

reiterates that the RRF did not process PCB materials, so there is no reason to believe that PCBs would be present in any of the waste or ash residues that remain on building surfaces; and that the Hazardous Building Materials survey will identify any PCB-containing building materials that will require removal and proper off-site disposal.

- (3) The decontamination and decommissioning of the neutralization basin and the equalization basin; and

Response: These two basins are associated with the collection, treatment and permitted discharge of wastewaters to the sanitary sewer. Both of these basins remain active following the shutdown of the RRF, and the timing of their ultimate shutdown, decontamination and decommissioning will be driven in large part by the cessation of water flow into them. Water that collects in the coal pond is permitted to flow to and through the neutralization basin for discharge to the sanitary sewer under the General Permit for the Discharge of Wastewaters from Significant Industrial Users (“SIU GP”). Prior to the shutdown of the RRF, the neutralization basin received boiler blowdown and water treatment wastewaters for pH adjustment and discharge to the sanitary sewer under Pretreatment Permit No. SP0000850. The source of water that collects in the equalization basin is primarily water intrusion (stormwater leakage) into the PBF. The equalization basin is permitted for discharge through an oil/water separator to the sanitary sewer under Pretreatment Permit SP0000850.

Similar to the discussion above regarding verification sampling of building surfaces, the Authority believes that it would be prudent for decisions about demolition of the neutralization basin and the equalization basin to be made before commitments are made for the collection of verification/confirmatory samples. The Authority believes that cleaning of these two basins to a visual clean standard should be acceptable until demolition decisions are made. Note that the cleaning of these basins is anticipated to consist of power washing with high pressure water, with the water removed by a vacuum truck for proper off-site treatment and disposal.

The Authority acknowledges that verification/confirmatory sampling of the basin surfaces (chip sampling of concrete, brick and mortar) after cleaning is merited for each basin that is ultimately not demolished. Additionally, if the decision is made to demolish the basins and utilized the concrete, brick and mortar as fill in the basin locations, then verification/confirmatory sampling of the basin surfaces would be merited to demonstrate that these materials would not present a risk of contamination to site soils and groundwater. If the decision is ultimately made to demolish the basins and remove the debris from the site for off-site disposal or recycling, then verification/confirmatory sampling would not be merited, but proper waste disposal characterization would be necessary.

Regarding constituents of concern if verification/confirmatory sampling of the basins’ surfaces is conducted, the Authority believes that the waste characterization parameters (i.e., the 8 RCRA toxicity characteristic metals), as

well as all chemical parameters listed in all of the RRF's wastewater discharge permits (NPDES Permit No. CT0003875, Pretreatment Permit No. SP0000850, and SIU General Permit Registration No. CTSIU0051) would be appropriate analytical parameters for confirmatory sampling.

- (4) The removal of the coal unloading crane and the decontamination/cleaning/confirmatory sampling of the associated coal transfer structures.

Response: The Closure Plan was not developed to address questions regarding the encroachment of site infrastructure, including the coal barge unloading crane, on the Flood Protection System that borders the eastern boundary of the property, because the GHFC and the USACE are the permitting authorities for such encroachments. The Authority therefore believes that evaluation of the coal barge unloading crane as part of the RRF's Closure Plan is not applicable because none of the DEEP-issued permits regulate the crane's operations, and there were no waste management activities associated with the operation of the coal transfer infrastructure.

As noted previously, the *RFP to Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study (RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)* does include a number of work tasks and project deliverables that will address the interactions of site infrastructure with the Flood Protection System. The Study will include not only assessment of the coal barge unloading crane, but also other infrastructure that passes over, under and/or is attached to the flood control dike, such as the referenced coal transfer conveyors, cooling water intake and discharge piping, and piping and conduits that are fastened to the concrete flood control wall.

Since the coal transfer infrastructure at the site was not associated with any permitted waste management activities, the Authority believes that cleaning of the structures to a visual clean standard is sufficient, and that confirmatory sampling of coal transfer surfaces is not required. The Authority acknowledges that any waste materials generated from cleaning of the transfer surfaces would be subject to proper waste disposal characterization. As previously noted, the Hazardous Building Materials survey will inform future decisions regarding whether to demolish the coal transfer infrastructure, as well as how any demolition debris will need to be managed for disposal.

Attachment (1)

**August 8, 2023 Letter to Commissioner Dykes RE: MIRA Dissolution Authority as
Successor to MIRA**

[Nine (9) Pages]



Dissolution Authority

300 Maxim Road • Hartford • Connecticut • 06114 • Telephone (860) 757-7700 • Fax (860) 757-7725

FedEx Tracking No. 7729 8444 7704

August 8, 2023

Commissioner Katie S. Dykes
Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

**Re: Substitute House Bill No. 6664, Public Act No. 23-170
An Act Concerning the Management of Solid Waste and Establishing the MIRA Dissolution Authority**

Dear Commissioner Dykes:

On June 29, 2023 Governor Lamont signed Public Act 23-170, which establishes the MIRA Dissolution Authority as the successor authority to the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (“MIRA”). Effective with the passage of the referenced legislation, the MIRA Dissolution Authority has succeeded MIRA.

(Note: Section 8(a) of the legislation establishes the MIRA Dissolution Authority as the successor to MIRA. A conforming, technical change will be made by the Legislative Commissioners’ Office (“LCO”) when the statutes are next published to delete “Connecticut Waste Authority” in Section 10(c)(1) of the legislation and insert “MIRA Dissolution Authority” in its place. The LCO is authorized by Section 8(c) of the legislation to make such conforming, technical changes.)

As part of the MIRA Dissolution Authority’s succession from MIRA, **the Permittee name on all effective environmental permits that were issued to MIRA by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“DEEP”) will need to be updated.** The MIRA Dissolution Authority believes that this request is administrative in nature because the MIRA Dissolution Authority is tasked by the legislation, in part, to continue the solid waste management services that were provided by MIRA (and for which associated activities were previously permitted by DEEP), and there are no facility modifications or alterations being implemented as part of the succession from MIRA to the MIRA Dissolution Authority.

Tables 1a through 1g that follow contain summaries, by facility, of currently-effective individual permits and general permits that have been issued in MIRA’s name. The MIRA Dissolution Authority believes that these tables constitute the full list of environmental permits that require a change in the named Permittee.

Please contact Christopher Shepard of the MIRA Dissolution Authority at 860-757-7706 or cshepard@ctmira.org if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Mark T. Daley
President & CFO

Attachments (Tables 1a – 1g)

C: Audra Dickson, DEEP
Gabrielle Frigon, DEEP
Raymond Frigon, DEEP

Jaimeson Sinclair, DEEP
File: MIRA Dissolution Authority Environmental File

Table 1a – Active Permits

**CSWS Resource Recovery Facility
Reserve Road, Gate 20
and
300 Maxim Road
Hartford, CT 06114**

Solid Waste Permit No. 064-1WPM, Permit to Construct and Operate

- Permit (04/04/1985)
- Modification No. 0640352-M/PC for Changes in the WPF (09/10/1999)
- Minor Amendment No. 064-1WPM-MA/PC to Implement Minor Physical and Operational Changes (12/20/1999)

Solid Waste Permit No. 06401260-PO, Permit to Operate

- Permit (05/16/2018)

NDDB – New Determination Number: 202300351 (Subject: MIRA RRF Closure Plan)

- Determination Issued 01/17/2023; Expires 01/17/2025

Air New Source Review Permit-to-Operate Nos. 075-0044, 075-0045, and 075-0046

- Application for License Revocation No. 202304303
- 075-0044 Issued 08/27/1993, last modified 05/28/2018
- 075-0045 Issued 08/27/1993, last modified 04/25/2007
- 075-0046 Issued 08/27/1993, last modified 04/25/2007

Air Title V Operating Permit No. 075-0245-TV

- Application for License Revocation No. 202304303
- Permit Issue Date 08/22/2018

Air Permit Nos. 075-0047 and 075-0052, Permits to Construct WPF Processing Lines

- Permits (01/28/86)

Pretreatment Permit No. SP0000850

- Permit (04/27/2011)
- Application to Renew No. 201508420
- Approval of Treatment System Modifications dated 01/28/2016
- Approval of Treatment System Modifications dated 02/07/2017

NPDES Permit No. CT0003875

- Permit (11/17/2004)
- Minor Permit Modification (12/22/2008)
- Application to Renew No. 200900982

**General Permit for Discharge of Wastewaters from Significant Industrial Users
Permit No. CTSIU0051**

- Approval of Registration Issued 07/25/2023

(NOTE: This SIU General Permit Approval was already issued in the name of the MIRA Dissolution Authority as the Permittee. It has been included here for completeness in the summary list of currently-active permits.)

