FOURTH FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT FOR COLEMAN-EVANS WOOD PRESERVING CO. SUPERFUND SITE **DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA**



July 2019

Prepared by

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 Atlanta, Georgia

<u>7/3/2019</u> Date

Franklin E Hill, Director Superfund & Emergency Management Division



Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	3
I. INTRODUCTION	4
Site Background	4
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SUMMARY FORM	6
II. RESPONSE ACTION SUMMARY	6
Basis for Taking Action	6
Response Actions	7
Status of Implementation	10
Systems Operations/Operation and Maintenance (O&M)	12
III. PROGRESS SINCE THE PREVIOUS REVIEW	14
IV. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS	14
Community Notification, Community Involvement and Site Interviews	14
Data Review	15
Site Inspection	15
V. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	16
QUESTION A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision documents?	16
QUESTION B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels and RAOs used at the	he
time of the remedy selection still valid?	16
QUESTION C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the	
protectiveness of the remedy?	16
VI. ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS	16
OTHER FINDINGS	17
VII. PROTECTIVENESS STATEMENTS	17
VIII. NEXT REVIEW	17
APPENDIX A – REFERENCE LIST	A-1
APPENDIX B – CURRENT SITE STATUS	B- 1
APPENDIX C – SITE CHRONOLOGY	C-1
APPENDIX D – PRESS NOTICE	D-1
APPENDIX E – INTERVIEW FORMS	E-1
APPENDIX F – SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST	F-1
APPENDIX G – SITE INSPECTION PHOTOS	G-1
APPENDIX H – DETAILED ARARS REVIEW	H-1
APPENDIX I – SCREENING-LEVEL RISK REVIEW	I-1

Tables

Table 1: COCs, by Media	7
Table 2: OU1 RAOs and Remedy Components	9
Table 3: Summary of OU1 Cleanup Levels for Soil, Sediment and Groundwater	9
Table 4: OU2 RAOs and Remedy Components	10
Table 5: OU2 Dioxin Cleanup Levels for Soil ^{a,b}	10
Table 6: Summary of Institutional Controls (ICs)	12

Table 7: O&M Costs (Rounded to the Nearest \$1,000) Over the FYR Period	
Table 8: Protectiveness Determinations/Statements from the 2014 FYR Report	
Table C-1: Site Chronology	1
Table H-1: Previous and Current ARARs for Groundwater COCs	H-1
Table H-2: Previous and Current ARARs for OU2 Soil COCs	H-2
Table I-1: Risk Evaluation of Human Health-based Soil Cleanup Goal	I-1

Figures

Figure 1: Site Location Map	5
Figure 2: Detailed Site Map	8
Figure 3: Institutional Control Map	13

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
AROD	Amended Record of Decision
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COC	Contaminant of Concern
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESD	Explanation of Significant Differences
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FYR	Five-Year Review
HQ	Hazard Quotient
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
IC	Institutional Control
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
µg/kg	Micrograms per Kilogram
μg/L	Micrograms per Liter
mg/kg	Milligrams per Kilogram
MNA	Monitored Natural Attenuation
NPL	National Priorities List
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OU	Operable Unit
PCP	Pentachlorophenol
PRP /	Potentially Responsible Party
RAO	Remedial Action Objective
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
RPM	Remedial Project Manager
RSL	Regional Screening Level
SCTL	Soil Cleanup Target Level
TEQ	Toxicity Equivalent Quotient
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
UU/UE	Unlimited Use and Unrestricted Exposure

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of a five-year review (FYR) is to evaluate the implementation and performance of a remedy to determine if the remedy is and will continue to be protective of human health and the environment. The methods, findings and conclusions of reviews are documented in FYR reports such as this one. In addition, FYR reports identify issues found during the review, if any, and document recommendations to address them.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is preparing this FYR pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Section 121, consistent with the National Contingency Plan (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 300.430(f)(4)(ii)) and considering EPA policy.

This is the fourth FYR for the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site (the Site). The triggering action for this statutory review is the completion date of the previous FYR. The FYR has been prepared because hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain at the Site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure (UU/UE).

The Site consists of two operable units (OUs). This FYR Report addresses both OUs. OU1 addresses soil, sediment, debris, surface water and groundwater contamination found on the former facility property and in the associated drainage features south of the facility. OU2 addresses residual site-related dioxin contamination in soils not addressed as part of OU1.

EPA remedial project manager (RPM) Joydeb Majumder led the FYR. Participants included EPA community involvement coordinator L'Tonya Spencer, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) project manager John Sykes and Treat Suomi and Claire Marcussen from EPA support contractor Skeo. The review began on 10/19/2018. Documents used to prepare this FYR are listed in Appendix A. Appendix B includes Site status information.

Site Background

The 11-acre Site is located in the community of Whitehouse which is part of the city of Jacksonville in Duval County, Florida (Figure 1). The CSX railroad borders the Site to the north. Residential homes border the Site to the south and to the west. A low-lying wooded area borders the Site to the east. The Site includes the area where site operators conducted wood-preserving activities from 1954 to the mid-1980s. In addition, the facility operated a permitted wastewater treatment unit up until 1980 when the unit was replaced by a closed loop system. Disposal practices released wood-treating waste to soil, surface water, sediment, and groundwater on the facility property, a drainage ditch which had conveyed the treated effluent to McGirt's creek, and portions of residential properties. EPA placed the Site on the National Priorities List (NPL) in 1983. The city of Jacksonville currently owns and maintains the former facility property which is grass-covered and fenced. The CSX railroad borders the Site to the north. Residences border the Site to the south and west. A low-lying wooded area borders the Site to the east.

The Site drainage flows through onsite ditches southward 2 miles to McGirts Creek. Groundwater occurs in the surficial aquifer which is confined from the deeper aquifer by a 65-foot-thick sandy clay unit. Groundwater flow in the surficial and deeper aquifers is to the southwest and west-southwest, respectively. Recharge to the surficial aquifer occurs in the vicinity of the Site and it discharges to McGirts Creek. Residential potable wells located immediately west and south of the Site are screened in the deeper aquifer where contaminants have not been detected.

Figure 1: Site Location Map



Disclaimer: This map and any boundary lines within the map are approximate and subject to change. The map is not a survey. The map is for informational purposes only regarding the EPA's response actions at the Site.

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SUMMARY FORM

Site Name: Coleman-Ev	ans Wood Preservin	g Co.		
EPA ID: FLD991279894	4			
Region: 4	State: Florida	City/County: Whitehouse/Duval		
NPL Status: Deleted				
Multiple OUs? Yes	Has th Yes	e Site achieved construction completion?		
Lead agency: EPA				
Author name: Joydeb N	lajumder (EPA) and	Claire Marcussen (Skeo)		
Author affiliation: EPA and Skeo				
Review period: 10/15/20	018 - 7/15/2019			
Date of Site inspection: 11/15/2018				
Type of review: Statutory				
Review number: 4				
Triggering action date: 7/8/2014				
Due date (five years after triggering action date): 7/8/2019				

II. RESPONSE ACTION SUMMARY

Basis for Taking Action

Site contamination was discovered in September 1980. In 1985, EPA conducted an emergency response action to excavate and remove the contents of two unlined pits. The pits were used to dispose of precipitate from the facility's wastewater treatment process. This process involved the application of caustic soda and aluminum sulfate which created a precipitate. The precipitate was then placed in the unlined pits. This practice was discontinued in 1970, after which the precipitate was placed in above ground storage tanks. Effluent from the wastewater treatment process was discharged into an onsite ditch which flowed into McGirts Creek. It was these processes and others that led to the contamination.

In 1986, the EPA conducted the Site's initial remedial investigation (RI) and human health risk assessment (HHRA). The EPA concluded in the 1986 HHRA that pentachlorophenol (PCP) in groundwater presented unacceptable future human health risks if shallow groundwater were to be used for potable purposes. In addition, the EPA concluded that PCP in on-site soils was a source of groundwater contamination.

Following additional investigations in 1996, the EPA completed a second HHRA. It concluded that that cancer risks based on onsite and offsite residential use exceeded the upper-bound of the EPA's risk management range of 1×10^{-4} due to dioxin and PCP in soil. The EPA conducted an ecological risk assessment, which indicated that the surface water concentrations of PCP and dioxin in the drainage ditch pose risk to aquatic species. A summary of the contaminants of concern (COCs) in associated media and exposure pathway are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: COCs, by Media

COC	Soil	Groundwater	Surface Water	Sediment
РСР	Н	Н	E	Н
Dioxin	H, E	Н	É	Н
Notas				

H = Contaminant is a COC in this medium based on the 1986 and 1996 HHRAs. E = Contaminant is a COC in this medium based on the 1996 ecological risk assessment.

Response Actions

In September 1980, the City of Jacksonville served the potentially responsible party (PRP) with a notice to comply for violating state and federal groundwater standards due to the confirmed the presence of groundwater contamination at the Site. In response, the PRP constructed a closed-loop wastewater treatment system onsite to treat its waste and cease discharge to McGirts Creek. The sludge cake generated as a result of the closed loop process qualified as a RCRA hazardous waste which the PRP stored onsite in above-ground tanks. Inspections by the Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER, now referred to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection or FDEP) between 1981 and 1983 showed that the PRP violated and continued to violate the RCRA hazardous waste reporting, planning, and safety requirements applicable to generators and treatment, storage and disposal facilities.

The EPA proposed the Site for listing on the Superfund program's NPL in December 1982 and finalized the listing in September 1983. Between 1985 and 1995, the EPA completed emergency cleanup activities to address immediate threats at the Site due to refusal of the PRP to comply with the EPA's order to address the cleanup. The removal activities included the following:

- Excavating two on-site disposal pits, off-site disposal, and backfilling with clean fill.
- Removing contaminated structures.
- Installing French drains.
- Excavating contaminated soil and sediment in the residential area next to the Site and placement onsite, secured by a permanent fence and signs.

Appendix C provides a detailed Site chronology of the all emergency response actions, RI, feasibility studies (FS), remedial design, remedial action and decision documents. A summary of the long-term response actions at OU1 and OU2 is provided in more detail below. Figure 2 shows the locations of the Site's OUs.

90 South CSX Railroad **General Avenue** Center Avenu 10 150 300 600 0 Legend Feet Fenced former facility OU1: Contaminated media Sources: 2006 OU2 Record of property with vegetated soil at former facility property Decision, Esri, DigitalGlobe, cover and in associated drainage GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, features CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, -- Drainage ditch AeroGRID, IGN, the GIS User OU2: Residual site-related Community, DeLorme, AND, Tele Atlas, First American and UNEPdioxin contamination in soils WCMC. not addressed as part of OU1 **Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site** Skeo City of Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida

Disclaimer: This map and any boundary lines within the map are approximate and subject to change. The map is not a survey. The map is for informational purposes only regarding the EPA's response actions at the Site.

NORTH

Figure 2: Detailed Site Map

<u>OU1</u>

The EPA selected the long-term cleanup plan for soil, sediment and groundwater contamination in the Site's 1986 OU1 Record of Decision (ROD) and updated the cleanup plan with two amended RODs (ARODs) in 1990 and 1997. The 1997 AROD listed the primary remedy components and formalized the remedial action objectives (RAOs). In addition, the EPA issued four Explanations of Significant Differences (ESDs) in 2001, 2003, 2004 and 2005. The 2001 and 2005 ESD clarified the selected remedy to include a polishing step of off-gas treatment and replacing the need for a groundwater recovery system with monitored natural attenuation (MNA), respectively. The 2003 and 2004 ESD noted significant changes to soil volume and costs. Cleanup of soil, sediment and groundwater prevented PCP runoff into the drainage ditch and ultimately into McGirts Creek. Table 2 provides a summary of the final remedial action objectives (RAOs) and remedy components. Table 3 lists OU1 cleanup goals.

Medium	RAO ^a	Remedy Components ^b
Soil,	Prevent ingestion and direct contact	Excavate and treat contaminated soil, sediment and wood
Sediment	with contaminated soils and	debris using an on-site thermal desorber.
and Wood	sediments in excess of cleanup	Treat off gases generated by the on-site thermal desorber.
Debris	levels.	Backfill excavated areas with treated material or clean fill.
	Prevent future groundwater contamination.	Treat groundwater and stormwater encountered during excavation at on-site wastewater treatment unit prior to discharge to on-site surface water.
		Collect free-product floating on the upper
		surficial aquifer for recycling and/or off-site disposal.
		Regrade and revegetate all excavated areas.
		Relocate residents, as necessary, to facilitate construction.
Groundwater	Protect groundwater as a current or potential drinking water supply by reducing contaminants to maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) or other protection levels established by the EPA and FDEP.	Monitored natural attenuation (MNA) of groundwater contamination. ^c
Notes: a. Current RA b. Current ren	Os were obtained from Section 7.3 of t	he 1997 AROD. on 10 of the 1997 AROD

Table 2: OU1 RAOs and Remedy Components

b. Current remedy components are described in Section 10 o

c. Added as a new remedy component in the 2005 ESD.

Table 3: Summary of OU1 Cleanup Levels for Soil, Sediment and Groundwater

COC	Soil and Sediment Cleanup Level (mg/kg) ^a	Groundwater Cleanup Level (µg/L) ^b
PCP	2	1
Dioxin ^b	0.001°	0.001
Notes: a. Established b. Established c. Cleanup lev Reassessment mg/kg = millig µg/L = microg	in Section 7.5 of the 1997 AROD. Level for PCP is to in Section 7.4 of the 1997 AROD. els for dioxin were considered interim cleanup levels Report. grams per kilogram grams per liter	based on site-specific leachability. , pending EPA's release of the Dioxin

<u>OU2</u>

The EPA selected the OU2 long-term cleanup plan in the 2006 ROD to address dioxin-contaminated soil at the former facility property and residential properties near the former facility property not previously treated as part of OU1. Table 4 presents a summary of the RAOs and remedy components. Table 5 lists the OU2 cleanup goals.

