



March 3, 2020

Mafcote
Attn: Mr. Steve Schulman
108 Main Street
Norwalk, Connecticut 06851

RE: PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT - REVISED
Miami Valley Paper LLC
413 Oxford Road
Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005
DEC Project No. 19.126.0001

Dear Mr. Schulman;

In accordance with direction from your environmental attorney, Mr. Neal Frink, Diversified Environmental Consulting, LLC ("DEC") has revised the original Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("PIESA") report for the above referenced property. Please find a copy of the revised report enclosed.

We declare that to the best of our knowledge and belief, we meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in §312.10 of 40 CFR and we have the specific qualifications based on education, training and experience to assess the Property, as described herein. We have developed and performed all the appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR, Part 312.

Respectfully submitted,

Diversified Environmental Consulting, LLC

Barry Franz
Environmental Professional

Attachment: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report - revised



DIVERSIFIED ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING, LLC

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Revised

**Miami Valley Paper LLC
413 Oxford Road
Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005**

**Prepared for:
Mafcote
108 Main Street
Norwalk, Connecticut 06851**

**DEC Project No.: 19.126.0001
Original Report Date: November 13, 2019
Revised Report Date: March 3, 2020**

*PO Box 518, Maineville, Ohio 45039
Phone: 513.223.4982
Website: www.div-environmental.com*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Contents	i
1.0 Summary	1
2.0 Introduction	5
2.1 Property Location and Legal Description	5
2.2 Scope of Services	5
2.3 Significant Assumptions	7
2.4 Limitations and Exceptions	7
2.5 Deviations	8
2.6 Special Terms and Conditions	8
2.7 Contractual Conditions	8
2.8 User Reliance	9
3.0 User-Provided Information	10
3.1 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations.....	10
3.2 Specialized Knowledge	10
3.3 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information.....	10
3.4 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues	10
3.5 Reason for Performing This Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	11
4.0 Records Review	12
4.1 Environmental Records.....	12
4.1.1 Property Listings.....	12
4.1.2 Near-by Properties Listings.....	14
4.1.3 Orphan Listings.....	18
4.2 Physical Setting Records	18
4.2.1 Topography.....	18
4.2.2 Geology.....	19
4.2.3 Soils	19
4.2.4 Groundwater	19
4.2.5 Surface Waters.....	20
4.3 Historical Use of Property and Near-by Properties.....	20
4.3.1 Aerial Photographs	20
4.3.2 Fire Insurance Maps	23
4.3.3 Property Tax and Recorded Land Title Records	25
4.3.4 Building Records.....	25
4.3.5 Topographic Maps	26
4.3.6 Local Street and City Directories	26
4.3.7 Data Summary	28
4.4 Previous Assessments	28
5.0 Site Walkover.....	29
5.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions.....	29



5.2 General Site Setting.....	29
5.2.1 Current Uses of the Property	29
5.2.2 Past Uses of the Property	29
5.2.3 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties.....	30
5.2.4 Past Uses of Adjoining Properties	30
5.2.5 Current and Past Uses of Near-by Properties.....	30
5.2.6 Physiographic, Geological, Hydrogeological and Topographic Conditions	30
5.2.7 General Description of Structures	30
5.2.8 Roads.....	31
5.2.9 Utilities.....	31
5.3 Exterior Observations.....	31
5.3.1 Exterior Chemical Products and Wastes	31
5.3.2 Exterior Storage Tanks	31
5.3.3 Odors	32
5.3.4 Pools of Liquid	32
5.3.5 Exterior Drums/Containers	32
5.3.6 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs).....	33
5.3.7 Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons	33
5.3.8 Stained Soil or Pavement	33
5.3.9 Stressed Vegetation.....	34
5.3.10 Solid Waste.....	34
5.3.11 Wastewater	34
5.3.12 Wells.....	34
5.3.13 Septic Systems	35
5.4 Interior Observation	35
5.4.1 Interior Chemical Products and Wastes	35
5.4.2 Interior Storage Tanks	36
5.4.3 Odors	38
5.4.4 Pools of Liquid	38
5.4.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls.....	38
5.4.6 Heating/Cooling.....	39
5.4.7 Stains or Corrosion	39
5.4.8 Drains and Sumps.....	40
5.4.9 Other Observations.....	41
6.0 Interviews.....	43
6.1 Interview with Key Site Manager.....	43
6.2 Interviews with Occupants.....	43
6.3 Interviews with State and/or Local Government Officials	43
6.3.1 City of Franklin	43
6.3.2 City of Franklin Fire Department	44
6.3.3 Warren County Public Health District.....	44
6.3.4 Warren County Local Emergency Planning Commission	44



6.3.5 Southwest Ohio Air Quality Agency44

6.3.6 Ohio Environmental Protection Agency45

6.3.7 State Fire Marshall’s Office, Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations...46

6.3.8 Ohio Department of Transportation, Archival Aerial Photograph Department.....46

6.3.9 Ohio State Emergency Response Commission46

6.4 Interviews with Federal Government Officials46

6.5 Interviews with Others.....47

7.0 Findings and Opinions.....48

7.1 Findings48

7.1.1 Recognized Environmental Conditions.....48

7.1.2 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions.....50

7.1.3 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions50

7.1.4 De Minimis Conditions50

7.2 Vapor Encroachment Screening.....51

7.3 Business Environmental Risks51

7.4 Opinion.....52

8.0 Additional Investigations53

9.0 Data Gaps54

9.1 Identification of Data Gaps.....54

9.2 Sources of Information Consulted to Address Data Gaps.....55

9.3 Significance of Data Gaps55

10.0 Conclusions.....56

11.0 Non-Scope Services.....59

12.0 Limiting Conditions/Deviations60

13.0 References61

13.1 Agencies61

13.2 Documents61

13.3 Previous Reports61

13.4 Website References61

14.0 Signature of Environmental Professional.....64

TABLES

Table No.	Description	Page(s)
1	Property Environmental Records Search Results	13
2	Near-by Properties Environmental Records Search Results	14-17
3	Aerial Photograph Review	21-23
4	Fire Insurance Map Review	24-25
5	Property Tax File Review	25-26
6	USGS Topographic Map Review	26-27
7	Local Street and City Directory Review	27-28



Table No.	Description	Page(s)
8	Utility Providers	32
9	Exterior Tank Storage Summary	33
10	Interior Chemical Products/Wastes	37
11	Interior Storage Tank Summary	38
12	PIESA Interviewees	43
13	Findings Summary	48
14	Summary of Potential Data Gaps	54

APPENDICES

Appendix	Description
A	Figures
B	Property Information
C	User Questionnaire and Environmental Liens/ AULs
D	Regulatory and Physical Setting Documentation
E	Historical Research Documentation
F	Site Walkover Photographs
G	Interview Documentation
H	Environmental Professional's Qualifications



1.0 SUMMARY

Diversified Environmental Consulting, LLC (“DEC”) has performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (“PIESA”) in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM International (“ASTM”) Standard Practice E 1527-2013 (“E1527”) of the Miami Valley Paper LLC (“MVP”) property located at 413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005 (“Property”). Any exceptions to or deletions from the Standard Practice are described in the text of this report. This report was original issued in November 2019 and was revised in March 2020.

This summary is provided for convenience and should not substitute for review of the complete report, including all attachments. Based on the data collected during the PIESA, the findings and conclusions of DEC are summarized below.

DEC has performed a PIESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM E1527 of the Property. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2 of this report. This assessment has revealed evidence of the following recognized environmental conditions (“RECs”), controlled RECs (“CRECs”), historical RECs (“HRECs”) or de minimis conditions (“DC”) in connection with the Property:

413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005	Yes	No
<p>Recognized Environmental Condition (REC)¹</p> <p><u>REC No. 1:</u> 413 Oxford Road – To the south-southeast side of Building No. 5, an underground storage tank (“UST”) was reportedly located. The UST was apparently removed sometime prior to 1975 according to the Maintenance Supervisor. The UST was used at various times for gasoline and diesel products. As the UST was apparently removed prior to Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations (“BUSTR”) regulations being in effect, no closure investigation was conducted. The lack of information concerning the operation, size, and closure of this UST represents a REC.</p> <p><u>REC No. 2:</u> 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 6, a mixing room for flammable compounds (Former Flammable Mixing Room – Building No. 6- see Figure 4) was identified. The room has both floor and wall staining with numerous cracks in the floor slab. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that flammable materials were mixed here when the facility used a solvent-based process. The lack of information concerning the Flammable Mixing Room, the presence of staining, the presence of a cracked floor slab and the unknown compounds mixed in the room represents a REC.</p> <p><u>REC No. 3:</u> - 413 Oxford Road – Due to the reported (Maintenance Supervisor and Operations Manager) use of solvents in the paper coating process, the presence of the Former Flammable Mixing Room (See REC No. 2), the fact that process waste waters flow through the linear floor grate drains, the lack of information on what solvents were used, and disposal of said solvents all give rise to the consideration of a REC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005	Yes	No
<p><u>REC No. 4:</u> - 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 10, a number of 55-gallon drums of used oil was removed by MVP’s contractor. The drums were removed, characterized and disposed of properly. However, staining of the lower walls along with a floor that is stained and deteriorated represents a REC.</p> <p><u>REC No. 5:</u> - 413 Oxford Road – Based upon a review of aerial photographs and fire insurance maps (see Appendices E-1 and E-2), an on-property power plant was revealed within the building footprint of Warehouse No. 3 (Building No. 11 – see Figure 4). The fire insurance maps identified at least two tanks at the Former Power Plant believed to be diesel fuel. The tanks were not identified as either aboveground storage tanks (“ASTs”) or USTs. Warehouse No. 3 was constructed in 1975 prior to the start of employment of the Maintenance Supervisor. Little to no information and/or documentation is available concerning this power plant. Due to the lack of information and the presence of the two tanks represents a REC.</p> <p><u>REC No. 6:</u> - Franklin Volatile Organic Compound (“VOC”) Plume – Ohio EPA has conducted two preliminary investigations of the area surrounding the Property as well as the installation of a temporary groundwater sampling point in the northwestern portion of the Property. Although the initial investigation did not detect any VOCs in the single use temporary sampling point, the latter investigation detected trichlorethylene (“TCE”), perchloroethylene (“PCE”), chloroform and methyl tert-butyl ether (“MTBE”) in various groundwater samples around the Property. There is no record of chlorinated solvent use at the Property and MTBE was not used as a gasoline additive during the time the UST identified in REC No. 1 was in use.</p> <p>According to Ohio EPA’s subcontractor’s investigations, the source area of the TCE plume appears to be located to the southwest of the adjoining rail line that bisects the plume investigative area. A second plume, containing PCE, was detected farther upgradient and appears to be originating from a separate source upgradient from Legacy Finishing, the adjoining property to the south. The lack of knowledge concerning the source area of this VOC Plume, its potential to impact the groundwater at the Property, the use of the on-site groundwater well, and the potential for vapor encroachment represents a REC.</p>		
<p>Historical Recognized Environmental Condition (HREC)²</p> <p><u>HREC No. 1:</u> 413 Oxford Road – To the northwest of Building No. 8, the Former Clay Shed, two USTs were removed in 2000, one 4,000 gallons and one 3,000 gallons containing ethyl acetate. At the time of removal, no closure report was prepared and submitted to BUSTR. A retroactive closure report was prepared in 2013 and submitted to BUSTR. No evidence of any releases (visual or odors) was detected during the retroactive closure activities. Laboratory analysis (US EPA Method 8260) did not detect ethyl acetate and acetic acid above method detection limits. Ethyl acetate is a solvent for inks used in the printing process. Acetic acid is a by-product of the chemical breakdown of ethyl acetate. BUSTR issued an No Further Action (“NFA”) status for the two USTs in mid-2013. Comparison to current US Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and Ohio EPA action levels indicate the results are below unrestricted use standards. Although this condition meets the definition of a HREC, it does not rise to the level of a REC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition (CREC)³</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005	Yes	No
<p><i>De minimis Condition⁴</i> <u>DC No. 1:</u> There are numerous dark oily/greasy stains on the floor of Building Nos. 3 through 12, on the walls near the air compressor lines at the oil filters and misters in Building Nos. 4, 5, and 9, and outside the buildings. These stains are apparently the result of leakage from vehicles, tow motors and other pieces of equipment such as hydraulic leaks. These constitute a DC condition, which is not considered a REC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>¹“The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De minimis conditions are not recognized environmental conditions.”</p> <p>²“A past release that would have been considered a REC but which is not considered a REC currently due to regulatory closure or environmental testing demonstrating contaminate levels meet unrestricted use criteria.”</p> <p>³“A site that has received risk-based regulatory closure, where no further remediation is required but residual contamination still exists at the site and the property is subject to some sort of control or use restriction.”</p> <p>⁴“A condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environmental and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. Conditions determined to be de minimis conditions are neither recognized environmental conditions nor controlled recognized environmental conditions.”</p>		

This assessment revealed the following business environmental risks (“BERs”) at the Property:

- **BER No. 1:** Potential Asbestos-Containing Building Materials – There are multiple areas of potential asbestos-containing building materials (“ACBM”) identified during the site visit. The first area is the front office area of the Main offices (Building No. 1) where brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement was observed. A second area was also noted in the Main Offices in the Physical Lab area where tan 9x9-inch square tiles floor tile was observed. The second-floor operations office located in the Main Production Department (Building No. 4) had brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement holding the tiles in place. Immediately below the operations office in the locker room, brown floor tile similar to that in the operations room was observed. All of these floor tiles appear to be in reasonable shape (i.e. in a non-friable condition at the present).
- **BER No. 2:** Another potential ACBM is due to the age of the roofs of the buildings. The roofs have been repaired over the years, but no known or reported materials testing of the roof materials has occurred. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that some portions of the buildings on the Property have roofs on them that pre-date his working at the Property. The roofs appear to be similar to many roofs which used ACBM in the manufacturer of the roofing tiles.
- **BER No. 3:** Due to the overall age of the various building at the Property, the potential for lead-based paint (“LBP”) is present. Although no observations of



the typical peeled paint characteristic of LBP was noted, the age of the facility makes this a consideration.