General Permit to Discharge Stormwater Certificate No. GSI000118

- Registration Status (Effective 10/01/2011 & Revised 06/01/2012)

**Water Diversion Registration Nos. 4000-091-PWR-RI, 4000-092-PWR-RI and
4000-093-PWR-RI**

- Transfer of Registrations to CRRA (02/20/2001)
- Amended Registrations (11/21/1984)

Permit to Place a Marker No. 064/0105-384

- Permit to Place a Marker for a Danger Area on the Connecticut River, Hartford (05/08/2001)

Table 1b – Active Permits

**South Meadow Station (Jet Turbine Facility)
Reserve Road, Gate 20
Hartford, CT 06114**

Air Title V Operating Permit No. 075-0252-TV

- Application for License Revocation No. 202304718
- Permit Issue Date 04/26/2018
- Application to Renew No. 202205432

Air Registration Certificate Nos. 075-0260, 0261, 0262, 0263, 0264, 0265, 0266, 0267

- Application for License Revocation No. 202304718
- Certificates (12/05/1973); Transferred to CRRA (02/14/2001); Modification (08/08/2012)

Trading Agreement and Order (TA&O) No. 8369

- TA&O (03/28/2018)

Table 1c – Active Permits
Ellington Transfer Station
217 Sadds Mill Road (Route 140)
Ellington, CT

Solid Waste Permit No. SW-048-1-TS, Permit to Construct

- Permit (09/28/1989)

Solid Waste Permit No. 04801040/PO, Permit to Operate

- Permit (09/26/2011)
- CT DEEP Approval Letter for suspension of regular operation (03/13/2013)
- Application to Renew No. 202107557

Table 1d – Active Permits

**Essex Transfer Station
Route 154
Essex, CT**

Municipal Transfer Station General Permit Registration Approval

- Approval of Registration with variance No. 05001125-MTSGP (06/25/2013)

Solid Waste Permit No. SW-050-2-C, Permit to Construct

- Permit (04/13/1987)
- Minor Permit Amendment for the Recyclables Transfer Area (07/29/1994)

Water Diversion Permit No. DIV-86-51

- Permit (04/30/1987)

Stormwater Discharge Certificate No. GSI000595

- Registration Status (Effective 10/01/2011)

Table 1e – Active Permits
Torrington Transfer Station
Vista Drive (f.k.a. Old Dump Road)
Torrington, CT

Municipal Transfer Station General Permit Registration Approval

- Approval of Registration with variance No. 14301124-MTSGP (06/25/2013)

Solid Waste Permit No. SW-143-4-T, Permit to Construct

- Permit (12/30/1987)

Stormwater Discharge Certificate No. GSI000521

- Registration Status (Effective 10/01/2011)

Table 1f – Active Permits

**Watertown Transfer Station
Echo Lake Road
Watertown, CT**

Municipal Transfer Station General Permit Registration Approval

- Approval of Registration with variance No. 15301123-MTSGP (06/25/2013)

Solid Waste Permit No. SW1530112, Permit to Construct

- Permit (12/27/1989)
- Minor Permit Amendment for the Addition of a Recycling Center (12/20/1991)
- Modification to Permit to Include Receipt of Waste from Waterbury (09/27/1994)

Stormwater Discharge Certificate No. GSI000522

- Registration Status (effective 10/01/2011)

Table 1g – Active Permits

**CSWS Regional Recycling Center
211 Murphy Road
Hartford, CT 06114**

Solid Waste Permit No. 06401153-PCO, Permit to Construct & Operate

- Permit (12/01/2014)
- Paragraph A.6 Approval of Operational Upgrades (09/03/2020)

Solid Waste Permit No. SW-0640145, Permit to Construct

- Permit (08/02/1991)

Stormwater Discharge Certificate No. GSI000814

- Registration Status (Effective 10/01/2011)

Attachment (2)

*Request for Proposals (RFP) to Conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment
Considerations Study (RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)*

[Thirty-Four (34) Pages]

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
To Conduct
THE SOUTH MEADOWS REDEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATIONS STUDY

**(SITE OF THE SHUTTERED MIRA RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY AND
JET TURBINE FACILITY)**

(RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)

MIRA Dissolution Authority
300 Maxim Road
Hartford, Connecticut 06114



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Request for Proposals:
 - A. Background
 - B. Scope of Work for the Study
 - 1. Existing Environmental Conditions
 - 2. Conceptual Site Considerations
 - 3. Potential Future Uses
 - 4. Environmental Needs and Knowledge Necessary for Potential Future Uses
 - 5. Study Conduct and Deliverables
 - C. RFP Projected Timeline
 - D. Notice of Interest
 - E. Availability of RFP
 - F. Mandatory Site Tour
 - G. Proposal Contents
 - H. Proposal Submittal Procedures
 - I. Proposal Opening
 - J. Proposal Open and Subject to Acceptance
 - K. Proposal Evaluation
 - L. Contract Award
- II. Notifications, Acknowledgements and Certifications
 - A. Nondiscrimination
 - B. Connecticut Campaign Contribution And Solicitation Limitations
 - C. Contractor's Representation concerning Consulting Agreements
 - D. Contractor's Representation Concerning Gifts
 - E. MIRA President's Representation Concerning Gifts
 - F. Contractor's Representation Regarding Iran Energy Investment
- III. Additional Terms and Conditions:
 - A. Definitions
 - B. Binding Effect
 - C. Authority Reserved Rights
 - D. Communications With Authority Staff and Board
 - E. Addenda And Interpretations
 - F. Modification or Withdrawal of A Proposal
 - G. Proposal Preparation and Other Costs
 - H. Proposer's Qualifications

IV. Attachments and Forms

- A. South Meadows Site General Layout Plan
- B. Table of Existing Environmental Documentation
- C. Closure Plan and Correspondence
- D. Proposed Agreement
- E. Proposal Form
- F. Background Questionnaire
- G. Questionnaire Concerning Affirmative Action, Small Business Contractors And Occupational Health And Safety

I. Request for Proposals:

A. Background

The MIRA Dissolution Authority (“the Authority”) was created by an act of the State of Connecticut Legislature – Public Act 23-170, effective July 1, 2023. As a result of this legislation, the Authority replaced the existing Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority (MIRA). It assumed MIRA’s statutory duties and responsibilities, control over all of MIRA’s assets, authorities and capabilities, and continues to operate MIRA’s ongoing waste transfer operations until acceptable alternatives become available. Additionally, it has been charged with supplementary duties and responsibilities related to MIRA’s dissolution.

The Authority is the owner of an approximate 80 acre site encompassing the now shuttered MIRA Resource Recovery Facility and Jet Turbine Facility located in the South Meadows section of Hartford, CT and more specifically identified as 300 Maxim Road and 100 Reserve Road in Hartford (the “South Meadows Site” or “Site”). A general layout of the South Meadows Site is provided in Attachment A.

The MIRA Resource Recovery Facility was shut down for numerous reasons including its age, serviceability and reliability. The Resource Recovery Facility stopped receiving, processing and combusting waste in July 2022. Since then, the facility has been broom cleaned, equipment oils, fuels and lubricants have been properly removed, explosive blast cleaning of the boilers has been performed and bag house filter bags have been removed. The Jet Turbine Facility (also located at the Site) was then shut down effective May 31, 2023. The Authority’s corporate offices are presently located at the Site.

The Authority’s charge includes the responsibility to wind down MIRA’s operations and activities in an orderly manner. A key component of this charge involves studying the South Meadows Site with an eye to future redevelopment and use. An additional facet of the Authority’s charge and duties includes the marketing and sale of its surplus property and facilities. Upon conclusion of this dissolution process (currently anticipated as early as July 1, 2025, but not later than July 1, 2026) any remaining rights, real or personal property of the Authority will pass to and vest in the State of Connecticut - including, but not limited to, the South Meadows Site. Additional information on the Authority’s creation and the MIRA dissolution process can be found at <https://www.ctmira.org/>.

Accordingly, the Authority seeks proposals from lead consultant and environmental engineers, including sub consultants if any are required, to conduct a study that will result in a report (known herein as the “Report of the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study”). The purpose of the Report is to identify the immediate environmental needs and knowledge necessary for potential future redevelopment of the South Meadows Site.

B. Scope of Work for the Study

The successful Lead Proposer and their team of Sub Consultants (“Proposer”) shall be expected to undertake all work necessary to answer the Authority’s charge to identify both the immediate environmental needs and information necessary for potential future redevelopment of the South Meadows Site. The Authority recognizes that the scope of such environmental needs and other necessary information may vary dependent on the nature of the redevelopment to occur. Accordingly, key components of the *Report of the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study* are the documentation of existing environmental conditions, conceptual site considerations and the immediate environmental needs and knowledge associated with potential future use of the South Meadows Site for:

- Industrial / Commercial Activities as defined in the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP) Remediation Standard Regulations;
- Residential Activities as defined in the CT DEEP Remediation Standard Regulations;
- Currently-Permitted Activities; and
- A combination of such activities on separate partitions of the Site.

