



**March 28, 2016**

**Mr. Phill Francis  
City of Griffin  
416 E. Taylor Street  
Griffin, Georgia 30223**

**SUBJECT: Report of Phase I Environmental Site Assessment  
N. 12th Street Property  
310 N. 12th Street  
Griffin, Spalding County, Georgia  
GEC Project No.: 160180.240**

**Dear Mr. Francis:**

Geotechnical & Environmental Consultants, Inc. (GEC) has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the above referenced site in general accordance with ASTM E 1527-05, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments. As required by the Practice, our evaluation included a records review, site reconnaissance, and interviews as detailed in the attached report.

GEC appreciates the opportunity to provide our professional services to you. If you have any questions concerning this report, or if we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,  
**GEOTECHNICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS, INC.**

**Tameka Gordon  
Environmental Specialist**

**Jon A. Spaller, P.G.  
Senior Geologist  
GA Reg. No. 710**

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mr. Phill Francis with City of Griffin retained Geotechnical & Environmental Consultants, Inc. (GEC) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) on the subject property (as defined in Section 3.1 of this report). GEC is not affiliated with Mr. Phill Francis or Raven Group LLC (the current owner of the property).

The Phase I ESA was performed in general accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 1527-2005, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments and their updates. The ASTM E 1527-2005 is the most current ASTM standard for this work. The Phase I ESA consisted of a site reconnaissance of the subject property, review of applicable and reasonably ascertainable information about the subject property, and interviews with selected officials knowledgeable about the subject property. The Phase I ESA was intended to provide an overview of environmental conditions at the subject property resulting from current and/or past site activities.

The user of this report should read the entire report for detailed descriptions of the property and the observations and judgments made by GEC. The user is ultimately responsible for assessing whether the limitations of the ASTM Practice and this project's scope of work are appropriate to the level of risk the user assumes for the subject property transaction.

Interviews and review of reasonably ascertainable records by GEC during the completion of the Phase I ESA indicate that the subject property has is being used as an automobile salvage yard that has included the dismantling and storage of automobiles, automobile parts, and waste fluids as part of its daily operations.

The site reconnaissance and research as noted throughout this report revealed evidence of a REC from the current usage of the subject property. Even though the on-site automotive parts salvage facility presents a recognized environmental condition (REC) because of the material threat of a release onto the subject property, it does not represent, in and of itself, an obvious or direct condition of environmental liability to the subject property. The site currently exhibits no visible signs of any releases beyond *de minimis* conditions. Continued good housekeeping, best management practices in handling the various petroleum, solvent, and other types of chemical products, and adherence to the pertinent regulations regarding the operations should help to mitigate the probability of future releases and/or liability from site operations. GEC does not expect the on-site activities to present undue environmental liability to the subject property or impact its current use, beyond that commonly present in any similar well-run operation.

During GEC's site reconnaissance on March 23, 2016, GEC observed that the subject property was commercially developed land. The property was primarily used for the on-site salvage operations. GEC observed one metal building on the subject property used to store automobile parts and other tools and equipment. An old building slab was observed in the northern portion of the subject property. GEC also observed some surface staining in various locations of the subject property. A waste oil container (approximately 200-gallons) was observed outside the subject metal building. One aboveground hydraulic lift was also noted on the subject property. Debris piles typically consisting of mainly old automobile parts were observed scattered throughout the property. Although, surface staining and automotive parts were observed on the subject property, GEC is of the opinion that this would likely be typical at other salvage facilities and would



be considered a house keeping issue more than a significant environmental concern. GEC observed no visual signs of hazardous substance or petroleum contamination (stressed vegetation and/or significant stains or odors) on the subject property. In addition, no odors, and/or pits/ponds, or lagoons associated with waste treatment were observed on the site.

Since no assessment can absolutely deny the existence of hazardous materials, especially surficial environmental assessments with limited or no subsurface sampling, existing hazardous materials can escape detection using the customary methods. The conclusions of the environmental assessment are based on conditions as observed on our site visit and historical information about the site. Future changes in environmental conditions and site characteristics may occur with the passage of time, in which case, the conclusions of this report may have to be reevaluated. The conditions are such in an operation using and storing petroleum that diligence is required in monitoring the equipment and adhering to proper operations and petroleum and chemical handling techniques and regulations to mitigate the chances for a release. Conducting further study becomes dependent on the property owner's risk tolerance of possible liability for such releases, when and if they occur, as well as the perception of such upon future prospective purchasers of the subject property.

