South Meadows Transition Committee
October 9, 2024
Meeting Minutes

A Regular Meeting of the South Meadows Transition Committee of the MIRA Dissolution Authority was held on October 9, 2024. Present either in-person or via video or audio conferencing were:

Committee Present:	Director William Beccaro, Committee Chairperson (via Zoom) Director John Fonfara (via Zoom) Director Matthew Dayton (via Zoom) Director Rachel Taylor (via Zoom) Director David Steuber (via Zoom, joined @ 11:15) Director Bert Hunter (Ex Officio) (via Zoom, joined @ 11:25)) Member Frank Dellaripa (arrived @ 11:15) Member William DiBella (arrived @ 11:15)
Other Directors Present:	David H. Barkin Michael Looney (via Zoom)
Other Members Present:	Thomas Swarr (via Zoom)
Authority Staff Present:	Mark T. Daley, President & CFO Christopher Shepard, Environmental Compliance Manager Thomas Gaffey, Director of Recycling & Enforcement (via Zoom) Cheryl Kaminsky, Comptroller (via Zoom) Ann Catino (Halloran & Sage), General Counsel
CT-DEEP Staff Present:	Jade Barber (via Zoom) David McKeegan (via Zoom) Claire Quinn (via Zoom) Akhila Mirza (via Zoom)
Others Present:	Robert Carr, Weston & Sampson (via Zoom) Susan Mara, Weston & Sampson (via Zoom) Justin Dominguez, SGH Peter Folino, Eagle Environmental (vai Zoom) Nicholas Casparino, City of Hartford DPW (arrived @ 11:15) Alex Garneau, US Army Corps of Engineers (via Zoom) Joanna Wozniak-Brown (via Zoom) Marcus Y. (via Zoom) (860)573-5203 (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 Chairperson Beccaro called the meeting to order at 11:03 A.M. and confirmed that a quorum was present.

2. Public Comment (3 minutes per speaker)

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

3. Approval of Minutes of the September 4, 2024 Regular Committee Meeting

Committee Chairperson Beccaro requested a motion to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2024 Regular Committee Meeting. The motion was moved by Director Dayton and seconded by Director Fonfara.

Committee Chairperson Beccaro asked if there were any discussion, comments, corrections or modifications requested. Member Swarr noted one error in the first full paragraph on page 7 of the minutes – the minutes erroneously state that "Member Swarr suggested that Parkville elementary school could be considered." Member Swarr requested that the minutes be corrected to state that he had suggested Burr Elementary School on Wethersfield Avenue, not Parkville Elementary School, for consideration.

Chairperson Beccaro asked if there were any other discussion, comments, corrections or modifications requested. Hearing none, Committee Chairperson Beccaro asked for a vote to approve the minutes with the correction requested by Member Swarr. The motion was approved unanimously by those in attendance, as indicated below:

Director	Raised	Second	Aye	Nay	Abstain
Chairperson Beccaro			X		
Matthew Dayton	X		X		
Rachel Taylor			X		
John Fonfara		X	X		
Dave Steuber					(Absent)

4. Presentation and Discussion of DRAFT Milestone Reports associated with the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study

Chairperson Beccaro introduced this update and discussion by noting that Attachments 2, 3, and 4 of the Committee package include the draft reports to be discussed. At Chairperson Beccaro's request, Mr. Daley then provided an overview of the draft milestone reports to be discussed during today's Committee meeting with Simpson Gumpertz & Heger Associates (SGH), a subconsultant to Weston & Sampson Engineers (WSE). Mr. Daley noted that SGH will be discussing the 3 draft milestone reports related to the Hartford flood control system,

and that the 3 draft reports have also been provided to the Greater Hartford Flood Commission, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the CT-DEEP Dam Safety Division for review and comment.

Mr. Daley continued by summarizing that the first draft report is a plan to deal with 12 identified penetrations of the floodwall, all of which are inactive except for one storm water discharge, as well as several above-ground encroachments to the floodwall. Mr. Daley then stated that the plan includes guidelines and a scope of work for abandonment of the penetrations and removal of the encroachments, with an estimated cost of $2.65 million excluding design and permitting (6 potential permits are identified in the plan)

Mr. Daley then summarized the second plan, which is an O&M and inspection plan related to the penetrations. Mr. Daley stated that the O&M and inspection plan documents how to manage the penetrations until proper abandonment is completed. Mr. Daley further stated that it defines the inspection and maintenance programs associated with the penetrations, including such work as dewatering, cleaning, lubricating, replacing seals, etc., which is important for both the Authority and its successor to understand.

