

381 WORK PLAN

GRAND TRAVERSE COMMONS DEVELOPMENT POD NO. 2

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Eligible property Information

a. Location

The project location is known as Development Pod No. 2 (Pod No. 2) and is situated within Sub Area No. 2 of the former Travers City Regional Psychiatric Hospital Property. Attached as Figure 5, please find a site map of Sub Area No. 2 that depicts the location of Pod No. 2. Pod No. 2 is approximately 14.58 acres and includes 6 buildings that total approximately 153,040 square feet.

b. Current Ownership

The Minervini Group, LLC
1200 West 11th Street, Suite 115
Traverse City, Michigan 49684 Contact Person: James Reardon
Phone: (231) 941- 1900
Facsimile: (231) 941-9713

c. Proposed Future Ownership

The Minervini Group, LLC. (the “Developer), plans to redevelop Development Area No. 2 in discrete separate phases per building. Each phase will have a separate development entity.

d. Delinquent Taxes, Interest, and Penalties

There are no delinquent taxes, interest, or penalties related to the properties.

e. Existing and Proposed Future Zoning for Each Eligible Property

The existing and proposed future zoning for the Eligible Property is Mixed Use/C1.

1.2 Historical Use of Each Eligible Property

The Traverse City State Hospital, formerly called the Traverse City Regional Psychiatric Hospital, was a state-owned mental health institution that operated from after 1885 until 1989. The main hospital building, now designated Building 50, was built in 1885. The need for additional facilities (the “cottages”) became apparent almost as soon as the Traverse City institution opened. Between 1890 and 1900 five cottages for women and six for men, one originally use as an infirmary, were built.

The Power House is a defunct steam and electric power plant that formally serviced the Psychiatric Hospital complex. Constructed in 1950, the structure is steel framed with concrete roof and floor slabs. The system provided both heat and electricity from three boilers and two 1-megawatt generators (a megawatt is sufficient electricity for approximately 1000 homes) driven by high-pressure steam turbines. The system was originally coal fired and served by a railroad siding.

The hospital was closed in 1989 as part of a nationwide trend in de-institutionalization of the mentally ill. On June 26, 1991, the City of Traverse City and the Charter Township of Garfield established the Grand Traverse Commons Redevelopment Corporation, a nonprofit corporation. The purpose of the GTCRC was to oversee the redevelopment of the 500-acre Grand Traverse Commons. On May 6, 2002 after 11 years and multiple but unsuccessful efforts to develop the site, The Minervini Group acquired the property and has commenced its redevelopment.

1.3 Current Use of Each eligible Property

The Eligible Property is currently vacant and unused.

1.4 Summary of Proposed Redevelopment and Future Use for Each Eligible Property

On June 19, 2001, The Grand Traverse Commons Redevelopment Corporation (GTCRC) entered into a Redevelopment Agreement with The Minervini Group (hereinafter the “Developer”) for the redevelopment of Sub Area No. 2 of the Grand Traverse Commons with certain redevelopment rights to Sub Area No. 3.

Under the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Developer is responsible to redevelop the Property in a manner consistent with the District Plan (a land use document adopted by the City of Traverse City and Garfield Township that provides development standards and concepts for redevelopment of the Grand Traverse Commons). The District Plan outlines a traditional neighborhood design (TND), the purpose of which is to encourage mixed-use, compact development that is sensitive to the environmental characteristics of the land and facilitates the efficient use of services. A TND diversifies and integrates land uses within close proximity to each other, and it provides for the daily recreational and shopping needs of the residents. A TND is a sustainable, long-term community that provides economic opportunity and environmental and social equity for the residents.