Based on the research and conclusions of this assessment, there is no indication to suggest that further environmental assessment is needed at this time.

## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this Phase I ESA report is to permit the user to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the *innocent landowner* defense under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). This is also known as one of the "landowner liability protections" or "LLPs" in the Practice. This practice constitutes the "all appropriate inquiry" (AAI) into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice as defined at 42 USC §9601 (35) (B).

### **2.2 Detailed Scope of Services**

This Phase I ESA was conducted in general accordance with ASTM E 1527-2005 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments. GEC's scope of work for this Phase I ESA was to identify "recognized environmental conditions" to the extent feasible by the processes outlined in Practice E 1527 and in general accordance with good commercial and customary practices for conducting an environmental site assessment of a parcel of land with respect to the range of contaminants within the scope of CERCLA and petroleum products.

Practice E 1527 defines "recognized environmental conditions" (RECs) as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De minimis conditions are not recognized environmental conditions (RECs).



The scope of Practice E 1527 does not include any testing or sampling of materials (e.g., soil, water, air, or building materials). Furthermore, GEC's scope of work for this Phase I ESA did not address ASTM non-scope items such as asbestos containing materials (ACMs), radon, lead-based paint, lead in drinking water, wetlands, regulatory compliance, cultural & historic resources, industrial hygiene, health and safety, ecological resources, endangered species, or for indoor air quality issues such as, biological agents, vapor intrusion, or mold.

GEC performed each of the four components (records review, site reconnaissance, interviews and a report of findings) of the ASTM E 1527 Phase I ESA in general accordance with Sections 6.0 through 12.0 of the Practice. The objective of the records review, site reconnaissance, and interviews is to obtain information used to identify RECs in connection with the property.

### **2.3 Significant Assumptions**

The following assumptions were made by GEC in the preparation of this report. GEC relied on information derived from secondary sources including governmental agencies, the client (User), designated representatives of the client, property contact, property owner, property owner representatives, computerized databases, and personal interviews. Except as identified in this report, GEC has made no independent investigation as to the accuracy and completeness of the information derived from secondary sources. GEC assumes that information provided by or obtained from governmental agencies is accurate and complete unless proven otherwise during the study. Groundwater flow and depth to groundwater, unless otherwise specified by on property well data, are assumed based on contours depicted on the USGS topographic maps and field observations. GEC assumes that the property has been correctly and accurately identified by the client and others associated with the project. GEC assumes that the client, property owner, interviewees and others providing information on the property used good faith in answering questions and in obtaining information relative to the subject property.

### **2.4 Limitations and Exceptions**

The conclusions of this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment are based on conditions as observed on our site visit and on historical information about the site. Information contained in this report was obtained by means of document review, interviews, and on-site observations. The conclusions presented in this report are our professional opinions based on our findings obtained in general accordance with customary practices, principles, and methodologies utilized in the fields of environmental science. Since no assessment can absolutely deny the existence of hazardous materials, especially surficial environmental assessments with limited or no subsurface sampling, existing hazardous materials can escape detection using the customary methods. Future changes in environmental conditions and site characteristics may occur with the passage of time, in which case, the conclusions of this report may have to be reevaluated.

### **2.5 Special Terms and Conditions**

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared in accordance with the stated and agreed upon Scope of Work. This report was specifically and only prepared for the identified specific client (user) and their designees and for their specific purpose; no other person or entity for any other purpose may use, or rely on this report or its contents unless specifically authorized in writing by GEC. No other special terms and conditions are applicable to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.



## **2.6 User Reliance**

This report is intended for the use of City of Griffin and their representatives for their use in evaluating the environmental liability associated with the subject property. GEC is not affiliated with the City of Griffin or Raven Group LLC (the current owner of this property). GEC is not responsible for opinions, conclusions, or recommendations made by others based on the findings in this report. This report and its findings shall not, in whole or in part, be disseminated to any other party, or used by any other party without the prior written consent of Geotechnical & Environmental Consultants, Inc.

## **3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

The following sections describe the subject site as it was encountered during the site reconnaissance, performed on March 23, 2016, as part of this ESA, or based on information reviewed as part of this ESA (from sources described within this report).

### **3.1 Location and Legal Description**

The subject site, which is 0.82-acres in size and consists of tax parcel 011 03001, is located within Spalding County, Georgia. The subject property is located at 310 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street and is situated at the western intersection of Experiment Street and Wright Street in Griffin, Spalding County, Georgia. A site location map is included in Appendix 1 as Figure 1.