Mr. Daley then provided an overview description of the emergency preparedness plan, which he noted as building on the information included in the other two plans. Mr. Daley noted that the emergency preparedness plan addresses such matters as notification requirements, preliminary response tasks and full response to flood situations, cessation activities after flooding subsides, and roles and responsibilities of the various agencies involved.

Mr. Daley then introduced Justin Dominguez from SGH to provide the presentation of the Floodwall Penetrations Status Update, a copy of which is included as Attachment #1 to these meeting minutes.

Mr. Dominguez began his presentation with background information regarding historic floods that occurred in Hartford in 1936 and 1938, which prompted the construction of the Hartford Flood Control System in the 1940s by the US Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Dominguez then noted that there are 12 penetrations of the floodwall (i.e., pipes passing through or under the floodwall) where it borders the South Meadows Station property; and that these penetrations present a risk to the integrity of the Hartford Flood Protection System even though the Facility has ceased operation. As the owner of the penetrations, the Authority is responsible for operations, inspections, and maintenance activities, and for operations during flooding, even for inactive penetrations, and even though some of the penetrations pre-date the operation of the waste-to-energy plant. Member Dellaripa and Mr. Casparino of the City of Hartford DPW/Greater Hartford Flood Commission (GHFC) confirmed that the responsibilities for operations, inspections and maintenance remain with the owner of the penetrations until such time as the penetrations are properly abandoned

Mr. Dominguez also noted that the responsibility for the penetrations will transfer to the Authority's successor (CT-DAS), and to any subsequent property owner(s), until such time as the proper abandonment of the penetrations eliminates the risks and responsibilities associated with them.

Mr. Dominguez then provided a brief description of each of the three draft reports that are included in the package for today's Committee meeting, followed by photographs and tabular summaries from his presentation that illustrate the characteristics of the 12 penetrations. Mr. Dominguez noted that only 1 of the 12 penetrations is still active, serving to convey stormwater runoff from a roof area and a portion of paved parking area on-site to the Connecticut River. The remaining penetrations are pipes that vary in diameter up to 48-inches, and that have historically conveyed water into the plant; water discharges to the Connecticut River; and fuel oil from a dock on the river to bulk fuel storage tanks that were formerly located on-site.

Member Dellaripa noted that it would be preferable to the GHFC that all 12 penetrations, including the single active penetration, be properly abandoned either ahead of or at the same time as site redevelopment activities. Mr. Dominguez noted that there is a significant storm drainage system on the interior (protected side) of the floodwall, and that re-routing that single stormwater discharge penetration would likely be feasible given the relatively small size of the discharge pipe when compared to other stormwater infrastructure on-site.

Chairperson Beccaro asked if it would be feasible to properly abandon the inactive penetrations, and if we would have the authority to do so sooner rather than later. Mr. Dominguez replied that such abandonment is definitely feasible, that he believed that it would be prudent to include abandonment of the single active penetration (after re-routing its discharge), and that SGH developed a cost estimate to abandon all 12 penetrations that was included in the draft report on the penetrations.

Mr. Dominguez then provided a more-detailed description of the penetration abandonment process. Mr. Dominguez noted that excavations to access underground pipes for abandonment, and the subsequent backfilling of those excavations, would have to be performed in accordance with Environmental Land Use Restrictions that have been recorded on the site. Attorney Catino asked if any steps would need to be taken to prevent "piping" around the piping that would remain in the ground after grouting. Mr. Dominguez stated that such soil movement is relatively low when the end of the pipe is buried on the protected side of the floodwall; however, some of the pipes emerge from the ground in the plant, so a "filter diaphragm" could be installed with the bulkheads on the ends of the pipes to intercept/arrest that type of soil movement.