These three BERs represent issues of concern during any remodeling, repair or demolition of portions of the structures present on the Property. They do not represent a current issue of concern.



2.0 INTRODUCTION

Mafcote engaged DEC to perform a PIESA of the property located at 413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005 . A Property Location Map, a Property Map, a Property Vicinity Map and a Current and Historic Facility Areas map are provided as Figures 1 through 4, respectively, in Appendix A.

2.1 Property Location and Legal Description

The Property is located at 413 Oxford Road in Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005. The Warren County Auditor identifies the Property as being 5.6408 Acres in size and as parcel number 02044280090. Property information obtained from the Warren County Auditor website is discussed in Section 4.3.3 and provided in Appendix B.

2.2 Scope of Services

DEC performed the PIESA in accordance with ASTM E1527-2013 *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process* (the “Standard Practice”).

The purpose of the Standard Practice (ASTM § 1.0) is intended to permit the User (ASTM § 3.2.98) to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the innocent landowner (ASTM § 3.2.44), contiguous property owner (ASTM § 3.2.17), or bona fide prospective purchaser (ASTM § 3.2.8) limitations on CERCLA liability (hereinafter, the ‘landowner liability protections (“LLPs”)); that is, the practice that constitutes all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice’ as defined at 42 U.S.C. §9601(35)(B), which is a rule promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and is frequently referred to as the ‘All Appropriate Inquiries’ (“AAI”) rule. Please refer to ASTM § 4.1 for the User’s reason for requesting a PIESA.

ASTM E1527 defines a recognized environmental condition (REC – ASTM § 1.1.1 and 3.2.78) as “*the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De minimis conditions are **not** recognized environmental conditions.*”

ASTM E1527 further defines two additional types of RECs as a *historical recognized environmental condition* and a *controlled recognized environmental condition*. The standard also defines a *de minimis condition*.¹

¹ ASTM E1527-2013 Sections 3.2.42 - HREC, 3.2.18 - CREC and 3.2.22 – de minimis



The Standard Practice also requires the Environmental Professional to evaluate the potential for vapor encroachment on or to the Property and to determine if such vapor encroachment constitutes evidence of a REC. The Standard Practice does not specifically state the methods that must be used to screen for potential vapor encroachment issues. However, ASTM has developed a separate *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions* (ASTM E2600-2015). This guidance outlines two methodologies (Tiers 1 and 2) to conduct various levels of vapor encroachment screening (“VES”), which will satisfy the vapor encroachment requirements under the Standard Practice. DEC has, in general, utilized the Tier 1 methodology for this PIESA report and no sampling of any media was approved as part of the Scope of Services.

This PIESA report consisted of the following five primary components (ASTM § 7.2):

- Review of federal, state and local environmental databases (where reasonably ascertainable) to identify the property or adjacent/near-by properties that have history of documented or potential environmental impact;
- Review of historic aerial photographs, files and other readily available and practically reviewable documentation to evaluate historic land use, current land use, onsite structures (if any), vegetation and topography to evaluate potential environmental concerns on the Property and adjoining/near-by properties;
- Performing a property walkover to perform visual inspection (if applicable) of the Property regarding land use, materials handling and storage (underground and/or above storage tanks, loading docks, etc.), indicators of potential contaminant release (surface staining, stressed vegetation), evidence of potential environmental degradation from adjoining properties and general Property conditions;
- Conducting interviews with personnel knowledgeable with the current and historic site use, operations and environmental practices (if applicable); and
- Preparation of this report.

In addition, the ASTM Standard defines business environmental risks as *“a risk which can have a material environmental or environmentally-driven impact on the business associated with the current or planned use of a parcel of commercial real estate, not necessarily limited to those environmental issues required to be investigated in this practice.”*² Environmental risks typically considered BERs include:

- Asbestos-Containing building materials;
- Biological agents;

² ASTM E1527-2013 Section 3.2.11



- Cultural and historic resources;
- Ecological resources;
- Endangered species;
- Indoor air quality unrelated to releases of hazardous substances or petroleum products into the environment;
- Industrial hygiene, health and safety and regulatory compliance;
- Lead-based paint and lead in drinking water;
- Mold;
- Radon; and
- Wetlands.

2.3 Significant Assumptions

This PIESA included a review of documents and interviewing/questioning individuals referenced in this report. DEC believes these documents and answers given during interview/questioning are accurate, unless conflicting data were obtained and stated otherwise. No attempts were independently made to verify site information (i.e., historical reports, file reviews, interviews, etc.) provided to DEC by other sources during this PIESA. In addition, no specific attempt was made to verify the compliance of present owners or operators with federal, state, or local laws and/or regulations.

2.4 Limitations and Exceptions

The limitations of this PIESA are consistent with the limitations of the Standard Practice, e.g., no sampling or testing of materials, soil, water, vapors, or air (ASTM § 7.4), was performed as part of the PIESA. No environmental property assessment can wholly eliminate uncertainty (ASTM § 4.5.1) regarding the potential for RECs (including CRECs and HRECs) in connection with a property. A PIESA is intended to reduce, but not eliminate, uncertainty regarding the potential for RECs in connection with a property.

Although the objective of this PIESA is to identify potential releases or releases of hazardous substances and petroleum at or onto the Property, potential sources of contamination may have escaped detection due to: the limited scope of this PIESA; the possibility of inaccurate or incomplete public records; the presence of undetected or unreported environmental incidents; the absence of obvious visual evidence of potential environmental issues, deliberate concealment of detrimental information; and/or data failures. It was not the purpose of this study to determine the actual presence, degree or extent of contamination, if any, at the Property.

The findings and opinions presented are relative to the dates of DEC's property work and should not be relied on to represent conditions at any later dates. The opinions included herein are based on information obtained during the study (November 13,



2019) and DEC's experience. If this PIESA included a review of documents prepared by others, DEC has no responsibility or assumed liability for the completeness or accuracy of information contained therein these documents.

There may be environmental issues or conditions at the Property that are outside the scope of the PIESA. For example, some substances may be present on a property in quantities and under conditions that may lead to contamination of the property or of near-by properties, but are not included in the definition of hazardous substances as defined by CERCLA (42 USC 9601(14)) or do not otherwise present potential CERCLA liability. Additionally, materials may be present at the Property that may not represent a REC and therefore, may not specifically be identified in this Report, but may have special handling and/or disposal requirements.

Furthermore, there may be BERs associated with the Property that may not specifically be identified in this report. BERs are defined as risks which can have a material environmental or environmentally-driven impacts on the business associated with the current or planned use of a parcel of commercial real estate and are not necessarily limited to those environmental issues required to be investigated as part of the PIESA. Examples of BERs and issues outside of the scope of this PIESA include, but are not limited to: asbestos-containing materials, radon, lead-containing paint, microbes (fungi, mold, bacteria, etc.), lead in drinking water, wetlands, non-hazardous wastes such as construction debris and used tires, regulatory compliance, cultural and historical resources, industrial hygiene, health and safety, ecological resources, endangered species, indoor air quality and high voltage power lines.

Limiting conditions, if any, incurred during the performance of this PIESA are described in Sections 5.1 and 11 of this report

2.5 Deviations

DEC made no deviations from the ASTM Standard Practice.

2.6 Special Terms and Conditions

DEC's services were performed in accordance with the scope of services and terms and conditions in DEC's proposal dated June 24, 2019, which was submitted to and authorized by Steven Schulman of Mafcote on June 27, 2019. No special terms or conditions were made unless identified in the scope of services and terms and conditions in DEC's proposal.

2.7 Contractual Conditions

No special contractual conditions between the User of this PIESA and the Environmental Professional performing this PIESA existed prior to or at the time of the



PIESA, except for the contractual terms and conditions agreed to by Mafcote and DEC in the proposal dated on June 24, 2019.

2.8 User Reliance

The information contained herein was compiled for the exclusive benefit of Mafcote in identifying RECs at the Property for selling of the Property. Reliance on this PIESA report by any other party shall be strictly forbidden without the written consent of both Mafcote and DEC and that party's acceptance of mutually agreeable terms and conditions. Use of the PIESA report for purposes beyond those stated above shall be at the sole financial and legal risk of that party with no financial or legal obligations on the part of Mafcote and DEC.

Continued viability of this PIESA report is subject to the provisions contained within the Standard Guide³. As such, this PIESA report is presumed to be valid if performed less than 180 days prior to the date of the intended transaction.

³ ASTM E1528-2013, Section 4.6



3.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION

The Standard Practice defines the “User” as the party seeking to use Standard Practice E1527 to complete an environmental site assessment of the property and may include among other parties: a potential purchaser of the property; a potential tenant of the property; an owner of property; a lender; or a property manager. For the purposes of this report, the User of this report, as defined by the Standard Practice, has been identified as:

- Mafcote
- MVP

As the Owner and User are one and the same, a User Questionnaire was completed by Mr. Bill Nasser with Mafcote on July 16, 2019. A copy of the completed User Questionnaire for this assessment is presented in Appendix C-1.

3.1 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations

DEC was retained by Mafcote to conduct a search of environmental lien (ASTM § 3.2.31) or activity use limitations (AUL - ASTM § 3.2.2) recorded on the Property title. DEC utilized the services of Environmental Risk Information Services (“ERIS”) to conduct this effort. No environmental liens or AULs were found to be recorded for this Property. A copy of the lien and AUL search report is presented in Appendix C-2.

3.2 Specialized Knowledge

In certain instances, the owner and/or property representative may be aware of specialized knowledge or experience that is material to identifying RECs in connection with the Property. No specialized knowledge was reported or provided to DEC during this PIESA by Mafcote.

3.3 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

In certain instances, the owner and/or property representative may be aware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information that is material to identifying RECs in connection with the Property. No commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information was reported or provided to DEC by the owner and/or property representative during this PIESA by Mafcote.

3.4 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

No information regarding the impact of environmental issues on the Property’s market value was reported or provided to DEC during this PIESA by Mafcote.



3.5 Reason for Performing This Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

This PIESA is being performed to fulfill environmental due diligence requirements in connection with selling of the Property.



4.0 RECORDS REVIEW

4.1 Environmental Records

The purpose of the environmental database review is to obtain and review records that will help identify activities at the Property or surrounding properties, likely to environmentally impact the Property. DEC retained ERIS to conduct a regulatory database search of available environmental records. The search was performed to satisfy the requirements of U.S. EPA's Standards and Practices for AAI (40 CFR Part 312) and the Standard Practice.

The ERIS Radius Report, included in Appendix D-1, provides a detailed description of the databases reviewed and a listing of all Properties identified by the database search. All of the *Standard Environmental Record Sources* (ASTM § 8.2.1) were searched as required by the ASTM Standard Practice. The database search also included *Additional Environmental Record Sources* (ASTM § 8.2.3) to enhance and supplement the Standard Environmental Record Sources.

The plotting of the properties in the database is done through geo-coding and the locations provided are approximations. DEC attempted to visually verify the distances to properties located in close proximity to the Property.

ERIS also reports listings that may be in the general subject area, but have inadequate address information to geographically locate. These listings appear on the 'Orphan List' contained in the database report. Orphan listings properties are not generally considered practicably reviewable; however, DEC has reviewed the list for sites that would be obviously in the proximity of the Property.

ERIS reports that their data are compiled from the most recent government data available and is, therefore, considered current. Please note that regulatory listings are limited and include only those properties that are known to the regulatory agencies at the time of publication to be contaminated, or in the process of evaluation for potential contamination. A copy of the ERIS report, which contains additional information about each regulatory list search, is provided in Appendix D-1.

This section summarizes relevant portions of the environmental records data.

4.1.1 Property Listings

A search of standard and additional environmental record sources was conducted for the Property by ERIS. Search results for the Property are summarized below in Table 1 below.



Table 1
Property Environmental Records Search Results

Business Name	Record Source	Description and Date of Database	Significance and Rationale
None Listed	ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System March 21, 2019 NRC Report # 474743	Waste material release from aboveground storage tanks- 02/22/1999
Miami Valley Paper Co.	FINDS/FRS	Facility Registry Service/Facility Index April 23, 2019 Facility # 110001626777	Multiple regulatory program listings 04/10/2015
Miami Valley Paper Co.	ICIS	Integrated Compliance Information System November 18, 2016 Facility # 110001626777	Air permit UNK
Miami Valley Paper Co.	LUST	Ohio Leaking Underground Storage Tanks April 10, 2019 Facility # 83000055 Incident # N00001 & N00002	Closure of six USTs with a reported NFA issued 03/01/2013 (Error in database as only two USTs removed)
Miami Valley Paper Co.	RCRA SQG	RCRA Small Quantity Generator March 4, 2019 Facility # OHD004247128	Small quantity generator of hazardous waste (F003) - violations reported 1989, 1999, 2001, 2002
None Listed	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill #s 669, 676, 63, & 2574	Numerous spills reported; no violations issued 1997, 1999, 2002
Miami Valley Paper Co.	UST	Ohio Registered Underground Storage Tank April 10, 2019 Facility # 83000055 Incident # N00001 & N00002	UST registration and removal 1999

AST=Registered Aboveground Storage Tanks; CERCLIS = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System; ERNS=Federal Emergency Response and Notification System; FBR-Federal Brownfields Sites; EC/IC=Engineering Control/Institutional Control Registry; LUST=Leaking underground Storage Tanks; NPL=National Priority (Superfund) List; Orphan=non-geocoded site; RCRA=Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; SPILL=State Spill Site; SWL=Solid Waste Landfill Sites; UST=Registered Underground Storage Tanks

The Property is listed on seven regulatory databases. The ERNS database indicated that material from one of the mixing tanks “spewed” out of the tank. It was identified as coating material containing aluminum powder. The release was contained on the floor and cleaned up. No violation was reported in the database. The FINDS/FRS database indicates that the facility is listed on various regulatory databases indicating those for air permits, small quantity generator status and the Ohio State Master List of regulated facilities. The ICIS database identifies the facility as being on an air emissions database. The LUST database is an Ohio-specific database which listed that six USTs were closed and a No Further Action (“NFA”) status was granted by Ohio. The LUST database is in error as only two USTs were removed and granted an NFA. The facility is a RCRA small quantity generator (“SQG”) with three informal violations involving generator paperwork. The violations were corrected and none further reported since 2002. The



SPILLS database indicates at least four spills (one in 1997, two in 1999 and one in 2002). Indications in the database indicate the spills were cleaned up and no violations reported. The UST database indicated that three USTs were removed (one in 1993 and two in 1999). No indications that an NFA status was granted in the environmental database for the 1993 UST removal but was granted for the two USTs removed in 1999.

Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) requests for information regarding the Property were submitted to U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA’s Central Office, Ohio EPA’s Southwest District Office and various local governmental agencies to confirm that no regulatory or local governmental agency has information not included in the databases searched. See Section 6.3 for information regarding the responses from these agencies.

4.1.2 Near-by Properties Listings

The ERIS database search reported several listings within the respective search radii of the Property, as summarized below (refer to the ERIS Report in Appendix D-1 for descriptions of each database and specific information on the sites identified for each database). Due to a major water divide, the Great Miami River, being located southeast and south and adjacent to the Property, only those listing on the northwestern side of the Great Miami River have been identified in the below table.

Search results for the near-by property listings are summarized below in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Near-by Property Environmental Records Search Results

Business Name	Address Franklin, Ohio	Record Source	Description and Date of Database	Significance and Rationale
Residential	306 South Avenue	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill # 794	Reported odor and indication of spill at Miami Valley Paper Company in 2000
Cast Plus (closed) & Legacy Finishing, Inc.	415 Oxford Road	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill # 3284	Wastewater spill in 2000
Residential	230 South Avenue	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill # 887	Reported odor at Miami Valley Paper Company in 2000
Religious Entity	South Avenue & Oxford Road	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill # 4541	Reported spill at Miami Valley Paper Company in 1998
Unknown	Forest Avenue & Maple Street	SPILLS	Ohio Emergency Response Spills August 8, 2018 Spill # 1675	Reported sludge from decomposed grass in 2009



Business Name	Address Franklin, Ohio	Record Source	Description and Date of Database	Significance and Rationale
Union Camp Corporation	300 Chestnut Drive	CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System Facility # 0504182	Preliminary Assessment conducted in 1987. No further activities planned at site.
		CERCLIS- NFRAP	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System - No Further Remedial Action Planned Facility # 0504182	The decision was made that no further activity is planned at the site. Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information.
		DERR	Ohio Division of Environmental Response & Revitalization Facility # 583000831	Site assessment as part of CERCLIS- NFRAP analysis.
Union Camp Corporation	300 Chestnut Drive	RCRA NON GEN	RCRA Non-Generators Facility #OHD004238747	Informal written violation in 1992. Violation addressed. Facility now considered a RCRA non-generator.
		SEMS ARCHIVE	Superfund Enterprise Management System Archived Site Inventory Facility #0504182	The site has been determined by US EPA that no further actions including remedial actions are planned.
Graphic Packaging Corporation (formerly Colorpac Inc.)	708 South Avenue	CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System Facility # 0507198	Preliminary Assessment conducted in 1992/1993. No further activities planned at site.
		CERCLIS- NFRAP	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System - No Further Remedial Action Planned Facility # 0507198	The decision was made that no further activity is planned at the site. Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information.
		DERR	Ohio Division of Environmental Response & Revitalization Facility # 583001853	Site assessment as part of CERCLIS- NFRAP analysis.



Business Name	Address Franklin, Ohio	Record Source	Description and Date of Database	Significance and Rationale
Sonoco Flexible Packaging (also Sonoco Products Co.)	708 South Avenue	RCRA CORRACTS	RCRA Corrective Action Facility # OHD058394313	The site generates hazardous waste and has RCRA corrective actions on-going.
		RCRA LQG	RCRA Large Quantity Generator Facility # OHD058394313	The site generates more than 1,000 kilograms of hazardous waste per month which includes waste codes D001 (ignitable waste) and F003 (nonhalogenated solvents). The facility has had multiple violations ranging from incorrect or missing paperwork, incorrectly labeled wastes and land disposal violations.
		SEMS Archive	Superfund Enterprise Management System Archived Site Inventory Facility # 0507198	The site has been determined by US EPA that no further actions including remedial actions are planned.
Atlas Roofing Company	675 Oxford Road	RCRA- SQG	RCRA Small Quantity Generator Facility # 0507198	The site is a small quantity generator of more than 100 kilograms and less than 1,000 kilograms per month of RCRA hazardous waste. No reported violations. Hazardous wastes generated include Doo1 (ignitable waste), F001 (halogenated solvents) and U228 (trichloroethylene).



Business Name	Address Franklin, Ohio	Record Source	Description and Date of Database	Significance and Rationale
Franklin VOC Plume	2651 Water Source Drive	DERR	Facility # 583003245	No information available from the environmental databases. However, a monitoring well at the northern point of the Property was installed by Ohio EPA.

AST=Registered Aboveground Storage Tanks; CERCLIS = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System; ERNS=Federal Emergency Response and Notification System; FBR-Federal Brownfields Sites; EC/IC=Engineering Control/Institutional Control Registry; LUST=Leaking underground Storage Tanks; NPL=National Priority (Superfund) List; Orphan=non-geocoded site; RCRA=Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; SPILL=State Spill Site; SWL=Solid Waste Landfill Sites; UST=Registered Underground Storage Tanks

A summary of pertinent listings within the search radii that are adjacent to; interpreted to be hydrogeologically up-gradient of the Property, or sites from which releases may have likelihood to have impacted the Property; are as follows:

- 415 South Avenue - Walter F. Stephens, Jr., Inc.

This site is located adjacent to the Property to the north and is not reported on any of the environmental databases searched.

Based on the lack of any regulatory database listing, it is not likely that a release from this site would pose a significant environmental concern to the Property.

- 415 Oxford Road - Legacy Finishing, Inc. and Cast Plus (reportedly closed)

This site is located adjacent to the Property to the southwest and is reported on the SPILLS database as a wastewater release in 2000. The facility housed two business: Cast Plus and Legacy Finishing Inc. Legacy Finishing specializes in powder coating, shot blasting and truck rim reconditioning.

Based on the location of this site and the apparent time frame that special metal finishing activities have been conducted at this site, it is likely that a release from this site would pose a significant environmental concern to the Property.

- 300 Chestnut Street - Union Camp Corporation

This site is located adjacent to the Property to the northwest and is reported on the CERCLIS, CERCLIS NFRAP, DERR, RCRA NON GEN and SEMS ARCHIVE environmental databases. A Preliminary Assessment ("PA") was conducted at the site in 1987. A decision was made that no further activity is planned at the site and furthermore the site does not qualify for the National Priority List ("NPL") based on the information developed during the PA.

An informal written violation was made in 1992 with the violation properly addressed. The site is now considered as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) non-generator of hazardous wastes.



The US EPA has been determined that no further regulatory actions including remedial actions are planned for the site.

Based on the location of the manufacturing operations at this site, the fact that the site is considered as a RCRA non-generator and that US EPA has determined that no further regulatory actions are planned at this site, it is not likely that a release from this site would not pose a significant environmental concern to the Property.

- 675 Oxford Road – Atlas Roofing Corporation

This site is located adjacent to the Property to the northwest and is reported on the CERCLIS, CERCLIS NFRAP, DERR, RCRA NON GEN and SEMS ARCHIVE environmental databases. A Preliminary Assessment (“PA”) was conducted at the site in 1987. A decision was made that no further activity is planned at the site and furthermore the site does not qualify for the NPL based on the information developed during the PA.

Based on the location of the manufacturing operations at this site, the fact that the site is considered as a RCRA non-generator and that US EPA has determined that no further regulatory actions are planned at this site, it is not likely that a release from this site would not pose a significant environmental concern to the Property.

4.1.3 Orphan Listings

Based on our review of the Orphan Listings within the ERIS report, none of the orphan facilities listed is likely to be a potential environmental concern to the Property if significant releases have occurred at the respective facilities

4.2 Physical Setting Records

DEC reviewed various sources of governmental and academic reports, documents and records (ASTM § 8.2.4) to develop information concerning the physical settings of the Property and adjacent area. A Physical Setting Report is included in Appendix D-2

4.2.1 Topography

DEC reviewed the most recently published U.S. Geological Survey (“USGS”)⁴ Franklin, Ohio Quadrangle 7.5-minute series topographic map (2016) for this PIESA. According to the contour lines on the topographic map, the Property is located at approximately 675 feet above mean sea level and has little to no relief across the Property. The topography of the Property slopes southeastward towards the Great Miami River.

⁴ <https://store.usgs.gov/map-locator>



4.2.2 Geology

Warren County is located in the Till Plains section of the Central Lowland physiographic province⁵. The County is characterized by steeply rolling uplands dissected by broad, flat-bottomed valleys, particularly in the vicinity of the Great Miami River. Bedrock in the vicinity of the Property consists of Ordovician interbedded limestone and shale (Grant Lake and Fairview Formations and the Kobe Formation series) and is typically encountered within 20 feet of the ground surface. However, due to the location of the Property adjacent to the Great Miami River, a sand and gravel aquifer with interbedded clay and silt lenses is commonly found from the ground surface to depths of over 100 feet below the ground surface⁶.

4.2.3 Soils

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Web Soil Survey⁷, the soil at the Property is characterized as Abscota sand, calcareous variant. This soil series consists of sand grading at depth to stratified coarse sand and gravelly sand. It is considered farmland of local importance, is well drained and has a very low runoff potential when thoroughly wet. Calcium carbonate is relatively high approaching 20 percent. This soil series is not considered a hydric soil (i.e. commonly associated with wetlands).

4.2.4 Groundwater

According to the Ground-Water Resources Map of Warren County⁵, the Property is in an area where groundwater yields from wells may produce more than five hundred (500) gallons per minute. The soil in the area is characterized as a sand and gravel aquifer typically 100 feet or more in thickness over interbedded shale and limestone bedrock. The bedrock is described as poor water quality. The nearest USGS recorded groundwater well is over 0.3 miles southeast of the Property.

The Property has a groundwater well for industrial purposes located on the Property near the northwest end of Building No. 4 (see Figure 4). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (“ODNR”) has assigned a well identification number of 9983036⁸. The well was installed by Layne-Ohio in April 1927. The well is 38-inches in diameter and 40 feet in depth. The well was test pumped at 1,000 gallons per minute which resulted in a static water level of 15 feet below ground surface. Other water wells are located adjacent to the Property to the northeast and southwest.

⁵ Fenneman, N.M., 1938. Physiography of the eastern United States. New York, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

⁶ <http://water.ohiodnr.gov/maps/groundwater-resources-maps>

⁷ <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

⁸ <https://apps.ohiodnr.gov/water/maptechs/wellogs/appNEW/>



The Property has been identified as being within a Sole Source Aquifer area⁹ (identified as the Great Miami Sole Source aquifer) and within an inner management zone of a source water protection area¹⁰ for the City of Franklin. In addition, the City of Franklin has determined that the Property lies within the 1-year time of travel zone¹¹ for its wellhead protection area.

Based on the U.S. EPA Ground Water Handbook, Volume 1 - Groundwater and Contamination (September 1990), the water table typically conforms to surface topography. This means the direction of flow for shallow groundwater should generally be from higher elevations to lower elevations. Localized flow direction may vary as a result of rainfall, development, geologic and soil characteristics, near-by surface water bodies, underground utilities such as storm drains, septic systems and sewers, or other influences such as the presence of water wells pumped at a high volume.

Based on DEC's review of the topographic map and Property observations, the natural shallow groundwater flow at the Property is interpreted to be predominately to the southeast towards the Great Miami River.

4.2.5 Surface Waters

The closest body of surface water is the Great Miami River located adjacent to and southeast of the Property. Based upon the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's wetland mapper website¹², no wetlands have been identified at the Property or on adjacent properties. The Property has been identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA")¹³ as lying within a Zone X which has a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding. The reason for this designation is the presence of the flood levee between the Property and the Great Miami River.

4.3 Historical Use of Property and Near-by Properties

DEC reviewed historical records, data and conducted interviews in order to ascertain the historical uses of the Property and near-by properties to evaluate the presence of activity that could represent RECs. Copies of the records reviewed are included in various appendices in Appendix E. Interviews are discussed in Section 6.0.

4.3.1 Aerial Photographs

Historical aerial photographs dating back to the 1930s are often available from private and local and federal government sources. Aerial photographs document the land use,

⁹ <https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b>

¹⁰ <http://epa.ohio.gov/ddagw/swap.aspx>

¹¹ <http://www.franklinohio.org/home/showdocument?id=126>

¹² <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>

¹³ <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search>



structures, development, construction and other physical changes. DEC reviewed the following aerial photographs (see Appendix E-1) and summarized Property and near-by site conditions below:

Table 3
Aerial Photograph Review

Year	Property	Near-by
1938	The clarity of the aerial photograph is poor; however, the Property is shown as having one building with an apparent railroad line running from the main rail line into the Property.	The clarity of the aerial photograph is poor; however, adjoining sites to the north and northeast are beginning to be developed into commercial and residential land uses. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. Further to the south and southwest the properties are used for agricultural purposes.
1947	The aerial photograph shows a number of roof vents on the middle of the main building and two vents on the northern end of the main building. A building north of the main building appears to be a power plant of some type with a tall stack. The rail line extension can be clearly identified entering into the Property and the main building.	The adjoining properties to the north and northeast appear to have been developed into residential land uses, primarily single-family units. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. It appears as though emissions from the operations at this facility have particulate matter as shown on the roof of the structures. In addition, there appears to be disturbed earth adjacent to but not on the Property. Further to the south and southwest the properties are used for agricultural purposes. Immediately south of the adjoining industrial complex is a municipal treatment plant of some type (sanitary or water treatment).
1952	The clarity of the aerial photograph is poor; however, the Property is shown with the main building present and what appears to be a second building to the northwest of the main building.	The clarity of the aerial photograph is poor; however, adjoining sites to the north and northeast have been developed into residential land uses, primarily single-family units. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. The adjacent areas are similar to the 1947 aerial photograph.
1957	The aerial photograph appears to be similar to the 1947 aerial photograph. Disturbed earth is noted north of the assumed power plant and appears to be the result of plant expansion and grading. There also appears to be some type of a drainage channel/ swale which runs northwest from the Property but appears to flow southeastward towards the Great Miami River off the Property.	Adjoining sites to the north and northeast have been developed into residential (primarily single-family units) with an occasional commercial land use. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. It appears as though emissions from the operations at this facility have particulate matter as shown on the roof of the structures. In addition, there appears to be disturbed earth adjacent to but not on the Property. Further to the south and southwest the properties are used for agricultural purposes except for the property adjacent to the southern industrial property which appears to be a municipal treatment plant of some type (sanitary or water treatment). An industrial complex is located northwest of the Property.