The subject property is legally described in the most current available deeds found at the Clerk's Office, Spalding County Superior Court and in Appendix III.

### **3.2 Site and Vicinity General Characteristics**

The subject property is currently developed land occupied by an automobile parts salvage yard. The vicinity of the subject property consists of industrial, religious, residential, and undeveloped wooded properties. Experiment Street borders the subject property to the north with railroad tracks and industrial property (abandoned textile mill) beyond. Experiment Street borders the subject property to the east with railroad tracks and undeveloped wooded land beyond. Wright Street borders the subject property to the south with religious property beyond. N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street borders the subject property to the west with residential properties beyond.

### **3.3 Current Use of the Property**

The subject property is currently occupied land rented by Griffin Import for the storage and disassembly of salvaged automobiles.

### **3.4 Descriptions of Structures, Roads, Other Improvements on the Site**

GEC observed one metal building on the subject site. Experiment Street borders the subject site to the north and east. Wright Street borders the subject property to the south. N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street borders the subject property to





the west. According to various sources, city water and sewer serve the subject site.

### **3.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties**

The vicinity of the subject property consists of industrial, religious, residential, and undeveloped wooded properties. Experiment Street borders the subject property to the north and northeast with railroad tracks and industrial property (abandoned textile mill) beyond. Experiment Street borders the subject property to the east with railroad tracks and undeveloped wooded land beyond. Wright Street borders the subject property to the south with religious property beyond. N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street borders the subject property to the west with residential properties beyond.

## **4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION**

### **4.1 Title Records**

The User did not provide GEC with any title information for the subject property. Additionally, the User did not request that GEC perform a title review for the subject property.

In an effort to obtain information on the subject property, personnel from GEC reviewed information concerning the subject property on the Spalding County Tax Assessor's website on March 10, 2016. The property tax information card indicates the owner of the property is Raven Group LLC. A copy of the property information is attached in Appendix III.

According to the reviewed property record card, Raven Group LLC obtained the subject property from Mr. Will Hill Newton, Jr. on April 18, 2006. The subject property was in the Newton family from 1950 to 2006 when it was sold to the current owner.

The limited review of the history of ownership did not indicate previous ownership site activities that would be expected to have created environmental concerns on the subject property other than previously noted within this report. A copy of the property information is attached in Appendix III.

### **4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations**

The User did not provide GEC with any information regarding environmental liens or activity and use limitations in association with the subject property, nor did the client request that GEC perform that a search for environmental liens and use limitations be performed.

The property records reviewed by GEC did not indicate any environmental liens or any activity or use limitations, and the Users and/or local public agency contacts reported none.

### **4.3 Specialized Knowledge**

GEC was not provided any specialized knowledge or experience material to recognized environmental



conditions in connection with the subject site.

GEC provided our client a User Questionnaire to complete. At the time of issuance of the report, a response was not received. GEC does not expect information from the client will affect the conclusions of this report.

#### **4.4 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information**

GEC was not provided any common knowledge or other reasonably ascertainable information demonstrating recognized environmental conditions in connection with the subject site, except as has been developed over the course of research of this assessment and reported herein.

#### **4.5 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues**

The User did not indicate or provide any information regarding valuation reduction due to environmental issues, nor have any environmental issues been identified while conducting this Phase I ESA, which would affect the property valuation.

#### **4.6 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information**

Based on information provided by the User or reviewed during the course of this ESA, the current property owner is Raven Group LLC, 2341 Peachwood Circle NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30345. The Property is currently developed, occupied land.

#### **4.7 Reason for Performing Phase I**

GEC was asked to perform a Phase I ESA (as part of a real estate transaction with subject property) in accordance with the current ASTM-E 1527-2005 standard to qualify for the innocent landowner or prospective purchaser defense to CERCLA liability and to identify RECs that could impact the property's financial liability.

#### **4.8 Other**

#### **Previous Environmental Studies**

GEC is not aware of, and did not identify any previous environmental studies on the subject site. In addition, the User did not indicate or provide GEC with any previous environmental studies, regarding the subject site.

### **5.0 RECORDS REVIEW**

#### **5.1 Standard Environmental Record Sources**

GEC contracted with a commercial database reporting company to conduct a site specific radius search and examination of reasonably ascertainable Federal, State, and Local regulatory files concerning the site and



nearby sites which have been targeted for clean-up or investigation, sites and facilities against which complaints have been filed, or sites on which generators of hazardous waste or regulated substances are located. A copy of the database report is included in Appendix IV. A list of the databases reviewed (including the currency of the records, their definitions and the sources for these records, as well as the search distances) is included in the database report.