The Developer intends to redevelop the South Cottages consistent with the District Plan and the Developers vision for the project, which is a mixed-use, walkable village environment that will offer a chance to live, work and play in the “Central Park” setting of the Grand Traverse Commons. While the overall zoning for the site calls for mixed use/C1, approximately 80% of the project is estimated to be residential. Development Pod 2 contains six buildings: a power house (Building 52) and five cottages (Buildings 22, 28, 30, 32 & 40). The cottages (20,000 – 40,000 square foot structures) are contemplated to be mostly residential with limited office and will represent approximately 80% of the total site housing. The vision is to create affordable housing for earners between 60% and 120% the area median income (\$54,000.000). The two – three bedroom home, priced at 150-160 thousand dollars is the most popular housing option in the Grand Traverse Area in terms of price, volume and absorption. This represents perhaps the majority of housing options with the continuum ranging from as low as \$70,000.00 to as high as \$250,000.00.

The projected private investment for Pod No. 2 is approximately \$15.3 million. The annual tax incremental revenue from this project over a 30-year period is estimated to exceed 10.1 million. The Developer estimates that construction will commence in 2003.

2.0 Current Property Conditions

2.1 Property Eligibility

Pod No. 2 is an Eligible Property because it is a Facility (see Section 2.2 below). Additionally, Pod No. 2 meets the definition of functionally obsolete property. . PA 145 of 2000 defines functionally obsolete as follows:

“means that the property is unable to be used to adequately perform the function for which it was intended due to a substantial loss in value resulting from factors such as overcapacity, changes in technology, deficiencies or superadequacies in design, or other similar factors that affect the property itself or the property’s relationship with other surrounding property.”

The State of Michigan, as part of a decision to deinstitutionalize mental health care, closed the Traverse City Regional Psychiatric Hospital Property. The function for which this property was constructed was eliminated by the State and the design of the building is inadequate for any other non-institutional use. Similarly, the State conducted a Physical Plant Inventory in the fall of 1969 and concluded that, "The building simply does not lend itself to modern psychiatry and razing is recommended."

2.2 Summary of Environmental Conditions

Soil and groundwater sampling and analysis have been conducted by the MDEQ Pre-Remedial Group in the area of Development Pod 2 which resulted in identification of hazardous substances in excess of the Part 201 Generic Residential Criteria. Soil samples collected from just beneath the surface near facility buildings were found to contain arsenic and lead at concentrations exceeding the Part 201 Direct Contact Criteria (DCC). The intermittent occurrence of these substances may be attributable to use of pesticides, coal, or as a constituent of the coal slag that has been reportedly used for fill and as road surfacing material on the property. Isolated occurrences of elevated lead above the DCC may be attributable to historic use of lead paint for the exterior of facility buildings.

Soil and groundwater analyses indicated the presence of contaminants in excess of drinking water protection criteria. Soil samples exceed drinking water protection criteria for antimony, arsenic, atrazine, chromium, iron, and magnesium. The groundwater samples exceed drinking water criteria for aluminum, iron, lead, manganese and sodium. Surface water sampling was also conducted at one location on Development Pod 2. Analyses of the surface water sample indicated the presence of metals at concentrations above the Part 201 Residential & Commercial Drinking Water Criteria.

Environmental assessment work conducted to date for Development Pod 2 has reported there are discarded or abandoned containers of hazardous substances within the buildings and on the grounds. These include miscellaneous chemicals and paints and oil filled machinery. In addition, there are two large aboveground storage tanks located next to the former power plant (Building 52) that contain fuel. These substances may present potential exposure risks to users of the property and are potential sources of soil and/or groundwater contamination.

The Environmental Site Assessments conducted to date for the property have identified past uses of the property that are relevant to identification of potential due care, including operation of a medical care facility, a laundry, coal and petroleum storage, power generation. Hazardous substances that have been identified, and other substances related to past uses of the property may exist anywhere on the property. It is possible that, during building demolition, renovation, construction and site excavating and grading work, additional sources of hazardous substances may be discovered. Such discoveries may include abandoned or discarded containers of hazardous substances, buried solid hazardous materials, subsurface free product petroleum or other hazardous liquids, and contaminated groundwater. Such discoveries may reveal additional exposure risks to users of the property, or potential exacerbation conditions. In the event that unacceptable exposure or exacerbation risks are identified during redevelopment work, due care measures will be required to mitigate such risks.