Year	Property	Near-by
1964	<p>The Property is shown with the multiple buildings. The operations at the Property have apparently expanded. The rail extension is shown as existing, but does not appear to have been used in some time. A building is located separate from the main complex of buildings and appears to be a power plant with a tall stack in the middle of the structure.</p>	<p>Adjoining sites to the north and northeast have been developed into residential (primarily single-family units) and commercial land uses. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex.</p> <p>The adjacent areas are similar to the 1957 aerial photograph.</p> <p>South of the Property lies the Great Miami River. A levee appears to exist between the river and the Property.</p>
1967	<p>The aerial photograph appears to be similar to the 1964 aerial photograph. The roof vents on the middle of the roof no longer appear to exist. A disturbed area of earth is noted north of the assumed power plant.</p>	<p>Adjoining sites to the north and northeast have been developed into residential (primarily single-family units) with an occasional commercial land use. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. In addition, there appears to be disturbed earth adjacent to but not on the Property. This disturbed area appears to be larger than that shown on the 1964 aerial photograph.</p> <p>The adjacent areas are similar to the 1964 aerial photograph.</p>
1973	<p>The aerial photograph appears to be similar to the 1967 aerial photograph. Additional construction has occurred and the assumed power plant has been incorporated into the buildings.</p>	<p>The adjacent areas are similar to the 1967 aerial photograph. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. In the area where previously a disturbed area was noted, an area of water was noted.</p>
1974	<p>The clarity of the aerial photograph is quite poor; although the main building can be discerned.</p>	<p>The clarity of the aerial photograph is quite poor. It appears that the adjoining properties to the north and northeast are residential with some commercial development. The agricultural fields are still present south and southwest of the Property with the industrial development present to the west-northwest of the Property.</p>
1985	<p>The buildings at the Property have undergone some major expansion with the main building expanding to the north and northwest. The building assumed to be some type of a power plant is no more and a large warehouse-like structure occupies its location. The rail extension is no longer present at the Property.</p>	<p>Adjoining sites to the north and northeast are residential (primarily single-family units) with some commercial development. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. Further to the south and southwest the properties have been developed into a major industrial complex. The building which appeared to be a municipal treatment plant of some type no longer exists. To the west-northwest of the Property, the industrial complex has expanded.</p> <p>The levee along the Great Miami River south of the Property is clearly seen on the aerial photograph.</p>



Year	Property	Near-by
1994	The buildings at the Property have undergone further expansion with a new warehouse-type structure built onto the main building at its northern portion.	Adjoining sites to the north and northeast are residential with some commercial development. A new commercial development has occurred to the north of the western portion of the Property. Immediately to the southwest on an adjoining property is an industrial complex. Further to the south and southwest the properties have been further expanded as a major industrial complex. To the west-northwest of the Property, the industrial complex has expanded.
2004	Little change noted in this photograph from the 1994 aerial photograph with the exception of what appears to be a horizontal tank located northwest of the buildings.	Little change noted in this photograph from the 1994 aerial photograph
2005	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2004 aerial photograph with the exception of a number of trailers placed on-site at the northern end of the Property. Also, an area has been clear out southwest of the horizontal tank identified in the 2004 aerial photograph.	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2004 aerial photograph with the exception of additional industrial expansion on the adjoining property to the southwest.
2006	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2005 aerial photograph.	
2009	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2006 aerial photograph.	
2010	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2009 aerial photograph. The cleared area adjacent to the horizontal tank appears to be a depression. Trailers still present on-site. The aerial photograph shows the Property as it is currently is.	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2009 aerial photograph. The industrial complex on the adjoining property to the southwest has significantly expanded what appears to be outside storage structures.
2013	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2010 aerial photograph.	
2015	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2013 aerial photograph.	
2017	Little change noted in this photograph from the 2015 aerial photograph.	

4.3.2 Fire Insurance Maps

Fire Insurance maps provide information on land use, development, storage tanks and similar items. Fire insurance maps have been produced for most urban areas dating back to the late 1800s. Fire insurance maps were available for the Property (see Appendix E-2) and surrounding area, were reviewed and are summarized below:



Table 4
Fire Insurance Map Review

Year	Property	Near-by
1916	<p>Property is developed with three buildings: a main rectangular building; a small rectangular building; and a building identified as the power house. The Property is identified as the Franklin Coated Paper Company. The main building is identified as having one aboveground storage tank and the power house as having two aboveground storage tanks and one underground storage tank. All tanks are of unknown size and contents.</p>	<p>The adjoining property to the south-southwest is identified as the Srere Pulp & Paper Co. Numerous aboveground storage tanks and two underground storage tanks are identified of unknown sizes and contents.</p> <p>Further south is the Franklin Water Works showing two underground storage tanks of unknow size and contents.</p> <p>The Fire Insurance Map is incomplete to the east, north and west of the Property boundary and only shows partial coverage to the south.</p>
1926	<p>The Property is now identified as the Miami Valley Coated Paper Company and has undergone significant expansion over the 1916 map. Eight aboveground storage tanks are identified along with two underground storage tanks. All tanks are of unknown size and contents. A rail line extension now serves the Property.</p>	<p>The adjoining property to the south-southwest is identified as The Miami River Mills, Inc. and The Philip Carey Company. This facility has also undergone significant expansion since the 1916 map. At least twelve aboveground storage tanks and three underground storage tanks are identified of unknown sizes and contents. A water tank is located to the northwest of the main building on this adjoining property.</p> <p>Further south is the Franklin Water Works similar to what is shown on the 1916 Fire Insurance Map but now shows five water wells on this property.</p> <p>Immediately northwest of the Property is the NYC Lines Engine House, part of an active railroad line.</p> <p>To the north, northeast and northwest of the Property, the area has been developed into residential housing with an occasional commercial land use scattered about.</p> <p>The map is incomplete to the west of the Property boundary.</p>
1940	<p>Little change noted in this map from the 1926 Fire Insurance Map with the exception of an office and scales located northwest of the main complex on the Property.</p>	<p>The adjoining property to the south-southwest is now identified as The Philip Carey Company, a manufacturer of felting materials. The facility appears to be similar to the 1926 Fire Insurance Map. A railroad switch house is located near the middle of this property.</p> <p>Further to the northwest, new commercial entities appear to be located including the Franklin Ice and Fuel Company showing fuel oil tanks –unknown if above or below ground tanks, their sizes, or contents.</p> <p>Further to the southwest is the City of Franklin Water Works similar to what is shown on the 1926 Fire Insurance Map.</p> <p>A railroad switch house is located on the adjacent property to the southwest of the Property near its middle.</p> <p>To the north, northeast and northwest of the Property, the area has been developed into residential housing with an occasional commercial land use scattered about.</p> <p>The map is incomplete to the west of the Property boundary.</p>



Year	Property	Near-by
1959	Property is still identified as the Miami Valley Coated Paper Co. Shown are office space, warehouse and production areas. A rail line extension is shown coming into the production area. Further north is shown an office with scales. The northwestern portion of the Property is identified as a farm. Nine aboveground storage tanks are identified. All tanks are of unknown size and contents. The two underground storage tanks at the Power Plant are no longer shown. The map only covers the southeastern portion of the Property.	<p>To the north, northeast and northwest of the Property, the area has been developed into residential housing with an occasional commercial land use scattered about. An auto repair garage is noted in this particular area (119 to 121 South Avenue).</p> <p>To the southwest and adjacent to the Property is Franklin Felting Inc. (formerly The Philp Carey Co.) The facility no longer has a water tank nor a number of building that were present on the 1940 Fire Insurance Map.</p> <p>Further to the southwest is the City of Franklin Water Works similar to what is shown on the 1940 Fire Insurance Map.</p> <p>The map is incomplete to the west of the Property boundary.</p>

4.3.3 Property Tax and Recorded Land Title Records

Property tax files are those files kept for property tax purposes by the local jurisdiction where the Property is located and includes records of past ownership, appraisals, maps, sketches, photos, or other information that is reasonably ascertainable and pertaining to the Property. A summary of the property tax files (see Appendices B-1 through B-3) reviewed is provided below.

Table 5
Property Tax and Recorded Land Title Records Review

File Type	Source	Property
Property Summary (Appendix B-1)	Warren County Auditor's Website	General information on the Property including parcel number, parcel size, ownership information, value and tax summary, sales' history and value history.
Survey Map (Appendix B-2)	Warren County Engineer's Website	1996 Survey Map of Property
Deed's, Agreements, & Liens (Appendix B-3)	Warren County Recorder's Website	Partial listing of deeds and various agreements back to 1989. None reasonably available prior to 1989.

4.3.4 Building Records

Building record files are those files kept for tax purposes by the local engineering and/or building departments where the Property is located and may include records of past buildings, construction details, inspections, appraisals, maps, sketches, photos, or other information that is reasonably ascertainable and pertaining to the Property. Based upon a review of the Franklin, Ohio Building and Zoning Division, only permits and associated information from the early 2010's is currently available. A FOIA request was made of the City of Franklin. As of the date of this report, very limited information has been received from the City (see Section 6.3.1).



4.3.5 Topographic Maps

Topographic maps produced by the USGS document elevation changes, drainage changes, development and other physical features. DEC obtained historical and the most current topographic maps (see Appendix E-3) in which the Property and surrounding area were located. A summary of the topographic maps reviewed is provided below.

Table 6
USGS Topographic Map Review

Year	Property	Near-by
1908	The Property is not shown as having undergone any development.	The nearby properties do not show any development. A rail line is present.
1951	The Property is shown as being developed with a building separated by a rail line extension off of the main rail line in the area.	The near-by properties exhibit multiple areas of development and expansion over the 1908 topographic map. The adjoining property to the south-southwest is shown as developed.
1965	Little change noted in this map from the 1951 topographic map.	The near-by properties to the north-northwest exhibit continued development.
1974	Little change noted in this map from the 1965 topographic map.	Little change noted in this map from the 1965 topographic map with the exception of development to the northwest of the Property
1981	The Property is shown as having a new building addition on the northwestern corner of the existing buildings. The rest of the map is similar to the 1974 topographic map.	The near-by properties to the northeast do not show any new additions. However, the near-by properties to the northwest and southwest appear to have undergone expansions with a major new industrial building to the far southwest.
1984	Little change noted in this map from the 1981 topographic map.	
1992	Little change noted in this map from the 1984 topographic map.	
2016	The USGS changed how information is presented on topographic maps. The Property boundary is outlined and indicates it is located within the City limits of Franklin, north of the Great Miami River. It appears that the Property is relatively flat and has a slope towards the Great Miami River to the southeast of the Property.	The surrounding properties indicate a probable mix of residential properties to the north and northwest of the Property. A major rail line runs along a portion of the Property. It appears that the properties near-by are relatively flat lying, also with a slope towards the Great Miami River.

4.3.6 Local Street and City Directories

Local Street and City directories have been produced for most urban and some rural areas. DEC reviewed past directories (see Appendix E-4) to determine historical use of the Property and surrounding area. Only listings of potential concern are listed. A summary of the directories reviewed is provided below:



Table 7
Local Street and City Directory Review

Year	Property	Near-by
1960	The Property is listed as the Miami Valley Coated Paper.	415 Oxford – Franklin Felting Inc. 226-308 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue –Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. Intersection of South & Cedar – Woodall Industries, Inc.
1998	The Property is listed as the Miami Valley Paper.	403 Oxford Road – Franklin Christian Church 415 Oxford –H&M Storage 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 415 South Avenue – All Tees by Stephens, Stephens Inc. and Walter Stephens Jr. Inc.
2000	The Property is listed as the Miami Wabash Paper.	403 Oxford Road – Franklin Christian Church 415 Oxford – Legacy Finishing Inc. 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 226-308 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue –Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. 708 South Avenue – Sonoco Flexible Packaging
2004	The Property is not listed.	403 Oxford Road – Franklin Christian Church 415 Oxford – Cast Plus, Inc. 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 226-308 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue –Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. 708 South Avenue – Sonoco Flexible Packaging
2009	The Property is listed as the Miami Wabash Paper.	403 Oxford Road – Franklin Christian Church 415 Oxford –Cast Pro Inc. 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 226-306 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue – All Tees by Stephens and Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. 708 South Avenue – Sonoco Flexible Packaging
2014	The Property is listed as the Miami Wabash Paper.	403 Oxford Road – Franklin Christian Church 415 Oxford – Legacy Finishing Inc. 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 226-308 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue – All Tees by Stephens and Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. 708 South Avenue – Sonoco Flexible Packaging
2019	The Property is listed as the Miami Wabash Paper.	415 Oxford – Legacy Finishing Inc. 675 Oxford – Atlas Roofing 226-306 South Avenue – Residential Units 415 South Avenue – All Tees by Stephens, Stephens Inc. and Walter Stephens Jr. Inc. 708 South Avenue – Sonoco Flexible Packaging



4.3.7 Data Summary

4.3.7.1 Property

Based upon the data reviewed and summarized above, the Property was developed sometime between 1908 and 1916 as The Franklin Coated Paper Company. Prior to 1908, the Property and surrounding area was utilized for agricultural purposes. By 1926, the Property was identified as the Miami Valley Coated Paper Company and had undergone significant expansion since 1916. New production areas and lines were expanded as part of this effort. Between 1926 and 1940, additional expansions occurred including a rail line extension into the Property off the main rail line to the southwest of the Property. A Power Plant was also constructed during this period. By 1952, a third building had been constructed to the northeast of the main building on the north side of the rail line extension. It appears that between 1957 and 1967, operations changed at the Property as indicated by the absence of roof vents. By 1973, the power plant was no more and had been incorporated into a new building connected to the main building. By 1985 additional expansions had occurred and the rail line extension was no longer in use. By 1994, further expansions had occurred into what is similar to that currently. No further significant changes were noted between 1994 and 2017.