Medium	RAO ^a	Remedy Components ^b
Soil	• Prevent incidental ingestion, dust inhalation or direct contact with surface soil that contains concentrations of dioxin attributable to the Site in excess of the soil cleanup goals.	 Excavate soil at areas adjacent to the former facility property and place on the pre-graded former facility property and install 2 feet of vegetated soil cover. Restore excavated areas using clean soil. Characterize contaminated soils and dispose of offsite at a permitted facility if deemed hazardous waste.
	• Control future releases of contaminants to ensure long-term protection of human health and the environment.	 Implement institutional controls on the former facility property through use of restrictive covenants to limit future land uses to commercial and recreational uses, and appropriate precautions are taken for any potential future intrusive subsurface work activities to prevent disturbance of subsurface waste soil. Conduct FYRs of the remedy to ensure that protectiveness is maintained.
Notes: a. RAOs b. Remed	obtained from Section 2.8 of the 2006 ROD. v components as described in Section 2.12.2	of the 2006 ROD.

Table 4: OU2 RAOs and Remedy Components

Table 5: OU2 Dioxin Cleanup Levels for Soil^{a,b}

COC	Off-facility Soil Cleanup Level (µg/kg)	On-facility Soil Cleanup Level (µg/kg)		
Dioxin TEQ	0.007 (Residential use)	0.030 (Industrial use)		
Notes:				
a. Established in Section 2.12.4 of the 2006 ROD for OU2.				
b. Basis for the cleanup levels is the Florida Administrative Code, Chapter 62-780.				
μg/kg = micrograms per kilogram				
TEQ = toxicity equivalent quotient				

Status of Implementation

<u>OU1</u>

In 1997, the EPA tasked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to complete the Site's remedial design and remedial action. USACE completed the remedial design in 1998. Remedial action began at the Site in 1999. Cleanup included removing and disposing of equipment and treating soil and sediment from the southern drainage ditch on site using thermal desorption. Groundwater and stormwater encountered during excavation was addressed through dewatering and treating it along with stormwater at the on-site wastewater treatment system prior to discharge to an on-site drainage ditch. USACE completed treatment of all contaminated soil from the former facility and from the drainage pathway to the south in May 2004. By September 2004, USACE placed the treated soil back on the former facility property, graded the area, and added topsoil and revegetated the final Site surface using seed and some turf placement. USACE completed the physical construction of the OU1 remedy in September 2004.

In 2004, the EPA initiated groundwater monitoring to determine whether the MNA remedy component identified in the 2005 ESD was feasible. The groundwater MNA remedy achieved the groundwater cleanup goals in June 2012. The wells were abandoned after the EPA conducted a groundwater MNA trend analysis for the Site in January 2013 confirming that the groundwater performance standards have been met. Ongoing activities include maintaining the vegetative cover and site security.

<u>OU2</u>

The EPA conducted the remedial design for OU2 between September 2006 and May 2007. Between May and August 2007, the EPA completed remedial action activities. These activities included excavation of soil with site-attributable dioxin contamination above cleanup goals in areas on and adjacent to the former facility property and adjacent to drainage pathways which may have been impacted by contaminated stormwater runoff from the Site. The excavated soils were disposed on site and covered with 2 feet of cover; an impervious cover was not warranted since the contaminants are not leaching to groundwater. In addition, excavated areas were backfilled with clean topsoil and revegetated. Upgrades to site erosion and sediment controls were also implemented at the former facility property. Contaminated soils classified as hazardous waste in one area of the Site were transported off site for incineration and disposal at a permitted facility.

Site-wide Deletion

The EPA submitted a formal letter to FDEP in November 2012 to begin the Site's deletion process from the NPL. The EPA signed the Site's Final Close-Out Report in July 2013. In September 2013, FDEP concurred with the EPA that the Site could be deleted from the NPL. The EPA subsequently placed a direct deletion notice in the Federal Register in March 2014; no comments were received on the proposed deletion and the EPA deleted the Site from the NPL in May 2014.

Institutional Control (IC) Review

In 2009, the city recorded a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants with Duval County for the area of the Site associated with the former facility property, which serves as an institutional control, as required by the 2006 OU2 ROD (Appendix J). The 2009 Declaration of Restrictive Covenants requires maintenance of a soil cover over the former facility property; prohibits disturbance of the soil cover without prior approval from the EPA and FDEP; restricts land use; requires maintenance of fencing and gates while the Site is not in use; requires activities as specified in the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan; prohibits use of the shallow groundwater for domestic or industrial uses prior to completion of the groundwater remedy; requires approval from the EPA, FDEP and the St. John's River Water Management District prior to use of the deep groundwater; prohibits disturbance of the groundwater monitoring well network without approval from the EPA and FDEP; and prohibits activities that are likely to create a risk for migration of hazardous substances or disturbance of the soil cover (Tabe 6). Figure 3 presents the institutional control map. Additionally, the Site's location in a Florida Groundwater Delineated Area serves as an institutional control for the Site (Figure 3), restricting the installation of groundwater wells. Appendix F includes a copy of the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants.

Table 6: Summary of Institutional Controls (ICs)

Media That Do Not Support UU/UE Based on Current Conditions	ICs Needed	ICs Called for in the Decision Documents	Impacted Parcel	IC Objective	Title of IC Instrument Implemented and Date
Soil	Yes	Yes	Former Facility Property (006699 0010)	Restricts land and groundwater use without prior approval by the EPA and state agencies and requires O&M activities.	2009 Declaration of Restrictive Covenants
Groundwater	Yesª	No ^b	Former Facility Property (006699 0010)	Shallow groundwater should not be used for drinking or other domestic or industrial uses until notified by the EPA that the groundwater remedy is complete.	2009 Declaration of Restrictive Covenants Florida Groundwater Delineated Area. ²

Notes:

a. ICs were not called for groundwater in decision documents as the groundwater contamination is restricted to the former facility and a Florida Groundwater Delineated Area was already in place. Now that groundwater cleanup goals have been achieved that portion of the restrictive covenant related to groundwater use in the shallow aquifer may longer be needed.

b. Florida's groundwater delineation areas restrict well placement and are available online at: https://ca.dep.state.fl.us/mapdirect/?focus=grndwtr_dl.

Systems Operations/Operation and Maintenance (O&M)

The groundwater MNA remedy achieved the groundwater cleanup goals in June 2012. The wells were subsequently abandoned after the EPA conducted a groundwater MNA trend analysis for the Site in January 2013. It concluded that the PCP groundwater performance standard had been met. Remaining O&M activities conducted at the Site are limited to visual inspections of the fence and vegetative cover and making repairs as warranted. A summary of the O&M costs during this FYR period is presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7: O&M Costs (Rounded to the Nearest \$1,000) Over the FYR Period

Date Range	Total Cost (rounded to nearest		
2014	\$500		
2015	\$500		
2016	\$1000		
2017	\$1000		
2018	\$500		

Figure 3: Institutional Control Map



Disclaimer: This map and any boundary lines within the map are approximate and subject to change. The map is not a survey. The map is for informational purposes only regarding the EPA's response actions at the Site.

III. PROGRESS SINCE THE PREVIOUS REVIEW

This section includes the protectiveness determinations and statements from the previous FYR Report as well as the recommendations from the previous FYR Report and the status of those recommendations.

OU #	Protectiveness Determination	Protectiveness Statement	
. 1	Protective	The remedy at OU1 is protective of human health and the environment and exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled. The excavation and treatment of contaminated soil and sediment at the former facility property and southern drainage area has eliminated the potential for exposure to these contaminated media and has also removed any source material that might have been contributing to groundwater contamination. MNA has addressed the remaining low- level contaminants in groundwater. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.	
2	Protective	The remedy at OU2 is protective of human health and the environment and exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled. The excavation and disposal of soil contaminated with residual site-attributable dioxin has eliminated the potential for exposure to contaminated soil and has eliminated any source material that might have been contributing to groundwater contamination. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.	
Sitewide	Protective	The remedy for the Site is protective of human health and the environment and exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled. Cleanup activities have addressed contamination in soil, sediment and groundwater. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.	

Table 8: Protectiveness Determinations/Statements from the 2014 FYR Report

There were no issues and recommendations in the previous FYR Report.

IV. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS

Community Notification, Community Involvement and Site Interviews

A public notice was made available by a public notice published in the *Star* newspaper on 11/3/2018 (Appendix D). It stated that the FYR was underway and invited the public to submit any comments to the EPA. The results of the review and the report will be made available at the EPA's website (https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-five-year-reviews).

During the FYR process, interviews were conducted to document any perceived problems or successes with the remedy that has been implemented to date. The completed interview forms are included in Appendix E and are summarized below. In addition, Site visit participants were able to talk with one of the nearby businesses. The manager at the local business indicated that they were aware of the site but did not have any issues, concerns or information that would affect the protectiveness of the remedy.

<u>Jeff Foster</u>: Mr. Foster is with the City of Jacksonville, the current Site property owner. Mr. Foster stated that the project was completed in accordance with the design and specifications and has provided the

required protections to human health and the environment. He also indicated that the soil cap is functioning as designed and that heavy vegetative cover is providing additional protection to the soil cap. The groundwater contamination has met the cleanup goals and no longer requires monitoring thus, the city's O&M is limited to visual inspections of the fence and vegetative cover and making repairs as warranted.

<u>John Sykes, III</u>: John Sykes III is the FDEP representative for the Site. He stated that the project, including cleanup and maintenance is going well except that no site-wide reuse activities have occurred. He also indicated that the remedy appears to be working as designed and is not aware of any complaints or inquiries from residents about site-related environmental issues or remedial activities in the past five years. Mr. Sykes indicated that the Site was not affected by the hurricanes this past year.

Data Review

There are no new data included in this FYR since the previous review. Soil sampling as part of the OU2 remedy implementation from 2006 to 2007 that confirmed the PCP and dioxin cleanup levels were met. MNA achieved the dioxin cleanup goal in February 2005 and the PCP cleanup goal in 2012. In January 2013, the EPA conducted a groundwater MNA trend analysis for the Site. It concluded that the groundwater performance standards had been met and that the endpoint had been achieved for MNA.

Site Inspection

The Site inspection took place on 11/15/2018. Participants included EPA RPM Joydeb Majumder, EPA RPM Rusty Kestle, and Treat Suomi and Claire Marcussen with Skeo (EPA FYR support contractor). The purpose of the inspection was to assess the protectiveness of the remedy. A completed checklist and Site inspection photos are included in Appendices F and G, respectively.

Participants met at the Site, located at 101 Celery Avenue South in the Whitehouse community of Jacksonville, Florida, to participate in the site inspection. Perimeter fencing surrounds the former facility property at the Site and locked gates off Celery Avenue South control access to the area. All gates were secured and locked, perimeter fencing was in good condition, and signs were in place indicating that the area is a Superfund Site and that digging within the fenced area is prohibited. The group observed the conditions of the soil cover across the former facility property. Vegetation has been established across the area to include grass, shrubs and small pine tree saplings across the Site. The city conducts O&M activities at the Site under FDEP oversight. The presence of trees and shrubs does not impact the soil remedy because the soil remedy does not require an impervious surface. O&M activities include maintaining drainage culverts to prevent ponding on the soil cover, maintaining perimeter ditches and mowing. Participants observed that two businesses are operating in areas southwest of the former facility where some soil remediation occurred as part of OU2. A recycling business is located on the southeastern corner of General Avenue and Celery Avenue. A roll-off dumpster business occupies the southwestern corner of the Site.

On November 14, 2018, Skeo staff visited the designated Site repository, Jacksonville Public Library – West Branch, as part of the Site inspection. The library no longer contained hard copies of site-related documents. Federal documents are stored electronically and can be accessed through the library's electronic catalog. The librarian indicated that the FYR reports can be accessed from the library's publicly accessible computers. In addition, once the FYR is published it will be made available at the EPA's website (<u>https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-five-year-reviews</u>).

V. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

QUESTION A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision documents?

Yes. The review of documents, ARARs, risk assumptions and the Site inspection indicate that the selected remedies are functioning as intended by the RODs and subsequent ARODs and ESDs for OU1 and OU2. Contaminated soil and sediment have been excavated and treated, and these treated media are contained on the former facility property under a vegetative cover. In January 2013, the EPA conducted a groundwater MNA trend analysis for the Site. It concluded that MNA has achieved the groundwater performance standards, which are drinking standards.

The former facility property at the Site, where treated contaminated media are contained under a vegetative cover, is located within a Florida Groundwater Delineated Area, which restricts potable well placement. Additionally, a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants was implemented in September 2009 for the former facility property to limit future land use and restrict the use of the shallow aquifer. In addition, an O&M Plan is in place to ensure that the vegetative cover over the treated media is properly maintained.

QUESTION B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels and RAOs used at the time of the remedy selection still valid?

Yes. The ARARs and RAOs used at the time of the remedy selection are still valid. The groundwater and soil ARARs have not changed for any of the COCs since the 2006 ROD (Appendix H). The 1997 AROD stated that the federal MCL for dioxin in drinking water is too stringent and selected a less stringent 10-day adult health advisory level of $0.001 \ \mu g/L$ as the final cleanup goal. The monitoring data from previous FYRs have demonstrated dioxin TEQ were below the more stringent MCL. A screeninglevel risk evaluation using the most current toxicity data shows that Site cleanup goals remain valid (Appendix I). Further, the vapor intrusion pathway is not a currently complete exposure pathway, because there are no building structures on site and a restriction is in place that prohibits any activities that might compromise the soil cover.

QUESTION C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?

No. No other information has come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy.