### Database Survey

The Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Report identified the subject property on the Spills database. According to the report, in 2001, caller alleges that the responsible party is disposing of household garbage and building demolition materials on a property which they lease. These materials are from dumpsters which the company takes to job sites. No response action was taken. No evidence of the past spill was observed during GEC's site reconnaissance. The regulatory listing for the subject site does not reflect conditions that would be expected to significantly impact the site or present significant financial liability to the subject property, nor impact the subject project areas.

The report identified sites, within applicable radii of the subject site, on the following databases:

### Database Summary

Database	No. of Sites Listed
Corrective Action Activity (CORRACTS)	1
State Hazardous Waste Site (SHWS)	1
Georgia Non Hazardous Site Inventory (GA Non HSI)	5
Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)	13
Underground Storage Tank (UST)	6
Aboveground Storage Tank (AST)	2
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Non Generator (RCRA NonGen/NLR)	3
Drycleaners	1
Manufactured Gas Plant (MGP)	1
US Historical Auto Station (US Hist Auto Stat)	1

GEC assessed the listed sites for potential environmental impacts to the subject property using the following criteria: (1) relative distance between the subject property and the regulated site, (2) topographic features and proximity of the subject property to the regulated site; GEC follows the generally accepted premise that shallow groundwater flow direction can be reasonably expected to mimic surface topography, and (3) common inferences about the nature and relevance of the regulatory listing with regard to the subject property.

The listed sites within ¼ mile of are summarized in the following table. Any site for which the REC determination was influenced by information other than that described in the paragraph above, that additional information is discussed following the table.





### Facility Summary

Facility Name	Database(s)	Distance	Direction	Elevation Relative to the Site	Deemed REC? Y/N
Cobbs Auto Repair Shop 344 N. 13 <sup>th</sup> Street	Hist Auto Stat	617 feet	NW	Lower	N
Thomaston Mills Inc. 502 W. Broad Street	RCRA NonGen/NLR, US Airs, LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	630 feet	E	Lower	N
City of Griffin 425 W. Broad Street	LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	692 feet	SE	Higher	N
Watson SS 356 N. 13 <sup>th</sup> Street	LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	696 feet	NW	Lower	N
Smith Dan J Jr Distributors 701 W. Quilley	RCRA NonGen/NLR, FINDS, ECHO	969 feet	NNW	Lower	N
Solomon Food Mart 627 W. Solomon Street	LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	1009 feet	SSW	Higher	N
345 W. Broad Street	LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	1020 feet	ESE	Higher	N
Korect Klean Cleaners 462 W. Solomon Street	RCRA NonGen/NLR, FINDS, ECHO, Drycleaners	1118 feet	SSE	Higher	N
Spalding Gas, Inc. 415 W. Solomon Street	AST	1184 feet	SE	Higher	N
Buckles Hardware 409 W. Solomon Street	AST	1200 feet	SE	Higher	N
Farzana & Willie McCord/Arthur 204 N. Ninth Street	LUST, UST, Financial Assurance	1237 feet	E	Higher	N

Due to the relative distance between the subject property and the listed regulated sites, the groundwater flow direction, topographic features, facility listing/status, and position of the subject property to the regulated sites, a release from the noted sites should not affect the subject property. No visual evidence of recognized environmental conditions was observed at the subject property during GEC's site visit. Liability for such a



release, if or when it occurs, should remain with the respective site owners.

All of the listed database facilities in the EDR report are registered with or under review by regulatory agencies, and liability for such a release, if or when it occurs, should remain with the respective site owners.

### **Orphan Sites**

GEC reviewed the "orphan summary" sites, which were not mapped due to poor or inadequate address information, in the database Report. No sites were found in the reviewed "orphan summary".

### **Vapor Encroachment**

GEC performed a Tier 1 Vapor Encroachment Screening (Tier 1) of the subject property, as part of this ESA. The Tier 1 screening was performed in general accordance with Sections 8.1.3.1 through 8.1.3.9 (which describes the Tier 1 process) of the *ASTM E 2600-10 Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions*.

GEC's methodology for performing this vapor encroachment screening consisted of assessing all the information collected in the Phase I investigation, including information collected in site reconnaissance, interviews, historical documentation and actual or probable chemical usage on the target property or nearby property.

The review of the information for the subject property did not indicate any sites within the area of concern (AOC) for the subject property. Based on this, it does not appear that vapor encroachment poses a significant concern to the subject property.