Reports documenting the results of environmental investigation work conducted to date are as follows:

1. Baseline Environmental Assessment and Section 20107a Compliance Analysis, The Village at Grand Traverse Commons, EC&S May 8, 2002.
2. Environmental Site Assessment, The Village at Grand Traverse Commons, Sub areas 2 and 3, EC&S, May 3, 2002
3. Preliminary Facility Assessment and Environmental Site Assessment, Building 50 Grand Traverse Commons, The Traverse Group, and August 17, 2000.
4. Brownfield Redevelopment Assessment Report for Grand Traverse Commons Building 50 Area, Traverse City, Michigan, MDEQ Pre-Remedial Group, September 27, 2001.
5. Brownfield Redevelopment Assessment Report for Grand Traverse Commons Core Campus Area, MDEQ Pre-Remedial Group, September 27, 2001.

Maps and tables that summarize the environmental sampling work are included as Attachment G.

2.3 Summary of Functionally Obsolete and/or Blighted Conditions

PA 145 of 2000 defines functionally obsolete as follows:

“means that the property is unable to be used to adequately perform the function for which it was intended due to a substantial loss in value resulting from factors such as overcapacity, changes in technology, deficiencies or superadequacies in design, or other similar factors that affect the property itself or the property’s relationship with other surrounding property.”

The State of Michigan, as part of a decision to deinstitutionalize mental health care, closed the Traverse City Regional Psychiatric Hospital Property. The function for which this property was constructed was eliminated by the State and the design of the buildings are inadequate for any other non-institutional use. Similarly, the State conducted a Physical Plant Inventory in the fall of 1969 and concluded that, "The buildings simply do not lend themselves to modern psychiatry and razing is recommended"

3.0 Scope of Work

3.1 DEQ Eligible Activities

Investigation for PNAs in Building 66 Area - Due Care

A soil sample collected from beneath the surface near Building 66, identified as the Fire House, (located adjacent to Development Pod 2 on the north west corner) was found to contain polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons at concentrations above the Part 201 Infinite

Source Volatile Soil Inhalation Criterion for Ambient Air for residential, commercial and industrial use. This MDEQ criterion assumes an infinite source thickness, and a 1/2-acre source area extent. Because other soil borings have not been conducted to refute the thickness or a real extent of the PNAs in this area, additional delineation work will be needed to confirm that the volatilization exposure pathway in ambient air will not be exceeded in this area.

The contamination may extend beneath the northwest corner of Development Pod 2. It is therefore anticipated that one third of the investigation work for this source area will be conducted on Development Pod 2. As such, one third of the total investigation costs are allocated to Pod 2 for planning purposes. The work scope below describes the source area investigation.

Soil samples will be collected using a geoprobe from up to ten soil borings (three on Pod 2) installed in and around former soil sample location SB11 for laboratory analysis of PNAs to allow estimation of the thickness and the real extent of soil impacted above this criterion. If the thickness of the PNA-impacted soil is found to be less than five meters and/or less than one half acre

in extent, then the new data will be compared to alternate air inhalation criteria for PNAs which may verify no unacceptable inhalation risk. If evaluation of the resulting data indicate the ambient air pathway is complete, then a plan for corrective action, such as contaminated soil excavation and off-site disposal, will be developed to abate exposure risks to workers or residents.

Cost Estimate Portion for Pod 2:\$8,000

Delineation of Arsenic and Lead in Surface Soil - Due Care

The intermittent occurrence of soil containing arsenic and lead at concentrations above the Part 201 Residential Direct Contact Criterion may be attributable to use of pesticides, coal, or as a constituent of the coal slag that has been reportedly used for fill and as road surfacing material on the property. Isolated occurrences of elevated lead above the DCC may be attributable to historic use of lead paint in the area of the former maintenance shops, and for painting the exterior of all facility buildings. The presence of lead and arsenic may also be attributable to use of lead arsenate pesticides during past agricultural operations.