4.3.7.2 Near-by Properties

Prior to 1916, the nearby properties to the south and southwest were utilized for industrial and agricultural purposes. Nearby properties to the north and northwest had already been developed as residential. Between 1916 and 2017, these properties to the north and northwest continued to be developed primarily as residential land uses with occasional commercial and light-industrial land uses particularly to the immediate north of the Property. The adjoining properties to the south and southwest were developed prior to 1916 as industrial and municipal water treatment. The industrial property changed ownership and type of manufacturing from paper to felting materials to metal finishing. The municipal water treatment operation, further south of this property, ceased operations between 1964 and 1974. Industrial development of the southern and northwestern nearby properties began between 1974 and 1985 and appeared to be fully developed by 1994 to 2004.

In general, near-by properties to the north-northwest and northeast have been developed for residential use with occasional commercial land uses. Near-by properties to the south and southwest have been developed for industrial land use and agricultural land uses.

4.4 Previous Assessments

DEC was not provided with copies of previous environmental assessment reports for the Property or near-by sites.



5.0 SITE WALKOVER

5.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions

Site walkovers of the Property was conducted by Mr. Barry Franz of DEC on July 16 and 17, 2019, November 5, 2019, and February 21, 2020. He also conducted a visual inspection of near-by properties from publicly accessible locations. Mr. Franz was accompanied by Mr. Kenneth Coyle of MVP during the first two site walkovers and Mr. Coyle of MVP and Mr. Neal Frink of the Frink Law Firm LLC. Site photographs taken during the first two site walkovers are provided in Appendix F.

During the site walkover, observations were limited by physical obstructions including:

- Asphalt pavement;
- Vegetative cover;
- Collapsed buildings; and
- Equipment within the buildings.

5.2 General Site Setting

The Property is located in an area developed with both residential and commercial/ industrial properties.

DEC observed, to the extent possible, the existing geologic, hydrogeologic, hydrologic and topographic conditions of and around the Property during the site walkover. Observations were consistent with the physical setting characteristics documented in the most recent records reviewed for the Property as summarized in Section 4.2 of this report and in the Physical Setting Report presented in Appendix C-2.

DEC looked for indications of past uses of the Property, adjoining properties and surrounding area during the site walkover. Observations were relatively consistent with the apparent past uses as documented in the most recent historical records reviewed as summarized in Section 4.3 of this report.

5.2.1 Current Uses of the Property

The Property is currently a closed coated paper manufacturing facility.

5.2.2 Past Uses of the Property

The Property has been utilized continuously since 1911 as a manufacturing facility for coated paper and labels. Prior to 1911 it is was used for agricultural purposes.



5.2.3 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties

Current uses of adjoining properties are summarized from aerial photographs in Table 3 (see Section 4.3.1), fire insurance maps in Table 4 (see Section 4.3.2) and visual observations from publicly accessible locations. If information was available from other sources, they have been included in this discussion.

Current uses of adjoining properties include residential to the north and northwest; industrial properties to the northwest, south and southwest; and the Great Miami River to the southeast.

5.2.4 Past Uses of Adjoining Properties

Past uses of adjoining properties include residential to the north and northwest; industrial properties to the northwest and south; farmlands to the southwest and west; and the Great Miami River to the southeast.

5.2.5 Current and Past Uses of Near-by Properties

Current and past uses of near-by properties include residential to the north and northwest; commercial/industrial properties to the north, northwest and south; farmlands to the southwest and west; and the Great Miami River to the southeast.

5.2.6 Physiographic, Geological, Hydrogeological and Topographic Conditions

Section 4.2 describes sources reviewed with regards to physiographic/topographic, geological and hydrogeological conditions on the Property. This section describes those conditions visually and/or physically observed from within and on the periphery of the Property boundaries.

The Property is located within a floodplain area adjacent to the Great Miami River and protected by a manmade levee between the Property and the river. The Property is flat lying with a slight gradient to the southeast towards the river. Exposed surface soils consist of sands and gravels similar to those soil types associated with the Great Miami Sole Source aquifer.

5.2.7 General Description of Structures

Buildings on the Property are primarily constructed of a variety of materials and construction techniques varying from masonry block and/or brick on both steel frame and wooden structures to aluminum-sided steel frame structures. There are twelve (12) distinctive buildings on the Property all interconnected to one another (see Figure 4).

The following is a list of the buildings (see Figure 4), when they were approximately constructed and the approximate square footage:



1. Main Offices – 1951 – 10,700 square feet (“sq ft”)
2. Fire Pump Shed – Unknown – 130 sq ft
3. Warehouse No. 1 – 1951 (part of the original Main Offices)
4. Main Production Department – 1911 – 32,040 sq ft
5. Former Finishing Department – 1975 – 9,000 sq ft
6. Former Print Room – 1975 – 5,060 sq ft
7. Warehouse No. 2 – Unknown (believed to be between 1974 and 1985) – 3,950 sq ft
8. Former Clay Shed – 1918 – 2,340 sq ft
9. Rewind Department – 1969 – 6,100 sq ft
10. Box Shop – Unknown – 470 sq ft
11. Warehouse No. 3 – 1975 – 19,500 sq ft
12. Warehouse No. 4 – 1986 – 23, 440 sq ft

5.2.8 Roads

Access to the Property is provided from Oxford Road to the southeast and South Avenue to the northeast.

5.2.9 Utilities

Utility providers are described below:

Table 8
Utility Providers

Type of Utility	Utility Service Provider
Potable Water System	City of Franklin
Sanitary Sewage System	City of Franklin
Electric System	Duke Energy
Natural Gas System	Duke Energy
Solid Waste Management	Republic Waste Services
Stormwater Management System	Direct discharge to the Great Miami River

5.3 Exterior Observations

Current and past uses of the Property are discussed in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2.

5.3.1 Exterior Chemical Products and Wastes

No observations were noted of any hazardous substances, petroleum products, drummed wastes, or other chemical products and/or product containers observed outside of buildings on the Property.

5.3.2 Exterior Storage Tanks

Three USTs were reported at the Property (see Table 9). One UST was located in the parking area near the front of the building (see Figures 3 and 4). It was reportedly removed prior to 1975 based upon discussions with the Maintenance Supervisor;



however, the environmental database report indicates it was removed in 1993. No closure reports were identified by BUSTR for this UST.

Two USTs containing ethyl acetate were removed in January 2000 from an adjoining area northwest of the Former Clay Shed (Building No. 8 – see Figures 3 and 4). However, no closure report was provided to BUSTR at that time. A retroactive BUSTR Closure Report was later prepared by Renz & Associates in February 2013. The Closure Report indicated that no evidence of a release was detected in the post-closure assessment and BUSTR issued an NFA for the two USTs.

An aboveground storage tank (“AST”), located in the northern portion of the Property (see Figure 3), was used as an auxiliary fuel source for various pieces of equipment on the Property. The AST is currently showing signs of weathering and reportedly has not been used since 2005 according to the Maintenance Supervisor.

Table 9
Exterior Storage Tank Summary

Tank Designation	AST or UST	Tank Contents	Tank Capacity
T-1	UST (unknown)	Gasoline and Diesel (both types at different times reportedly)	Unknown
T-2A	UST (Fiberglass)	Ethyl Acetate	4,000 gallons
T-2B	UST (Fiberglass)	Ethyl Acetate	3,000 gallons
T-3	AST (Steel)	Propane	30,000 gallons

5.3.3 Odors

No strong, pungent, noxious, or unusual odors were noted during the site walkover.

5.3.4 Pools of Liquid

No pools of liquids were observed on the exterior of the Property during the site walkover with the exception of pools of stormwater.

5.3.5 Exterior Drums/Containers

Observations were noted of former locations of drums and/or totes outside of buildings on the Property. Two areas were noted at the southwestern rear of Warehouse No. 3 and southeastern rear of Warehouse No. 4. No visual evidence of spills or releases were noted. It is reported that the materials stored in the drums and totes were non-hazardous materials generated as part of the wastewater treatment process at the facility. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated these drums and totes were removed by



Disposal Solutions LLC under contract to MVP. These items were characterized, documented and properly disposed.

5.3.6 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

One pad-mounted electrical transformer was noted outside of Building No. 9 (see Figures 3 and 4) on the Property, but was originally unable to be visually observed due to it being inaccessible except from the adjoining property. On the second site visit, this pad-mounted electric transformer was observed. The transformer had a faded blue non-PCB label on it and no visual signs of any release from the transformer was noted. The transformer appears to be in good condition.

Three poles were observed upon which electrical transformers were noted. Two of the poles had blue non-PCB labels on the electrical transformers. The electrical transformer on the third pole did not have a blue non-PCB label although the transformer was badly weathered and a label may have deteriorated. Figure 3 presents the locations of the pole-mounted transformers and the one pad-mounted transformer. All transformers were in good condition, with the exception of the one transformer. No evidence of any spills or releases were noted from the pole-mounted transformers.

5.3.7 Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons

No pits, ponds or lagoons that are associated with wastewater or disposal were observed on, or adjacent to, the Property.

A depressed area surrounding a reported dry well was identified to the rear of the Property (see Figure 3). The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that during periods of heavy rain, this depressed area fills with storm water and the water appears to discharge through the dry well. He further indicated that the reported planned use for this dry well was in the event of a propane release from the 30,000-gal AST located adjacent to the area to collection and dispose of the propane to the subsurface.

5.3.8 Stained Soil or Pavement

Areas of stained soil and pavement were observed on the exterior of the Property (i.e. outside any structures on the Property) during the site walkover. Normal staining from vehicles was observed on the asphalt pavement.

Stained soils were observed at the solid waste compactor located between Warehouse Nos. 3 and 4, and appeared to be the result of the hydraulic system leaking or malfunctioning during compaction operations.

Stained soils were also observed at the two loading dock areas (Warehouse Nos. 3 and 4).



5.3.9 Stressed Vegetation

No areas of obvious stressed vegetation of environmental significance was observed on the Property during the site walkover.

5.3.10 Solid Waste

No evidence of disposed or buried solid waste was observed at the Property during the site walkover; however, windblown trash was observed.

Currently, a trash compactor is located at the northern end of the buildings between Warehouse Nos. 3 and 4 (Building Nos. 11 and 12). Stained soils were observed at the compactor and appeared to be the result of the hydraulic system leaking or malfunctioning during compaction operations.

The Maintenance Supervisor indicated there had been numerous 55-gallon drums (both metal and plastic) which were filled with solid waste scattered around the outside of the various buildings on the Property including a pile of waste paper. Disposal Solutions LLC was retained by MVP to remove and properly disposed of these materials and containers.

5.3.11 Wastewater

Sanitary wastewater generated at the Property discharges into the City of Franklin sanitary sewer system.

Storm water from the roof of the buildings are discharged to downspouts, which discharge to ground or to the storm water system. Storm water from most of the paved areas of the Property flows via sheet flow to stormwater collection inlets located throughout the Property. It is reported that the storm water discharges directly to the Great Miami River under a City of Franklin permit granted by the Ohio EPA.

5.3.12 Wells

The Property has a groundwater well for industrial purposes located at the northern end of the Main Production Building (Building No. 4 - see Figures 3 and 4). ODNR has assigned a well identification number of 9983036⁸. The well was installed by Layne-Ohio in April 1927. The well is 38 inches in diameter and 40 feet in depth. The well was test pumped at 1,000 gallons per minute which resulted in a static water level of 15 feet below ground surface.

A reported dry well was identified in the northern portion of the Property. Discussion with the Maintenance Supervisor indicated that it was installed pre-1975 (when he came to work at the Property). He had no knowledge of its construction, or any maintenance



of the dry well. Currently scrub vegetation is growing immediately adjacent to it. The dry well appears to be constructed of a concrete pipe capped with a concrete cover approximately six (6) feet in diameter. The concrete shows evidence of pitting due to age with little visual indication of water staining. The dry well is located within a depression which the Maintenance Supervisor indicates fills with stormwater after heavy rains.

5.3.13 Septic Systems

No locations of a septic tank system or cesspools were reported or observed on the Property.

5.4 Interior Observation

5.4.1 Interior Chemical Products and Wastes

Office and bathroom cleaning supplies were observed throughout the facility most notably in the front office area and in the bathrooms and locker rooms in Building No. 4.

A Wet Lab is present in the Main Offices (Building No. 1). The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that Disposal Solutions LLC, under contract with MVP, conducted a laboratory cleanup and removed all chemicals found in the Wet Lab along with various process samples. The chemicals and process samples were lab-packed, documented and disposed of properly. No chemicals were observed during the site walkover.

Within the Maintenance Shop (Building No. 4), various chemical products were identified used to maintain the equipment at the Property. The most common products included:

- Various types of lubricating oils;
- Antifreeze fluids;
- Brake fluids;
- Spray cleaners for removing grease (both solvent and citrus-based);
- Cutting fluids (both oil-based and water-based); and
- Specialty lubricating oils for air compressor system.