## **5.2 Additional Environmental Record Sources**

The additional environmental record sources (Section 8.2.2 of the ASTM E 1527-05 standard) are included in the "State and Local Records" section of the database report (Appendix IV). These additional environmental record sources include local Brownfields, local landfill/solid waste disposal sites, local hazardous waste/contaminated sites, local registered storage tanks, emergency release reports (Spills), and contaminated public wells. No other environmental records are believed available, and no additional environmental record sources were deemed necessary.

## **5.3 Physical Setting Sources**

### **Physical Setting/Topographic Map**

The subject property can be found on the Griffin North, Georgia Quadrangle of the U.S.G.S. 7.5-minute series Topographic Map with contour intervals of 10 feet photo-revised in 1981. A copy of the pertinent portions of this topographic map, showing the subject property and the surrounding area, is presented as Figure 2 in Appendix I.



On the topographic map, the site is shaded pink, indicating urban development. No structures are shown on the subject property on the reviewed topographic map.

The site elevation, as shown on the topographic map is approximately 950 feet above mean sea level, and the down slope of on-site surface drainage features at the site appear to be mostly to the north-northwest. Based on review of the topographic map and observations made during the site reconnaissance, the assumed groundwater flow direction is to the north-northwest.

## **Geologic Setting**

The site is located in the Piedmont Physiographic Province of Georgia. The Piedmont is composed of igneous and metamorphic rocks, most commonly granites, granitic gneiss, and schists. These rocks have undergone extensive alterations, folding and faulting during the mountain building episodes, which produced the Appalachian Mountains and have since experienced a long period of stability. Chemical and physical weathering have produced the present topography. The depth of weathering can vary greatly. The general Piedmont subsurface profile consists of clayey soils near the surface, which grade into silty sands and sandy silts with depth. Soils beneath the upper clayey zones often retain and exhibit the relic structure (banding, foliation) of the parent rock and are termed saprolite. A zone of weathered rock often separates saprolite from hard relatively unweathered bedrock. The various rock types resist weathering in different degrees depending on their chemical composition, fracturing, jointing, and bedding, so the depth to bedrock is often quite erratic and can vary over a short distance. Also, it is not unusual to find lenses of partially weathered rock and hard rock boulders within the saprolite. Alluvial, or water deposited, soils are present in association with rivers and streams. These soils consist of interlayered sands silts and clay with varying amounts of organic materials.

Groundwater occurs in the Piedmont Region in surficial unconfined aquifers in the soil/saprolite overburden and within the fractured bedrock (fractured rock aquifer). Due to the relatively low yields of these aquifers, groundwater usage in the Piedmont is usually limited to domestic water supply wells.

## **5.4 Historical Use Information on the Property**

The purpose of the historical review of the subject property is to develop a history of the site and the activities that occurred there, in an effort to identify any past uses or activities that may have resulted in recognized environmental conditions in association with the subject property. The following standard historical sources were sought and/or consulted in constructing the history of the subject site:

**Aerial Photographs** - GEC reviewed readily available aerial photographs of the subject property, to assist in developing the historic usage of the site. The photos were obtained through a commercial database search firm and from Google Earth™. The aerial photographs reviewed for the subject site are included in Appendix III.

Aerial photographs (2010, 2009, 2007, 2006, 2005, 1993, 1988, 1981, 1973, 1965, 1958, 1941, and 1937) were obtained through a commercial database search firm, Environmental Data Resources, Inc. A current aerial photograph was obtained off the Internet at the Google Earth™ web page. A copy of the current aerial photograph appears in Appendix I (Maps/Figures as Figure III).



The aerial photographs reviewed did not indicate obvious environmental impacts to the site. GEC's review of all of the readily available historical sources, such as Sanborn Maps, and aerial photographs, indicates that the subject property has been historically, developed residential land on the 1937 aerial photograph. The subject property appears developed residential or commercial land on the 1941 to 2014 aerial photographs. The site vicinity in all directions of the subject property appears as developed, commercial or residential land on all the reviewed aerial photographs. Experiment Street appears bordering the subject property to the north and east on all the aerial photographs.

GEC contacted Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) to search for Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, which were devised by insurance adjusters as early as the 1800s to show the use of properties at specified dates for the purpose of determining the risk of fire. The maps also identify businesses and activities, as well as some construction details, for those properties they cover. The Sanborn Maps are helpful in identifying historical environmental concerns that may have otherwise been unrecorded or left no evidence of their existence. Sanborn Map coverage exists for the target property. Copies of the 1961, 1958, 1949, 1925, 1915, 1909, 1905, 1900, 1895 Sanborn Maps can be found in Appendix III.