VI. ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS

OU(s) without Issues/Recommendations Identified in the FYR:

OU1 and OU2

OTHER FINDINGS

One recommendation was identified during the FYR; however, the recommendation does not affect current or future protectiveness. The EPA should evaluate whether the O&M Plan should be updated to reflect that trees do not need to be removed from the protective cover because it is a soil cover without a liner.

VII. PROTECTIVENESS STATEMENTS

Operable Unit: OU1 Protectiveness Determination: Protective

Protectiveness Statement:

The remedy at OU1 is protective of human health and the environment. Contaminated soil and sediment at the former facility property and southern drainage area were treated on site and placed on site under a soil and vegetated cover. Contaminated groundwater and stormwater were treated at an on-site wastewater treatment plant and discharged to the drainage ditch. MNA has achieved the groundwater cleanup goals. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.

Operable Unit: OU2

Protectiveness Determination: Protective

Protectiveness Statement:

The remedy at OU2 is protective of human health and the environment. Site-attributable dioxin-contaminated soils were excavated and placed on site under a vegetated soil cover. Contaminated soils that were classified as hazardous waste were disposed of off-site at a permitted facility. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.

Protectiveness Determination: Protective

Protectiveness Statement:

The remedy for the Site is protective of human health and the environment because exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled. Cleanup activities have addressed contamination in soil, sediment and groundwater. Appropriate institutional controls are in place to ensure future land uses do not compromise the integrity of the remedy.

VIII. NEXT REVIEW

The next FYR Report for the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site is required five years from the completion date of this review.

APPENDIX A – REFERENCE LIST

Black & Veatch. 2008. Sitewide Interim Remedial Action Report. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site. Operable Units 1 and 2. July 2008.

Black & Veatch. 2008. Post Remedial Action Erosion and Sediment Control Monitoring Summary, Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Site, Operable Unit 2 Remedial Action. October 2008.

Camp, Dresser, and McKee, Inc. Remedial Investigation Report for the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Site. February 1986.

Camp, Dresser, and McKee, Inc. Feasibility Study Report, Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Site. October 1986.

CERCLA Information System (CERCLIS) Site Information accessed from Web site http://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csitinfo.cfm?id=0401202. November 2013-June 2014.

EPA. 2009. Second Five-Year Review Report for Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site. June 2009.

Ebasco Services Inc. 1990. Treatability Study Final Report for Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Site. Volumes 1 and 2. April 1990.

EPA. 1984. Unilateral Administrative Order: Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Docket No. 85-01-C. October 15, 1984.

EPA. 1986. Record of Decision. OU1. September 1986.

EPA. 1990. Record of Decision Amendment. OU1. September 1990.

EPA. 1995. Focused Feasibility Study, Coleman Evans Wood Preserving Site. April 1995.

EPA. 1997. Record of Decision Amendment. OU1. September 1997.

EPA. 2001. Explanation of Significant Differences. OU1. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. June 2001.

EPA. 2003. Explanation of Significant Differences. OU1. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. August 2003.

EPA. 2004. Explanation of Significant Differences. OU1. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. February 2004.

EPA. 2004. First Five-Year Review Report for Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving. May 2004.

EPA. 2005. Explanation of Significant Differences. OU1. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. September 2005.

EPA. 2006. Record of Decision. OU2. September 2006.

EPA. 2007. Preliminary Close-Out Report: Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Superfund Site. September 2007.

EPA. 2009. Operations and Maintenance Plan. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. June 2009.

EPA. 2010. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Ground Water Natural Attenuation Monitoring Report. March 2010.

EPA. 2012. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Ground Water Natural Attenuation Monitoring Report. January 2012.

EPA. 2012. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Ground Water Natural Attenuation Monitoring Report. November 2012.

EPA. 2013. Memorandum for Ground Water Monitored Natural Attenuation Trend Analysis for the Coleman-Evans Superfund Site. January 2013.

EPA. 2013. Letter to FDEP. NPL Deletion, Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Superfund Site. May 2013.

EPA. 2013. Sitewide Final Remedial Action Report. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site. Operable Units 1 and 2. May 2013.

EPA. 2013. Final Close Out Report: Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Superfund Site. June 2013.

FDEP. 2009. Coleman-Evans Alternate Dispute Resolution Briefing. April 2009.

FDEP. 2012. Coleman-Evans Site Update. 2012.

FDEP. 2013. Letter to EPA. NPL Deletion, Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site. September 2013.

Science Applications International Corporation 2004. Remedial Design Addendum. Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Superfund Site. September 2004.

APPENDIX B – CURRENT SITE STATUS

- Current human exposures at the Site are under control.

- Contaminated groundwater migration is under control.

🛛 All 🗌 Some 🗌 None

🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Yes No

Portions of OU2 have been put into reuse. A recycling business is located on the southeastern corner of General Avenue and Celery Avenue. A roll-off dumpster business occupies the southwestern corner of the Site. In addition, residential areas are in continued use.

APPENDIX C – SITE CHRONOLOGY

Table C-1: Site Chronology

Event	Date
Initial discovery of site contamination	September 1980
The EPA finalized the Site on the NPL	September 8, 1983
The EPA initiated the remedial investigation/feasibility study	September 24, 1984
The EPA issued a Unilateral Administrative Order pursuant to Section 106 of	October 15, 1984
CERCLA, requiring that Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Company	
(Coleman-Evans) conduct sampling and perform immediate removal activities;	
Coleman-Evans refused to comply	
The EPA and the U.S. Department of Justice obtained an order granting site	June 1985
access	
The EPA began an emergency response action to excavate and remove contents	June 26, 1985
of two unlined pits on the Site	
The EPA completed the emergency response action	July 12, 1985
The EPA completed the remedial investigation/feasibility study and baseline	September 25, 1986
risk assessment, and signed the OUT ROD for excavation and on-site	
The DDA issued a Conserved Newton to Colomon Events according	October 1096
The EPA issued a General Notice Letter to Coleman-Evans regarding	Uctober 1986
The EDA began a one of assumed armedial design and remedial action	Ann:10 1097
The EPA began a one of several remedial designs for OUT	April 9, 1987
Figure an encontrainty to enter into negotiations with the EBA to implement the	December 1987
Evans an opportunity to enter into negotiations with the EPA to implement the	
The U.S. Department of Justice filed suit against Coleman-Evans	 Iuly 1988
The EPA began a treatability study for OUL	April 28, 1989
The EPA completed the treatability study for OUT	Lune 30, 1990
The EPA signed the AROD for OUL that changed the soil sediment and	September 26, 1990
groundwater remedy	September 20, 1990
The EPA discovered dioxin contamination at the Site	June 1992
The EPA performed a removal assessment for the Site	December 31, 1992
The EPA began a removal action at the Site to address surface contamination	June 24, 1993
from adjacent residential vards and install fencing between the residential area	
and the drainage ditch	
The EPA prepared a focused feasibility study due to the presence of dioxin	April 30, 1995
The EPA completed a removal action for the Site	December 31, 1995
The EPA completed a supplemental baseline risk assessment to address dioxin	January 24, 1996
in soil	-
The EPA began a treatability study for OU1	June 2, 1997
The EPA signed the OU1 AROD for an interim response action of thermal	September 25, 1997
desorption of 45,000 cubic yards of PCP- and dioxin-contaminated source	
material	
The EPA completed a treatability study for OU1	June 30, 1998
The EPA began the remedial action for OU1	September 28, 1998
The EPA completed all remedial design activities and began remedial action	June 6, 2000
activities for OUI	
The EPA issued an ESD for OUT regarding thermal oxidizer	June 11, 2001
The EPA began a re-evaluation of the OU1 remedial design	April 30, 2003
The EPA issued an ESD for OUT regarding revised treatment quantities	August 14, 2003
The EPA issued another ESD for OUT regarding revised treatment quantities	February 26, 2004
The EPA signed the first FYK Report for the Site	June 20, 2004
The EPA completed the re-evaluation of the OUT remedial design	September 24, 2004
The EPA issued an ESD for UUT selecting MNA as the groundwater remedy	September 20, 2005
The EPA began the OO2 remedial design	September 27, 2006

Event	Date
The EPA completed the OU2 remedial investigation and issued the OU2 ROD	September 28, 2006
The EPA completed the OU2 remedial design	May 15, 2007
The EPA began the remedial action for OU2	May 18, 2007
The EPA prepared the Preliminary Close-out Report for OU1	September 18, 2007
The EPA completed the remedial action for OU2	August 22, 2008
The EPA signed the second FYR Report for the Site	June 16, 2009
The city of Jacksonville filed the restrictive covenants on the Site	November 4, 2009
The EPA conducted the final MNA sampling event	June 27, 2012
The EPA completed MNA trend analysis	January 2013
The EPA completed the remedial action for OU1	May 31, 2013
The EPA completed the Final Close-Out Report	July 2, 2013
The EPA deleted the Site from the NPL	May 27, 2014
The EPA signed the third FYR Report for the Site	July 8, 2014

APPENDIX D – PRESS NOTICE



The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4

Announces Fourth Five-Year Review for the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund Site, Whitehouse, Duval County, Florida

Perpose/Objective: The EPA is conducting a Five-Year Review of the remedy for the Celeman-Evans Wood Preserving Co. Superfund tits (the Size) in Whitebouse, Florida. The purpose of the Five-Year Review is to make sure the selected clearup actions effectively protect human health and the environment.

Site Background: The 11-arre area is located about eight miles west of downtown Jacksonville. Surrounding land uses include residences, wooded areas and a CSX rail line. From 1954 to the mid-1980s, the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Company reated wood products with a mixture of pentachlorophenol (PCP) and fuel oil. Operations straamed, dried and pressure soaked the wood. Condensed steam containing PCP and wood treatment products collected at the bottom of the prestruizing chamber. Dispotal grateries before 1970 involved dumping wastewater into unlined drainage dichtes, which led to a creek on the southern part of the Site. The - drainage dicht frequently overflowed. Wastewater spread over the ground surface and to the neighboring residential area. After 1970, wast shadge was stored in aboveground storage tasks. In 1980, the cry of Jacksonville's Health Department identified contaminated groundwater at the Site. Further investigations by the EPA and dioxin and PCP-contaminated ground water, sediment and soil. The EPA placed the Sites on the Superfund program's National Priorities List (NPL) in 1983.

Cleanup Actions: The EPA designated two operable units (OUs) to address the contamination. OUI addressed soil, surface water, address the contamination on a well as debits on site at the former facility property. OU2 addressed residual siterelated dioxin contamination in soil. In September 1986, the EPA signed the Record of Decision (ROD) electric tip the cleanup plan far OUI and updated the plan with two amended RODs in 1990 and 1997 and four Explanations of Significan Differences in 2001, 2003, 2004 and 2005. The OUI remedy included excavation and treatment of contaminated soil, sediment and wood debits using consite thermal desorption, backfilling, regrating and vegetaing of ezcavated areas, and groundwater monitoring. The EPA completed construction of the OUI remedy in 2013. The EPA selected the remedy for OU2 in the Site's September 2006 ROD. It called for the removal of dioxincontaminated soil on the former facility property, capping of soilsminsted soil on the former facility property, capping be soil with 2 feet of clean cover and institutional controls. The EPA disposed of soils with high contaminated OU2 temedial actions in 2008.

Five-Year Review Schedule: The National Contingency Plan requires review of remachial actions that result in any hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants remaining at the Site above levels that allow for unlimited use and curstricted exposure every five years to ensure the protection of human health and the environment. The fourth of the Five-Year Reviews for the Site will be completed by July 2019.

The EPA lavies Community Participation in the Five-Vear Review Precess: The EPA is conducting this Five-Vear Review to evaluate the effectiveness of the Site's remedy and to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment. As part of the Five-Year Review process, EPA staff is available to answer any questions about the Site. Community members who have questions about the Site or the Five-Year Review process, or who would lake to participate in a community interview, are asked to contact:

> Joydeb Majumder, EPA Remedial Project Manager Phone: (404) 562-9121 Email: majumder.joydeb@epa.gov

L'Tanya Spencer, EPA Community Involvement Coardinator Phone: (404) 562-8463 Email: spencer.latanya@epa.gov

Mailing Address: U.S. EPA Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., 11th Floor, Atlanta, GA 30303-8960

Additional information is available at the Site's local document repository, West Regional Jacksonville Public Library, located at 1425 Chaffee Road South, Jacksonville, Florida 32221, and online at http://www.eps.gov/superfund/coleman-evans-wood.

APPENDIX E – INTERVIEW FORMS

Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co.	Five-Year Review Interview Form			
Superfund Site				
Site Name: <u>Coleman-Evans Wood</u>	EPA ID No.: FLD991279894			
Preserving Co.				
Subject Name: <u>Jeff Foster</u>	Affiliation: <u>City of Jacksonville</u>			
Time: <u>11:00 a.m.</u>	<u>Date:</u> 01/30/2019			
Interview Format (circle one): In Person	Phone Email <u>X</u> Other:			

Interview Category: O&M Contractor

- 1. What is your overall impression of the project, including cleanup, maintenance and reuse activities (as appropriate)? Project was completed in accordance with the design plans and specifications and has provided the required protections to human health and the environment.
- 2. What is your assessment of the current performance of the remedy in place at the Site? Soil cap is functioning as designed. Heavy vegetative cover is providing additional protection to the soil cap.
- 3. What are the findings from the monitoring data? What are the key trends in contaminant levels that are being documented over time at the Site? I do not receive monitoring data since it is my understanding it is not required as part of the closure. Visual inspection by COJ staff only. My understanding there was a request for the monitoring wells need to be PTA.
- 4. Is there a continuous on-site O&M presence? If so, please describe staff responsibilities and activities. Alternatively, please describe staff responsibilities and the frequency of site inspections and activities if there is not a continuous on-site O&M presence. Maintenance consists of visual inspections of the fence and vegetative cover by walking and vehicle traverses. Repairs would be completed by Solid Waste staff as soon as possible if the vegetative and soil cap or fence is damaged.
- 5. Have there been any significant changes in site O&M requirements, maintenance schedules or sampling routines since start-up or in the last five years? If so, do they affect the protectiveness or effectiveness of the remedy? Please describe changes and impacts. None.
- 6. What is the approximate O&M costs spent over the last five years? Have there been unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the Site since start-up or in the last five years? If so, please provide details. O&M Costs Over the FYR Period (Rounded to the Nearest \$1,000)

Data Danga	Total Cost (rounded to
Date Kange	nearest
2014	\$500
2015	\$500
2016	\$1000
2017	\$1000
2018	\$500

7. Have there been opportunities to optimize O&M activities or sampling efforts? Please describe changes and any resulting or desired cost savings or improved efficiencies. None since the O&M requirements are minimal.

