

For EPA Internal Use ONLY

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

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

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date: November 16, 2016

1. Grant number: 96166601
2. Grant recipient: City of Chicopee, MA
3. Person providing site information: Lee M. Pouliot
4. Property/site name: Uniroyal Buildings 28 North, 28 North Extension, 28 South, 28 Extension, 40
5. Property address: Former Uniroyal Tire Complex, 154 Grove Street, Chicopee, MA 01020
6. Current property owner: City of Chicopee, MA
7. Work to be done: Phase I Phase II Phase III Other
Explain Other:

B. SITES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

1. Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfields (*a real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants*)? Yes No
2. Type of contamination present: Hazardous Substances Petroleum Co-Mingled
(*If the site has both hazardous substances and incidental petroleum contamination, check the box the "co-mingled" box. If the site has hazardous substances and distinguishable petroleum contamination, you must obtain approval from the State and EPA.*)
3. Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The former Uniroyal Tire Complex consists of approximately 28 acres of land, originally developed during the late 1800's. In 1870, the property was used as a lumber yard by the Chicopee Manufacturing Company. From 1896 to 1898, the property was owned by the Spaulding and Pepper Company, who manufactured bicycle tires. The Fisk Rubber Company, which later changed its name to United States Rubber Company and then to Uniroyal, Inc., manufactured bicycle, automobile and truck tires and adhesives from 1898 to 1981. Uniroyal Inc. closed their plant

in 1980 and sold the property to Facemate Corporation in 1981. Facemate leased portions of the Uniroyal buildings to various companies for manufacturing, printing, machine shops, office, storage and health care facilities. Currently, nine vacant buildings, encompassing approximately 750,000 square feet, remain standing at the Site. Building #28 North Extension encompasses a footprint of 11,330 square feet (.79 acres) of the Uniroyal property with approximately 56,500 square feet of vacant industrial space on five floors, not including the basement level. Building #28 South encompasses a footprint of 54,000 square feet (1.24 acres) of the Uniroyal property with approximately 270,000 square feet of vacant industrial space on five floors, not including the basement level. The building was also originally utilized for the production of tires and related products. Building #28N encompasses a footprint of 48,000 square feet (1.1 acres) of the Uniroyal property with 240,000 square feet of vacant industrial space on five floors, not including the basement level. Buildings 28 Extension and 40 are located east of Building 28 North and 28 North Extension and represent small additions to the middle tier buildings.

4. Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you think it is contaminated? : The site became contaminated throughout its long manufacturing history. Hazardous building materials including asbestos, lead, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and others have been identified within these buildings. Former manufacturing operations entailed the use of approximately 22 underground storage tanks (USTs) and five aboveground storage tanks for the storage of various petroleum products and solvents. 25 pad and/or wall-mounted transformers were used to distribute electrical power for site operations. Of these, 23 contained PCB-based dielectric fluids.

5. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The City is interested in redevelopment schemes that provide a diverse mix of uses on the Site. This mix will include complementary uses that directly and indirectly enhance the area as a place to live, work, shop, dine, visit and connect with recreational and environmental amenities. Schemes should provide for high quality improvements that will actively contribute to the economy of the City, provide public access where appropriate and add to the neighborhood's vitality and tax base. Also, the City has a vested interest in preserving the site's history as a part of the redevelopment process. It is hoped that redevelopment schemes will address how the site's industrial past can be incorporated into its reuse, remembering the site's history. Finally, development schemes should strive to surround proposed buildings with a series of green spaces linked with pedestrian walkways, greenways or trails that also take advantage of the Chicopee River Walk that is currently under development. The entire RiverMills development should strive to be a pedestrian friendly environment, while enhancing the Chicopee River. Redevelopment schemes should propose avenues through which the river can be accessed and utilized from RiverMills by the public.

C. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

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

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

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

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

1. How was the property acquired (or how will it be acquired)?
 - a. Negotiated purchase from a private individual
 - b. Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
 - c. Tax foreclosure
 - d. Eminent domain
 - e. Donation
 - f. Other (explain):
2. What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)? The property was acquired by the City in 2003.
3. What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired? The property was acquired from the Facemate Corporation.
4. Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the assessment grant recipient has or has had with all prior owners or operators of the property: As a municipality, the grant recipient has collected property taxes from prior owners. Michelin North America, Inc. (MNA) acquired the assets of Uniroyal, Inc. circa 1990 and is considered the primary responsible party (PRP) dealing with residual contamination at the Uniroyal Property. To date, MNA has identified and removed all known USTs on the property and all transformers have

been removed by MNA and the City. The City is working in cooperation with MNA to address other environmental conditions at the Site.

5. Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the assessment grant recipient acquired (or will acquire) the property? Yes No
6. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site? Yes No
7. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site? Yes No
8. Did the assessment grant recipient perform any environmental inquiry prior to the purchase of the property? Yes No
9. If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and indicate whether the applicant performed the pre-purchase inquiry in accordance with EPA's All Appropriate Inquiry rule (or ASTM E1527-05, or its equivalent at the time of purchase): n/a

F. PETROLEUM ONLY SITES - PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

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

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

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

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

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

contamination at the site, and/or is not financially viable to pay for the assessment and cleanup costs, then the site may still be eligible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?

Yes No

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

G. ACCESS

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

Yes No

H. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) COMPLIANCE

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

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

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

Unikyal 28 NOKTA + ext
Smith + ext

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

- 3. Is your selected property (site) part of a designated Historic District? Yes No
- 4. Will your project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures? Yes No
- 5. Does your project have the potential to impact archaeological resources? Yes No

I. SITE ELIGIBILITY

(To be filled out by EPA Project Officer.)

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

Christine Lombard
Project Officer

11/17/10
Date

Need for Attorney Consultation: Yes No Notes:

Additional Information:

