

Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment

Executive Summary

(Note: Referenced “burn disposal site” is located outside the boundaries of the property being offered for sale.)

Full reports are available upon request but due to the large size of the documents, reports will be copied onto a CD-ROM to be viewed on a computer. No paper copies of the reports will be mailed to bidders.

1.0 SUMMARY

Bailey Edward and Alfred Benesch & Company (Benesch) were retained by the United States Department of Agriculture - Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and provide responses to GSA Real Property Checklist Questions 11-19 for the USDA-ARS Ohio North Appalachian Experimental Watershed (NAEW) research facility (the Property). The Property has a mailing address of 28850 State Route 621, Fresno, Coshocton County, Ohio. This Expanded ESA was conducted on behalf of the USDA-ARS ("User") in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-05 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process.

The Property encompasses approximately 631 acres of federally owned land and 421 acres of land the USDA leases from Coshocton County. The Property has several notable features of potential environmental concern including two emergency generators, three diesel aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), one gasoline underground storage tank (UST), five heating oil USTs, three heating oil ASTs, one non-hazardous solid waste dumpster, pole mounted electrical transformers, a burn/disposal site, a research laboratory building, pesticide use and storage, a private potable water system and septic waste water system, and vehicle and farm equipment maintenance.

Based on historical sources, the Property has been used since 1938 by the USDA-ARS as an agricultural research facility in cooperation with the Ohio State University (OSU). Prior to its development by USDA, the Property was the location of small agricultural use fields and forested land with some farmsteads or residences in the area. No significant data gaps affected our ability to identify *recognized environmental conditions* (RECs) in connection with the Property.

According to persons interviewed for this assessment, typical research at the NAEW site included soil erosion, water quality, and the effect of livestock practices on watershed runoff. Based on interview information, all pesticide use was from retail packaged and labeled containers, pesticides were generally applied by OSU employees at recommended rates, and bulk storage of pesticides or fertilizers has not been utilized at the Property. In addition, with the exception of the historical gasoline (leaking underground storage tank) LUST site, interviewees were not aware of any significant leaks/spills of hazardous substances or petroleum products at the Property.

The Property is listed in the Environmental Data Resources (EDR) Federal Agency Database Listings as a RCRA-CESQG (conditionally exempt small quantity generator) site because small amounts of laboratory chemicals (chromium, mercury and silver) that were used until recently at the NAEW facility. According to EDR, the Property has a current regulatory status of "No Violations Found." There are no other federal agency database sites located within the relevant search radii of the Property.

The Property is listed in the EDR State Agency Database Listings as a UST site. The Property has a 1,000-gallon double walled fiberglass UST for gasoline storage that was installed in 1992. The current UST replaced a fuel house and gasoline USTs originally installed in the 1940s at the Property in the area west of Buildings 7-11. There are no other state agency database sites located within the relevant search radii of the Property. Based on site reconnaissance observations, current regulatory status and apparent compliance at the Property with current regulations, the current gasoline UST is not considered a significant risk at this time

USDA records indicate that three USTs formerly located in the vicinity of Building 12 (gas house) situated in the circle west of Buildings 7-11 were removed in 1991-92. Extensive excavation and removal of impacted soils for off-site disposal was conducted in the area. The Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations (BUSTR) with the Ohio Department of Commerce, Division of State Fire Marshal subsequently issued a “No Further Action” letter for the Property leaking underground storage tank (LUST) site indicating that BUSTR “is not requiring further corrective actions of any contamination resulting from petroleum UST activity at this facility.” The gasoline LUST site at the Property represents a *historical recognized environmental condition*.

USDA records indicate that five heating oil USTs formerly located in the vicinity of main facility buildings were removed in 1997. No visual evidence of leaks or spills of heating oil was documented in the tank pits. However, there were laboratory indications of some contamination in selected stockpiled soils so approximately 21 tons of contaminated soils were removed from the Property and transported to a licensed landfill for disposal. The heating oil tanks at the Property were not given a LUST site designation by BUSTR when removed in 1997. Based on regulatory records and file information, the former Property heating oil USTs do not represent a *recognized environmental condition*. In addition, based on site reconnaissance observations, current regulatory status and apparent compliance at the Property with current regulations, the current heating oil USTs are not considered a significant risk at this time.

Benesch identified the following *recognized environmental conditions* (RECs) in connection with the Property:

1. The main cluster of buildings at the Property have a septic system for waste water disposal which dates to circa 1938. The system reportedly has three tanks and laterals leading to a leach field. The septic system is a potential conduit for contamination from the on-site historic laboratory and/or vehicle maintenance activities to enter local groundwater resources and represents a concern for the Property.
 - a) Since its founding in 1938 until perhaps 10-20 years ago, significant vehicle maintenance at the Property was conducted in the Repair Shop (Garage, Building No. 9), with additional farm equipment maintenance conducted at the Upper (South) Quonset (Building No. 14). Although there are no reported releases regarding the farm and vehicle maintenance activities at the Property, it is the

experience of the report Environmental Professionals that the unknown disposition of waste materials prior to circa 1980 generated in the long term use of the Property Repair Shop, combined with the presence of floor drains in the building and the on-site septic system represents a *recognized environmental condition* for the Property.