- 8. Do you have any comments, suggestions or recommendations regarding O&M activities and schedules at the Site? None.
- 9. Do you consent to have your name included along with your responses to this questionnaire in the FYR report? Yes.

Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co.			Five-Year Review Interview Form		
Superfund	Site		a.		
Site Name:	Coleman-Evans V	Vood Preserving	EPA ID	No.: Fl	LD991279894
	<u>Co.</u>				
Subject Name	e: John Sykes, I	II	Affiliati	on: <u>F</u>	DEP
Subject Conta	act Information:	John.Sykes@dep	o.state.fl.u	us (850) 2	<u>45-8960</u>
Time: 11:30	a.m.		Date:	02/21/201	<u>19</u>
Interview Loo	cation: <u>Via e</u>	mail			
Interview For	mat (circle one):	In Person	Phone	Mail	Other: <u>Email</u>

Interview Category: State Agency

- 1. What is your overall impression of the project, including cleanup, maintenance and reuse activities (as appropriate)? All going well, except no site wide reuse activities, which we do not have a problem with.
- 2. What is your assessment of the current performance of the remedy in place at the Site? Remedy appears to be working as designed.
- 3. Are you aware of any complaints or inquiries regarding site-related environmental issues or remedial activities from residents in the past five years? No.
- 4. Has your office conducted any site-related activities or communications in the past five years? If so, please describe the purpose and results of these activities. Post hurricane visits to check for damage (none noted).
- 5. Are you aware of any changes to state laws that might affect the protectiveness of the Site's remedy? No.
- 6. Are you comfortable with the status of the institutional controls at the Site? If not, what are the associated outstanding issues? Yes.
- 7. Are you aware of any changes in projected land use(s) at the Site? No.
- 8. Do you have any comments, suggestions or recommendations regarding the management or operation of the Site's remedy? No.
- 9. Do you consent to have your name included along with your responses to this questionnaire in the FYR report? Yes.

APPENDIX F – SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST					
I. SITE INFORMATION					
Site Name: Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Co.	Date of Inspection: <u>11/15/18</u>				
Location and Region: Whitehouse, FL	EPA ID: FLD991279894				
Agency, Office or Company Leading the Five-Year Review: EPA Region 4	Weather/Temperature: <u>57°F, overcast</u>				
Remedy Includes: (Check all that apply) \[Landfill cover/containment \[Access controls \[Access controls \[Institutional controls \[Groundwater pump and treatment Surface water collection and treatment Other: Soil excavataion and treatment Other: Soil excavataion and treatment					
II. INTERVIEWS	(check all that apply)				
1. O&M Site Manager Jeff Foster City of Jacksonville, Project 1/30/2019 Name Manager Date Title Interviewed [] at site [] at office [] by phone [X] by email Problems_suggestions Report attached					
2. O&M Staff					
Name Title Date Interviewed [] at site [] at office [] by phone Phone: Problems/suggestions [] Report attached: See Appendix E					
Agency FDEP Contact John Sykes, III Project 2/21/2019 (850) 245-8960 Name Manager Date Phone No. Title Problems/suggestions Report attached: see Appendix E					
Agency Contact NameTit	le Date Phone No.				
4. Other Interviews (optional) Report attached:					
III. ON-SITE DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS VERIFIED (check all that apply)					
1. O&M Documents					
🛛 O&M manual 🛛 🖂 Readily availab	le 🛛 Up to date 🗌 N/A				
As-built drawings Readily availab	le 🗌 Up to date 🕅 N/A				
Maintenance logs Readily availab	$\square Up \text{ to date } \square N/A$				
2. Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan	$\square \text{ Readily available} \square \text{ Up to date } \square \text{ N/A}$				
Contingency plan/emergency response plan	Readily available Up to date N/A				

3.	O&M and OSHA Training Records	Readily available Up to date XN/A			
4.	Permits and Service Agreements	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Air discharge permit	🗌 Readily available 🗌 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
	Effluent discharge	🗌 Readily available 🛛 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
	🗌 Waste disposal, POTW	🗌 Readily available 🛛 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
	Other permits:	🗌 Readily available 🔲 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
5.	Gas Generation Records	Readily available 🔲 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
6.	Settlement Monument Records	🗌 Readily available 🔲 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
7.	Groundwater Monitoring Records	🗌 Readily available 🗌 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
8.	Leachate Extraction Records	🗌 Readily available 📋 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
9.	Discharge Compliance Records	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Air Readily availab	ole 🗋 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
	Water (effluent) Readily availab	ole 🗌 Up to date 🛛 N/A			
10.	Daily Access/Security Logs	Readily available Up to date N/A			
	IV. O&!	M COSTS			
1.	O&M Organization				
· ·	State in-house	. Contractor for state			
	PRP in-house	Contractor for PRP			
	Federal facility in-house	Contractor for Federal facility			
	City of Jacksonville				
2.	O&M Cost Records				
	Readily available	Up to date			
	Funding mechanism/agreement in place	🔀 Unavailable			
	Original O&M cost estimate: 🔲 Breakdown attached				
	. Total annual cost by ye	ar for review period if available			
	From: To:	\$500.00 Breakdown attached			
	Date Date	Total cost			
	From: To:	\$500.00 Breakdown attached			
	From: To:	\$1000.00 Breakdown attached			
	Date Date	Total cost			
	From: To:	\$500.00 Rreakdown attached			
·	Date Date	Total cost			
3.	Unanticipated or Unusually High O&M Cost	ts during Review Period			

Describe costs and reasons:				
V. ACCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS 🛛 Applicable 🗌 N/A				
A. Fencing				
1. Fencing Damaged Location shown on site map Gates secured N/A				
Remarks:				
B. Other Access Restrictions				
1. Signs and Other Security Measures □ Location shown on site map □ N/A				
Remarks: Signs are located along perimeter fencing surrounding the former facility property at the S	<u>site.</u>			
Signs indicate that the area is a Superfund site and that digging is prohibited within the fenced area.				
C. Institutional Controls (ICs)				
1. Implementation and Enforcement				
Site conditions imply ICs not properly implemented I Yes I No N/A				
Site conditions imply ICs not being fully enforced I Yes IN N/A				
Type of monitoring (e.g., self-reporting, drive by): drive by				
Frequency: <u>quarterly</u>				
Responsible party/agency: <u>FDEP</u>				
Contact John Sykes				
Name Title Date Phone no.				
Reporting is up to date 🛛 🖾 Yes 🗌 No 🔅 N/A	L .			
Reports are verified by the lead agency 🛛 🖾 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/.	4			
Specific requirements in deed or decision documents have been met 🛛 Yes 🗍 No 🗌 N/	4			
Violations have been reported Violat	4			
Other problems or suggestions: Report attached				
2. Adequacy \square ICs are adequate \square ICs are inadequate \square N/A				
Remarks: Institutional controls have been implemented through the Florida Groundwater Delineated				
Area and a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants to ensure future land uses do not compromise the				
integrity of the remedy and limit groundwater use.				
D. General	•			
1. Vandalism/Trespassing 🗌 Location shown on site map 🛛 No vandalism evident				
Remarks:				
2. Land Use Changes On Site				
Remarks:				
3. Land Use Changes Off Site XI/A				
Remarks:				
VI. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS				
A. Roads Applicable N/A				
1. Roads Damaged Location shown on site map Roads adequate N/A				

Remark A. Landfill Su 1. Setti Area 2. Crac Leng 3. Eros Area 4. Hold Area 5. Veg D N Remark 6. Alte 7. Bulg 8. Wet 9. Slop	VII. LAN Urface Uement (low spots) extent: cks ths: sion extent: es extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: Shrubs, grass and does not affect the cap rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damage	Application Image: Description of the second seco	Dele N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depths: Erosion not evident Depth: Holes not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Depth: N/A N/A N/A Bulges not evident Height: Evident		
A. Landfill Surface 1. Settle Area 2. Crack Leng 3. Eros Area 4. Hold Area 5. Vega S. Vega 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet S. Sope 9. Slop	VII. LAN urface lement (low spots) extent: cks sion extent: es extent: estative Cover lo signs of stress arks: Shrubs, grass and does not affect the car rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damage	Applicable	ble N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Cracking not evident Depths: Erosion not evident Depth: Holes not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depths: Oracking not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Oracking not evident Depth: Note: N/A Bulges not evident Height: Evident		
Landfill Su 1. Setti Area 2. Crac 2. Crac 3. Eros 3. Eros 4. Hole 5. Veg 5. Veg 6. Alte 7. Bulg 8. Wet 9. Slop	urface lement (low spots) extent:	Location shown on site map Uccation shown on site map Widths: Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Grass Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and loged area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map	⊠ Settlement not evident Depth: ⊠ Cracking not evident Depths: ⊠ Erosion not evident Depth: ⊠ Holes not evident Depth: ⊠ Cover properly established Depth: ⊠ Cover properly established Depth: ⊠ Cover properly established Depth: ⊠ N/A ⊠ Bulges not evident Height:		
1. Settle Area Area 2. Crac 2. Crac 3. Eros 3. Eros 4. Hole 5. Veg □ N Remainstrates 6. 7. Bulg 8. Wet □ N □ P □ S 9. Slop	lement (low spots) extent: cks ths: sion extent: es extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and does not affect the ca</u> rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damage	Location shown on site map Widths: Location shown on site map Widths: Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Solution Shown on site map Control Location shown on site map Solution Shown on site map Location shown on site map Description: Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Description: Location shown on site map	⊠ Settlement not evident Depth: ⊠ Cracking not evident Depths: ⊠ Erosion not evident Depth: ⊠ Holes not evident Depth: ⊠ Holes not evident Depth: ⊠ Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) ner facility property. The presence o with no liner. ⊠ N/A ⊠ Bulges not evident Height:		
Area 2. Crac Leng 3. Eros Area 4. Hole 5. Veg □ N Remainstrees 6. 6. Alte 7. Bulg 8. Wet □ N □ N 8. Wet □ N □ N □ N □ N 0	extent:	Location shown on site map Widths: Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and long) Index size are present across the form apped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map ge X Wet areas/water damage not ended	Depth:		
2. Crac Leng 3. Eros Area 4. Hole Area 5. Veg □ N Rem trees 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S □ S 9. Slop	cks ths:	Location shown on site map Widths: Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Location shown on site map Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and location shown on site map Index small trees are present across the form Index since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map	 ☑ Cracking not evident ☑ Depths: ☑ Erosion not evident ☑ Depth: ☑ Holes not evident ☑ Depth: ☑ Cover properly established ☑ cover property. The presence of with no liner. ☑ N/A ☑ Bulges not evident Height: 		
Leng 3. Eros 4. Hold 4. Hold 5. Veg 5. Veg 6. Alte 7. Bulg 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S 9. Slop	ths: sion extent: es extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the ca rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damage	Widths:	Depths: Erosion not evident Depth: Holes not evident Depth: Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) ther facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: evident		
3. Eros Area 4. Hole Area 5. Veg □ N Remain trees 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ N □ S □ S 9. Slop	sion extent: es extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: Shrubs, grass and does not affect the ca rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damage	 □ Location shown on site map □ Location shown on site map □ Location shown on site map ○ Grass ○ Trees/shrubs (indicate size and located small trees are present across the form upped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) □ Location shown on site map 	 Erosion not evident Depth: Holes not evident Depth: Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) ner facility property. The presence o with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: 		
Area 4. Hole Area 5. Veg 5. Veg 6. Alte 7. Bulg 6. Alte 7. Bulg 8. Wet 9. Slop 9. Slop	extent:es extent:e etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the ca rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	Location shown on site map Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and load small trees are present across the form upped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map ge X Wet areas/water damage not e	Depth: Model Holes not evident Depth: Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) mer facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: evident		
4. Hole <u>Area</u> 5. Veg □ N <u>Remain trees</u> 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ N □ S □ S 9. Slop	es extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and does not affect the ca</u> rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	□ Location shown on site map □ Location shown on site map □ Grass □ Trees/shrubs (indicate size and lo id small trees are present across the form ipped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) □ Location shown on site map □ Location shown on site map	 Holes not evident Depth: Cover properly established Ocations on a diagram) ner facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: 		
Area 5. Veg 5. Veg 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area N 8. Wet □ N <td>extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the car rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag</td> <td>Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and lo ad small trees are present across the form upped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map</td> <td>Depth: Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) her facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: evident</td>	extent: etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the car rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and lo ad small trees are present across the form upped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map	Depth: Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) her facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: evident		
5. Veg □ N Rem trees 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S 0. Slop	etative Cover lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the car rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	Grass Grass Trees/shrubs (indicate size and lo ad small trees are present across the form apped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map ge X Wet areas/water damage not e	 Cover properly established ocations on a diagram) ner facility property. The presence of with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height: 		
□ N Rem <u>trees</u> 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet 0 V □ P □ S 0 Slop	lo signs of stress arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and does not affect the ca</u> rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	Trees/shrubs (indicate size and lo ad small trees are present across the form apped area since the cap is made of soil, armored rock, concrete)	ocations on a diagram) <u>ner facility property. The presence o</u> <u>with no liner.</u> N/A Bulges not evident Height:		
Remittees 6. Alte 7. Bulg Area Net 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S 9. Slop	arks: <u>Shrubs, grass and</u> does not affect the ca rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map	ner facility property. The presence o with no liner. N/A Bulges not evident Height:		
6. Alte 7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S □ S 9. Slop	rnative Cover (e.g., a ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	armored rock, concrete) Location shown on site map ge XI Wet areas/water damage not e	N/A Bulges not evident Height:		
7. Bulg Area 8. Wet □ V □ P □ S □ S 9. Slop	ges extent: Areas/Water Damag	Location shown on site map	Bulges not evident Height:		
Area 8. Wet 9. 9. Slop	extent: Areas/Water Damag	ge 🛛 Wet areas/water damage not e	Height:		
8. Wet V P S 9. Slop	Areas/Water Damag	ge 🕅 Wet areas/water damage not e	evident		
□ V □ P □ S □ S 9. Slop					
. □ P □ S □ S 9. Slop	Vet areas	Location shown on site map	Area extent:		
□ S □ S 9. Slop	onding	Location shown on site map	Area extent:		
Slop	eeps	Location shown on site map	Area extent:		
9. Slop	oft subgrade	Location shown on site map	Area extent:		
	e Instability		Location shown on site map		
	No evidence of slope instability				
Area	extent:	•	·		
B. Benches					
(Horizo order to	ontally constructed mo o slow down the veloc	ounds of earth placed across a steep land city of surface runoff and intercept and c	dfill side slope to interrupt the slope convey the runoff to a lined channel		
1. 1. Flow	vs Bypass Bench	Location shown on site map	N/A or okay		
2. Ben	ch Breached	Location shown on site map	N/A or okay		
3. Ben	ch Overtopped	\square Location shown on site man	N/A or okay		