Collectively, these items are referred to as “Potential Future Uses”

1 - Existing Environmental Conditions

The selected Proposer shall review and compile existing background environmental information and analyses concerning the Site as described below:

The South Meadows Site is an “Establishment” under Connecticut’s “Transfer Act” stemming from its original development and operation as a coal fired electric plant in the 1920s. It was converted to petroleum fuels by the 1940s and then to its Resource Recovery operation in the early 1980s. In 2001, the site was purchased by the then “Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority” triggering the requirement to investigate and remediate prior environmental contamination. There were 44 “areas of concern” identified through thousands of soil samples taken, and the Site went through 12 years of active remediation work including removal of 60,000 tons of impacted soil, pumping and treatment of ground water, installation of engineered controls, imposition of deed restrictions and environmental land use restrictions.

A Verification Report (indicating that the required remediation of the Site was complete) was initially submitted to CT DEEP on June 26, 2018. However, additional contaminants were discovered in January 2019 causing rejection of the Verification Report, and requiring additional remediation. This necessary additional remediation activity is presently underway. The work is expected to be completed in early 2024 at which time the Verification Report will be updated and resubmitted. An extensive volume of information is publicly available as a result of these efforts including but not limited to the environmental site assessments, remediation activities and reports, Environmental Land Use Restrictions (ELURs) and Verification Report (listed on Attachment B).

In addition to the steps already taken to shut down the Resource Recovery Facility, a formal “Closure Plan” is required by regulation to be submitted to CT DEEP for its approval prior to implementation. MIRA submitted its formal Closure Plan to CT DEEP in May 2022. The major

elements of this work primarily involves additional removal of commercial chemical products, draining and sealing of tanks and vessels, more extensive cleaning of equipment and building surfaces and storm water drainage systems, sealing floor drains, cleaning the coal pond, cleaning and dismantling the duct work that joins the waste processing and power block components of the facility, sealing the cooling and service water intakes and discharges and removing lamps, batteries and smoke detectors. The cost to perform this work is estimated and funded at \$3.3 million.

Comments on the Closure Plan were received from the CT DEEP on October 14, 2022, which MIRA responded to on January 5, 2023. As part of its reply, MIRA agreed to additional work involving non accessible storm drain and floor drain systems, removal of coal, removal of caulking containing PCBs from the former NU Admin Building, coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers, Greater Hartford Flood Commission, City of Hartford and CT DEEP, and oversight by an independent engineer. Approval of the revised Closure Plan is pending. Copies of the Closure Plan and subsequent correspondences are included as Attachment C.

The Authority engaged TRC Environmental Corporation over an extended period as the Certifying Party for the Site remediation under Connecticut's Transfer Act (TRC executed a Form III for the Site under Connecticut's Transfer Act as the Certifying Party). TRC's role excludes the redevelopment of the Site and is limited to pre-existing (prior to December 2000) environmental conditions and other exclusions, and remediation to commercial/industrial standards based on the then-current site use and configuration of structures. The remediation that has been performed to date includes a number of environmental use restrictions (EURs) which will be included in the review of Existing Environmental Conditions. The Authority separately engaged TRC for the purpose of preparing the Closure Plan for the now shuttered MIRA Resource Recovery Facility. Additionally, the Authority continues to retain TRC under an "On Call" contract and will make copies of its publicly-available work products readily available to the successful Proposer. Some documents are available in hard-copy form only, while others are available in electronic (PDF) form. TRC is not prohibited from proposing as a Proposer or Sub Consultant under this RFP. During the term of the RFP process, Proposers are otherwise prohibited from contacting TRC with any questions regarding this RFP or Site environmental conditions. Proposers should refer to Attachment B for publicly available environmental information.

For this initial task, the selected Proposer shall review and compile existing information and analyses available through the Verification Report, Closure Plan and other sources as necessary in order to document environmental remediation work completed and planned and how such work impacts upon the immediate environmental needs and knowledge necessary for future redevelopment of Potential Future Uses. The selected Proposer will further assess the impact of an unapproved Verification Report and / or unapproved Closure Plan upon the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study (if applicable).

2 - Conceptual Site Considerations

The selected Proposer shall be expected to review and document existing conditions on the Site that may also impact Potential Future Uses and assist in defining portions of the Site suitable for such uses, details of which shall be discussed in the Study. The scope of this portion of the undertaking is expected to include:

- A review and documentation of existing Site infrastructure including Site boundaries, buildings, utilities and other structures historically supporting the Site’s energy generation and waste management uses.
- A survey of all buildings for “Hazardous Building Materials” (HBMs – including but not limited to asbestos, lead-based paint, PCBs) in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and Local rules, regulations, and guidance, which shall include:
 - An inspection of all buildings to inventory potential HBMs (types, locations, estimated quantities)
 - A sampling of potential HBMs to confirm status
 - An estimate of the costs to abate all HBMs for building renovation or demolition
 - An estimate of the costs to demolish all buildings following HBM abatement
- A review and documentation of the roles and responsibilities of the Army Corps of Engineers, Greater Hartford Flood Commission and Property Owner in the ongoing inspection, maintenance and operation of the Site’s Flood Protection System. Such a review shall include: dike penetrations being dealt with in the Closure Plan, other legacy penetrations associated with prior Site uses, and other Site infrastructure encroachments on the Flood Protection System. In this context, the selected Proposer will specifically address the following:
 - A review of a letter dated May 10, 2022, including its associated Appendices A through D, from the Greater Hartford Flood Commission (GHFC) to the Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority RE: Hartford Flood Protection System - Emergency Action Planning.
 - The production of an Operation, Inspection and Maintenance Plan for existing Flood Protection System penetrations and encroachments, outlining obligations of the Property Owner and estimated costs to meet those obligations prior to proper penetration/encroachment abandonment/removal. This Plan shall include but not be limited to a detailed inventory of penetrations/encroachments, including structures attached to, or in close proximity to Flood Protection System including river-side structures, land side structures, and structures above Flood Protection; as well as a detailed plan for inspection and maintenance, and estimated recurring costs to comply with the Plan.
 - Developing an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) for the current and future Property Owner in consultation with the GHFC and the Authority. The EPP shall outline the responsibilities for operation and emergency preparedness planning for the portions of the Site infrastructure that directly impact the Flood Protection System. The EPP shall be provided to the GHFC for incorporation into the GHFC’s Emergency Action Plan.
 - The production of a report on proper abandonment/removal requirements (per GHFC, US Army Corps of Engineers, and CT DEEP Dam Safety) for each penetration/encroachment of the Flood Protection System. This report shall include but may not be limited to: types of permits required and estimated cost of permitting for such work, a description of work required to achieve proper

abandonment/removal of each penetration/encroachment, as well as an estimate of costs to properly abandon/remove each penetration/encroachment.

- Review and documentation of additional Site considerations including:
 - Eversource easements and neighboring infrastructure
 - Flood control system
 - Other easements
 - Zoning
 - Proximity to Brainard Airport
 - Proximity to the Connecticut River
 - Wetlands and Site drainage considerations
 - The potential for mixed uses on various portions of the Site

3 - Potential Future Uses

The selected Proposer shall document and present the Existing Environmental Conditions and Conceptual Site Considerations, including the requirements posed by each, to the Authority's South Meadows Transition Committee. Such Potential Future Uses are to be defined in narrative form only to the level of detail necessary to answer the Authority's charge to identify the immediate environmental needs and knowledge necessary for future redevelopment of the South Meadows Site. **THE AUTHORITY IS NOT SEEKING A RECOMMENDED REDEVELOPMENT OPTION, LAYOUT PLAN OR DRAWING FOR THE SOUTH MEADOWS SITE AS A COMPONENT OF THIS STUDY.**

4 – Environmental Needs and Knowledge Necessary for Potential Future Uses.

The Study shall include an examination and analysis of the following:

- The specific remediation standards to be met for each Potential Future Use.
- Permitting and remediation activities required to prepare the Site for each Potential Future Use shall be fully documented and assessed, including:
 - Description of additional Site investigation and remediation work associated with each Potential Future Use;
 - Federal, state, local and all other applicable permits, approvals, statutes and regulations applicable to the Site investigation and remediation work; and
 - Timelines and cost for all permitting, investigation and remediation activities.
- The examination of additional Site work shall include, but need not be limited to, demolition of structures, and other environmental investigation to evaluate potential data gaps resulting from potential changes in Site use, as further described below:
- For Industrial/Commercial Activities (as are defined in the CT-DEEP's Remediation Standard Regulations to mean any activity related to the commercial production, distribution, manufacture or sale of goods, services, or any other activity which is not a residential

activity) the Study shall address and assess the future disposition of all Site infrastructure including the following.