Director Barkin asked Mr. Dominguez if SGH's study has identified any locations where there has been soil subsidence associated with these penetrations. Mr. Dominguez replied that no signs of subsidence were identified by SGH during its site visits and floodwall inspections. Director Barkin asked what would be the typical signs of such subsidence. Mr. Dominguez replied that typical signs of subsidence would include conditions such as cracking of paved surfaces above the penetrations, leading to development of depressions. Mr. Shepard also noted that the GHFC does some monitoring of the concrete flood wall on a regular/quarterly basis to check for movement. Mr. Casparino clarified that that monitoring is to determine if any deflections of the floodwall are developing at joint locations. Mr. Casparino also indicated that some deflections have been noted on-site in the past, and that such deflections are likely related to changes in the floodwall's foundation type (i.e., from piles to sheet piles, etc.) along the length of the floodwall.

Chairperson Beccaro asked if it would be possible and practical for the Authority to pursue the abandonment work in an effort to leave the site in a better condition. Director Hunter agreed that it would be the responsibility of the Authority to ensure that the property is "stabilized" as part of the plan for handing it off to CT-DAS. Director Barkin stated that DAS would prefer that the abandonment be pursued by the Authority. Director Hunter asked what the timeline for such a project would be, to which Mr. Dominguez indicated that this would likely be a 2 to 2.5 year process from conception through completion. Mr. Dominguez indicated that design and permit application submittals could likely be prepared between now and June 30, 2025, and that DAS would then have to continue forward with permitting process.

Chairperson Beccaro asked if the costs for abandonment have been estimated. Mr. Dominguez indicated that the construction cost estimate is approximately $2.65 million, plus another $300,000 to $400,000 for project design and permitting work. Mr. Dominguez also noted that there would be considerable stakeholder involvement and permitting through multiple authorities (GHFC, US Army Corps of Engineers, multiple divisions of the CT-DEEP).

Mr. Dominguez then provided an overview of intake and discharge tunnels associated with Screenhouse #2 that were previously abandoned by CL&P. Mr. Dominguez noted that the abandonment of these tunnels included concrete plugs under the floodwall and at the end of the discharge tunnel at the river, and sand fill inside of the discharge tunnel where it runs parallel to the floodwall on the river side. Director Barkin asked if the concrete plug at the discharge end of the tunnel is compromised, to which Mr. Dominguez stated that it is not currently compromised. Mr. Dominguez indicated that the GHFC has expressed a potential stability concern regarding the sand-filled portion of the tunnel; specifically, that the concrete plug could deteriorate over time, and that the sand from the tunnel could then run out of the tunnel and leave a void space in the tunnel that could be followed by the collapse or partial collapse of the tunnel, which could then de-stabilize the floodwall. Mr. Dominguez indicated that such a scenario would likely develop over a long period of time. Mr. Casparino stated that he has seen conflicting information regarding how the tunnel penetration was abandoned, and that it is not clear that the tunnels are filled with concrete beneath the floodwall.

Director Barkin asked why the tunnel section filled with sand would not simply be removed via excavation, to which Mr. Dominguez responded that the depth of the tunnel is near the river level, so such excavation would be complicated by the needs to keep the excavation de-watered while simultaneously excavating in close proximity to the floodwall without undermining it. Mr. Dominguez indicated that another potential option for proper abandonment of the sand-filled tunnel would be to drill holes through the top of the tunnel and then inject grout into the sand to effectively solidify the sand and make it less porous. Mr. Dominguez noted that SGH has not estimated the potential costs associated with this option to grout the sand in the tunnel.

Mr. Dominguez also recommended that a seepage analysis of the intake and discharge tunnel penetrations be completed because there are potential gaps between the sides of the tunnels and the sheet piles associated with the floodwall, and there are no sheet piles below the tunnels. Mr. Dominguez indicated that a computerized modeling and analysis of the seepage would be completed to estimate seepage rates. If the estimated seepage rate is found to be

unacceptable, then grouting of the areas around the tunnel with no sheet piling would be recommended in order to lower the seepage rate.

Mr. Dominguez then mentioned that there are a number of encroachments over and attached to the floodwall that could hamper future flood fighting activities, and that therefore need to be removed. Director Barkin asked if the oil pipes that remain still contain oil. Mr. Dominguez indicated that some of the pipes have labels indicating that they are empty, but we do not know if there are any residual materials present in those pipes, so proper precautions should be taken to ensure that any residual materials are collected and properly handled.