	cover without creating erosion	gullies.)			•
1.	Settlement (Low spots)	Location shown	on site map] No evid	ence of settlement
	Area extent:		Ľ	Pepth:	
2.	Material Degradation	Location shown	on site map] No evid	ence of degradation
	Material type:		A	rea extent	·
3.	Erosion	Location shown	on site map] No evid	ence of erosion
	Area extent:		·	Pepth:	
4.	Undercutting	Location shown	on site map] No evid	ence of undercutting
	Area extent:		D	epth:	_
5.	Obstructions	Туре:	[] No obst	ructions
	Location shown on site r	nap Ar	ea extent:		
	Size:				
6.	Excessive Vegetative Grow	wth Ty	pe:		
	No evidence of excessiv	e growth			
	Vegetation in channels does not obstruct flow				
	Location shown on site r	nap Ar	ea extent:		
D. Co	ver Penetrations] Applicable 🛛 N	//A		· ·
1.	Gas Vents			Passive	
	Properly secured/locked	Functioning	Routinely samp	led 🗌	Good condition
	Evidence of leakage at p	enetration	Needs maintena	nce 🗌	N/A
2.	Gas Monitoring Probes				
	Properly secured/locked	Functioning	Routinely samp	led	Good condition
	Evidence of leakage at p	enetration	🗌 Needs maintena	nce	N/A
3.	Monitoring Wells (within su	urface area of landfill) .		
	Properly secured/locked	Functioning	Routinely samp	led 🗌	Good condition
	Evidence of leakage at p	enetration	Needs maintena	nce 🔲	N/A
4.	Extraction Wells Leachate				
:	Properly secured/locked	Functioning	Routinely samp	led 🗌	Good condition
	Evidence of leakage at p	enetration	Needs maintena	nce 🗌	N/A .
5.	Settlement Monuments		Routinely surve	yed 🗌	N/A
E. Ga	s Collection and Treatment	Applicable	N/A		
1.	Gas Treatment Facilities				
	🗌 Flaring	Thermal destru	iction		Collection for reuse
	Good condition	Needs mainten	ance		
2.	2. Gas Collection Wells, Manifolds and Piping				
	Good condition	Needs mainten	ance		

.

J.	Gas Monitoring Facilitie	s (e.g., gas monitoring of adjacent hom	nes or buildings)
	Good condition	Needs maintenance	□ N/A
F. Co	over Drainage Layer	Applicable 🛛 N/A	
1.	Outlet Pipes Inspected	Functioning	□ N/A
2.	Outlet Rock Inspected	Functioning	□ N/A
G. D	etention/Sedimentation Pon	ds 🗌 Applicable 🛛 🛛	N /A
1.	Siltation Area	extent: Depth:	∏ Ń/A
	Siltation not evident		
2.	Erosion Area	extent: Depth:	
	Erosion not evident		
3.	Outlet Works	unctioning	□ N/A
4.	Dam 🗌 F	unctioning	□ N/A
H. R	etaining Walls	Applicable 🛛 N/A	·
1.	Deformations	Location shown on site map	Deformation not evident
	Horizontal displacement: _	Vertical disp	lacement:
	Rotational displacement:	<u> </u>	
2.	Degradation	Location shown on site map	Degradation not evident
I. Pe	rimeter Ditches/Off-Site Dis	charge 🛛 Applicable 🗌] N/A
1.	Siltation	Location shown on site map	Siltation not evident
	Area extent:	· · · · ·	Depth:
2.	Vegetative Growth	Location shown on site map	□ N/A
	Vegetation does not imp	bede flow	
	Area extent:		Туре:
3.	Area extent: Erosion	Location shown on site map	Type: Erosion not evident
3.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent:	Location shown on site map	Type: Erosion not evident Depth:
3. 4.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure	 Location shown on site map Functioning 	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A
3. 4. VIII.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A
3. 4. VIII. 1.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident
3. 4. VIII. 1.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent:	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth:
3. 4. VIII. 1. 2.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map Type of monitoring:	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth:
3. 4. VIII. 1. 2.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring Performance not monitor	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map Type of monitoring: pred	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth:
3. 4. VIII. 1. 2.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring Performance not monitor Frequency:	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map Type of monitoring: pred	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Evidence of breaching
3. 4. VIII. 1. 2.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring Performance not monito Frequency: Head differential:	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable Location shown on site map Type of monitoring: pred	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Evidence of breaching
3. 4. 1. 2.	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring Performance not monitor Frequency: Head differential: GROUNDWATER/SURFAC	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable [2] Location shown on site map Type of monitoring:	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Evidence of breaching cable N/A
3. 4. VIII. 1. 2. IX. C A. G	Area extent: Erosion Area extent: Discharge Structure VERTICAL BARRIER W Settlement Area extent: Performance Monitoring Performance not monitor Frequency: Head differential: GROUNDWATER/SURFACTION	Location shown on site map Functioning ALLS Applicable [2] Location shown on site map Type of monitoring:	Type: Erosion not evident Depth: N/A N/A Settlement not evident Depth: Evidence of breaching cable N/A Applicable N/A

	Good condition All required wells properly operating Needs maintenance N/A
2.	Extraction System Pipelines, Valves, Valve Boxes and Other Appurtenances
	Good condition Needs maintenance
3.	Spare Parts and Equipment
	Readily available Good condition Requires upgrade Needs to be provided
. B. Si	rface Water Collection Structures, Pumps and Pipelines 🗌 Applicable 🖾 N/A
1.	Collection Structures, Pumps and Electrical
	Good condition Needs maintenance
2.	Surface Water Collection System Pipelines, Valves, Valve Boxes and Other Appurtenances
	Good condition Needs maintenance
3.	Spare Parts and Equipment
	Readily available Good condition Requires upgrade Needs to be provided
C. T	reatment System
1.	Treatment Train (check components that apply)
	Metals removal Oil/water separation Bioremediation
	Air stripping Carbon adsorbers
	Filters :
	Additive (e.g., chelation agent, flocculent):
	Others:
	Good condition
	Sampling ports properly marked and functional
	Sampling/maintenance log displayed and up to date
	Equipment properly identified
	Quantity of groundwater treated annually:
·	Quantity of surface water treated annually:
2.	Electrical Enclosures and Panels (properly rated and functional)
	N/A Good condition Needs maintenance
3.	Tanks, Vaults, Storage Vessels
	N/A Good condition Proper secondary containment Needs maintenance
4.	Discharge Structure and Appurtenances
	N/A Good condition Needs maintenance
5.	Treatment Building(s)
· .	N/A Good condition (esp. roof and doorways) Needs repair
<u> </u>	Chemicals and equipment properly stored
6.	Monitoring Wells (pump and treatment remedy)
	Properly secured/locked Functioning Routinely sampled Good condition

	All required wells located Needs maintenance N/A
D. M	onitoring Data
1.	Monitoring Data
	Is routinely submitted on time Is of acceptable quality
2.	Monitoring Data Suggests:
·	Groundwater plume is effectively contained Contaminant concentrations are declining
E. M	onitored Natural Attenuation
1.	Monitoring Wells (natural attenuation remedy)
	Properly secured/locked Functioning Routinely sampled Good condition
	□ All required wells located □ Needs maintenance ⊠ N/A
	Remarks: The groundwater remedy achieved the cleanup goals and wells have been removed and abandoned so there is no longer any monitoring required.
	X. OTHER REMEDIES
If the	re are remedies applied at the site and not covered above, attach an inspection sheet describing the physical
nature	e and condition of any facility associated with the remedy. An example would be soil vapor extraction.
<u> </u>	XI. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS
<u>A.</u>	Implementation of the Remedy
	Describe issues and observations relating to whether the remedy is effective and functioning as designed.
	Begin with a brief statement of what the remedy is designed to accomptish (e.g., to contain containmain plume, minimize infiltration and gas emissions)
	The remedy has cleaned up soil, sediment and groundwater. Excavation and treatment of contaminated
	soil and sediment have eliminated the potential for exposure to these contaminated media and have also
	removed any source material that might have been contributing to groundwater contamination. Any
	contamination remaining on the former facility property of the Site is covered by a 2-foot vegetated soil
	cover. MNA has addressed remaining low-level contaminants in groundwater. ICs are in place to restrict
P	Adaquade of the former facility property and pronioit use of shallow groundwater.
D .	Describe issues and observations related to the implementation and scope of O&M procedures. In
	particular, discuss their relationship to the current and long-term protectiveness of the remedy.
	The Site's remedy is currently operational and functional. The EPA developed the O&M Plan for the Site
	in 2009. The city is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the fence and cover maintenance such as
	mowing. During the site inspection, small pine trees were observed to be growing on the Site; however,
	the trees do not affect the cover since the cover is made of soil with no liner.
<u>C.</u>	Early Indicators of Potential Remedy Problems
	Describe issues and observations such as unexpected changes in the cost or scope of O&M or a high
	in the future
	None.
D .	Opportunities for Optimization
	Describe possible opportunities for optimization in monitoring tasks or the operation of the remedy.
	None.

Attendees:

EPA RPM Joydeb Majumder EPA RPM Rusty Kestle Treat Suomi with Skeo Claire Marcussen with Skeo

APPENDIX G – SITE INSPECTION PHOTOS



Locked gate at western entrance to the former facility property



Sign at western entrance to the former facility property



Vegetated capped area, looking east



Vegetated capped area, looking northwest



Recycling business on the southeastern corner of General Avenue and Celery Avenue (OU2 area)



Roll-off dumpster business on the southwestern corner of General Avenue and Celery Avenue (OU2 area)

APPENDIX H – DETAILED ARARS REVIEW

CERCLA Section 121(d)(1) requires that Superfund remedial actions attain "a degree of cleanup of hazardous substance, pollutants, and contaminants released into the environment and of control of further release at a minimum which assures protection of human health and the environment." The remedial action must achieve a level of cleanup that at least attains those requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate. In performing the FYR for compliance with ARARs, only those ARARs that address the protectiveness of the remedy are reviewed.

Groundwater

The 1997 AROD identified the federal MCLs (40 CFR 141) as the ARARs for the groundwater COCs, which are equivalent to the state MCLs (Florida Administrative Code [FAC] 62-550) (Table H-1). The 1997 groundwater ARARs were not revised in the subsequent decision documents (i.e., the 2001, 2003, 2004 and 2005 ESDs and the 2006 ROD). The 1997 AROD stated that the federal MCL for dioxin in drinking water is too stringent and selected a less stringent 10-day adult health advisory level of 0.001 μ g/L as the final cleanup goal. The monitoring data from previous FYRs have demonstrated that dioxin TEQs were below the more stringent MCL.

Table H-1: Previous and Current ARARs for Groundwater COCs

COC	1997 AROD ARAR (µg/L)	Current ARAR (µg/L) ^a	ARAR Change
Dioxin	0.00003	0.00003	None
PCP	1.0	1.0	None
Notes: a. Lower of the https://www regulations (https://www	e federal and state Primary MCLs. <u>epa.gov/ground-water-and-drinkir</u> accessed 9/19/2018); FDEP MCLs flrules.org/gateway/notice Files.a	Federal MCLs are available at ng-water/national-primary-drinks are available at sp?ID=17870715 (accessed 9/1	king-water-

The 1997 AROD stated that there are also other contaminants in the groundwater, such as free product and petroleum hydrocarbons associated with diesel fuel used in the wood-treatment process. However, the AROD indicated that appropriate performance standards for these additional contaminants would be addressed during the remedial design since they were not listed as COCs. The 2004 remedial design document listed the groundwater target cleanup level of 5,000 micrograms per liter (μ g/L) for total petroleum hydrocarbons as defined in FAC Chapter 62-777; this ARAR value has not changed. This value was achieved as part of the MNA groundwater remedy component by 2012.

Soil

Federal soil ARARs have not been established for site COCs dioxin or PCP. However, the 2006 ROD established a state soil cleanup target level (SCTL) for dioxin, which is a state ARAR established under FAC 62-780 (Table H-2). The PCP cleanup goal was based on site-specific leachability and not a state ARAR. The residential SCTL applies to the properties surrounding the former facility property, while the industrial SCTL applies to the former facility property.