The direct contact pathway may be complete if unrestricted residential use is to occur in areas where soil exceeding the DCC exists at the surface. To eliminate this potential exposure pathway, up to 50 representative soil samples will be collected and analyzed for arsenic and lead from the ground surface in areas of the property used by residents that are left exposed (i.e. unpaved and not covered by clean imported fill) following redevelopment of the property. Samples will be collected from a depth of 0 to 6 inches below the ground surface and submitted for laboratory analysis of lead and arsenic. A report will then be prepared and submitted which includes illustrative and tabular summaries of the data, a description of the investigation, methods used, discussion of the results, conclusions and recommendations regarding the next course of action for abatement of exposure risks to workers or residents.

Cost Estimate:\$17,000

Site Specific Arsenic and Lead Risk Assessment - Response Activity

Soil sampling conducted at the property has identified concentrations of arsenic and lead in the surface soil at levels above the MDEQ default Direct Contact Criteria. Following delineation of the extent of lead and arsenic in the surface

soil, a site-specific direct contact risk assessment will be performed to determine if an alternate direct contact criterion is appropriate for the site. The first approach is to conduct a statistical evaluation of analytical data to determine the 95 percent upper confidence limit for the mean concentration for the contaminants.

For this analysis it is anticipated that up to ten additional samples will be collected in accordance with the MDEQ guidance document: *Sampling Strategies and Statistic Training Materials for Part 201 Cleanup Criteria*. This statistical procedure may enable demonstration that there is not an unacceptable exposure risk. If an unacceptable risk of direct contact exposure to arsenic or lead is indicated after conducting the statistical evaluation, then work will be conducted to determine a site-specific criterion for lead and/or arsenic.

The approach for determination of a site specific criterion for lead and/or arsenic will involve laboratory testing to determine the actual absorption efficiency for these metals from samples of soil collected from the site. Such methods would be conducted to pursue development of higher site-specific direct contact criteria for arsenic and/or lead.

The site specific direct contact criteria will then be compared to the concentrations of these metals identified in potential exposure areas at the site to confirm that the site-specific risk based criteria are not exceeded, thus eliminating the need for costly active remediation efforts.

Cost Estimate\$20,000

Baseline Environmental Assessment and Compliance Analysis

Environmental Assessment research and reporting will be conducted in order to identify current environmental conditions for Development Pod 2 as necessary to enable liability protection for future developers/owners and to enable preparation of an adequate Due Care Plan. This effort will result in generation of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Baseline Environmental Assessment, and Section 20107a Compliance Analysis (including a Due Care Plan), conducted in accordance with MDEQ guidance documents.

Cost Estimate:\$8,000

Consulting for Land Use Restrictions - Response Activity

Because there are areas in which soil and or groundwater contains contaminants in excess of Part 201 Residential Criteria, it may be appropriate to pursue Land Use Restrictions as a Due Care measure to mitigate exposure risks. Land use restrictions will be placed on surface water and groundwater from beneath the property to prohibit consumptive use contaminated water. If necessary, land use restrictions will also be placed on gardening or digging by residents in areas where soil containing hazardous substances has been mitigated by capping with pavement or clean fill. Such restrictions will require assemblage of information, surveys, documentation and other planning efforts by environmental experts so that effective and enforceable restrictions may be placed on all or portions of the property.