- Maintaining some or all structures
 - Removing some or all structures
 - Utilizing Environmental Use Restrictions (EURs)
 - Remediation to Release EURs
 - Identifying environmental knowledge data gaps resulting from removing permanent structures and /or engineered controls, including, but not limited to:
 - lack of environmental sampling data beneath structural foundations
 - evaluation of soil that is currently “environmentally-isolated” in comparison to pollutant mobility criteria from the Remediation Standard Regulations
 - Preparing a draft plan with cost estimates to address identified environmental knowledge data gaps
 - Evaluating the advantages or disadvantages of dedicating a portion or portion(s) of the Site to Industrial / Commercial Activities
- For Residential Activities (as are defined in the CT-DEEP’s Remediation Standard Regulations to mean a place intended for people to live, including, but not limited to, a residence, dwelling, house, apartment, condominium, nursing home, or dormitory; a pre-school, primary school, secondary school, day care center, playground, or outdoor recreational area; or a hospital, solely for the purposes of compliance with volatilization criteria) the Study shall address and assess the future disposition of all Site infrastructure including the following.
 - Maintaining some or all structures
 - Removing some or all structures
 - Utilizing Environmental Use Restrictions (EURs)
 - Remediation to Release all EURs
 - Identifying any environmental knowledge data gaps resulting from changing the Site’s use and applicable remediation standards from Industrial/Commercial Activities to Residential Activities, including, but not limited to:
 - degree and extent of pollutant concentrations in soil to meet Residential standards from the Remediation Standard Regulations
 - lack of environmental sampling data beneath structural foundations
 - evaluation of soil that is currently “environmentally-isolated” in comparison to pollutant mobility criteria from the Remediation Standard Regulations
 - Preparing a draft plan with cost estimates to address identified environmental knowledge data gaps
 - Evaluating the advantages or disadvantages of dedicating a portion or portion(s) of the Site to Residential Activities
 - Currently-Permitted Use (waste management and/or recycling facility) the Study shall address and assess the future disposition of all Site infrastructure including the following.
 - Maintaining some or all structures

- Removing some or all structures
- Identifying any environmental knowledge data gaps resulting from removing permanent structures and /or engineered controls
- Preparing a draft plan with cost estimates to address identified environmental knowledge data gaps
- Evaluating the advantages or disadvantages of dedicating a portion or portion(s) of the Site to waste management and/or recycling facility development

5. Study Conduct & Deliverables

The selected Proposer shall be expected to perform and manage the work of both the Proposer and any of its proposed Sub Consultants, coordinating between the Authority and various stakeholders including the CT DEEP, the City of Hartford, the Greater Hartford Flood Commission, Eversource, and the Capital Region Development Authority (CRDA). Key project management activities will include:

- Implementing a community outreach strategy to include the conduct of public meetings informing the community on the goals and progress of the study. These meetings shall also allow for public comment with respect to the goals, progress and scope of this Study.
- Maintaining a detailed work plan with specific dates for interim milestones
- Updating the Authority regularly on project progress and completion of interim milestones
- Presenting interim milestone reports to the Authority’s South Meadows Transition Committee.
- Presenting final reports and findings to the Authority as well as City and State officials.

In addition to the above, deliverables for this project shall consist of the following reporting requirements:

Milestone Reports:

The selected Proposer shall develop milestone reports for submission to the Authority, and shall provide an in person presentation of each milestone report at the then next regularly-scheduled meeting after that milestone’s due date, of the Authority’s South Meadows Transition Committee. The selected Proposer shall then consider feedback from the Authority, and utilizing that feedback, finalize each milestone report within 30 days after its initial presentation to the South Meadows Transition Committee.

The anticipated milestone reports include the following:

- A report documenting Existing Environmental Conditions and Conceptual Site Considerations used in further defining Potential Future Uses;
- A report of the “Hazardous Building Materials” (HBMs) survey of all on-site buildings;
- An Operation, Inspection and Maintenance Plan for the existing penetrations of and encroachments by Site infrastructure on the Flood Protection System;

- An Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) that outlines the Property Owner's responsibilities for operation and emergency preparedness planning for the portions of the Site infrastructure directly impacting the Flood Protection System;
- A report assessing the requirements for proper removal and/or abandonment of each Flood Protection System penetration and encroachment by Site infrastructure; and
- A report of the Potential Future Uses to be assessed.

The schedule for submission of the milestone reports summarized above shall be based, in part, on the Study Schedule submitted by the selected Proposer in its response to this RFP. The submission of the milestone reports is not required to follow the order listed above, and the selected Proposer may submit multiple milestone reports to the Authority simultaneously.

Final Report of the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study – Preparation and Publication:

The final deliverable under this Scope of Work shall be the Report of the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study, which Report is expected (as delineated in detail above) to document existing environmental conditions, conceptual site considerations, Potential Future Uses, and the immediate environmental needs and knowledge associated with those uses. It is anticipated that the milestone reports shall inform this Report and be included as appendices to the Report.

The selected Proposer shall submit an initial draft of the Report to the Authority, and shall also provide a subsequent in person presentation of the initial draft Report at the then next regularly-scheduled meeting of the Authority's full Board of Directors. The selected Proposer shall then consider feedback from the Authority, and utilizing that feedback, finalize the Report within 30 days after the presentation of the draft Report to the full Board of Directors. This final Report shall be in a format suitable for submission to the State Legislature, other stakeholders, and for posting on the Authority's web-site for public information purposes. The selected Proposer shall provide an in person presentation of this final Report at a meeting of the full Board of Directors.

C. RFP Projected Timeline

The following is the projected timeline for the RFP process:

ITEM	DATE
RFP Documents Available	Thursday, January 18, 2024
Mandatory site tour	Wednesday, February 7, 2024
Deadline for proposers to submit Written Questions	3:00 p.m., Wednesday, February 21, 2024
Authority Response to submitted Questions	Wednesday, February 28, 2024
Proposals Due at The Authority	3:00 p.m., Monday, March 11, 2024
Proposal evaluation including clarifications, interviews and negotiations	Between March 11 and April 16, the Authority may contact Proposer to clarify information in proposal or participate in meeting to discuss their proposal.
Approval by MIRA Dissolution Authority Board of Directors	Expected at meeting of Board of Directors on April 16, 2024

D. Notice of Interest

Proposers should express their interest in this RFP by providing their contact information in writing to the Authority as soon as possible following publication of this RFP. This may be done by writing or e-mailing the Authority’s Supply Chain Manager as follows:

**Mr. Roger Guzowski
Supply Chain Manager
MIRA Dissolution Authority
Phone (860) 757-7703
rguzowski@ctmira.org
300 Maxim Road
Hartford, CT 06114**

The required contact information includes Proposer’s full legal name and address and the name, title, telephone number and e-mail address of the Proposer’s contact person. While not mandatory, the Authority will use potential Proposer’s contact information to provide direct

notice of availability, and copies where applicable, of addenda and other information related to this RFP.

E. Availability of RFP

Complete sets of this RFP and all Attachments may be obtained on the World Wide Web at <http://www.ctmira.org> on the “Current Solicitations” page, under the “Business Links” section of the website. The RFP and Attachments can be accessed by selecting the link titled: RFP: “TO CONDUCT THE SOUTH MEADOWS REDEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS STUDY”.

The RFP and all Attachments and forms are in PDF format. Applicable forms are also available for downloading in Microsoft Word format for ease of completion at the same place on the Authority’s web site where the PDF of the RFP is located. The Authority encourages firms to make use of the downloaded Word forms.

The RFP, Attachments and forms are also available Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Authority’s offices, 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut 06114. Anyone intending to pick up the documents at the Authority’s offices must contact Roger Guzowski at (860) 757-7703 at least 24 hours in advance. There is a charge of \$30.00 for anyone picking up the documents at the Authority’s office. Payment should be made by check payable to “MIRA Dissolution Authority.”

F. Mandatory Site Tour

The Authority has scheduled two tours of the South Meadows site for February 7, 2024 (one beginning at 8:00AM and another beginning at 12:00 Noon). The Authority believes attendance at a Site tour is essential to the development of complete and accurate Proposals. The Authority has therefore reserved the right to reject Proposals from Proposers who were not represented at a Site tour. Authority representatives will anecdotally describe aspects of the Site during tour and will formally follow up with answers to written questions submitted by the deadline indicated in the RFP Projected Timeline. Additional information concerning the Site tour will be provided to all Proposers expressing interest in this RFP approximately forty-eight hours prior to the tour by Addenda issued pursuant to Section III.E of this RFP.

The Authority reserves the right to schedule additional times for a Site tour prior to the deadline for written questions at its discretion if the Authority considers such additional tours to be in its best interests. Such additional Site tours may include, but are not limited to, further entry into Site buildings for purposes of better quantifying the survey of all buildings for Hazardous Building Materials.