Mr. Dominguez then provided additional details regarding the estimated construction costs for the penetration abandonment work, noting that the $2.65 million cost estimate does not include potential costs associated with disposal of contaminated soils, which SGH estimated could approach $550,000 depending upon what pollutants are present in any soil that might need to be disposed of. Director Barkin recommended that SGH include a cost escalation table so that there is an awareness of how the costs will increase over time.

Mr. Dominguez then transitioned his presentation to a discussion regarding the operations, inspection, and maintenance plan, noting that the approach to this plan is to leave all valves associated with inactive floodwall penetrations closed, because there is no operational need for the valves to ever be opened again. Regarding the one active penetration, Mr. Dominguez stated that there is a gate valve on the protected side of the floodwall that would need to be exercised regularly to ensure that it continues to operate correctly, as well as a "flap valve" on the discharge end of the pipe that would have to be inspected regularly to ensure proper function.

Mr. Casparino then stated that the inspection protocols established by the US Army Corps of Engineers for floodwall penetrations requires a CCTV inspection every five years, and that the CCTV inspection requirements still apply to the inactive penetrations until they are properly abandoned. Mr. Casparino noted that the valves of the inactive penetrations would have to be opened for these CCTV inspections.

Mr. Dominguez continued with a discussion regarding additional visual inspections of all floodwall penetrations and surrounding ground surfaces that need to be conducted on an annual basis, as well as additional inspections that need to be conducted before, during and after flood events. Director Barkin asked what the regular inspection frequency is for the active penetration, and Mr. Dominguez confirmed that it is an annual inspection requirement.

Mr. Daley asked if the inspection work that SGH have completed to date for this project would qualify as meeting the annual inspection requirement, to which Mr. Dominguez stated that it would be considered a partial inspection. Mr. Dominguez stated that there are 2 valves in valve chambers, one of which was filled with water that would require confined space entry in order to inspect and exercise the valves. Mr. Daley asked for a summary of the scope necessary to complete the first annual inspection, and Attorney Catino asked if the CCTV inspection should be completed at the current time to identify any issues that the Authority could address before July 1, 2025. Mr. Dominguez said that he would certainly recommend CCTV of the active stormwater drain pipe; however, he also noted that there is no ready access point into the cooling water intake and discharge lines, so there is concern that CCTV of those lines could require cutting into the pipes for access, which would then pose a potential risk of

failure of those pipes. Mr. Daley asked when the next five-year CCTV inspection is due, to which Mr. Casparino replied that the GHFC is not aware of any CCTV inspections being completed in the past.

Director Barkin then offered that proper abandonment of the 12 penetrations, which would include re-directing the current stormwater discharge away from the floodwall, would resolve the concerns regarding potential floodwall impacts. Mr. Casparino noted that there are other things associated with the site that could potentially impact the floodwall, such as the foundations of the screen houses located on the riverbank outside the floodwall which could lead to riverbank subsidence. Mr. Dominguez noted that the scope of work for SGH does not include evaluating potential impacts from the screen houses, but that the Weston & Sampson scope of work includes evaluation of the screen houses as part of future site redevelopment considerations. Mr. Carr noted that Weston & Sampson's scope does not include inspections of the screen houses with respect to potential impacts on the floodwall; but that Weston & Sampson's scope does include developing costs estimates for demolition or renovation of the screen houses.

Mr. Dominguez then began discussions regarding the emergency preparedness plan, which plan covers both readiness for floods, as well as flood fighting if potential floodwall failure conditions develop, such as "sand boils." Mr. Dominguez stated that flood fighting requires supplies, labor and equipment, and he noted that supplies could be obtained but that there is no longer any labor or equipment on-site. Mr. Dominguez indicated that labor and equipment could be sub-contracted on an on-call basis that would have to be activated each time a flood condition occurs.

Mr. Dominguez then discussed how the emergency preparedness plan has been developed to be integrated with the City of Hartford's emergency response system. He then summarized the four phases of flood response (notification, preliminary response, full response, and cessation). Mr. Dominguez then noted that the "preliminary response" phase (requiring daily patrols) has been activated 27 times during the last 15 years, and that the "full responses" phase (requiring patrols every 4 hours) has been activated 2 times in the last 15 years.