Cost Estimate:\$3,000

Handling of Discarded or Abandoned Containers - Response Activity

Environmental assessment work conducted to date has reported there are numerous discarded or abandoned containers of hazardous substances within the buildings and on the grounds of Development Pod 2. These include miscellaneous chemicals paints and oil filled machinery and two large above ground storage tanks containing fuel oil. These substances may present potential exposure risks to users of the property and are potential sources of soil and/or groundwater contamination. All known discarded or abandoned containers of hazardous substances will be removed from the property and appropriately disposed of during redevelopment of the property. If during redevelopment work additional discarded or abandoned containers of hazardous substances are discovered, documentation of the discovered containers will be conducted, a Notice Regarding Discarded or Abandoned Containers (EQP4476) will be submitted to the MDEQ, and the hazardous substances will be properly disposed of. The following cost estimate includes demolition of the two large above ground fuel oil storage tanks, and disposal of waste liquids contained in the tanks.

Cost Estimate:\$31,000

Discovered Source Areas - Response Activity

During renovation, construction and grading work, additional sources or releases of hazardous substances into the soil or groundwater may be discovered. Such discoveries may include leaking containers of hazardous substances, buried solid hazardous materials, subsurface free product petroleum or other hazardous liquids, and contaminated groundwater. Such discoveries may reveal additional exposure risks to users of the property, or potential exacerbation conditions. In addition, response activities may be required by MDEQ Regulations including Act 451, Parts 111, 201, 211 and 213. In the event that unacceptable exposure or exacerbation risks are identified during redevelopment work, due care measures will be required to mitigate such risks. This may include delineation of contaminated soil or groundwater by soil and water sampling and analyses, soil or waste excavation and disposal, contaminated groundwater removal, or other measures needed to characterize and remove sources of unacceptable exposure risks to users of the property following redevelopment. To prepare this estimate, it was assume that activities in response to discovered source areas would involve 60 hours of professional consulting, \$25,000 in waste disposal fees, and collection of 10 samples for analysis of VOCs, PNAs, and metals.

Cost Estimate:\$40,000

MDEQ Reporting - Response Activity

During the course of property redevelopment, site characterization, monitoring or remediation work may have to be conducted to eliminate exposure or exacerbation risks which would require MDEQ reporting in accordance with regulations under Act 451, Parts 111, 201, 211 and 213. The reporting may be required as a response activity measure in order to receive validation that measures taken to mitigate exposure or exacerbation risks are within the guidelines, procedures and criteria established within the various divisions of the MDEQ. The cost estimate was prepared assuming that 120 hours would be required for MDEQ reporting.

Cost Estimate\$10,000

3.2 MEGA Eligible Activities

Public Infrastructure Improvement:

Sanitary Sewer

The sanitary sewer consists of a network of 8", 10" and 12" sewers. In December of 1999, 3584 feet of the system was televised and root cut and assessed to be in fair to good condition. Manholes were evaluated at this time and likewise found to be in fair to good condition; their spacing is less than 300 feet. All service is by gravity sewer, and no pump stations are located within the Sub-areas. The sanitary sewer ultimately discharges to the City of Traverse City system at the boundary of Sub-area 2. The system within the sub-areas is currently private. Evaluation and negotiations are under way to convey the system to the City of Traverse City. The city is unwilling to accept the system without substantial upgrades. The system is considered antiquated and hence high maintenance and difficult to access. Documented root intrusion requires frequent root cutting, alternatively each junction could be grouted or an insituform sleeve inserted in the existing pipe. The worst-case scenario requires complete replacement. Access is complicated by its proximity to a regulated wetland on one side and a steep embankment on the other. Easement/right-of-way will be granted to the City of Traverse City prior to commencement of work.

Replacement of the system has been estimated to be \$40.00/lineal foot. Access will require the construction of a road over this difficult terrain, capable of supporting heavy equipment.

Cost Estimate\$294,370

Public Road

An area wide road circulation study, which includes the Grand Traverse Commons, is in process. Recommendations will likely include improvements to the roads, (widening, resurfacing and curbs) serving the project. Some or all of these roads will likely be conveyed to the City of Traverse City. This cost estimate assumes that a 1,492 linear foot section of Silver Road (the section within Development Pod No. 2) will be reconstructed as a public roadway. Roads will be dedicated to the City of Traverse City upon completion of improvements.