G. Proposal Contents

All Proposals shall be structured to include the following (in the order presented):

1. Title page, including the title of this RFP, the name of the Lead Proposer, all proposed Sub Consultants and the date the proposal is submitted;

2. Cover letter, signed by a person authorized to execute the Proposal and Agreement on behalf of the Lead Proposer, which includes the following:

- The name of the Lead Proposer;
- The legal structure of the Lead Proposer (e.g., corporation, joint venture, etc.);
- Summary nature of the proposal specifically identifying the Lead Proposer and all proposed Sub Consultants;
- Summary of Lead Proposer, Sub Consultant and key staff background and experience in identifying environmental requirements for Potential Future Uses as contemplated herein as well as undertaking all associated alternatives analysis and study conduct activities;
- Summarize key aspects of the proposal including Project Approach, Study Schedule and Financial Proposal
- A clear statement indicating that the proposal constitutes a firm and binding offer by the Lead Proposer to the Authority considering the terms and conditions outlined in the RFP;
- The Lead Proposer's promise, if any, to set aside a portion of the contract for legitimate minority business enterprises;
- The cover letter should not exceed three pages.

3. Table of Contents for the proposal;

4. Background and Experience Narrative including the following:

- General description of the Lead Proposer and all Sub Consultants including the number of years in the business of, and examples of, identifying the environmental needs and knowledge required for a redevelopment of the nature described herein, including assessing existing environmental conditions, conceptual site considerations, formulating Potential Future Use alternatives and managing the conduct of such a study as described in its proposal and specifically including:
 - Proposer's and parent company (if any) legal name, state and year in which organized, and structure (corporation, partnership, joint venture, other);
 - Central / headquarters office address;
 - Address of local office serving the Authority;
 - Summary of additional office locations (if any);
 - Number of employees of Proposer and parent company (if any).
 - Include written confirmation of participation in the proposal and project from all proposed Sub Consultants.
- For up to five projects similar to its proposal, identify the following:

- Project identification including study name, location and project owner and/or governing body;
 - Description of project site including size, infrastructure, historical uses and relevance to the South Meadows Site;
 - Nature of the services provided and relevance to the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study;
 - Participation in the project by the Lead Proposer and/or Sub Consultants as applicable;
 - Summary type of contract (hourly, lump sum etc.) and length of term;
 - Summary project costs including original estimate, final actual cost and narrative of major variances; and
 - Reference name, title, address, e-mail and phone contact information.
- Identify and provide resumes and professional licensing of key personnel to be assigned to this project including that of the Lead Proposer and all Sub Consultants. Applicable professional licenses issued by the State of Connecticut include Licensed Environmental Professional (LEP); Professional Engineer (PE); Asbestos Inspector; Asbestos Management Planner; Asbestos Project Designer; Lead Inspector; Lead Inspector-Risk Assessor; and Lead Planner-Project Designer.

5. Project Approach

Clearly identify the role of the Lead Proposer and each proposed Sub Consultant in the conduct of the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study. Further specify the approach to completing each study task in a timely and efficient manner while garnering stakeholder support of the Study process and work products. Identify any proposed deviations from the scope of work envisioned herein including the rationale for any deviation and how such deviation benefits the Authority's objectives in conducting the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study

6. Study Schedule

Develop a Study Schedule depicting all key milestones and their associated reports within the conduct of each study task including the Existing Environmental Conditions, Conceptual Site Considerations, Potential Future Uses and Environmental Needs and Knowledge Necessary for Each Potential Future Use. The Authority considers the Hazardous Buildings Materials Survey as a key deliverable and desires that it be conducted and completed as early in the study process as possible. Proposers should further state the underlying rationale for the schedule proposed. As noted in Section I (A) of this RFP, the MIRA dissolution process is currently anticipated to conclude as early as July 1, 2025 but not later

than July 1, 2026. Accordingly, the Authority views completion and consideration of the Study during the State of Connecticut's 2025 legislative session as advantageous provided that such a target for completion in no way compromises the Study effort. The 2025 legislative session begins January 8, 2025, the Report could practically be considered through March 2025 and the session concludes June 4, 2025.

7. Financial Proposal

Provide all information necessary for the Authority to reach informed conclusions on the total cost to undertake the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study as contemplated in this RFP including, but not limited to, the following:

- Proposed hourly billing rates for the Lead Proposer and each proposed Sub Consultant broken down into professional and staff level position classifications to be assigned to the Study.
- Proposed estimated hours necessary to complete the Existing Environmental Conditions, Conceptual Site Considerations, Potential Future Uses, Environmental Needs and Knowledge Necessary for Each Potential Future Use and Study Conduct.
- Total proposed cost of each task in the Scope of Work.
- A separately stated fixed fee for the Hazardous Buildings Materials survey component of the Conceptual Site Considerations including the hours and billing rates noted above together with estimated and proposed quantities of sampling, testing and analytical services, associated unit pricing and total costs.
- It is anticipated that the Agreement resulting from this RFP will incorporate hourly billing rates and monthly invoicing by task subject to a "not to exceed" value for completion of each task with the exception of the Hazardous Buildings Materials (HBM) survey. A fixed fee for the HBM survey subject to adjustment based on agreed actual quantities of sampling, testing and analytical services is anticipated.
- Modifications to the Financial Proposal that would result from the Authority's acceptance of any deviations from the scope of work that may have been specified in the Proposer's Project Approach.

8. Business Exceptions

Identify any exceptions, additions or deletions to the provisions of the proposed Agreement included as Attachment D. In each instance, identify the applicable agreement section, schedule or attachment number and specific language of concern. State the reason for concern and proposed modification to resolve the concern. Specify why the proposed modification is in the Authority's best interest and assists in accomplishing the objectives of this RFP.

9. Complete and attach the Proposal Form attached hereto as Attachment E;

10. The completed Background Questionnaire attached hereto as Attachment F for Proposer and each proposed Sub Consultant (subscribed and sworn before a Notary Public or Commissioner of the Superior Court);
11. The completed Questionnaire Concerning Affirmative Action, Small Business Contractors And Occupational Health And Safety attached hereto as Attachment G with the proposer's most recent EEO-1 data attached if the proposer wishes such data to be considered in the evaluation of its proposal;
12. A copy of the Proposer's and each proposed Sub Consultant's up-to-date certificate of insurance showing all current insurance coverage.

Proposers should not include copies of text from this RFP in their proposals. Proposers should not include information that is not directly related to the subject matter of this solicitation.

H. Proposal Submittal Procedures

Sealed proposals shall be submitted as per the schedule set forth in Section I.B of this RFP to the offices of the MIRA Dissolution Authority, 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut 06114, Attn: Roger Guzowski. The Authority reserves the right to reject any proposals received after the time and date set forth above.

Each Proposer must submit one (1) original and two (2) hard copies, and one electronic copy, of its proposal in a sealed envelope that shall be clearly marked "PROPOSAL TO CONDUCT THE SOUTH MEADOWS REDEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS STUDY" The original proposal shall be stamped or otherwise marked as such.

Unless otherwise identified by Proposer pursuant to Section I.F.8 hereof, the terms and conditions of the Agreement are non-negotiable. The Authority will review and consider any Business Exceptions taken by Proposer as part of its proposal evaluations.

I. Proposal Opening

All proposals will be opened at the Authority's convenience on or after the proposal due date. The Authority reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the proposals, or any part(s) thereof, and/or to waive any formality or informalities in any proposal or this RFP process.

J. Proposal Open and Subject to Acceptance

This RFP does not constitute an offer to any Proposer and neither this RFP nor any subsequent discussions shall give rise to any commitment on the part of the Authority to enter into the Agreement or confer any rights on any proposer unless and until the Agreement is fully executed by the necessary parties. The Agreement, once executed, will represent the entire agreement between the proposer and the Authority and will supersede all prior negotiations, representations

or agreements, alleged or made, between the parties. The Authority shall assume no liability for costs incurred by the proposer or for payment of services under the terms of the Agreement until the successful proposer is notified that the contract has been accepted and approved by the Authority's Board of Directors and executed by its duly authorized agent. All proposals shall remain open and subject to acceptance by the Authority for ninety (90) days after the deadline for proposal submission

K. Proposal Evaluation

The award of an Agreement to conduct the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study will be made, if at all, to the Proposer whose evaluation by the Authority results in the Authority determining that such award is in the best interests of the Authority. However, the selection of a Proposer and the award of such Agreement, while anticipated, are not guaranteed.

The Authority is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action employer and does not discriminate in its hiring, employment, contracting, or business practices. The Authority is committed to complying with the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 (ADA) and does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to, access to, or operation of its programs, services, or activities.