Mr. Dominguez then discussed a summary of emergency preparedness plan responsibilities for each entity involved with flood emergencies, including the Authority; Hartford DPW; Hartford Police, Fire and Rescue; the Mayor of Hartford; the US Army Corps of Engineers; and the National Weather Service. Mr. Casparino noted that the Hartford DPW has certain responsibilities specific to the flood protection system, but those responsibilities do not include entering any site buildings. Member Dellaripa noted that the emergency coordinator for the City of Hartford is the Fire Chief.

Chairperson Beccaro thanked Mr. Dominguez for the presentation and asked what are the next steps that the Authority should undertake with respect to the floodwall penetrations. Mr. Dominguez suggested that the Authority should initiate the design and permitting process for abandonment of the penetrations as soon as possible. Member Dellaripa stated that the GHFC will also provide a formal response to the three plans that were discussed during today's meeting. Mr. Daley indicated that the Authority would request that the consultants start work on a scope of work for the design and permitting work, and that we will keep that process moving forward.

Director Barkin noted that DAS will apparently be handling the bidding and execution of the work for abandoning the penetrations, which means that all DAS requirements and standards will ultimately have to be met. Director Barkin then asked if the project design would have to be 100% complete before proceeding with permitting, or if permitting could proceed without completion of the full design. Mr. Dominguez stated that the design would not have to be 100% designed, but that it would have to be substantially developed beyond what SGH has presented in its report for this study. Mr. Dominguez then noted that the required abandonment work is relatively straight-forward, and that a significant portion of the design should be able to be completed before the hand-off to DAS. Director Barkin then requested that there be coordination of the design work with DAS in order to ensure that the work ultimately meets DAS's standards so that DAS can then move forward seamlessly with the next phase of the work. Chairperson Beccaro agreed with Director Barkin, but cautioned that he would not want to see the recommended work unnecessarily delayed in an effort to make everything "perfect." Director Barkin agreed, and Mr. Dominguez noted that the permitting authorities are typically concerned with the technical plans and specifications, and have little concern regarding the procurement, contracting, etc.

Chairperson Beccaro noted that the scheduled end time for this Committee meeting was close and that some Directors have a hard-stop at 12:30, and he then asked if there were any additional formalities that needed to be addressed. Mr. Daley noted that today's meeting agenda also includes a presentation on the draft milestone report regarding existing environmental conditions and how they relate to potential future uses. Given the limited meeting time remaining, Mr. Daley suggested that this planned presentation be carried over to the next regular meeting of this Committee. Chairperson Beccaro asked if any of the information from the planned presentation was time-sensitive such that a special Committee meeting would be required. Mr. Daley and Mr. Shepard indicated that they thought it would be fine to move the planned presentation to the next regularly-scheduled Committee meeting.

5. Update and Discussion Regarding the South Meadows Redevelopment Considerations Study – Hazardous Building Materials Survey and Second Public Informational Meeting

Chairperson Beccaro requested an update regarding the hazardous building materials survey and the second public informational meeting. Mr. Daley stated that we are still in a holding pattern regarding whether or not to submit the collected building material samples for analysis of PCBs. There is another meeting planned to discuss this matter. Regarding the next public information meeting, Mr. Daley reminded the Committee that it is scheduled for November 12, 2024 at the Metzner Center, from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM. Mr. Daley also noted that Weston & Sampson is also working on a "Frequently Asked Questions" sheet to provide the public with additional information.

Director Steuber asked when the decision would be made regarding the analysis of building material samples for PCBs. Mr. Daley stated that another meeting is being scheduled to discuss the implications to the Study and to the Closure Plan of not analyzing the samples for PCBs. Chairperson Beccaro indicated that there would be some additional discussion on this matter at next week's meeting of the full Board, and Director Steuber stated that he does not want time-pressure to limit the Authority's options on this matter, regardless of what the Board ultimately decides.

6. Adjournment

Committee Chairperson Beccaro asked if there were any other matters to discuss. Hearing none, Committee Chairperson Beccaro requested a motion to adjourn. Director Steuber moved to adjourn, and Committee Chairperson Beccaro adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.

Attachment

Presentation Entitled "Floodwall Penetrations Status Update"