Table H-2: Previous and Current ARARs for OU2 Soil COCs

<u> </u>	2006 ROD ARARs (µg/kg)*		Current ARARs (µg/kg) ^a		ARARs	
	Industrial	Residential	Industrial	Residential	Change	
Dioxin	0.030	0.007	0.030	0.007	None	
РСР	NA	NA	NA	NA	None	
Notes: a. FAC 62-780 SC	TLs – <u>https://flor</u> evels based on a	ridadep.gov/waste/	district-business-	support/documents/t	able-ii-soil-	
NA – a state ARAR	was not selected	as a cleanup goal f	for PCP.	· /·		

APPENDIX I – SCREENING-LEVEL RISK REVIEW

The 1997 AROD selected the cleanup goal for PCP was based on site-specific leachability. The dioxin cleanup goal was established in the 2006 ROD. The 1997 site cleanup goals for PCP were based on site-specific leachability and thus are more stringent than the industrial and residential SCTLs. To evaluate whether there were any toxicity value changes since the 1997 AROD and 2006 ROD, this FYR conducted a screening-level risk evaluation. As shown in Table I-1, the and PCP soil cleanup goals fall within the EPA risk management range of 1×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6} . Similarly, the equivalent hazard quotients (HQs) are below the EPA's threshold of 1.0. Further, the PCP cleanup goals are more stringent than the SCTLs. These results demonstrate that the cleanup goals remain valid.

Cleanup Goal	EPA RSL ^a			Noncancer
(mg/kg)	1 x 10-6 Risk	HQ=1	Risk	HQ°
Indu	strial - on facility	a Barris		
0.00003	0.000022	0.00072	1 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.04
2	4.0	2,800	5 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.0007
Resid	ential - off facility			
0.000007	0.0000048	0.000051	2 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.1
2	. 1	250	2 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.008
eening levels (RSLs), da v/risk/regional-screening re calculated using the fo k: cancer risk = (cleanup	ted November 201 -levels-rsls-generic ollowing equation, o goal + soil cancer	8, are available <u>c-tables</u> (access based on the fa RSL) × 10 ⁻⁶ .	e at sed 11/19/201 act that RSLs	8). are derived
	Cleanup Goal (mg/kg) Indu 0.00003 2 Resid 0.000007 2 eening levels (RSLs), da v/risk/regional-screening re calculated using the for sk: cancer risk = (cleanup)	Cleanup Goal (mg/kg) EPA RS Industrial – on facility 1 x 10 ⁻⁶ Risk 0.00003 0.000022 2 4.0 Residential – off facility 0.000007 0.0000048 2 1 eening levels (RSLs), dated November 201 v/risk/regional-screening-levels-rsls-generic re calculated using the following equation, sk: cancer risk = (cleanup goal ÷ soil cancer	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Cleanup Goal & EPA RSL^* & & \\ \hline 1 x 10^6 Risk & HQ=1 & \\ \hline 1 x 10^6 $	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$

Table I-1: Risk Evaluation of Human Health-based Soil Cleanup Goal

 $HI = (cleanup goal \div soil noncancer RSL).$

d. Used the RSL established for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzodioxin

The vapor intrusion pathway is not a currently complete exposure pathway, because there are no building structures on site and a restriction is in place that prohibits any activities that might compromise the soil cover. The 2009 Declaration of Restrictive Covenants also prohibits all unrestricted uses of the Site (e.g., residential, schools, lodging, day care), thereby eliminating vapor intrusion as a potential exposure pathway. Further, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were not prevalent at the Site due to the use of diesel fuel which has a low benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene content. The only fuel-related VOCs detected were naphthalene and toluene in the 1986 remedial investigation at concentrations of 14 μ g/L and 300 μ g/L, respectively. Entering these concentrations in EPA's Vapor Intrusion Screening Level calculator¹ assuming future residential use results in risks within EPA's risk management range of 1 x 10⁻⁶ to 1 x 10⁻⁴ and is also below a noncancer hazard index of 1.0.

¹ Located at <u>https://semspub.epa.gov/work/HQ/196702.xlsm</u> and accessed 1/9/2019.

APPENDIX J – 2009 RESTRICTIVE COVENANT

Doc # 2009266439, OR BK 15057 Page 557, Number Pages: 20, Recorded 11/04/2009 at 11:03 AM, JIM FULLER CLERK CIRCUIT COURT DUVAL COUNTY

This instrument prepared by: Kristina G. Nelson Assistant General Counsel Office of General Counsel 117 West Duval Street Suite 480 Jacksonville, FL 32202

DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS

THIS DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT (hereinafter "Declaration") is made this <u>29</u> day of ______, 2009, by the CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, a body politic and corporate of the State of Florida, (hereinafter "Grantor"), having an address of 117 West Duval Street, Suite 480, Jacksonville, FL 32202 and the FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, a political subdivision of the State of Florida (hereinafter "FDEP" or "Grantee").

RECITALS

- A. WHEREAS, Grantor is the fee simple owner of a parcel of land situated in Duval County, State of Florida, more particularly described in <u>Exhibit A1 and A2</u> attached hereto and made a part hereof (hereinafter the "Property");
- B. WHEREAS, the Property subject to this restrictive covenant is the property known as the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Superfund Site ("Site"), which the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9605, proposed for the National Priorities List, set forth at 40 C.F.R. Part 300, Appendix B, by publication in the Federal Register on September 8, 1983, at 48 Fed. Reg. 40658;
- C. WHEREAS, in December 1982, the Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER, now FDEP) and Coleman-Evans signed a Consent Order for a two-phase remedial action study of the site. Compliance with the Consent Order was unsatisfactory. To address these deficiencies, a new Consent Order was drafted by FDER in May 1984, which required immediate removal and disposal of contaminated soils, wastewater and groundwater at Coleman-Evans the site, and sampling of private wells immediately adjacent to the site. Coleman-Evans did not sign this Consent Order.
- D. WHEREAS, in September 1984, FDER requested that the EPA take the lead management role on the site and conduct an immediate removal of the waste sludges in the disposal pits. EPA issued an administrative order to Coleman-Evans in October 1984, requiring Coleman-Evans to take immediate action. Coleman-Evans did not comply and refused site access. EPA was granted site access in federal court in May 1985. An

Page 1 of 20

J-1

immediate removal of the waste sludges in the disposal pits was conducted in June 1985.

- E. WHEREAS, field investigations were completed in October 1985, and the Superfund Remedial Investigation (RI) report was completed in April 1986. The RI confirmed PCP contamination in on-site soils as well as in sediments in the drainage ditch off-site. PCP contamination in the surficial aquifer appears to be limited to groundwater in contact with adjacent soils. On-site incineration of contaminated soils and treatment of ground water associated with soil excavation was selected as the most cost-effective and environmentally sound alternative for site remediation. A Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in September 1986.
- F. WHEREAS, EPA initiated remedial design in April 1987 and completed design for soil incineration and groundwater recovery and treatment in July 1988. Design data indicated that four times the originally estimated volume of soil would require remediation. EPA completed initial treatability testing in April 1990 to evaluate the feasibility of using either bioremediation or chemical fixation as the soil remedy rather than the more costly incineration remedy. EPA developed an alternative site cleanup program for contaminated soils, which was documented in an amended ROD, signed in September 1990. The selected alternative included soil washing to separate clean sands, chemical fixation of contaminated sludges, and bioremediation of wash water followed by polishing with a filter system.
- G. WHEREAS, additional site sampling was performed in March and July 1991, which confirmed the presence of dioxin contamination in the groundwater and on-site soils, as well as the existence of free product (diesel) floating on the water table. Treatability studies were completed in January 1992 to determine if the revised remedy would effectively treat dioxin. The results of the treatability Coleman-Evans studies and technical memorandum data indicated that additional site characterization for dioxin was needed to define the volume and extent of dioxin contaminated soils and refine the proposed treatment scenario. Additional soil sampling, performed in June and October 1992 and June 1993, confirmed that dioxin contaminated soils existed both on-site and offsite in the drainage ditch area and adjacent residences. EPA-Emergency Response conducted removal actions in July and August 1993; excavating contaminated offsite soils and stockpiling the soils on-site along with dismantling and removal of tanks and equipment used in the former wood treating operations. Additional soil and well sampling was performed in the spring of 1994. Sampling results indicated that groundwater contamination is limited in extent and has not migrated into the deeper private wells.
- H. WHEREAS, EPA developed a draft Focused Feasibility Study in May 1994 to reevaluate the soil remedy in light of the new data. A public meeting was held in June 1995 to present the revised soil remedy identified in the draft Record of Decision (ROD). EPA's proposed remedy consisted of excavation and treatment of approximately 52,000 cubic yards of soils contaminated with pentachlorophenol and dioxin. Contaminated soils would be treated by thermal desorption to destroy the contaminants and disposed of

Page 2 of 20

onsite. A treatability study was proposed as part of the remedial design to confirm the effectiveness of the remedy. If cleanup goals could not be met by thermal desorption, the site would be capped and groundwater remediation, including free product recovery, implemented.

- WHEREAS, in response to comments from the DEP regarding the draft ROD, EPA conducted soil leaching tests to determine a site specific remedial goal for PCP in soils protective of groundwater as well as direct exposure to soils. The February 1996 EPA Site Specific Soil Screening Levels Report documented a site specific soil leaching criteria of 2 mg/kg for PCP. EPA also conducted additional offsite soil sampling in July and December 1996 to further delineate the extent of dioxin contamination both onsite and in surrounding residential areas.
- J. WHEREAS, EPA Region IV issued an Interim Record of Decision (ROD) in September 1997, which identifies thermal desorption as the selected soil remedy and groundwater recovery and treatment to address contaminated groundwater. A soil dioxin cleanup level of 1.0 µg/kg has been identified as an interim cleanup level for the site. The Soils Remedial Design was completed in January 1999 followed by a public meeting in March 1999 to discuss the upcoming construction activities. The Groundwater Remedial Design was completed in December 1999 and included site dewatering by groundwater recovery and treatment prior to discharge to enable the excavation of contaminated soils located below the groundwater table.
- K. WHEREAS, Construction of the soil remedy began in June 1999 and included debris removal, soil excavation and stockpiling, construction of the thermal desorption unit and construction of the water treatment unit based on the Groundwater Remedial Design. Operation of the Groundwater Coleman-Evans Treatment System commenced during October 2000.
- L. WHEREAS, a Remedial Design Addendum report, dated September 2004, evaluated what steps may be necessary for remediation of the groundwater at the site. Active groundwater cleanup was originally projected to take ten (10) years with a site cleanup date of 2013 in the 1997 ROD. However, evaluation of the groundwater contamination levels in the 2004 report, indicate that the groundwater contamination has been significantly reduced as a result of the soil removal, which also included the treatment of some 74.5 million gallons of contaminated water. The report indicates that groundwater contamination levels are now significantly lower than the DEP's natural attenuation default concentrations (NADCs), but still exceed the Primary Drinking Water Standards (onsite only). This has led the EPA to propose Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) as the selected remedy for the groundwater cleanup. The report concluded that the drinking water standards would be met within a 4 to 5 year time frame (2008 - 2009). DEP has concurred with this revised approach to the groundwater cleanup. In 2005 the remedial activities at the site were reorganized into two Operable Units (OU 1 & 2). OU 1 was further divided into Phase I (onsite Soils), and Phase II (surficial groundwater and miscellaneous site activities). OU 2 was created to address the remaining dioxin-

Page 3 of 20

contaminated offsite soils. The EPA signed the Final ROD on September 28, 2006. The ROD identified several offsite areas with dioxin contamination believed to be site related exceeding the DEP's soil cleanup target level (SCTL) of 7 ng/kg dioxin TEQ. This contaminated soil was excavated and placed onsite under 2 ft of clean soil and the offsite excavation areas were backfilled with clean soil. Since contaminated soil exceeding the DEP's SCTLs will remain onsite, Institutional Controls for the former Coleman – Evans property will be necessary to ensure the protectiveness of this remedy.

- M. WHEREAS, contaminants in excess of allowable concentrations for unrestricted use will remain at the Property after completion of the remedial action.
- N. WHEREAS, it is the intent of the restrictions in this declaration to reduce or eliminate the risk of exposure of the contaminants to the environment and to users or occupants of the property and to reduce or eliminate the threat of migration of the contaminants.
- O. WHEREAS, it is the intention of all parties that EPA is a third party beneficiary of said restrictions and said restrictions shall be enforceable by the EPA, FDEP, and their successor agencies.
- P. WHEREAS, the parties hereto have agreed 1) to impose on the Property use restrictions as covenants that will run with the land for the purpose of protecting human health and the environment; and 2) to grant an irrevocable right of access over the Property to the Grantee and its agents or representatives for purposes of implementing, facilitating and monitoring the remedial action; and
- Q. WHEREAS, Grantor deems it desirable and in the best interest of all present and future owners of the Property that the Property be held subject to certain restrictions and changes, that will run with the land, for the purpose of protecting human health and the environment, all of which are more particularly hereinafter set forth.

NOW THEREFORE, Grantor, on behalf of itself, its successors, its heirs, and assigns, in consideration of the recitals above, the terms of the Record of Decision and Amendments, and other good and valuable consideration, the adequacy and receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, does hereby covenant and declare that the Property shall be subject to the restrictions on use set forth below, which shall touch and concern and run with the title of the property, and does give, grant and convey to the Grantee, and its assigns, with general warranties of title: 1) an irrevocable use restriction and site access covenant of the nature and character, and for the purposes hereinafter set forth, and 2) the perpetual right to enforce said covenants and use restrictions, with respect to the Property. Grantor further agrees as follows:

- a. The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.
- b. Grantor hereby imposes on the Property the following restrictions:

Page 4 of 20

1.