The Authority will evaluate proposals based upon, but not limited to, the following criteria, which are not necessarily presented in order of importance:

1. Demonstrated lead Proposer, Sub Consultant and staff experience in the conduct of studies similar to the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study contemplated herein;
2. Reasonableness of the proposed Project Approach and Study Schedule;
3. The Financial Proposal;
4. Reasonableness of any proposed Business Exceptions;
5. Any other factor or criterion that the Authority, in its sole discretion, deems relevant to such evaluation.

All proposals will also be rated on the proposer's demonstrated commitment to affirmative action. Sections 46a-68-1 to 46a-68-17 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies require the Authority to consider the following factors when awarding a contract that is subject to contract compliance requirements:

1. The proposer's success in implementing an affirmative action plan (see Question 4 of Attachment G);
2. The proposer's success in developing an apprenticeship program complying with Sections 46a-68-1 to 46a-68-17 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, inclusive (see Question 5 of Attachment G);
3. The proposer's promise to develop and implement a successful affirmative action plan (see Question 4B of Attachment G);

4. The proposer's submission of EEO-1 data indicating that the composition of its work force is at or near parity when compared to the racial and sexual composition of the work force in the relevant labor market area; and
5. The proposer's promise to set aside a portion of the contract for legitimate minority business enterprises.

L. Contract Award

The successful Lead Proposer will be required to execute the Agreement attached hereto as Attachment D ("Agreement"). The Proposer substantially agrees to all the terms and conditions of this attached Agreement unless otherwise specified as provided in Section I.F.8 hereof.

If the Agreement is to be awarded, the Authority will issue to the successful proposer(s) a Notice of Award within ninety (90) days after the proposal due date.

The Authority reserves the right to correct inaccurate awards resulting from Authority errors. This may include, in extreme circumstances, revoking a Notice of Award already made to a proposer and subsequently awarding the Notice of Award to another proposer. Such action by the Authority shall not constitute a breach of this RFP by the Authority since the Notice of Award to the initial proposer is deemed to be void ab initio and of no effect as if no agreement ever existed between the Authority and the initial proposer.

II. Notifications, Acknowledgements and Certifications

Potential Proposers and Sub Consultants are hereby notified that any agreement resulting from this RFP shall contain the provisions specified in this RFP Section II, and that in submitting a proposal, Proposer and Sub Consultants acknowledges receipt of such notification and agrees that Proposer is prepared to sign an agreement with these provisions. For purposes of this RFP Section II, Contractor shall mean any Proposer with whom the Authority enters an agreement resulting from this RFP.

A. Nondiscrimination

- a. For purposes of this Section, “Contractor”, “contractor” and “Consultant” shall have the same meaning, “Contract”, “contract” and “Agreement” shall have the same meaning and other otherwise undefined terms have the meaning ascribed to them in Connecticut General Statutes § 4a-60g.
- b. Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 4a-60:
 1. The Contractor agrees and warrants that in the Performance of this Contract such Contractor will not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, gender identity or expression, status of a veteran, intellectual disability, mental disability or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown by such Contractor that such disability prevents Performance of the work involved, in any manner prohibited by the laws of the United States or of the State of Connecticut; and the Contractor further agrees to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants with job-related qualifications are employed and that employees are treated when employed without regard to their race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, gender identity or expression, status of a veteran, intellectual disability, mental disability or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown by the Contractor that such disability prevents performance of the work involved;
 2. the Contractor agrees, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the Contractor, to state that it is an "affirmative action equal opportunity employer" in accordance with regulations adopted by the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities (the “Commission”);
 3. the Contractor agrees to provide each labor union or representative of workers with which the Contractor has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding and each vendor with which the Contractor has a contract or understanding, a notice to be provided by the Commission, advising the labor

union or workers' representative of the Contractor's commitments under this Section and to post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment;

4. the Contractor agrees to comply with each provision of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes §§ 46a-68e and 46a- 68f and with each regulation or relevant order issued by said Commission pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §§ 46a-56, 46a-68e and 46a-68f; and
 5. the Contractor agrees to provide the Commission with such information requested by the Commission, and permit access to pertinent books, records and accounts, concerning the employment practices and procedures of the Contractor as relate to the provisions of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56.
 6. If the contract is a public works contract, municipal public works contract or contract for a quasi-public agency project, the contractor agrees and warrants that he or she will make good faith efforts to employ minority business enterprises as subcontractors and suppliers of materials on such public works or quasi-public agency project.
- c. The Contractor shall include the provisions of subsection (b) of this Section in every subcontract or purchase order entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a contract with the state, and in every subcontract entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a municipal public works contract or contract for a quasi-public agency project, and such provisions shall be binding on a subcontractor, vendor or manufacturer unless exempted by regulations or orders of the Commission. The Contractor shall take such action with respect to any such subcontract or purchase order as the Commission may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions including sanctions for noncompliance in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes §46a-56; provided if such Contractor becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation with a subcontractor or vendor as a result of such direction by the Commission, the Contractor may request the state of Connecticut to enter into any such litigation or negotiation prior thereto to protect the interests of the state and the state may so enter.
- d. Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 4a-60a:
1. The Contractor agrees and warrants that in the performance of this Contract such Contractor will not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the grounds of sexual orientation, in any manner prohibited by the laws of the United States or the State of Connecticut, and that employees are treated when employed without regard to their sexual orientation;
 2. the Contractor agrees to provide each labor union or representative of workers with which such Contractor has a collective bargaining Contract or other contract

or understanding and each vendor with which such Contractor has a contract or understanding, a notice to be provided by the Commission advising the labor union or workers' representative of the Contractor's commitments under this Section, and to post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment;

3. the Contractor agrees to comply with each provision of this Section and with each regulation or relevant order issued by said commission pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §46a-56; and
 4. the Contractor agrees to provide the Commission with such information requested by the Commission, and permit access to pertinent books, records and accounts, concerning the employment practices and procedures of the Contractor which relate to the provisions of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes §46a-56.
- e. The Contractor shall include the provisions of subsection (d) of this Section in every subcontract or purchase order entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a contract with the state, and in every subcontract entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a municipal public works contractor contract for a quasi-public agency project, and such provisions shall be binding on a subcontractor, vendor or manufacturer unless exempted by regulations or orders of the Commission. The Contractor shall take such action with respect to any such subcontract or purchase order as the Commission may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions including sanctions for noncompliance in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56; provided, if such Contractor becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation with a subcontractor or vendor as a result of such direction by the Commission, the Contractor may request the State of Connecticut to enter into any such litigation or negotiation prior thereto to protect the interests of the state and the state may so enter.
- f. Pursuant to subsection (c) of section 4a-60 and subsection (b) of section 4a-60a of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Contractor, for itself and its authorized signatory of this Contract, affirms that it understands the obligations of this section and that it will maintain a policy for the duration of the Contract to assure that the Contract will be performed in compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements of such sections. The Contractor and its authorized signatory of this Contract demonstrate their understanding of this obligation by initialing this nondiscrimination affirmation where specified in the Agreement.

B. Connecticut Campaign Contribution And Solicitation Limitations

For all state contracts, defined in section 9-612 of the Connecticut General Statutes as having a value in a calendar year of \$50,000 or more, or a combination or series of such agreements or contracts having a value of \$100,000 or more, the authorized signatory to this

Agreement represents that they have received the State Elections Enforcement Commission's notice advising state contractors of state campaign contribution and solicitation prohibitions, and will inform its principals of the contents of the notice. See https://seec.ct.gov/Portal/data/forms/ContrForms/seec_form_10_final.pdf. The Consultant makes the representations set forth in the Campaign Contribution Certification (OPM Form 1) attached as Exhibit G of the form of Agreement included as RFP Attachment 1.

C. Contractor's Representation Concerning Consulting Agreements

Any agreement resulting from this RFP shall require Consultant to make a representation (the form of which is included as Exhibit F of the form of Agreement included as Attachment 1 of this RFP) that Contractor either has not entered into any Consulting Agreement for the purposes of (A) providing counsel to a contractor, vendor, consultant or other entity seeking to conduct, or conducting, business with the state, (B) contacting, whether in writing or orally, any executive, judicial, or administrative office of the state, including any department, institution, bureau, board, commission, authority, official or employee for the purpose of solicitation, dispute resolution, introduction, requests for information, or (C) any other similar activity related to such contracts; or to disclose the name and basic terms of any such consulting Agreement.