At the location of numerous equipment scattered throughout Building Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9, various types of specialty lubricating oils were present in 1-gallon to 5-gallon containers. These oils were created specifically for a particular piece of equipment. Most of the containers were partially full and all containers appeared to be intact. Some spillage and/or releases were noted but typically were small in size (less than 1 sq ft in area).



Containers (primarily 50-pound bags) of color dye, and various process chemicals were noted throughout the Main Production Department (Building No. 4). The color dye is a water-based compound and according to their Safety Data Sheets (“SDSs”) are considered as non-hazardous. The various process chemicals are also identified in their SDSs as non-hazardous materials.

According to the Maintenance Supervisor, due to a malfunction in the principal process wastewater treatment tank in 2018, the facility had been required to place the process wastewater into plastic totes. However, MVP retained the services of Disposal Solutions LLC to gather, characterize, document, transport, and properly dispose of these totes. No totes were noted during the site walkover.

In the Former Clay Shed, Building No. 8 and at the Cooking Kitchen area in Building No. 4, bags of clay filler were identified. This material was used in the coating process at one time, but was no longer in use according to the Maintenance Supervisor.

The Maintenance Supervisor, as well as the manager for Disposal Solutions LLC, stated that a number of 55-gallon drums of used oils were found in the former Box Shop (Building No. 10 – see Figure 4). Disposal Solutions LLC removed the drums, characterized them, documented and properly disposed of them.

Table 10
Interior Chemical Product/Waste

Chemical Product/Waste - Inside	Storage Container	Quantities	Damaged/Intact
Office and bathroom cleaning supplies	Various sizes	Various numbers	Intact
Maintenance Shop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various types of lubricating oils; • Antifreeze fluids; • Brake fluids; • Spray cleaners for removing grease (both solvent and citrus-based); • Cutting fluids (both oil-based and water-based); and • Specialty lubricating oils for air compressor system 	1-pint bottles to 5-gallon buckets	Numerous	Intact
Specialty Compressor Oils	1-gallon containers and 5-gallon buckets	Less than 20 containers	Intact
Water-based Color Dye	1-quart containers to 50-pound bags	Numerous	Damaged and Intact
Clay Filler	50-pound bags	Approximately 40 bags	Damaged and Opened

5.4.2 Interior Storage Tanks

Within the facility, four groupings of ASTs were observed during the site walkover. In the Wastewater Treatment Area of Building No. 5 (see Figure 4), three fiberglass ASTs were observed. The three ASTs are 7,000 gallons (1) and 9,000 gallons (2) in size



although the Maintenance Supervisor stated the ASTs were never completely filled. Two of the ASTs are considered the primary treatment tanks and discharge to the third tank which is the final treatment tank. In the final treatment tank, the wastewaters are treated with lime, polymers and a coagulant to reduce the pH and solids content. The treatment tank discharges to a filter press where the excess waters are discharged to the City of Franklin wastewater system under an industrial discharge permit. The solids are placed into a hopper for pickup and disposal as a solid waste.

The second set of tanks were the dye mixing and holding ASTs. The water-based color dyes were mixed in various ASTs located throughout Building No. 4 (see Figure 4) and then pumped to holding tanks for incorporation into the paper coating process. There were three areas where ASTs were located in Building No. 4. Numerous spills and releases from the water-based color dye ASTs were observed throughout Building No. 4.

As part of the coating paper process, latex was utilized for some products. The Maintenance Supervisor identified two areas where ASTs were used to mix the latex. In the area near where the pressure tank is located for the water well, latex has been released multiple times as evidenced by the buildup of dried latex on the floor due to spills and/or releases. A similar situation occurred at the other latex tank areas.

The fourth area consists of two ASTs located in a sump which acts as secondary containment. The ASTs are 1,000 gallons in capacity. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated the two ASTs were used to mix chemicals used in the coating process.

Table 11
Interior Storage Tank Summary

Tank Designation	AST or UST	Tank Contents	Tank Capacity (gallons)
Process Wastewater Treatment - P1 through P-3	AST	Wastewater from process operations at the Facility - all ASTs are fiberglass	One 7,000 & Two 9,000
Dye Mixing and Holding Tanks	AST	Water-based color dyes used	Varies from 1,800 to 2,500
Latex Tanks - L-1 through L-10	AST	Latex compound for paper coating processes - ASTs are steel and fiberglass	Varies from 500 to 7,000
Mixing Tanks (2)	AST	Unknown - both ASTs are located in a sump which acts as secondary containment	1,000

No interior USTs were identified or reported by the Maintenance Supervisor during the site walkover.



5.4.3 Odors

No strong, pungent, noxious, or unusual odors were noted during the site walkover with the exception of a solvent-like odor in the Flammable Mixing Room in Building No. 6 (see Figure 4).

5.4.4 Pools of Liquid

No unusual pools of liquid were observed inside the building during the site walkover with the exception of an occasional pool of water resulting from portions of the roof which leaks and fluids in the equalization sumps which are part of the wastewater treatment system in Building No. 5.

5.4.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

At least twelve (12) dry-type non-PCB containing transformers were identified throughout the various buildings on the Property (see Figure 4). Additional dry-type transformers made be present, but due to the placement of existi9ng equipment, not all could be identified or counted. All of the identified transformers appeared to be in good condition, although were older dry-type transformers. No evidence of any spills or releases were observed.

One wall-mounted electrical transformer was noted in the Former Finishing Department (Building No. 5 - see Figure 4) which appears to be liquid-filled rather than a dry-type transformer. Due to the height of its location and being an active transformer, confirmation could not be made if it was a liquid-filled or dry-type transformer.

Many of the pieces of equipment in the buildings may have had transformers, either dry-type or fluid-filled) built into their control and operations systems which were not readily accessible.

An airline system was noted at numerous locations throughout Building No. 4. According to the Maintenance Supervisor, he does not recall this airline system being in continuous use after he was employed at the Property in 1975. The airline system is **not** associated with a natural gas pipeline system¹⁴. The system has multiple misters and oil filters, although no oils were noted in either the misters or the filters. Staining of the wall was noted at six of the airline locations.

Note that the assessment of fluorescent light ballasts, which may contain PCBs or di-ethyl-hexyl phthalate ("DEHP"), was beyond the scope of this Phase I ESA; however, individual light ballasts were observed which apparently had been removed from their

¹⁴ USEPA, Revisions to the PCB Q and A Manual, June 2014.



light fixtures as well as fluorescent light fixtures, including four (4) feet, six (6) feet, and eight (8) feet in length. Also, most of the active lighting in the various buildings are fluorescence lights and appear to be of sufficient age to have PCB-containing or DEHP-containing light ballasts. Some broken light fixtures were opened and revealed to have light ballasts with indications that they contain PCBs.

5.4.6 Heating/Cooling

Heating of the production and warehouse buildings at the Property were a combination of overhead natural gas-fired heaters and moveable forced-air kerosene heaters which were moved around wherever additional heating was needed during the cooler months. Heating of the offices is by natural gas-fired furnaces.

A natural-gas fired boiler is located in Warehouse No. 1 (Building No. 3) for hot water used throughout the Property.

Cooling in the production and warehouse buildings at the Property was accomplished by large fans circulating air throughout the buildings; no central air conditioning was employed. Cooling in the offices, the break room and one floor manager's office in Building No. 4 was accomplished through the use of window-mounted air conditioning units.

5.4.7 Stains or Corrosion

No significant areas of staining were observed in the Maintenance Shop with the exception of the metal cutting equipment where oil-based and water-based coolants have been utilized over time.

Areas of staining were observed inside the Main Production Department (Building No. 4 - See Figure 4) during the site walkover. The most common staining observed throughout the building were the water-based color dyes used in the coating process. Also noted was staining by and accumulation of the water-based dyes in the linear floor grates, throughout Building Nos. 4 and 5. The floor grates lead to the two equalization sumps near the Wastewater Treatment Area in the Former Finishing Department (Building No. 4- see Figure 4).

Staining was also noted at the current location of the air compressor in the Building No. 4 and appears to be due to the release of air compressor oils. Near the air compressor, four 5-gallon specialty compressor oil containers were observed with staining on the bucket lids.



Staining on the walls at the locations of the air compressor lines (air filter and oil mister) were noted during the site walkover. Most of the staining appear to be the result of the lines or misters leaking down or spraying up the walls.

Near the latex tank areas in Building No. 4, extensive staining was observed on the floors. The staining is due to spilled latex which has hardened and built up over time.

Staining due to petroleum leaks from the tow motors was observed throughout the entire facility. Most of the staining was about 1 sq ft in size.

Floor and wall staining were common throughout the former Flammable Mixing Room located in the Former Print Room (Building No. 6 – see Figure 4).

Areas of deteriorated concrete were observed in the buildings at the Property including Building Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 (see Figure 4). The deterioration appears to be the result of the aging of the concrete, spilling of unknown compounds and areas at and near where lead-acid batteries (for equipment used on-site) were observed at the Property.

5.4.8 Drains and Sumps

A number of floor drains were noted within the Main Office area (Building No. 1 – see Figure 4). One drain was located near the mail/office supplies area and one in each of the two labs present within the Main Office area. The Maintenance Supervisor stated that the floor drains within the Main Office area discharge to the City of Franklin’s sanitary sewer system.

Floor sumps and drains were noted during the site walkover (see Figure 4 for some locations). Multiple floor grates were observed throughout the Building Nos. 4 and 5. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated the linear floor grates all discharge to the two equalization sumps located in the Wastewater Treatment Area in Building No. 5 (see Figure 4). At the time of the site walkover, most if not all of these grates were filled with residuals from process operations in Building No. 4. The most common residuals were color dyes which based upon their SDSs are classified as water-based chemicals and non-hazardous materials. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that some of floor grates required occasional cleaning out due to clogging but that the majority of the floor grates have never been cleaned out since he started at the facility in 1975.

There are two mixing tanks located in the Main Production Department (Building No. 4 – see Figure 4) which have been constructed in a sump which acts as secondary containment. The sump drains into one of the linear floor grate drains connected to the process wastewater treatment system.



At the location of the boiler, located in Warehouse No. 1 (Building No. 3 – see Figure 4) the floor has been built up to create a secondary containment area. This containment area also discharges into a linear floor grate drain according to the Maintenance Supervisor.

There are two equalization sumps which are part of the process wastewater treatment system located in the Wastewater Treatment Area (Building No. 5 – see Figure 4).

5.4.9 Other Observations

Wastewater generated from process operations at the Property as well as discharges from linear floor grate drains was treated on-site at the Wastewater Treatment Area located in the Former Finishing Department (Building No. 5 – see Figure 4). The following description of the wastewater operations was provided by the Operations Manager and the Maintenance Supervisor.

The wastewater treatment system consisted of two equalization sumps which collected flow for the printing operations. These two equalization sumps fed two equalization ASTs, each 9,000 gallons in size and composed of fiberglass. Fluids from the two equalization ASTs are pumped to the treatment AST (7,000 gallons in size) where the fluid is treated with lime, polymer and coagulant to reduce the pH and solid content of the untreated fluid. The treated fluids are pumped from the treatment AST to a filter press. The treated waters from the filter press are pumped into the City of Franklin sanitary sewer system under an industrial discharge permit. The solids were dumped into a hopper for pickup and disposal at a licensed solid waste landfill.

The treatment AST became non-operational in August 2018 when the blender components at the base of the treatment AST became clogged and stopped the blending operation from occurring. Wastewater was then pumped into 375-gallon totes until May 2019 when all production activities stopped at the Property.

Occasionally the lines from the production areas to the two equalization sumps would clog. A plumber would be called in to waterjet the lines. No records were available to indicate how often this occurred.

A number of the production equipment had dust collection systems attached. The dust was collected in 55-gallon steel drums. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that at one time (pre-1990's), the dust was mixed with water and then discharged into the City of Franklin sanitary sewer system under a City of Franklin industrial discharge permit. However, sometime in the 1990's the dust was shipped offsite for disposal as a non-hazardous waste.



The Maintenance Supervisor stated that a water softening system, utilizing sodium chloride tablets is attached to the water intake of the boiler system to minimize iron scaling from the hard water from the on-site industrial water well.

It was noted that many of lights in the newer buildings (Building Nos. 11 and 12) and some in the older buildings (Building Nos. 2 through 9) were mercury-vapor or sodium-vapor lamps.

In discussions with the Operations Manager, he indicated that a solvent-based printing process for “shelf-line paper” was utilized from sometime prior to 1975 to about 2002 when the Property changed compounds over to all water-based compounds. He had little further information on this process as it was used prior to his employment at MVP.



6.0 INTERVIEWS

The following persons and/or governmental entities were interviewed or emailed for information regarding current and past operations and uses of hazardous substances and petroleum products on the Property during conduct of this PIESA. If the information requested from these persons or governmental entities is not reasonably ascertainable within 20 calendar days, it is considered a data gap and is discussed in Section 9.0 of this report.

Documentation of the interviews and emails including reasonable documentation provided by the interviewees is presented in Appendix G.

Table 12
PIESA Interviewees

Name	Title	Affiliation	Date	Interviewed By
Steven Schuler	CEO	Mafeco	07/12/19	Barry Franz
Bill Nasser	Operations Manager	Miami Valley Paper LLC	07/16/19 07/31/19 11/5/19	Barry Franz
Kenneth Coyle	Maintenance Supervisor	Miami Valley Paper LLC	07/16/19 07/17/19 07/31/19 11/5/19	Barry Franz

6.1 Interview with Key Site Manager

Interviews were held with the three individuals identified in Table 12 above. The information obtained from these interviews were incorporated into the body of this Report. Mr. Kenneth Coyle, the Maintenance Supervisor, provided the most information covering operations at the Property since he was employed at the Property starting in 1975.

6.2 Interviews with Occupants

As the current owner is the current occupant, interviews are described in Section 6.1 above.

6.3 Interviews with State and/or Local Government Officials

Interviews, emails and FOIA requests were made with the following local, county and state government officials.