The constructed roadway will consist of 24' wide bituminous paving and concrete curb and gutter. Work will include removal of the existing road, construction of a new roadway with curb and gutter and drainage. It is planned to design the roadway for drainage to the existing storm sewer structures located within Sub Area No. 2.

The project will require a topographical survey of existing terrain and utility location, a site plan and profile, details and soil erosion control measures. Also, a certificate of survey with a description of the new road and parcel division is needed. The project and required permits are subject to approval from the MDEQ and the City of Traverse City.

Cost Estimate\$134,280

Lead Paint Abatement

Lead paint is ubiquitous throughout the interiors and exteriors of the buildings including structural steel, painted brick and block, various wall plasters, and a variety of building components including windows, doors, door frames and miscellaneous trim. The failure of the waterproofing materials is creating an opportunity for lead based paint hazards to migrate into the surrounding soils and sanitary sewer system.

It will be necessary to remove the paint by various methods including, scraping, needle scaling, sand or water blasting and chemical treatments.

Cost Estimate\$1,275,200

Asbestos Abatement

Asbestos is found throughout the buildings in various forms including straight run pipe insulation, mudded fittings, building insulation, various 9x9 floor tiles and mastic, fire doors and plaster. This asbestos will be abated by different methods including glove bagging and full negative pressure containment.

Cost Estimate (Does not include the Power House)\$546,514

Interior Demolition

The basic layout of the cottage buildings consists of an eleven-foot wide double loaded corridor with 9' x 11' foot patient rooms on either side. The goal is to adapt these psychiatric facilities to a new use by reconfiguring these "cell" like spaces in a manner that will accommodate commercial and residential uses. To remediate the functional obsolescence, significant interior wall demolition must occur. Walls between the rooms will be removed by creating an arched opening. These openings will emulate existing arched openings that were created, on a limited basis, during original construction.

This interior demolition will be accomplished by removing 7 courses of brick at the top of the wall. One half of the wall (which consists of five wythe of brick) will be removed at a time in order to install a two piece engineered pre-cast concrete lintel. Each part of the lintel is designed to replace the brick in ½ of the wall thickness. Following insertion of the first lintel, the brick in the other half of wall is removed and the second part of the lintel is installed. Special lifting equipment will be employed to lift the lintels into place. Once both lintels are installed, the brick wall beneath the lintel will be saw cut and removed. Plaster will be applied to the exposed brick and lintels to match the historic wall treatment. In some cases, only door openings will be created in the manner described below.

Corridor wall removal will be done differently. The wide corridor and circulation pattern are an historic element that will be preserved whenever possible. Corridor walls that are removed will be retrofitted with a straight steel lintel installed just above the door openings. By so doing a four-foot bulkhead and transom windows will remain at the top of the wall thereby preserving the sense of the historic corridor and the rhythm of openings. This procedure is similar to the process described above, but utilizes a two-piece steel "C" channel. Saw cuts are made in the brick, one wythe is removed and the "C" channel is installed, slightly recessed. This procedure is repeated on the opposite side of the wall. The two pieces of steel are then bolted together. The brick beneath the lintel is removed and plaster or drywall is installed to match the historic finish.

The projected cost to remove these walls and create openings is \$2,500.00 per opening. Door openings are estimated at \$750.00 per opening. The number of openings varies with end use, typically requiring more for commercial uses than residential. Floor plans for tenants reserving space in our first phase, mixed use 30,000 square building require eleven new door openings and 91 full openings at a projected cost of \$228,335.00 or approximately \$7.60 per square foot of building. These budget numbers extrapolated to the cottages yield a projected cost of \$1,020,148. 574 window openings will also have to be demolished in order to replace the windows in these buildings. Demolition and repair of the openings associated with this replacement is estimated to be \$287,000.