<u>Restrictions on use</u>: The following covenants, conditions, and restrictions apply to the use of the Property:

a) The Property has been permanently covered with two feet of uncontaminated soil. Grantor shall permanently maintain this cover by periodically verifying the soil depth using the installed elevation markers, repairing eroding areas, properly maintaining existing stormwater features, and maintaining the vegetative cover over the soils.

- b) The upper two feet of soil shall not be disturbed in any manner without the Grantor obtaining prior written approval of the Director of EPA Region 4 Superfund Division and FDEP.
- c) Excavation and construction below two feet surface elevations is not prohibited provided that such activity is reviewed and approved by EPA and FDEP.
- d) Generally, there shall be no agricultural use of the land including forestry, fishing and mining; no hotels or lodging; no residential uses; and no educational uses such as elementary and secondary schools, or day care services. These prohibited uses are specifically defined by using the North American Industry Classification System, United States, 2002 (NAICS), Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget. The prohibited uses by code are: Sector 11 Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting; Subsection 212 Mining (except Oil and Gas); Code 512132 Drive-In Motion Picture Theaters; Code 51412 Libraries and Archives; Code 53111 Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings; Subsector 611 Elementary and Secondary Schools; Subsector 623 Nursing and Residential Care Facilities; Subsector 721 Accommodation (hotels, motels, RV parks, etc.); and Subsection 814 Private Households.
- e) The existing chain-link fence and gates shall be maintained and kept closed and locked as long as the Site is vacant or not in usc. Any changes to the fence and gating will be submitted to, reviewed and approved by EPA and FDEP prior to making any such changes.
- f) Grantor shall perform such "Site Activities" as set forth in Section V.1 in the EPA/FDEP approved "Site-Wide Operations and Maintenance Manual for the Coleman-Evans Wood Preserving Company Superfund Site."
- g) The shallow groundwater aquifer shall not be used for drinking or other domestic or industrial uses unless and until notified by EPA that the groundwater remedy is complete. The use of the deeper aquifers shall remain unrestricted so long as construction of such wells are reviewed and approved by FDEP, EPA & SJRWMD.

Page 5 of 20

- h) The groundwater monitoring wells and network shall not be disturbed in any manner without the Grantor obtaining prior written approval of the Director of EPA Region 4 Superfund Division and FDEP.
- i) Except as necessary to protect human health, safety or the environment, no action shall be taken, allowed, suffered or omitted on the Property if such action or omission is reasonably likely to:
 - i. Create a risk of migration of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants or a potential hazard to human health or the environment; or
 - ii. Result in a compromise of the two-feet of soil cover utilized at the Property to control exposure to hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants.
- 2. <u>Irrevocable Covenant for Site Access</u>: Grantor hereby grants to the Grantee, its agents and representatives, an irrevocable, permanent and continuing right of access at all reasonable times to the Property for purposes of:
 - a) Implementing the response actions in the ROD;
 - b) Verifying any data or information submitted to EPA and Grantee;
 - c) Verifying that no action is being taken on the Property in violation of the terms of this instrument or of any federal or state environmental laws or regulations;
 - d) Monitoring response actions on the Site and conducting investigations relating to contamination on or near the Site, including, without limitation, sampling of air, water, sediments, soils, and specifically, without limitation, obtaining split or duplicate samples;
 - e) Conducting periodic reviews of the remedial action, including but not limited to, reviews required by applicable statutes and/or regulations; and
 - f) Implementing additional or new response actions if EPA determines i) that such actions are necessary to protect the environment because either the original remedial action has proven to be ineffective or because new technology has been developed that will accomplish the purposes of the remedial action in a significantly more efficient or cost effective manner; and, ii) that the additional or new response actions will not impose any significantly greater burden on the Property or unduly interfere with the then existing uses of the Property.

Page 6 of 20

- 3. <u>Modification</u>: This Declaration shall not be modified, amended, or terminated without the written consent of FDEP or its successor agency. FDEP shall not consent to any such modification, amendment or termination without the written consent of EPA.
- 4. (a) <u>Reserved rights of Grantor</u>: Grantor hereby reserves unto itself, its successors, its heirs, and assigns, all rights and privileges in and to the use of the Property which are not incompatible with the restrictions, rights and covenants granted herein.

(b) <u>Reserved Rights of EPA</u>: Nothing in this document shall limit or otherwise affect EPA's rights of entry and access or EPA's authority to take response actions under CERCLA, the NCP, or other federal law.

(c) <u>Reserved Rights of Grantee</u>: Nothing in this document shall limit or otherwise affect Grantee's rights of entry and access or authority to act under state or federal law.

5. <u>Notice requirement</u>: Grantor agrees to include in any instrument conveying any interest in any portion of the Property, including but not limited to deeds, leases and mortgages, a notice which is in substantially the following form:

NOTICE: THE INTEREST CONVEYED HEREBY IS SUBJECT TO A DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE AND AFFIRMATIVE COVENANTS, DATED______, 200_, RECORDED IN THE PUBLIC LAND RECORDS ON ______, 20___, IN BOOK ______, PAGE _____, IN FAVOR OF, AND ENFORCEABLE BY, THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

Within thirty (30) days of the date any such instrument of conveyance is executed, Grantor must provide Grantee and EPA with a certified true copy of said instrument and, if it has been recorded in the public land records, its recording reference.

6. Enforcement: The Grantee shall be entitled to enforce the terms of this instrument by resort to specific performance or legal process. All remedies available hereunder shall be in addition to any and all other remedies at law or in equity, including CERCLA. Enforcement of the terms of this instrument shall be at the discretion of the Grantee, and any forbearance, delay or omission to exercise its rights under this instrument in the event of a breach of any term of this instrument shall not be deemed to be a waiver by the Grantee of such term or of

Page 7 of 20

any subsequent breach of the same or any other term, or of any of the rights of the Grantee under this instrument. It is expressly agreed that EPA is not the recipient of a real property interest but is a third party beneficiary of the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants, and as such, has the right of enforcement.

- 7. **Damages:** Grantee shall be entitled to recover damages for violations of the terms of this instrument, or for any injury to the remedial action, to the public or to the environment protected by this instrument.
- 8. <u>Waiver of certain defenses</u>: Grantor hereby waives any defense of laches, estoppel, or prescription.
- 9. <u>Covenants</u>: Grantor hereby covenants to and with the Grantee, that the Grantor is lawfully seized in fee simple of the Property, that the Grantor has a good and lawful right and power to sell and convey it or any interest therein, that the Property is free and clear of encumbrances, except those noted on <u>Exhibit B</u> attached hereto, and that the Grantor will forever warrant and defend the title thereto and the quiet possession thereof.
- 10. <u>Notices</u>: Any notice, demand, request, consent, approval, or communication that either party desires or is required to give to the other shall be in writing and shall either be served personally or sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, referencing the Site name and Site ID number and addressed as follows:

To Grantor:

Assistant General Counsel Environmental Department Office of General Counsel 117 West Duval Street Suite 480 Jacksonville, FL 32202

. ز

To Grantee: Florida Department of Environmental Protection 2600 Blairstone Rd. Tallahassee, FL32399

To EPA:

Director, Superfund Division The United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 4 61 Forsyth Street, SW Atlanta, GA 30303

11. <u>Recording in Land Records</u>: Grantor shall record this Declaration of Restrictive and Affirmative Covenants in timely fashion in the Official Records of Duval County, Florida, and shall rerecord it at any time Grantee may require to preserve its rights. Grantor shall pay all recording costs and taxes necessary to record this document in the public records.

Page 8 of 20

12. General provisions:

a) <u>Controlling law</u>: The interpretation and performance of this instrument shall be governed by the laws of the United States or, if there are no applicable federal laws, by the law of the state where the Property is located.

b) <u>Liberal construction</u>: Any general rule of construction to the contrary notwithstanding, this instrument shall be liberally construed in favor of the grant to effect the purpose of this instrument and the policy and purpose of CERCLA. If any provision of this instrument is found to be ambiguous, an interpretation consistent with the purpose of this instrument that would render the provision valid shall be favored over any interpretation that would render it invalid.

c) <u>Severability</u>: If any provision of this instrument, or the application of it to any person or circumstance, is found to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this instrument, or the application of such provisions to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is found to be invalid, as the case may be, shall not be affected thereby.

d) <u>Entire Agreement</u>: This instrument sets forth the entire agreement of the parties with respect to rights and restrictions created hereby, and supersedes all prior discussions, negotiations, understandings, or agreements relating thereto, all of which are merged herein.

e) <u>No Forfeiture</u>: Nothing contained herein will result in a forfeiture or reversion of Grantor's title in any respect.

f) <u>Joint Obligation</u>: If there are two or more parties identified as Grantor herein, the obligations imposed by this instrument upon them shall be joint and several.

g) <u>Successors</u>: The term "Grantor", wherever used herein, and any pronouns used in place thereof, shall include the persons and/or entities named at the beginning of this document, identified as "Grantor" and their personal representatives, heirs, successors, and assigns. The term "Grantee", wherever used herein, and any pronouns used in place thereof, shall include the persons and/or entities named at the beginning of this document, identified as "Grantee" and any successor state agency having administrative jurisdiction. The rights of the Grantee and Grantor under this instrument are freely assignable, subject to the notice provisions hereof.

h) <u>Termination of Rights and Obligations</u>: A party's rights and obligations under this instrument terminate upon transfer of the party's interest in the Property, except that liability for acts or omissions occurring prior to transfer shall

Page 9 of 20

survive transfer.

i) <u>Captions</u>: The captions in this instrument have been inserted solely for convenience of reference and are not a part of this instrument and shall have no effect upon construction or interpretation.

j) <u>Counterparts</u>: The parties may execute this instrument in two or more counterparts, which shall, in the aggregate, be signed by both parties; each counterpart shall be deemed an original instrument as against any party who has signed it. In the event of any disparity between the counterparts produced, the recorded counterpart shall be controlling.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD unto the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection and its successors and assigns forever.

Remainder of this page intentionally left blank.

Page 10 of 20

OR BK 15057 PAGE 567

> IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has caused this Agreement to be signed in its name. Executed this _____ day of 👱 2009. WITNESSES: **CITY OF JACKSONVILLE** By: Name: By: Name: John Peyton, Mayor, City of Jacksonville 117 West Duval Street By: Jacksonville, FL 32202 Name: // Kerri Stewart Form approved: Deputy Chief Administrative Officer For: Mayor John Peyton **Under Authority of:** Executive Order No. 07-12 Assistant General Counse Attest McArthur, Jr., Sr. Ass't Gen. Counsel & Corporation 36 **STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL** The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this by <u>dervised warf</u>, the <u>up.Chief A</u> 2009, by hill Admin O the City of Jacksonville, a body politic and corporate, on behalf of the City. Such person: (notary must check applicable box) ď is personally known to me; or driver's license as identification; or O produced a current produced as identification. Print Mame: Notary Public, State of Florida My Commission Expires NY L. DWYER-FRAZEE Commission DD 809402

> > Page 11 of 20

Expires July 28, 2012

form by the partment of Environmental Protection, Office of General Approved as to Counsel.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection has executed this instrument, this day of ______, 2009.

By

Witnes Print Name

Witness Print Name

FLO IDA DEPARTMENT OF **ONMENTAL PROTECTION** EN

Mary Jean Yon Director of the Division of Waste Management Division of Waste Management 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF <u>LEON</u>

On this $3^{e^{o}}$ day of 100, 2009, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Florida, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared MAZY JEAN to 100, known to be the Director of the Division of Waste Management, the State Agency that executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged the said instrument to be the free and voluntary act and deed of said corporation, for the uses and purposes therein mentioned, and on oath stated that they are authorized to execute said instrument.

Witness my hand and official seal hereto affixed the day and year written above.

Notary Public in and for the State of Florida

My Commission Expires: 0

Attachments: Exhibit A Exhibit B Legal Description of the Property Existing Liens and Encumbrances on the Property

Page 12 of 20

71 72 122 POINT OF BEGINNING TL. 71 77 75.--MAP SHOWING BOUNDARY SURVEY OF 0120 10'20'22' 1 ---. . . . - **N** -**.** -4 <u>___</u> 23.00° E. <u>.</u>Л 73 EB. Ē. 61 420T 00000 PAGE 13 of 20 1. 101.00 ha mi *** ÷..... 22 - 27L 71 ZA Zar T. GENERAL AVENUE - **Z**--71 *78. 2 in. 1 -----.... -----CHARLES BASSETT & ASSOCIATES, GRAPHIC SCALE . <u>(2</u>.22),

EXHIBIT A

OR BK 15057 PAGE

569

J-13

LOT R. I. 2. (EXCEPT THE EAST 92 FEET OF LOTS I AND 2/14 AND IS BLOCK 22, TOGETHER ALTH A FORTION OF THE WEST 1/2 OF CENTER AVENUE (AN BOIFOOT RIGHT-OF-MAT CLOSED BY OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 2652, PAGE 224 OF THE CURRENT PUBLIC RECORDS OF DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA) AND A PORTION OF WILLIS AVENUE (AN BOIFOOT RIGHT OF MAT CLOSED BY OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 280, PAGE 215 OF SAID PUBLIC RECORDS), AND COTS, BLOCK 23, (EXCEPT THE SOUTH 25 FEET OF THE MEST (42 FEET OF LOTIS) AND MINTE CITY, ACCORDING TO FLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 5, PAGE 71 OF SAID PUBLIC RECORDS, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

FOR A POINT OF SEGINING, COMMENCE AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHER, M RIGHT-OF-MAY LINE OF COX RAILROAD (A 120 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY AS NOW ESTABLISHED) AND THE CENTRUME OF SAID CENTER AVENUE RUN THENCE SOUTH COTOB18" AFTI, A ONG SALD CENTERLINE OF CENTER AVENUE AND THE MESTERLY LINE OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OFF CIAL RECORDS VOLUME 12551, PAGE 1817, OF SAID PUBLIC RECORDS, A DISTANCE OF 356,02 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OTHIC A. RECORDS VOLUME 3065, MASE 335, OF SAID MUSE C RECORDS, RUN THENCE SOUTH 874209" WEST ALONG THE NORTHEREY LINE OF LAST SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF 132.00 FELT TO THE NORTHNEST CORNER OF SAID LANDS: KUN THENCE SOUTH OO"OB'ID" ALST. ALONG THE RESTERLY LINE OF SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF ICOLOO FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 0334, PAGE 465 OF SAID PUBLIC RECORDS RUN THENCE SOUTH BY 42'OF WEST, ALONG THE SOUTHER Y LINE OF SAID LANDS AND THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 10331, PAGE 466 OF SAID FUBLIC RECORDS AND ITS WESTERLY PROLONGATION THE SOUTHERLY LINES OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 1629, PAGE 316 OF SAID FUSLIC RECORDS, AND THE NORTHER, Y LINES OF THOSE LANDS AS DESCRIBED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS VOLUME 6441 PAGE 430 OF SAID PUBLIC RECORDS, A DISTANCE OF 1030,000 FEET, RUN THENCE NORTH 0010818 HAST A DISTANCE OF 2500 FEET RUN THENCE SOUTH 891421091 MEST A DISTANCE OF 142,00 FEET TO A FOINT ON THE EASTERS Y RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF CHIERY AVENUE (AN BO FOOT RIGHT-OF-MAY AS NOW ESTABL SHED), RUN THENSE NOR "HIDO"OB'IB" EAST ALONG SAID EASTER_" RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE A DISTANCE OF 28850 FEET TO A FOINT ON THE AFORESAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY _ NE OF CEX RA _ROAD; RUN THENCE NOR TH 83"28"22" EAST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE A DISTANCE OF BIZ B4 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINN NG.