6.3.1 City of Franklin

A FOIA request was submitted to the City of Franklin on July 12, 2019. A letter was received on July 17, 2019 requesting additional information. A further response was sent to the City on July 22, 2019. On September 5, 2019, a response was received from



the City of Franklin (see Appendix G-1). The response contained a fire inspection report and two fire run reports for the Property. This response also contained fire inspection and fire run reports for 300 Chestnut Street (Union Camp), 415 Oxford Road (Cast Plus) and 675 Oxford Road (Atlas Roofing).

6.3.2 City of Franklin Fire Department

A FOIA request was submitted to the City of Franklin Fire Department on July 12, 2019. As of the date of this report, no information has been received directly from the fire department; however, a response was received from the City of Franklin (see Section 6.3.1).

6.3.3 Warren County Public Health District

A FOIA request was submitted to the Warren County Public Health District on July 10, 2019. A response was received on July 12, 2019 (see Appendix G-3). The response was a nuisance complain for the adjoining property at 415 Oxford Road. After the County investigated the complaint, it was deemed invalid.

6.3.4 Warren County Local Emergency Planning Commission

A FOIA request was submitted to the Warren County Local Emergency Planning Commission (“LEPC”) on July 10, 2019. A response was received on July 29, 2019 (see Appendix G-4). The response indicated that the County LEPC did not have any records for the four sites requested.

6.3.5 Southwest Ohio Air Quality Agency

A FOIA request was submitted to the Southwest Ohio Air Quality Agency (“SWOAQA”) on July 10, 2019. Responses were received on July 11 and 17, 2019 (see Appendix G-5). A number of air permits and nuisance complaint documentation was received for the Property and adjoining properties. Only that documentation for the Property is discussed here and included in Appendix G-5. The remaining documentation is available upon written request to DEC.

Documents received from SWOAQA for MVP include the following:

- Complaint reports in the years 1999 and 2000 for orange and green particulate matter being deposited on adjoining property residences.
- Complaint reports in the year 2000 for odors noted at adjoining property residences.
- Air permit listings between the years of 1992 to 2009. The 1998 air permit specifically identified VOCs being allowed to discharge at a rate of 216 pounds per day.



6.3.6 Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

A FOIA request was submitted to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on July 10, 2019. A number of documents were received for the Property and adjoining properties. Only that documentation for the Property is included in Appendix G-6. The remaining documentation is available upon written request to DEC.

- Miami Valley Paper LLC - Documentation provided is from 1996 through 2002 and addresses two items: the permitting and installation of an industrial pretreatment system; and inspections/violation documentation concerning management and disposal of hazardous wastes (VOCs used in the printing process) and their corrections. The inspections/violations and corrections occurred during a period of facility cleanup in 2001 and 2002 of all solvents and solvent-based inks used in an older printing process which ceased to be used sometime around 2000.
- Atlas Roofing - Documentation from Ohio EPA stated that the agency had no records on this facility.
- Cast Plus - Documentation from Ohio EPA stated that the agency had no records on this facility.
- Franklin Felting - Documentation from Ohio EPA stated that the agency had no records on this facility.
- Franklin Ice & Fuel - Documentation from Ohio EPA stated that the agency had no records on this facility.
- Union Camp - Documentation provided indicated the facility underwent a Preliminary Assessment by Ohio EPA and the assessment indicated that the property was a low priority for the state with a Field Investigation Team activity not recommended.
- Franklin Volatile Organic Compound ("VOC") Plume - Documentation provided indicated that Ohio EPA and its subcontractors performed an investigation in the area of the former Franklin Municipal Water Treatment Plant for the source of volatile organic compounds. Results of the plume investigation indicate that groundwater at the Franklin VOC Plume Site contained detections of four VOC compounds. A sampling point was chosen at the northwestern end of the Property. No VOC detections were made at this sampling point. A later targeted investigation (not including the Property) was conducted by an Ohio EPA contractor who detected TCE, PCE, chloroform and MTBE in various groundwater samples. According to sample results from both the Ohio EPA and their subcontractor's investigations, the source area of this TCE plume appears to be located to the south/southwest of Georgia Pacific Road and southwest of the rail line that bisects the plume investigative area. A second plume, containing PCE, was detected farther upgradient and appears to be originating from a separate source upgradient from Legacy Finishing. The final report



recommended additional efforts including permanent monitoring wells to define the source areas.

6.3.7 State Fire Marshall's Office, Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations

A FOIA request was submitted to the State Fire Marshall's Office, BUSTR on July 2, 2019. A number of documents were received for the Property and adjoining properties on July 3, 2019 (see Appendix G-7). BUSTR indicated they had no information on the adjoining properties. BUSTR did have a retroactive closure report (dated February 2013) for the two ethyl acetate USTs removed from the Property in January 2000. The closure report referenced the BUSTR regulations and action levels in effect in 2012. The conclusion of the closure report stated that no evidences of a release was detected. An NFA status was granted for the UST closure.

6.3.8 Ohio Department of Transportation, Archival Aerial Photograph Department

A request was made to the Ohio Department of Transportation, Archival Aerial Photograph Department on July 2, 2019. A response was received on July 17, 2019 indicating they had a number of archival aerial photographs for the Property. A number of the aerial photographs were used to supplement the ERIS aerial photograph package and are included in Appendix E-1 and further described in Appendix G-8.

6.3.9 Ohio State Emergency Response Commission

A FOIA request was submitted to the Ohio State Emergency Response Commission ("SERC") on July 10, 2019. A number of documents were received for the Property and adjoining properties on July 11, 2019. Only that documentation for the Property is included in Appendix G-9. The remaining documentation is available upon written request to DEC.

- The facility had a number of spills/releases from 1997 to 2002 and 2019.
 - ▶ An estimated 40-gallon petroleum release in 1997 due to a failed fuel line on a truck at the warehouse loading docks. A cleanup occurred with no petroleum reaching the Property storm sewer system.
 - ▶ A release of orange-colored materials to the surrounding streets in 1999 and 2002, and while transporting waste materials to the landfill in 2019.
- An explosion occurred at the Property in February 2002
- In the documentation concerning the fire/explosion and release of materials to the storm sewer system, Ohio EPA was going to request that the facility submit an application for a storm water permit.

6.4 Interviews with Federal Government Officials

A FOIA request was submitted to the US EPA on July 10, 2019. A call was made to Mr. Kaushal Gupta, EPA Region 5 FOIA Office on July 17, 2019 after receiving a FOIA



response indicating that it would take 45 days to respond. Information provided in the call matched up with documents received from Ohio EPA. Therefore, the FOIA request was cancelled.

6.5 Interviews with Others

No other interviews were conducted as part of this assessment.



7.0 FINDINGS AND OPINIONS

7.1 Findings

A PIESA was conducted for the Property located at 413 Oxford Road, Franklin, Warren County, Ohio 45005 in accordance with the standards set forth in ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13. Conduct of the PIESA in accordance with these standards has identified the following conditions. The logic and reasoning used in evaluating information (i.e., the rationale for concluding that a condition does or does not exist) is presented in the below sections and referenced in the table below.

Table 13
Findings Summary

On-Property Findings	REC	CREC	HREC	DC	None
Current use of the Property				X	
On-Property observations	X		X	X	
User-provided information					X
Regulatory listing of the Property			X		
Historical use of the Property	X		X		
Interviews	X		X	X	
Off-Property Findings	REC	CREC	HREC	DC	None
Current use of the surrounding properties					X
Regulatory listing of near-by properties	X				
Historical use of near-by properties	X				
Notes					
REC: Recognized Environmental Condition					
CREC: Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition					
HREC: Historic Recognized Environmental Condition					
DC: De Minimis Condition					
None: Neither a REC, CREC, HREC nor a DC.					

7.1.1 Recognized Environmental Conditions

This assessment has revealed the evidence of the following REC(s) in connection with the Property:

- **REC No. 1:** 413 Oxford Road – To the south-southeast side of Building No. 5, a UST was reportedly located. The UST was apparently removed sometime prior to 1975 according to the Maintenance Supervisor. The UST was used at various times for gasoline and diesel products. As the UST was apparently removed prior to BUSTR regulations being in effect, no closure investigation was conducted. The lack of information concerning the operation, size, and closure of this UST represents a REC.
- **REC No. 2:** 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 6, a mixing room for flammable compounds (Former Flammable Mixing Room – Building No. 6- see Figure 4)



was identified. The room has both floor and wall staining with numerous cracks in the floor slab. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that flammable materials were mixed here when the facility used a solvent-based process. The lack of information concerning the Flammable Mixing Room, the presence of staining, the presence of a cracked floor slab and the unknown compounds mixed in the room represents a REC.

- REC No. 3: - 413 Oxford Road – Due to the reported (Maintenance Supervisor and Operations Manager) use of solvents in the paper coating process, the presence of the Former Flammable Mixing Room (See REC No. 2), the fact that process waste waters flow through the linear floor grate drains, the lack of information on what solvents were used, and disposal of said solvents all give rise to the consideration of a REC.
- REC No. 4: - 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 10, a number of 55-gallon drums of used oil was removed by MVP’s contractor. The drums were removed, characterized and disposed of properly. However, staining of the lower walls along with a floor that is stained and deteriorated represents a REC.
- REC No. 5: - 413 Oxford Road – Based upon a review of aerial photographs and fire insurance maps (see Appendices E-1 and E-2), an on-property power plant was revealed within the building footprint of Warehouse No. 3 (Building No. 11 – see Figure 4). The fire insurance maps identified at least two tanks at the Former Power Plant believed to be diesel fuel. The tanks were not identified as either ASTs or USTs. Warehouse No. 3 was constructed in 1975 prior to the start of employment of the Maintenance Supervisor. Little to no information and/or documentation is available concerning this power plant. Due to the lack of information and the presence of the two tanks represents a REC.
- REC No. 6: - Franklin VOC Plume – Ohio EPA has conducted two preliminary investigations of the area surrounding the Property as well as the installation of a temporary groundwater sampling point in the northwestern portion of the Property. Although the initial investigation did not detect any VOCs in the single use temporary sampling point, the latter investigation detected TCE, PCE, chloroform and MTBE in various groundwater samples around the Property. There is no record of chlorinated solvent use at the Property and MTBE was not used as a gasoline additive during the time the UST identified in REC No. 1 was in use.

According to Ohio EPA’s subcontractor’s investigations, the source area of the TCE plume appears to be located to the southwest of the adjoining rail line that bisects the plume investigative area. A second plume, containing PCE, was detected farther upgradient and appears to be originating from a separate source upgradient from Legacy Finishing. The lack of knowledge concerning the source area of this VOC Plume, its potential to impact the groundwater at the Property,



the use of the on-site groundwater well, and the potential for vapor encroachment represents a REC.

Figure 5 (Appendix A) presents a general location map of the Property showing the locations of the RECs. Figure 6 (Appendix A) presents the findings from Ohio EPA's "Franklin TCE Investigation - August 2016 Ground Water Sampling Results".

7.1.2 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions

This assessment has revealed no evidence of a CREC in connection with the Property.

7.1.3 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions

This assessment has revealed the evidence of the HREC in connection with the Property:

- HREC No. 1: 413 Oxford Road - To the northwest of Building No. 8, the Former Clay Shed, two USTs were removed in 2000, one 4,000 gallons and one 3,000 gallons containing ethyl acetate. At the time of removal, no closure report was prepared and submitted to BUSTR. A retroactive closure report was prepared in 2013 and submitted to BUSTR. No evidence of any releases (visual or odors) was detected during the retroactive closure activities. Laboratory analysis (US EPA Method 8260) did not detect ethyl acetate and acetic acid above method detection limits. Ethyl acetate is a solvent for inks used in the printing process. Acetic acid is a by-product of the chemical breakdown of ethyl acetate. BUSTR issued an NFA status for the two USTs in mid-2013. Comparison to current US EPA and Ohio EPA action levels indicate the results are below unrestricted use standards. Although this condition meets the definition of a HREC, it does not rise to the level of a REC.

Figure 5 (Appendix A) presents a general location map of the Property showing the locations of the HREC.

7.1.4 De Minimis Conditions

This assessment revealed the following two DCs at the Property:

- DC No. 1: There are numerous dark oily/greasy stains on the floor of Building Nos. 3 through 12, on the walls near the air compressor lines at the oil filters and misters in Building Nos. 4, 5, and 9, and outside the buildings. These stains are apparently the result of leakage from vehicles, tow motors and other pieces of equipment such as hydraulic leaks. These constitute a DC condition, which is not considered a REC.



7.2 Vapor Encroachment Screening

DEC conducted a VES generally utilizing the Tier 1 methodology as outlined in the ASTM Standard E 2600-15 *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions* to determine whether a vapor encroachment condition (“VEC”) exists on or to the Property, that a VEC likely exists, a VEC cannot be ruled out, or a VEC does not exist. A VEC is ‘presence or likely presence of chemicals of concern (“COC”) (i.e., petroleum hydrocarbons and/or compounds with a sufficient vapor pressure to vaporize) vapors in the subsurface of the subject property caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil and/or groundwater on or to the subject property.’¹⁵

The Tier 1 analysis involves a review of physical setting records (Section 4.2), the regulatory database report (Appendix D), available historical records (Appendix E) and interview documentation (Appendix G) to make a determination if any known or suspect potentially contaminated sites exist within the VES search radius distances. The area of concern (“AOC”) is defined as any upgradient, cross or down gradient sites within the approximate minimum search distances of approximately 0.33 miles for volatile organic compounds and 0.10 miles for petroleum products.

The vapor migration/intrusion pathway is very complex and can vary considerably within a site. It should be noted that this “screening” is not an absolute and definitive methodology for confirming vapor migration/intrusion impacts. Property specific impacts from vapor migration/intrusion can only be determined through a specific testing program. No such testing program was undertaken as part of this PIESA.

This assessment revealed that a VEC cannot be ruled out on the Property and has been taken into consideration when identifying the RECs above.