- b) Since 1938 until recently, routine USDA laboratory work was conducted in Building Nos. 3 and 4. Although there are no reported releases regarding the laboratory activities at the Property, it is the experience of the report Environmental Professionals that the unknown disposition of laboratory materials prior to circa 1980 combined with the presence of the on-site septic system represents a *recognized environmental condition* for the Property.
2. A burn disposal site is located near the northeast Property boundary on land leased from Coshocton County. Although there is no empirical evidence that hazardous substances were disposed of at the burn site, it is the experience of the report Environmental Professionals that the unknown character of materials burned at this location dating to perhaps 1938 and their potential for site contamination represents a *recognized environmental condition* for the Property.

To further assess the significance of these RECS at the Property, Benesch makes the following recommendations:

1. Benesch recommends sampling the settling tanks of the main septic system, if accessible, for the presence of contaminants associated with vehicle maintenance such as solvents which are volatile organic compounds (VOCs) using EPA Method No. 8260B; heavy metals (also referred to as the 8 RCRA metals [Arsenic, Barium, Cadmium, Chromium, Lead, Mercury, Selenium and Silver]) using EPA Method Nos. 6010 and 7470; and petroleum constituents (total petroleum hydrocarbons or TPH) using Ohio Method and/or EPA Modified Method No. 8015; and BTEX (Benzene, Toluene, Ethylene and Xylenes) using EPA Method No. 8260B.
2. Benesch recommends sampling the settling tanks of the main septic system, if accessible, for the presence of contaminants associated with laboratory use such as VOCs using EPA Method No. 8260B and heavy metals using EPA Method Nos. 6010 and 7470.
3. Benesch recommends that the contents of the Property burn/disposal site be visually characterized and loaded for transport to an appropriate licensed landfill for disposal according to local, state and/or federal regulations. Following the disposal of the burn site materials, surface soils in the immediate vicinity of the burn site could then be composite sampled for the presence of residual contaminants such as VOCs using EPA Method No. 8260B, SVOCs using EPA Method No. 8270 and pesticides using EPA Method No. 8082.

Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment

Executive Summary

(Note: Referenced “burn disposal site” is located outside the boundaries of the property being offered for sale.)

Full reports are available upon request but due to the large size of the documents, reports will be copied onto a CD-ROM to be viewed on a computer. No paper copies of the reports will be mailed to bidders.

Section 1 Executive Summary

A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA) was performed by Alfred Benesch & Company (Benesch) on behalf of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The USDA has operated an agricultural research facility in Coshocton County, Ohio since 1938. The facility was operated in cooperation with the Ohio State University. The USDA no longer operates the facility and desires to transfer ownership of the property to the State of Ohio.

In 2012 a Phase I ESA was performed at the site. The Phase I ESA identified two recognized environmental conditions (RECs):

- A septic system for waste water disposal services the laboratory and vehicle maintenance facility. The septic system infiltration gallery was considered a REC.
- A burn disposal site was located near the northeast Property boundary on land leased from Coshocton County. The burn disposal area was considered a REC.

A Phase II ESA was performed by Benesch on April 10-11, 2013 to examine these two RECs and determine if hazardous substances are present at either site as a result of USDA use of the property.

The Phase II ESA found no groundwater beneath the septic tank infiltration gallery. Consequently, no groundwater samples were tested. The investigation found no evidence of a release of hazardous substances at the septic tank infiltration gallery.

The residual waste material in the former burn pit area was removed prior to the Phase II ESA being conducted. Three samples and a duplicate sample were collected from soil in the former burn disposal area. The samples were submitted to TestAmerica's North Canton, Ohio laboratory for analysis of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile compounds (SVOCs), and the seven metals regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

The results of the soil sample analysis were compared to the USEPA's residential and industrial risk based screening levels (RBSLs). RBSLs were generated by the EPA to provide guidance on chemical concentrations that may pose a potential risk under various exposure scenarios. The potential risk from exposure to chemicals at concentrations below the RBSLs is considered negligible and may be used as cleanup goals. Chemical concentrations above the RBSLs do not, however, indicate that a site poses an unacceptable risk but rather that further evaluation of the potential risks is appropriate. Further evaluation may include evaluation of the potential site specific risk under reasonable exposure scenarios, or consideration of ambient background levels in the environment.

When considering cleanup goals, it is USEPA's preference to assume maximum beneficial use of a property; that is, the residential RBSLs unless another less restrictive exposure scenario (e.g. an industrial use exposure) is justified.