ANDS THUS DESCRIBED CONTAINING 485,002 SOLARE FEET, OR (113 ACRES, MORE OR LESS,

CERTIFIED TO: U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

	FT 6435 N1554
-	"OFFICIAL RECORDS "
	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
	NOTICE OF FEDERAL LIEN UNDER THE SUPERFUND AMEMOMENTS AND REAUTHORISATION ACT OF 1986
	As provided by Section 107(1) of the Superfund Amendments and
•	Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) Public Law Mumber 99-499, amending
	the Comprehensive Environmental Response Comprehensive and Liability
	Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9601 ot geg, matice is hereby given
	that coats of \$1,534,390.40 (one million, five-hundred and
•	thirty-four thousand, three hundred and ninety dollars and sixty
	cente) plus interest and administrative expenses constitute a lien in
	favor of the United States upon the real property described below and
	all rights to such property which belong to Coleman Evans Wood
• .	Preserving Company or to Jack Coleman and which have been or will be
•	subject to or affected by removal or remedial action.
• • • •	Lot "N", 1, 2, (Except the East \$2 feet of Lots 1 and 2.) 14 and 15 in Block 22, and Lot "S" in Block 23, (Except the Bouth 25 feet of West 142 feet or Lot "S"), all in White City, being a part of the Boutheast 1/4 of Marthwest 1/4 of Section 10, Township 3 South, range 35 East, according to Flat thereof recorded in Flat Book 5, page 71 of the Gurrent public records of Duval County, Florids.
· .	This statutory lien secures the payment to the United States of
	all costs and damages covered by Section 107(s) of SARA for which
•	Coleman Evans Wood Preserving Company or Jack Coleman is liable.
	This statutory lies shall continue until the liability for such costs
1	

EXMBIT B

Fi 6435 n1595 "OFFICIAL RECORDS or damages is satisfied or becomes unenforceable through the operation of the statute of limitations as provided by Section 113 of ministrator before * of. . . .* 87= 140574 17 0C 1 P2: 24 14.11 1161



(CONSOLIDATED CONFIRMMENT) CONNEY OF DEVAL, STATE OF LLORIDA

KNOW ALL MEN BY HIESE PRESENTS. That whereas the following Tax Certificates, towar

Certificate Number 00813

Date Issued

5 3

2

7

3

P

ផ្ល

was, were duly filed in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of this County and application made for the iss iil a fax deed therein, and due notice of sale having them published as required by faw, and no person entitled auto do having appeared to redeem said lands, such lands were on the little day of JANUARY 1995 offered for sale at the Courthouse date for each to the highest hidder, and there heing no hidders at the public sale the Clerk entered the lands on a fist-initited (E ands Assifable to: Taxes), and seven years having clapsed from the date said land was officied for public sale, said land is hereby given, granted and conveyed to City of Jackson officiel onsolidated Concernments

NOW, THEREFORE, the County of Duval, State of Florida, in consideration of the premises, and in consideration of the premises, and in pursuance of the statistics in such cases made and provided, has given, granted, and does hereby give, grant, and convey to the said City of Jacksons (he (Consolidated Government), CO Real Estate Division, Room 1200. City Hall Annex, Jacksonville, Florida 32207, and to its successors and ensigns turciver, to their own proper use, benefit and behavit the following fands situated in the County and State atoreiand and described as follows 05-071 19-28 15E GS

WHITE CITY'S DPT NI-2 LOTS L2(EX E 92 FT) BLK 22

CUMBINING acres, more or less, provides), however, that said lands shall continue subject and liable for any unpaid general taxes of equal dignity with county taxes represented by the certificate or certificates above described



INTESTIMONY WHERFUF, by vistue of authority in me vested by law, and fur and on behalf of the City of Jacksonville (Comolidated Government) County of Duval, State of Florida, J, the undersigned, as Clerk of the Circuit Court for the County and State aforenaid, have executed this deed and have hereunty set my official signature and seal, at Jacksonville, in the County of A 11 2002 Deval, and State of Florida, this the 10th - day of JANUARY.

and the second second Clerk of the Circuit Court, David County, Florida.

anci, scaled and delivered in the presence of: a Slence

Margaret Menu

(As Deputy Clerk) (As Denny Clerk)

Ületten a

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF DEVAL fin this Birk day of JANUARY 2002 before mu a notary public, personally appeared Jim Fuller, Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for City of Inclasmille (Consolidated Government) the State and County aforesaid, to inc known to be the person described in, and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged the execution

thereof to he his own free act and deed for the use and purposes therein mentioned. Witness my hand and official seal aforesand

Tipedad. A Worten

No Discuncentary Stamp No Recording Fee

OR BK 15057 PAGE 574

	YNEED
(Chapter	1 1971 Stitula Matuical
CONSCILIDATED COVERSAL	Book 10334 Bana
UCHINIY OF DUVAL, STATE OF (F	
ENDALALI MEN BY HIRSE PRESENTS IN	at when we she full to the 1 as 6 entities from it
E stations Actions	I tota lactual
00813	(1941)
was were duly isled in the office of the Clerk of the f	cituat Four: of the County and application made for the r
of a tax devil thereon, and due notice of safe having h	cen published as required by law, and on person entitled so
having aniwated to redgen and lands, such lands we	re units this day of JANUARY 1995
for sale at the Courthouse duty for each to the highs of	t indire, and there being no budders at the public safe the C
entrued the lands on a lost entitled "Lands Assolaties to	an Later" and seven so are has one element from the date so
a so alfored the middle and and had a bergha and	an entrol and concerned to first of a harmonic first france for
THE STREET OF THE PRICE SERVICE SERVICE SERVICE SERVICES	Patricen dan ermaeliten ira ja de stemmer ist. Je juittigerite
MIND I HARD BRIDT the County of Days of New	and Shanda an owner departure of the measure and an owner of
Sorw, Interserver, Int County of Dusal, Sul	TO FORMER, IN CONSIGNATION OF INC INCOMES, 400 IN CORSE
Ut the permittees and in pursuance of the statutes in su	en cases made and provided, has given, granied, and dries i
give, grant, and convey to the said filly of Jacksonvil	ie (Constitution Carserminient), 6 42 Near I state Division, 1
200, City Hall Annex, Jacksonville, Florida 32202	and in its succession and assigns forever, to their own prop
tionetist and boliesis the following lands situated in the	County and State aforesaid and described as tollows
05-071 E9-28 256 GS	
WHILE CITY S D PT N (2	
EQ18 (4.)5 BLK 22	
IN TESTIMONY WITERLEO of the City of Jacksonville (i undersigned, as Clerk of the this deed and have hereunti	IF, by virtue of authority in me vested by faw, and for and i consolidated (invernment) County of Doval, State of Flow Circuit Court for the County and State aloreasid, have exe- set my official signature and seal, at Jacksonville, in the Ci-
Daval, and State of Florida	this the tothe Jay of JANCART A D 2002
	t tens of the Circuit Court Thurst County.
Nigned, sealed and delivered in the presence of	
Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of	(As Deputy Cloth)
Nigned, scaled with delivered in the presence of Symposium Stations MORGON ET MORATIN	(As Deputy Clork) (As Deputy Cl
Nigned, sealed and delivered in the presence of Sympole States NOVODE ET NOVEMEN NTALE OF FLUKIDA	(As Deputy Clork) (As Deputy Clork)
Nigned, sealed and delivered in the presence of Symposic States STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL	(As Deputy Clock) (As Deputy Cl
Nigned, sealed and delivered in the presence of STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL On this Mith day of JANUARY 2002 Clierh of the Circuit Court in and for City of Jackson- ine hairing in the the person described in, and who each thereof to be his own free act and deed for the use and	(As Deputy Clark) (As Deputy Clark) (Ba Deputy Cl
Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL Unithis 30th day of JANUARY 2002 Clerk of the Curcuit Court in and for City of Jackaons- ine known is be the person described in, and who each thereof to be his own free act and deed for the use and Winness my hand and official seal aforesaid	(As Deputy Clerk) (As Deputy Clerk) (As Deputy Clerk) before me, a notary public, personally appeared Jim Fu tille (Cun-olulated Government) the State and County afore suiced the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged the exer- pupures therein mentioned Windland A. W. between
Nigned, sealed and delivered in the presence of Winess Markow Statemen NEATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL On this 30th day of JANUARY 2002 Clieft of the Circuit Court in and for City of Jackson- me known to be the preson described in, and who each thereof to be his own free act and doed for the use and Winness my hand and official seal aforesaid	(As Deputy Clork) (As Deputy Clork) (As Deputy Clerk) (As Deputy C



Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of Amelia Stauce Monopolet Monthly

(As Deputy Clerk) (As Deputy Clerk)

Ξ

ž

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF DUVAL

On this Juth day of JANUARY 2002 , herore me, a notary public, personally appeared Jun Fuller, Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for City of Jackwonselle (Consolidated Government) the State and County eforesaid, to inclusion to he the person described in, and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged the execution thereaf to be hot own free act and deed for the use and purposes therein mentioned Witness my hand and ufficial seat efforesaid.

No Discurrentary Stanip No Recording Fee

Hildrent & Wostin

TAX DEED TD494-069 RE1006701-0000 ent : 115 29 apr: 37 5 ileg & Bygmes By 18/205 - 12/03/11 (* it hapter 197 Florida Statutes: 5 MIN. RETURN CITY OF JACKSONVILLE PHONE # 2029 CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT) įĮ CORINEY OF DUVAL, STATE OF FLORIDA KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS. That whereas, the following Tax Contribution town Certificate Number Date Issued 00815 1400 3 way, were duly filed in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of this County and exploration made for the issuance of a tax deed therean, and due notice of sale having been published as required P. Iav., and misperson contribution in to do having apprared to redeem said lands, such lands were on the IOTH - day of IFHRUARY 1997 aticied for sale at the Courthouse door for cash to the highest hidder, and there being no hidders at the public sale the Clerk. entered the lands on a list entitled "Lands Available for Faves", and seven years having clapsed from the date and land Ş was affered for public rate, raid land is hereby given, granted and conveyed to City of Jacksonville (Cursolidated Guvernment). NUW, THEREFORE, the County of Dural, State of Florida, in consideration of the premises, and in consideration of the premises, and in pursuance of the statutes in such cates made and provided, has given, granicil, and does hereby give, grant, and convey to the said City of Jacksonville (Consolidated Government), Cit) Real Estate Division, Room 1208, City Hall Annea, Jacksonville, Florida 12202, and to its successors and assigns forever, in their own proper use, benefit and behout the following lands situated in the County and State aforesaid and described as follows 5 71 19-25-25E GS WHITE CITY SOPT NV2 YELLOT S RECD D BK 1685-444 ŝ BLK 23 3 containing acres, more or less, provided, however, that said fands shall continue subject and liable for any unpaid general taxes of equal dignity with county taxes represented by the certificate or certificates above described. IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, by viewe of authority in me vested by law, and for and on behalf of the City of Jacksonville (Consubdated Government) County of Duval, State of Florida, I, the undersigned, as Clerk of the Circuit Court for the County and State aforesaid, have executed this deed and have bereanto set my official signature and seal, at Jacksonville, in the County of Duval, and State of Florida, this the 10TH day of FFHRUARY A D. 20/H and the second Clerk of the Circuit Court, Duvil County, Florida. Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of . Xem (As Deputy Clerk) Mappinet Marin (As Deputy Clerk) STATE OF FLORUDA COUNTY OF DEVAL On this 101H day of FEBRUARY 2004 , before me, a notary public, personally appeared Jim Fuller, ("herk of the Circuit Court in and for City of Jacksonville (Consolidated Government) the State and County eforesed, to 7220 me known to he the person described in, and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged the execution thereof to he his own free act and deed for the use and purposes therein mentioned. Witness my hand and official seal aforesaid Wildred & Wostion NELDRED L WOOTBON No Documentary Stamp No Recording Fee