The subject property is not shown on the 1895 and 1900 Sanborn maps. The subject property appears to be occupied with a dwelling in the southeastern portion of the subject property on the 1905, 1909, and 1915 Sanborn maps. A store and church appear in the northern portion of the subject property on the 1925 Sanborn map. The church no longer appears on the subject property on the 1949 Sanborn map. An auto parts warehouse appears in the central portion of the subject property and a dwelling appears in the northern portion of the subject property on the 1949 Sanborn map. The dwelling in the southeastern portion of the subject site no longer exists on the subject property on the 1958 Sanborn map. The subject property appears essentially as it does currently on the 1958 and 1961 Sanborn maps. The Griffin Manufacturing Co. Cotton Mill appears to the northeast of the subject property on all the review Sanborn maps. The site vicinity appears as mostly dwellings east, south, and west of the subject property with small stores and religious properties scattered within the vicinity.

Examination of the EDR – Sanborn Map Report revealed that the subject property has been used for commercial activities, and the surrounding area has also been mostly used for residential purposes.

City Directory – GEC contracted with EDR, Inc. to search for city directories, which have been published for cities and towns across the U.S. since the 1700s. Originally a list of residents, the city directory developed into a sophisticated tool for locating individuals and businesses in a particular urban or suburban area. Directories are generally divided into three sections; a business index, a list of resident names and addresses, and a street index. With each address, the directory lists the name of the resident or, if a business is operated from this address, the name and type of business (if unclear from the name). While city directory coverage is comprehensive in major cities, it may be spotty for rural areas and small towns. City directory coverage does not exist for the target property. EDR reviewed city directories, for the most part, at five-year intervals spanning the 1992 through the 2012 volumes, but these years are not necessarily inclusive. A copy of the EDR – City Directory Abstract is presented in Appendix III.

The nearby properties, off of Wright Street and N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, include commercial properties (EDS



Carburetor & Ignition Service, Carburetor & Ignition Service, Robert L Jones Plumbing & Heat, Whitehead Performance, etc.) and individuals. Examination of the EDR – City Directory Abstract did not reveal any indications of environmental concerns for the subject property or the surrounding area.

The Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Historical Topographic Map Report, which provided additional U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps, is included in Appendix III.

### **5.5 Historical Use Information on Adjoining Properties**

In the past, the adjoining properties were largely commercial or residential properties in all directions of the subject site.

## **6.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE**

GEC performed a site reconnaissance of the subject property on March 23, 2016. All comments included in this section refer to the conditions at the time of the site reconnaissance only. Selected photographs taken identified during the site reconnaissance are included in Appendix II.

### **6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions**

GEC's methodology for performing the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was in general accordance with ASTM E 1527-05. No significant limiting conditions were encountered during the site reconnaissance.

### **6.2 General Site Setting**

The site is 0.82-acres in size, and is located in a mostly residential and commercial portion of Griffin, Georgia. During the site reconnaissance, the subject property appeared to be a developed, occupied tract of land.

Historically, the subject property appears to have been residential land on, if not before, the 1937 aerial photograph. The 1941 to 2014 aerial photographs show the subject property as developed residential or commercial land. The vicinity appears essentially as it does current, commercially and residentially developed, since the 1937 aerial photograph.

During the site reconnaissance, GEC observed a mixture of undeveloped, residentially, and commercially developed land within the site vicinity.

### **6.3 Exterior Observations**

During the site reconnaissance, the following items were used as visual indicators of potential on-site contamination sources: (1) surface spills or disposal areas of liquids or solids; (2) surface storage of drums; (3) areas of distressed vegetation, stained soils/pavement, or odors; (4) solid waste and/or fill areas; (5) site drainage features or water bodies (including pits, ponds, or lagoons); (6) waste water; (7) wells and/or septic systems; and (8) general housekeeping and maintenance.





#### 6.3.1 Drums

None observed.

#### 6.3.2 Hazardous Substances & Petroleum Products in Connection with Identified Users

Due to the current nature of the subject site, certain hazardous substances and petroleum products were observed on the subject property during GEC's site reconnaissance on March 23, 2016.

#### 6.3.3 Storage Tanks

One approximately 200-gallon waste oil storage tank was noted on the subject property.

#### 6.3.4 Odors

None observed.

#### 6.3.5 Pools of Liquid

None observed.