7.3 Business Environmental Risks

This assessment revealed the following BERs at the Property:

- **BER No. 1:** Potential Asbestos-Containing Building Materials – There are multiple areas of potential asbestos-containing building materials (“ACBM”) identified during the site visit. The first area is the front office area of the Main offices (Building No. 1) where brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement was observed. A second area was also noted in the Main Offices in the Physical Lab area where tan 9x9-inch square tiles floor tile was observed. The second-floor operations office located in the Main Production Department (Building No. 4) had brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement

¹⁵ ASTM Standard E 2600-15 Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions, Section 3.2.37.



holding the tiles in place. Immediately below the operations office in the locker room, brown floor tile similar to that in the operations room was observed. All of these floor tiles appear to be in reasonable shape (i.e. in a non-friable condition at the present).

- BER No. 2: Another potential ACBM is due to the age of the roofs of the buildings. The roofs have been repaired over the years, but no known or reported materials testing of the roof materials has occurred. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that some portions of the buildings on the Property have roofs on them that pre-date his working at the Property. The roofs appear to be similar to many roofs which used ACBM in the manufacturer of the roofing tiles.
- BER No. 3: Due to the overall age of the various building at the Property, the potential for lead-based paint (“LBP”) is present. Although no observations of the typical peeled paint characteristic of LBP was noted, the age of the facility makes this a consideration.

7.4 Opinion

The logic and reasoning used in evaluating information (i.e., the rationale for concluding that a condition is or is not a REC, CREC, HREC or a DC and whether a VEC exists) is presented in Sections 4 through 7 in which the information is reviewed and an opinion developed by the Environmental Professional. It is the opinion of the Environmental Professional that RECs and HRECs are identifiable to or on the Property based upon the work performed and that a VEC likely exists on the Property. In addition, a number of DCs were identified as described in Section 7.1.4 and BERs as described in Section 7.3.



8.0 ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

With regard to this PIESA, no additional investigation is suggested to detect the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products in regards to determining whether a REC, CREC, HREC, or de minimis condition(s) exists on or to the Property as part of this PIESA.



9.0 DATA GAPS

A data gap is the lack of or inability to obtain information required by the ASTM Standard despite good faith efforts to gather such information. A data gap is not inherently significant. Data failure, as defined by the ASTM Standard Practice, is a type of data gap, but not necessarily a significant data gap. Significant data gaps are those that affect the ability of the Environmental Professional to identify RECs.

9.1 Identification of Data Gaps

DEC did encounter data gaps during the performance of this PIESA. If a significant data gap is identified in the below table, a discussion of the data gap and conclusions associated with that data gap is discussed in the following sections.

Table 14
Summary of Potential Data Gaps

Report Section	Information/Data	Data	Data Gap Present	Significant Data Gap	Additional Action(s) Required
User-Provided Information					
3.1	Environmental Liens or AUL	Obtained	No	No	No
3.2	Specialized Knowledge	Client-provided	No	No	No
3.3	Commonly Know Information	Client-provided	No	No	No
3.4	Valuation Reduction	Client-provided	No	No	No
Historical Use Information					
4.3.1	Aerial Photographs	Obtained	No	No	No
4.3.2	Fire Insurance Maps	Obtained	No	No	No
4.3.3	Property Tax Records & Title Records	Obtained	No	No	No
4.3.4	Building Records	Obtained	No	No	No
4.3.5	Topographic Maps	Obtained	No	No	No
4.3.6	Local Street & City Directory	Obtained	No	No	No
Site and Area Walkover					
5.3	Exterior Observation	Accessible	Yes	Yes	No
5.4	Interior Observations	Accessible	Yes	Yes	No
Interviews					
6.1	Key Site Manager	Obtained	No	No	No
6.2	Past Owner/ Operator/Occupants	Obtained	Yes	Yes	No
6.3	State/Local Government Officials	Obtained	No	No	No



9.2 Sources of Information Consulted to Address Data Gaps

Per the Standard Guidance, DEC has relied upon user-provided information to complete this PIESA report. If the user fails to provide this information to DEC, it could result in a determination that “all appropriate inquiry” for this Property is incomplete. Furthermore, DEC is not responsible for any errors or omissions associated with the user-provided information.

There were data gaps identified for this PIESA report. Data gaps were identified for the Property as follows:

- Limited information available for the years prior to 1947;
- Limited access to specific areas of the Property during the site visit; and
- Lack of previous occupants of the Property for purposes of interviewing.

9.3 Significance of Data Gaps

DEC did encounter project history data gaps during the performance of this PIESA for the periods of 1908-1916, 1916-1926, 1926-1938 and 1940-1947. Based upon the information and documentation reviewed, DEC’s Environmental Professional is of the opinion that these project history data gaps rise do not rise to the level of a significant data gap.

Other data gaps identified included portions of the Property being inaccessible during the site walkover due to very limited access (would have to access through adjoining properties) and the locations of equipment prohibiting visual observations. These data gaps arise to the level of a significant data gap and have been taken into consideration when identifying RECs and the Property.

The lack of complete responses from the City of Franklin and the City of Franklin Fire Department represents a data gap. However, obtaining of information from other sources has allowed DEC’s Environmental Professional to formulate opinions and conclusions. Therefore, DEC’s Environmental Professional does not believe these data gaps rise to the level of a significant data gap.



10.0 CONCLUSIONS

DEC LLC has performed a PIESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527 for the Property located at 413 Oxford Road, 413 Oxford Road. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Sections 2, 5.1 and 11 of this report. This assessment has revealed evidence of one of the three types of RECs or DCs in connection with the Property:

- REC No. 1: 413 Oxford Road – To the south-southeast side of Building No. 5, a UST was reportedly located. The UST was apparently removed sometime prior to 1975 according to the Maintenance Supervisor. The UST was used at various times for gasoline and diesel products. As the UST was apparently removed prior to BUSTR regulations being in effect, no closure investigation was conducted. The lack of information concerning the operation, size, and closure of this UST represents a REC.
- REC No. 2: 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 6, a mixing room for flammable compounds (Former Flammable Mixing Room – Building No. 6- see Figure 4) was identified. The room has both floor and wall staining with numerous cracks in the floor slab. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that flammable materials were mixed here when the facility used a solvent-based process. The lack of information concerning the Flammable Mixing Room, the presence of staining, the presence of a cracked floor slab and the unknown compounds mixed in the room represents a REC.
- REC No. 3: - 413 Oxford Road – Due to the reported (Maintenance Supervisor and Operations Manager) use of solvents in the paper coating process, the presence of the Former Flammable Mixing Room (See REC No. 2), the fact that process waste waters flow through the linear floor grate drains, the lack of information on what solvents were used, and disposal of said solvents all give rise to the consideration of a REC.
- REC No. 4: - 413 Oxford Road – In Building No. 10, a number of 55-gallon drums of used oil was removed by MVP’s contractor. The drums were removed, characterized and disposed of properly. However, staining of the lower walls along with a floor that is stained and deteriorated represents a REC.
- REC No. 5: - 413 Oxford Road – Based upon a review of aerial photographs and fire insurance maps (see Appendices E-1 and E-2), an on-property power plant was revealed within the building footprint of Warehouse No. 3 (Building No. 11 – see Figure 4). The fire insurance maps identified at least two tanks at the Former Power Plant believed to be diesel-type fuel tanks for powering the plant. The tanks were not identified as either ASTs or USTs. Warehouse No. 3 was constructed in 1975 prior to the start of employment of the Maintenance Supervisor. Little to no information and/or documentation is available



concerning this plant. Due to the lack of information and the presence of the two tanks represents a REC.

- REC No. 6: - Franklin VOC Plume - Ohio EPA has conducted two preliminary investigations of the area surrounding the Property as well as the installation of a temporary groundwater sampling point in the northwestern portion of the Property. Although the initial investigation did not detect any VOCs in the single use temporary sampling point, the latter investigation detected TCE, PCE, chloroform and MTBE in various groundwater samples around the Property. There is no record of chlorinated solvent use at the Property and MTBE was not used as a gasoline additive during the time the UST identified in REC No. 1 was in use.

According to Ohio EPA's subcontractor's investigations, the source area of the TCE plume appears to be located to the southwest of the adjoining rail line that bisects the plume investigative area. A second plume, containing PCE, was detected farther upgradient and appears to be originating from a separate source upgradient from Legacy Finishing. The lack of knowledge concerning the source area of this VOC Plume, its potential to impact the groundwater at the Property, the use of the on-site groundwater well, and the potential for vapor encroachment represents a REC.

- HREC No. 1: 413 Oxford Road - To the northwest of Building No. 8, the Former Clay Shed, two USTs were removed in 2000, one 4,000 gallons and one 3,000 gallons containing ethyl acetate. At the time of removal, no closure report was prepared and submitted to BUSTR. A retroactive closure report was prepared in 2013 and submitted to BUSTR. No evidence of any releases (visual or odors) was detected during the retroactive closure activities. Laboratory analysis (US EPA Method 8260) did not detect ethyl acetate and acetic acid above method detection limits. Ethyl acetate is a solvent for inks used in the printing process. Acetic acid is a by-product of the chemical breakdown of ethyl acetate. BUSTR issued an NFA status for the two USTs in mid-2013. Comparison to current US EPA and Ohio EPA action levels indicate the results are below unrestricted use standards. Although this condition meets the definition of a HREC, it does not rise to the level of a REC.

Figure 5 (Appendix A) presents a general location map of the Property showing the locations of the RECS and HREC.

BERs were identified in connection with the property. The following BERs were identified:

- BER No. 1: Potential Asbestos-Containing Building Materials - There are multiple areas of potential asbestos-containing building materials ("ACBM")



identified during the site visit. The first area is the front office area of the Main offices (Building No. 1) where brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement was observed. A second area was also noted in the Main Offices in the Physical Lab area where tan 9x9-inch square tiles floor tile was observed. The second-floor operations office located in the Main Production Department (Building No. 4) had brown 9x9-inch square tiles with a fibrous mastic cement holding the tiles in place. Immediately below the operations office in the locker room, brown floor tile similar to that in the operations room was observed. All of these floor tiles appear to be in reasonable shape (i.e. in a non-friable condition at the present).

- BER No. 2: Another potential ACBM is due to the age of the roofs of the buildings. The roofs have been repaired over the years, but no known or reported materials testing of the roof materials has occurred. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that some portions of the buildings on the Property have roofs on them that pre-date his working at the Property. The roofs appear to be similar to many roofs which used ACBM in the manufacturer of the roofing tiles.
- BER No. 3: Due to the overall age of the various building at the Property, the potential for lead-based paint (“LBP”) is present. Although no observations of the typical peeled paint characteristic of LBP was noted, the age of the facility makes this a consideration.



11.0 NON-SCOPE SERVICES

Services outside the scope of this Standard Practice were not provided as part of this PIESA.



12.0 LIMITING CONDITIONS/DEVIATIONS

Any exceptions to, or deviations from ASTM Standard Practice E1527 in the conduct of this PIESA are briefly described in Sections 2 and 5.1 of this report. As noted in those section, no exceptions to or deviations from the Standard were noted.



13.0 REFERENCES

References for site-specific information obtained from published sources and summarized in this report for the Property are noted in the text or included as footnotes throughout the report.

13.1 Agencies

City of Franklin – Ms. Lynnette Dinkler, Law Director, Franklin, Ohio

City of Franklin Fire Department – Chief Westendorf, Franklin, Ohio

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency – Southwest District Office, Ms. Penny Prather, Dayton, Ohio.

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency – Central Office, Mr. Richard Boudier, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio State Emergency Response Commission – Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know, Columbus, Ohio

Southwest Ohio Air Quality Agency - Ms. Kerri Castlen, Cincinnati, Ohio

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 5, FOIA Officer, Chicago, Illinois.

Warren County Health District, Records Manager, Lebanon, Ohio

Warren County Emergency Management Agency – Mr. David Woods, Lebanon, Ohio

13.2 Documents

No documents were received from the User nor obtained from other sources, with the exception of governmental agency documents, during the course of this PIESA.

13.3 Previous Reports

No previous reports were received from the User during the course of this PIESA. Other sources were utilized to obtain previous reports conducted on the Property.

13.4 Website References

Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological Survey, Mine Locator Interactive Map Website:

<https://gis.ohiodnr.gov/MapView/?config=OhioMines>



Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Geological Survey, Oil & Gas Well Locator Interactive Map Website:

<https://gis.ohiodnr.gov/MapView/?config=oilgaswells>

Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Water Resources, Groundwater Mapping:

<http://water.ohiodnr.gov/maps/groundwater-resources-maps>

<http://water.ohiodnr.gov/maps/pollution-potential-maps>

Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Soil and Water Resources, Groundwater Mapping and Technical Services Water Well Locator:

<https://apps.ohiodnr.gov/water/maptechs/wellogs/appNEW/>

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Source Water Assessment and Protection Program:

<http://epa.ohio.gov/ddagw/swap.aspx>

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, eDocument Search Website:

<http://edocpub.epa.ohio.gov/publicportal/edochome.aspx>

State Fire Marshall's Office, Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations:

<https://apps.com.ohio.gov/fire/OTTER>

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey:

<http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map Service Center:

<https://msc.fema.gov/portal>

<http://fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=49069b91c14a411fa8defccf5c1f6266>

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Envirofacts Website:

<https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/>

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, FOIA Online Website:

<https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/request/publicPreCreate>

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, FRS Query Page Website:

<https://www.epa.gov/enviro/frs-query-page>



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Sole Source Aquifers Website:

<https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b>

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper:

<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>

U.S. Geological Survey, Map Locator & Downloader website:

<https://store.usgs.gov/map-locator>



14.0 SIGNATURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL

I, Barry J Franz declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in 40 CFR Part 312.10. I have the specific qualifications based on education, training and experience to assess a property of the nature, history and setting of the Property. I have developed and performed all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Barry J. Franz
Environmental Professional

November 13, 2019
Original Date

March 3, 2020
Revised Date

Diversified Environmental Consulting, LLC
PO Box 518
Maineville, OH 45039

Mr. Franz's qualifications as an Environmental Professional is presented in Appendix H.