Cost Estimate\$1,307,148

Power House

The decommissioning of the Power House generally includes removal of asbestos, boiler treatment chemicals, fly ash, coal, PCB containing equipment, oils and greases, and mercury containing equipment. Insulation and Environmental Services, the contractor used by both Munson Medical Center and Grand Traverse County to provide hazardous materials abatement, estimated that decommissioning of the Power House would cost approximately \$593,860.

Cost Estimate\$593,860

3.3 Other DEQ & MEGA Eligible Costs:

381 Work Plan

The GTCBRA intends to capture reasonable costs to prepare the DEQ & MEGA 381 Work Plan as well as the actual invoiced DEQ and MEGA work plan review costs. The cost estimate related to preparation, approval, and review fees for the 381 Work Plan is as follows:

Cost Estimate\$7,000

Financing Costs

The GTCBRA intends to capture tax incremental revenue for interest generated from unreimbursed eligible activities that the Authority is contractually obligated to pay via tax incremental revenue. Interest shall be calculated at a rate of 2.25%. The cost estimate for financing costs is as follows:

Contingency

The DEQ and MEGA allow a 15 percent contingency to be added to the estimated cost of the proposed eligible activities. This contingency allows for unforeseen circumstances and cost overruns.

Cost Estimate.....\$583,491

4.0 Schedule and Costs

4.1 Schedule of Activities (Estimate)

Eligible Activities will be conducted concurrent with redevelopment activities. The estimated construction schedule per building is set forth below. Please see Table 3 (TIR Proforma) for additional schedule information.

Building	Square Footage	Private Investment	Year of Construction
Building 22	19,020	\$1,902,000	2003
Building 28	19,000	\$1,900,000	2004
Building 40	43,550	\$4,355,000	2005
Power House – 52	26,690	\$2,669,000	2006
Building 32	21,780	\$2,178,000	2007
Building 34	23,000	\$2,300,000	2008

4.2 Estimated Costs

a. Description of DEQ Eligible Activities Costs

DESCRIPTION OF COSTS	ESTIMATED COST
DEQ Eligible Activities	
a. Investigation for PNAs	\$8,000
b. Delineation of Arsenic & Lead in Surface Soils	\$17,000
c. Site Specific Arsenic and Lead Risk Assessment	\$20,000
d. BEA & Compliance Analysis	\$8,000
e. Consulting for Land Use restrictions	\$3,000
f. Discarded or Abandoned Containers	\$31,000
g. Discovered Source Areas	\$40,000
h. MDEQ Reporting	\$10,000
Sub Total DEQ:	\$137,000
Other DEQ Eligible Activities	
a. Contingency (15%)	\$20,550
b. 381 Work Plan Preparation	\$3,500
c. Allocated Financing Costs (% Ttl Basis)	\$41,080
Sub Total Other:	\$65,130
Total DEQ Eligible Costs:	\$202,130

b. Description of MEGA eligible Activities Costs

DESCRIPTION OF COSTS	ESTIMATED COST
MEGA Eligible Activities:	
a. Public Infrastructure:	
i. Sanitary Sewer	\$294,370
ii. Public Roadway	\$134,280
b. Lead Paint Abatement *	\$1,275,200
c. Asbestos Abatement *	\$546,514
d. Demolition:	
i. Interior Demolition	\$1,045,718
ii. Power House *	\$593,860
Sub Total MEGA:	\$3,889,942.00
Other MEGA Eligible Activities:	
a. Contingency (15%)	\$583,491.00
b. 381 Work Plan Preparation	\$3,500
TOTAL	\$4,476,933.00
* See Attachment H for Supporting Vendor Quotes	

4.3 Governing Body Certification Regarding Available School Tax Capture

The Grand Traverse County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority and the Grand Traverse County Commission approved the Brownfield Plan for Development Pod No. 2. The Brownfield Plan authorizes the capture of all approved local and school taxes. Exhibit D to the Plan sets forth the available school taxes for BRA capture.