#### 6.3.6 Hazardous Substance and Petroleum Products Containers (Not Necessarily in Connection With Identified Uses)

See above in Section 6.3.2.

#### 6.3.7 Unidentified Substance Containers

None observed.

#### 6.3.8 PCBs

One pole mounted transformer was observed. The transformer appeared to be in good condition with no visible signs of leakage (stained soils or dead vegetation) beneath. They are owned by, and the responsibility of, the local public utility. No other suspected PCB-containing materials were observed during GEC's site reconnaissance.

#### 6.3.9 Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons

None observed.

#### 6.3.10 Stained Soil or Pavement



Neither stained soil nor pavement, other than *de minimis* as noted previously, was observed on the subject property during GEC's site reconnaissance.

#### 6.3.11 Stressed Vegetation

None observed.

#### 6.3.12 Solid Waste

Tools, auto parts, and other items were observed on the subject property. GEC would consider this to be more of a general housekeeping item, rather than a significant environmental problem for the subject property, but these items should be identified and properly disposed of.

#### 6.3.13 Wastewater

No wastewater was observed discharging into a drain, ditch or stream on or adjacent to the subject property during GEC's site reconnaissance.

#### 6.3.14 Water Supply & Wells

No public or private wells were noted on the property. According to various sources, public water serves the subject site.

#### 6.3.15 Sewage Disposal/Septic System

According to various sources, city sewer serves the subject site.

### 6.4 Interior Observations

The interior of the on-site building was indicative of that expected of typical warehouse/storage area.

#### 6.4.1 Heating/Cooling

No heating/cooling system was observed on the subject site.

#### 6.4.2 Stains or Corrosion

No visible signs of significant stains and/or corrosion were observed during GEC's site reconnaissance.

#### 6.4.3 Drains and Sumps



Other than normal interior sewer drains and the observed exterior storm water runoff drains, there were no floor drains observed.

## **7.0 INTERVIEWS**

### **7.1 Interview with Owner**

GEC was accompanied by the prospective purchaser during the site reconnaissance and a representative of the current tenant, Griffin Import Repair. The tenant's representative stated that the property was used for the storage and disassembly of automobiles for parts. He stated he was not aware of any underground tanks on the property or other environmental hazards. GEC was not provided any other reasonably ascertainable information in connection with the subject site.

### **7.2 Interview with Site Manager**

No site manager was interviewed during the course of this Phase I ESA.

### **7.3 Interview with Occupant**

The lack of interviews with the current or past occupants is not considered to be a significant data gap, since significant information beyond what was available from other interviews and the public record is not expected.

### **7.4 Interviews with Local Government Officials**

#### **Environmental Health Department**

GEC faxed an information questionnaire to the Spalding County Environmental Health Department on March 10, 2016. At the time of issuance of the report, a response was not received. GEC does not expect information from the department will affect the conclusions of this report. A copy of the information questionnaire is presented in Appendix V.

#### **Fire Department**

GEC faxed an information questionnaire to the City of Griffin Fire Department on March 10, 2016. GEC received a response from Captain John Hamilton indicating that the department does not have record of environmentally related fires, hazardous materials responses, or additional known environmental concerns at the subject property. He noted that there are no storage tanks (above or underground) currently or formerly located on the subject property. Captain Hamilton stated that the subject property has been used as an automotive repair facility for more than ten years. A copy of the completed information questionnaire is presented in Appendix V.

#### **Planning & Zoning**

GEC faxed an information questionnaire to the City of Griffin Planning & Zoning Department on March 10,



2016. GEC received a response from Ms. Jennifer Freeman indicating that the zoning for the subject property is Planned Industrial Development (PID). She noted that there are no zoning restrictions on the subject property and that the department does not have record of past usage of the subject site. Ms. Freeman indicated that city water and sewer serve the subject site. She indicated that the department does not have record of environmental conditions or concerns at the subject property or in the immediate site vicinity. A copy of the completed information questionnaire is presented in Appendix V.

## 7.5 Interviews with Others

No other interviews were conducted and no other interviews were deemed necessary.

## 8.0 FINDINGS

GEC has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05 on the subject property.

Data gaps experienced during the course of this Phase I ESA include the following:

- Intervals between aerial photographs longer than five years. Intervals between topographic maps longer than five years.
- The lack of complete title history on the property.
- The lack of an environmental lien or activity and use limitations review for the property.
- Lack of interview response.

