



## Village of Hastings-on-Hudson

7 Maple Avenue  
Hastings-on-Hudson, NY 10706

February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Alan Peterson  
Atlantic Richfield Company BP  
150 West Warrenville Road  
Naperville, IL 60563  
*Sent via email*

Re: response to estimate for preserving Building 52

Dear Mr. Peterson:

I am writing to relay questions raised in regards to estimates provided by BP Arco for the cost to arrest further decay of Building 52, including the expense to maintain the building until surrounding remedial work is completed, approximately eight years from now. We would like to see answers to these questions either provided explicitly before the public session on March 5<sup>th</sup>, or answered at that event either as part of the presentation or as a separate hand-out. This letter will be posted along with your estimate for public access on the village website. Your response will become part of the public record and published as well.

The comments are listed below:

1. Abatement costs will be incurred whether the building is torn down or preserved. The estimate for mothballing the building should only include the difference in cost between abatement for a building that is about to be demolished and abatement for a building that is planned to be preserved.
2. The objective is to preserve (“mothball”) the building for a least expensive use like a parking garage warehouse or sustainable infrastructure: costs associated with conversion to meet current code should not be included. That would be the ultimate responsibility of the developer.
3. There is no need to rebuild a missing roof monitor not required nor requested by the Village.
4. Why is “foundation / pile study under slab” included in this cost? The most recent study of the slab shows the loading capacity for the slab. Why is additional study included in the cost model for mothballing?
  - a. If a future user intends to exceed the 125 LL found as the minimum load capacity of the existing slab, that user would incur all costs to provide their own slab reinforcement study.

- b. If this building is demolished in the same manner as the others, the slab would remain after demolition, so isn't "foundation / pile study under slab" a cost that is incurred whether the building is demolished or not, meaning it should be removed from the mothballing estimate?
  - c. If this cost is intended to represent the potentially destabilizing impact of the adjacent cut for remediation, then it should be clearly defined as such and include the alternate cost for construction of a five foot tall retaining wall around Building 52 to prevent any destabilizing effects from the remediation. In this case, this cost would be reduced to zero and stabilization costs would be under a different line item.
5. Is the existing slab intended to remain? If so, how would the required remediation under the slab be achieved? Shouldn't the cost of stabilization only be the difference between remediation with demolition versus that without? All other costs should be borne by developer. What will remain at the end of the clean-up?

We look forward to your response and your presentation on March 5<sup>th</sup>.

Sincerely,



Peter Swiderski  
Mayor  
Village of Hastings-on-Hudson  
7 Maple Avenue  
Hastings-on-Hudson, NY 10706

Cc: John Taylor, Vice-President for Public Affairs