D. Contractor's Representation Concerning Gifts

Any agreement resulting from this RFP shall require the contractor to make the following representation:

That no gifts were made by (A) such person, firm, corporation, (B) any principals and key personnel of the person, firm or corporation, who participate substantially in preparing bids, proposals or negotiating state contracts, or (C) any agent of such person, firm, corporation or principals and key personnel, who participates substantially in preparing bids, proposals or negotiating state contracts, to (i) any public official or state employee of the state agency or quasi-public agency soliciting bids or proposals for state contracts, who participates substantially in the preparation of bid solicitations or requests for proposals for state contracts or the negotiation or award of state contracts, or (ii) any public official or state employee of any other state agency, who has supervisory or appointing authority over such state agency or quasi-public agency; (2) That no such principals and key personnel of the person, firm or corporation, or agent of such person, firm or corporation or principals and key personnel, knows of any action by the person, firm or corporation to circumvent such prohibition on gifts by providing for any other principals and key personnel, official, employee or agent of the person, firm or corporation to provide a gift to any such public official or state employee; and (3) That the person, firm or corporation is submitting bids or proposals without fraud or collusion with any person. (d) Any bidder or proposer that does not agree to the representations required under this section shall be rejected and the state agency or quasi-public agency shall award the contract to the next highest ranked proposer or the next lowest responsible qualified bidder or seek new bids or proposals.

E. Authority's President's Representation Concerning Gifts

Pursuant to section 4-252 of the Connecticut General Statutes and Acting Governor Susan Bysiewicz Executive Order No. 21-2, promulgated July 1, 2021, in signing any agreement resulting from this RFP, the authorized signatory of the Authority shall be required to represent that the selection of the most qualified or highest ranked person, firm or corporation was not the result of collusion, the giving of a gift or the promise of a gift, compensation, fraud or inappropriate influence from any person.

F. Representation Regarding Iran Energy Investment

Any agreement resulting from this RFP shall require the contractor to make the following representation:

- a. Pursuant to section 4-252a of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Contractor certifies that it has not made a direct investment of twenty million dollars or more in the energy sector of Iran on or after October 1, 2013, as described in Section 202 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Divestment Act of 2010, and has not increased or renewed such investment on or after said date.
- b. If the Contractor makes a good faith effort to determine whether it has made an investment described in subsection (a) of this section, it shall not be subject to the penalties of false statement pursuant to section 4-252a of the Connecticut General Statutes. A "good faith effort" for purposes of this subsection includes a determination that the Consultant is not on the list of persons who engage in certain investment activities in Iran created by the Department of General Services of the State of California pursuant to Division 2, Chapter 2.7 of the California Public Contract Code. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impair the ability of the state agency or quasi-public agency to pursue a breach of contract action for any violation of the provisions of the Agreement.

III. **Additional Terms and Conditions:**

A. **Definitions**

As used in this RFP the following terms shall have the meanings as set forth below:

1. Addenda: Written or graphic documents issued prior to the proposal due date that clarify, correct or change any or all of the Contract Documents.
2. Contract Documents:
 - The Agreement;
 - This RFP and all Attachments
 - Addenda;
 - Proposer's Proposal (including all documentation attached to or accompanying such Proposal, all other documentation submitted in connection with such Proposal, and all post-proposal documentation submitted prior to the Notice of Award);
 - Notice of Award; and
 - Any written amendments to the Agreement.
3. Laws And Regulations: Any and all applicable laws, rules, regulations, ordinances, codes, orders and permits of any and all federal, state and local governmental and quasi-governmental bodies, agencies, authorities and courts having jurisdiction.
4. Notice of Award: Written notification from the Authority to the apparent successful proposer that states that the Authority has accepted such proposer's proposal and sets forth the remaining conditions that must be fulfilled by such proposer before the Authority executes the Agreement.
5. Site: The South Meadows Site as defined in Section I.A of this RFP.

B. **Binding Effect**

This Request for Proposals and any responses thereto shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns of the parties hereto.

C. **Authority Reserved Rights**

During the entire solicitation process the Authority retains the right to:

1. Extend any of the actual or proposed dates in the Projected Timeline;
2. Reject any and all proposals and republish this RFP;
3. Terminate this RFP process at any time prior to the execution of an agreement;

4. Supplement, amend, or otherwise modify or cancel the solicitation process with or without substitution of another solicitation;
5. Issue additional or subsequent solicitations;
6. Investigate the qualifications of any entity under consideration (including subcontractors and parties otherwise related to a proposing entity);
7. Clarify the information provided pursuant to this RFP;
8. Request additional evidence or documentation to support the information included in any submittal;
9. Appoint an evaluation committee to review submittals and use the assistance of outside professionals in submittal evaluation;
10. Approve or disapprove of particular subcontractors, joint venture partners, or other proposed team members;
11. Interview and hold discussions with any entity at any time after receipt of a submittal and before the signing of a legally binding agreement;
12. Enter into any final agreement(s) which result from this RFP which the Authority, in its sole and absolute discretion, determines to be in its best interest. Such determination will be based on a variety of factors including but not limited to experience, price, reasonable plans and business exceptions as described herein, and any other consideration which the Authority in its sole discretion determines is relevant;
13. Enter into a final Agreement with terms that vary from the terms set forth in the Authority's solicitation documents;
14. Visit and examine any of the facilities referenced in any submittal;
15. Conduct contract discussions with one or more submitting entities; and
16. Reject any and all submittals, or parts thereof, and/or to waive any informality or informalities in any proposal, if such rejection or waiver is deemed in the best interests of the Authority.

D. Communications With Authority Staff and Board

Except as otherwise authorized by this RFP, during the period while the RFP process is active (i.e., from the date the Authority issues the RFP until the date the successful proposer accepts the Notice of Award), contractors contemplating or preparing proposals are prohibited from contacting Authority staff or Authority Board Directors or Members in an ex parte manner to discuss the RFP submission process. A contractor's RFP submission shall be rejected if any of the foregoing ex parte communications take place.

E. Addenda And Interpretations

The Authority may issue Addenda to this RFP that shall, upon issuance, become part of the RFP and binding upon all potential or actual Proposers. Such Addenda may be issued in response to questions regarding Site conditions and requests for interpretation or clarification received from potential Proposers. Any questions regarding Site conditions and any request for interpretation or clarification of this RFP must be submitted in writing to Roger Guzowski by e-mail

(rguzowski@ctmira.org) or by correspondence (MIRA Dissolution Authority, 300 Maxim Road, Hartford, Connecticut 06114). To be given consideration, any such written questions and requests must be received by the Authority by the deadline set forth in Section I.C of this RFP. Addenda, if any, will be mailed and/or e-mailed to all persons who expressed interest or arranged to pick up this RFP pursuant to Sections I.D and I.E hereof. Such addenda will also be posted on the Authority's web site (<http://www.ctmira.org>) on the "Current Solicitations" page, under the "Business Links" section of the website. The RFP and Attachments can be accessed by selecting the link titled: RFP: "TO CONDUCT THE SOUTH MEADOWS REDEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS STUDY". Such addenda will be mailed/e-mailed and posted on the web site no later than the date set forth in Section I.C of this RFP.

Failure of any Proposer to receive any such Addenda shall not relieve such Proposer from any conditions stipulated in such Addenda. Only questions answered or issues addressed by formal written Addenda will be binding. All oral and other written responses, statements, interpretations or clarifications shall be without legal effect and shall not be binding upon the Authority.

F. Modification or Withdrawal of A Proposal

Proposals may be modified or withdrawn by an appropriate document duly executed (in the manner that a Proposal must be executed) and delivered to the place where Proposals are to be submitted at any time prior to the Proposal due date and time.

G. Proposal Preparation and Other Costs

Each proposer shall be solely responsible for all costs and expenses associated with the preparation and/or submission of its proposal, or incurred in connection with any interviews and negotiations with the Authority, and the Authority shall have no responsibility or liability whatsoever for any such costs and expenses.

H. Proposer's Qualifications

The Authority may make any investigation deemed necessary to determine the ability of any Proposer to perform the Agreement as required. Each Proposer shall furnish the Authority with all such information as may be required for this purpose.

Attachment A - South Meadows Site General Layout Plan

The following seven (7) site plans will remain available for review and/or downloading until after the proposal submission deadline at the following Google Drive shared folder: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11ytROAwCuzckPV023EIF9ATXV9UnM5S1?usp=sharing>

1. Site Plan from MIRA's January 5, 2023 response to CT-DEEP's Request for Additional Information. This Site Plan depicts the entire property, with buildings, piping, the air pollution control system and the solid waste permit boundary labelled.
2. Exhibit C of the ELUR that has been recorded in the City of Hartford Land Records for the Site is comprised of six (6) survey map sheets entitled "Exhibit C: Declaration of Environmental Land Use Restriction and Grant of Easement, Property of Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority, 300 Maxim Road and 100 Reserve Road, Hartford, Connecticut," dated March 8 2013, revised to March 28, 2018. The six (6) ELUR survey map sheets follow, and are summarized as follows:
 - Sheet 1 of 6: Property boundary survey that depicts all property boundaries and encumbrances (i.e., easements, rights-of-way, etc.) listed in the Title Report for the Site (refer to Sheet 5 of 6 for the list of all encumbrances)
 - Sheet 2 of 6: Property boundary survey that depicts the bearing and distance measurement of each property boundary line (refer to Sheet 6 of 6 for the metes and bounds property descriptions for the Site)
 - Sheet 3 of 6: Boundary depictions of ELUR Subject Areas A-1 and A-2 within the property boundary
 - Sheet 4 of 6: Boundary depictions of ELUR Subject Areas B, C, D, E, F-1, F-2, G-a, G-b, H-1, H-2, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, and R within the property boundary
 - Sheet 5 of 6: List of encumbrances from the Title Report for the Site (refer to Sheet 1 of 6 for the surveyed locations)
 - Sheet 6 of 6: List of Map References incorporated into the property boundary survey, and metes and bounds property descriptions for the Site (refer to Sheet 2 of 6 for the surveyed depiction of the property boundary lines)

Attachment B – Table of Existing Environmental Documentation

Environmental Investigation and Remediation Reports

Previous investigations and remedial activities performed at the Site have been documented in the following reports, listed in chronological order.

Those reports specified as “Available On-Line” will remain available until after the proposal submission deadline for review and/or downloading at the following Google Drive shared folder: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11ytROAwCuzckPV023EIF9ATXV9UnM5S1?usp=sharing>

Potential proposers who would like to review hard-copies of the reports that are not specified as “Available On-Line” should contact the Authority in the manner specified in Section I.D. (Notice of Interest) of the Request for Proposals in order to schedule a time to review hard-copies of the requested documents in the Authority’s main offices.

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
Land Tech Remedial	December 1995	<i>Subsurface Investigations and Remedial Installation Report.</i>	No
HRP Associates Inc.	October 1998	<i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report CRRR Power Block Facility and Waste Processing Facility Maxim Road and Reserve Road Hartford, Connecticut.</i>	Yes
Metcalf & Eddy Inc.	March 1999	<i>Phase I Environmental Assessment Connecticut Light and Power Company South Meadow Station Hartford.</i>	No
HRP Associates Inc.	June 1999	<i>Subsurface Investigation Report Mid-Connecticut Project Maxim and Reserve Roads Hartford Connecticut.</i>	Yes
Metcalf & Eddy Inc.	July 1999	<i>Phase II Field Investigation Report South Meadows Hartford.</i>	No
HRP Associates Inc.	June 1999	<i>Mercury Boiler Investigation.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	October 2001	<i>Phase III Work Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	June 2002	<i>Sample Work Plan for Area 7B.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	September 2002	<i>Phase III Remedial Investigation Report.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	June 2003	<i>Supplemental Phase III Site Investigation Report.</i>	No

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
TRC Environmental Corporation	September 2003.	<i>Specifications: Remediation of Areas WPF-4, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6 and PBF-5 by Soil Excavation South Meadows Station.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	February 2004	<i>Sampling Work Plan for the Track Hopper Room and Soils Below the Mercury Boiler Room.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	March 2004	<i>Closure Report; South Meadows Former Mercury Boiler Room Decommissioning & Demolition.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	July 2004.	<i>Excavation Remedial Action Plan for Area PBF-3 Former Transformer/Switchyard.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	August 2004	<i>Supplemental Site Investigation Area WPF-4 and Area 1-2.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	April 2005	<i>Area PBF-3 PCB Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	July 2005	<i>Track Hopper Room Investigation Report.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	August 2005	<i>95 Percent Upper Confidence Limit Determination for Arsenic.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	January 2006	<i>Remedial Action Plan for Soils Beneath Remaining Structure at the Former Mercury Boiler Room.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	January 2006	<i>Parcel No. 3 (CL&P Parcel) Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	March 2006	<i>Remedial Action Plan for Area PBF-4 Former PCB Oil Storage Tanks.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	April 2006	<i>Soil Investigation Report Electrical Switchyards Parcel 3.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	June 2006	<i>Waste Processing Facility Engineered Control Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	June 2006	<i>Waste Processing Facility Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	July 2006	<i>Remedial Action Plan for Former PCB Storage Tank Piping and Appurtenances.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	February 2007	<i>Waste Processing Facility Area 3 Asbestos Containing Materials Investigation Work Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	February 2007	<i>Remedial Action Plan for Area 3.</i>	No

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
TRC Environmental Corp.	September 2007	<i>Remedial Action Plan for Soil Beneath Former 1927 Boiler Room Addition.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	September 2008	<i>Specifications; Track Hopper Room Remediation.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	March 2010	<i>Remedial Action Report: Former PCB Storage Tank Piping and Appurtenances.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	April 2010	<i>Self-Implementing Cleanup Plan for 115 kV Switchyard.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2011	<i>Remedial Action Report Retained Parcel 115 kV Switchyard.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	January 2012	<i>Fuel Farm (Area 2-2) Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	September 2012	<i>Remedial Action Report Area PBF-3/Former Transformer Switchyard.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	September 2012	<i>Waste Processing Facility Storm Water Detention Basin Engineered & Access Control Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	October 2012	<i>Fuel Line (Delineation Area 2) Engineered Control Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2012	<i>Fuel Oil Line Investigation Report.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2012	<i>Waste Processing Facility Storm Water Detention Basin Engineered & Access Control Remedial Action Plan.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	April 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area PBF-4 Former PCB Oil Storage Tanks.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	March 2013	<i>Alternative SWPC Application and PMC Exception Document.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area 1-3: Excavation of ETPH impacted Soils.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area 1-6: Former Vanadium Pile.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Power Block Facility Wetlands Area Remedial Action Plan</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	January 2014	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area 2-1 & 2-2: Former Fuel Farm.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	January 2014	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area 1-2, 1-4 and 1-5: Coal Pond/Coal Pile Areas.</i>	No

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
TRC Environmental Corp.	July 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: PBF-1 Mercury Boiler Room, Track Hopper Room, PBF-4 and PBF-5.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Waste Processing Facility Area WPF4.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Waste Processing Facility Areas 1, 2 and 3.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Waste Processing Facility Areas 4 and 5.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Memorandum: Bollard Excavation/Remediation.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Fuel Line (Delineation Area 2)</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	December 2013	<i>Remedial Action Report: Waste Processing Facility Storm Water Detention Basin.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	February 2014	<i>Remedial Action Report: Areas 3-2 and 3-3</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	March 2014	<i>Remedial Action Report: Area 3-1.</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	February 2014	<i>Memorandum: WPF Storm Water Basin Fence Line Remediation.</i>	No
TRC Environmental Corp.	November 2015	<i>Remedial Action Report: PBF Wetlands A and E.</i>	No
Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority	April 18, 2018*	<i>Declaration of Environmental Land Use Restriction and Grant of Easement</i>	Yes
TRC Environmental Corp.	May 2018	<i>Verification Report</i>	Yes
* The <i>Declaration of Environmental Land Use Restriction and Grant of Easement</i> includes six (6) associated survey map sheets, and was recorded in the City of Hartford Land Records on April 20, 2018.			

Other Documents of Interest

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
Fuss & O'Neill Inc.	March 2002	<i>Connecticut Light & Power Company and Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority Drainage Study of Parcel 1 South Meadows Generating Station and Regional Trash-to-Energy Facility</i>	Yes

Author	Date	Report Title	Available On-Line?
HRP Associates Inc.	March 29, 2012	<i>Hazardous Materials Survey Report, Northern Portion of the Administration Building, South Meadows Station, Gate 20 Reserve Road, Hartford, Connecticut</i>	Yes
HRP Associates Inc.	January 17, 2014	<i>Hazardous Materials Abatement Documentation Northern Portion of the CRRA Facility Administration Building, Gate 20 Reserve Road, Hartford, Connecticut</i>	Yes
Greater Hartford Flood Commission	May 10, 2022	<i>Hartford Flood Protection System – Emergency Action Planning, Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority Site (MIRA), Hartford, Connecticut</i>	Yes

Attachment C – Closure Plan and Correspondence

The *Closure Plan for CSWS Resource Recovery Facility* and related correspondence, as summarized below, are available at the following location on the Authority web-site:

<https://www.ctmira.org/records-reports/additional-communications/closure-plan>

Author	Date	Report Title
TRC Environmental Corp.	May 2022	<i>Closure Plan for CSWS Resource Recovery Facility</i>
Greater Hartford Flood Commission	August 5, 2022	<i>Letter to CT-DEEP RE: MIRA Closure Plan Dated May 2022</i>
CT-DEEP	October 14, 2022	<i>Request for Additional Information for Closure Plan for CSWS Resource Recovery Facility</i>
Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority	January 5, 2023	<i>Response to Request for Additional Information Regarding Closure Plan, Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority – Hartford RRF</i>