GEC has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05 on the 0.82-acre subject property located at 310 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street in the City of Griffin, Spalding County, Georgia. No recognized environmental conditions, historical environmental conditions, or de minimis conditions were identified during the course of this assessment other than the site's current usage, were identified during the course of this assessment. Some surface soil staining and *de minimis* conditions were identified during this assessment; however, these conditions would likely be typical observations at any other salvage facility and are generally a housekeeping issue rather than a significant environmental concern.

## 9.0 OPINION

Based on the information reviewed during the course of the Phase I ESA, the following is noted regarding the items listed in the Findings section, above:

- None of the above data gaps are deemed to be significant, based on the availability of information from other sources, as well as the lack of development in the previous years.

The site reconnaissance and research, as noted throughout this report, revealed evidence of a REC from the current and past usage of the subject property. Even though the on-site automotive parts salvage facility presents a recognized environmental condition (REC) because of the material threat of a release onto the subject property, it does not represent, in and of itself, an obvious or direct condition of environmental liability to the



subject property. Conducting further study becomes dependent on the property owner's risk tolerance of possible liability for such releases, when and if they occur, as well as the perception of such upon future prospective purchasers of the subject property.

## 10.0 CONCLUSIONS

GEC has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05 on the subject property. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.4 of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the subject property.

Interviews and review of reasonably ascertainable records by GEC during the completion of the Phase I ESA indicate that the subject property has is being used as an automobile salvage yard that has included the dismantling and storage of automobiles, automobile parts, and waste fluids as part of its daily operations.

The site reconnaissance and research as noted throughout this report revealed evidence of a REC from the current usage of the subject property. Even though the on-site automotive parts salvage facility presents a recognized environmental condition (REC) because of the material threat of a release onto the subject property, it does not represent, in and of itself, an obvious or direct condition of environmental liability to the subject property. The site currently exhibits no visible signs of any releases beyond *de minimis* conditions. Continued good housekeeping, best management practices in handling the various petroleum, solvent, and other types of chemical products, and adherence to the pertinent regulations regarding the operations should help to mitigate the probability of future releases and/or liability from site operations. GEC does not expect the on-site activities to present undue environmental liability to the subject property or impact its current use, beyond that commonly present in any similar well-run operation.

During GEC's site reconnaissance on March 23, 2016, GEC observed that the subject property was commercially developed land. The property was primarily used for the on-site salvage operations. GEC observed one metal building on the subject property used to store automobile parts and other tools and equipment. An old building slab was observed in the northern portion of the subject property. GEC also observed some surface staining in various locations of the subject property. A waste oil container (approximately 200-gallons) was observed outside the subject metal building. One aboveground hydraulic lift was also noted on the subject property. Debris piles typically consisting of mainly old automobile parts were observed scattered throughout the property. Although, surface staining and automotive parts were observed on the subject property, GEC is of the opinion that this would likely be typical at other salvage facilities and would be considered a house keeping issue more than a significant environmental concern. GEC observed no visual signs of hazardous substance or petroleum contamination (stressed vegetation and/or significant stains or odors) on the subject property. In addition, no odors, and/or pits/ponds, or lagoons associated with waste treatment were observed on the site.

Since no assessment can absolutely deny the existence of hazardous materials, especially surficial environmental assessments with limited or no subsurface sampling, existing hazardous materials can escape detection using the customary methods. The conclusions of the environmental assessment are based on conditions as observed on our site visit and historical information about the site. Future changes in





environmental conditions and site characteristics may occur with the passage of time, in which case, the conclusions of this report may have to be reevaluated. The conditions are such in an operation using and storing petroleum that diligence is required in monitoring the equipment and adhering to proper operations and petroleum and chemical handling techniques and regulations to mitigate the chances for a release. Conducting further study becomes dependent on the property owner's risk tolerance of possible liability for such releases, when and if they occur, as well as the perception of such upon future prospective purchasers of the subject property.

Based on the research and conclusions of this assessment, there is no indication to suggest that further environmental assessment is needed at this time.

## **11.0 DEVIATIONS**

GEC has completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05, with no deletions or deviations.

## **12.0 ADDITIONAL SERVICES**

The User requested no additional services, outside the ASTM 1527-05 prescribed scope, as part of this Phase I ESA.

## **13.0 REFERENCES**

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 1527-2005, Standard Practice for  
Environmental Site Assessments  
Mr. Phill Francis, City of Griffin, GEC's client  
County Tax Assessor (Property Record Cards)  
Health Department  
Fire Department  
Planning & Zoning  
United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.)  
Georgia Geologic Survey  
Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR)

