



**PHASE I/II ENVIRONMENTAL
SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

170 FRANKLIN STREET

STONEHAM MASSACHUSETTS

for

John M. Corcoran & Company LLC

June 13, 2013

Project No. 5561



June 13, 2013

John M. Corcoran & Company LLC
100 Grandview Road, Suite 203
Braintree, MA 02184

Attention: Mr. Peter Mahoney

Reference: 170 Franklin Street; Stoneham, Massachusetts
Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith is our Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment Report prepared for the property located at 170 Franklin Street in Stoneham, Massachusetts, herein referred to as the "subject site." The general site locus is shown on the enclosed Figure 1, and the boundaries of the subject site are shown on the enclosed Figure 2. This letter provides an executive summary of our findings.

This report was prepared by McPhail Associates, LLC in accordance with our agreement with John M. Corcoran & Company LLC dated December 12, 2012, and is subject to the limitations included in Appendix A.

This environmental site assessment was conducted pursuant to the provisions contained in ASTM E 1527-05, "Standard Guide for Environmental Site Assessment: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process", as referred to in 40 CFR Part 312 (the All Appropriate Inquiries Rule). The objective of the environmental assessment was to identify the potential presence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), as defined by ASTM, at the subject site or on nearby property that may pose a threat to the subject site. The Massachusetts Oil and Hazardous Materials (OHM) Release Prevention and Response Act (MGL Chapter 21E) and Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) 310 CMR 40.0000 were utilized in our evaluation of the potential presence of RECs as defined herein.

The objectives of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as defined in the ASTM E-1527-05 Standard, are to identify the presence of RECs at the subject site or on surrounding properties that may potentially pose a threat to the subject site. The objective of the Phase II portion of this Environmental Assessment was to assess the potential impacts to soil and groundwater from the current and historical use as a farm, which was identified in the Phase I portion of our assessment as a potential REC.

Our scope of services consisted of the following: (i) a visual reconnaissance of the site and surrounding properties, (ii) an assessment of the subject site history relative to the possible presence of oil and hazardous materials (OHM) at the subject site; (iii) a search of the Town of Stoneham municipal records for permits issued for the storage and/or use of oil or hazardous materials (OHM) at the subject site; (iv) a database search of Federal and State records including the National Priorities List, the CERCLA List and the RCRIS Handlers List by EDR Inc.; (v) a search of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) online database for records of incidents involving releases of oil and/or hazardous materials at and in the vicinity of the subject site; (vi) a subsurface exploration consisting of borings and test pits and installation of groundwater monitoring wells, (vii) the screening of soil samples obtained from the borings completed as part of our subsurface exploration for the presence of total volatile organic compounds (TVOC) utilizing a photoionization detector (PID); (viii) chemical analysis of selected soil and groundwater samples obtained from the explorations; (ix) subcontracting with a hazardous building material consultant to conduct a survey of the subject site buildings for the presence of asbestos



John M. Corcoran & Co. LLC
June 13, 2013
Page 2

containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint (LBP); and (x) assessing the above and documenting the results in a Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment Report.

The scope of our Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment did not include an assessment of the property for the presence of mold, radon, urea formaldehyde foam insulation (UFFI), or other naturally occurring pollutants. Further, our scope of services did not include a title or environmental lien search.

Fronting onto Franklin Street to the south, the approximate 27.2-acre subject site is bounded by residential properties to the east and west and undeveloped woodland and wetlands to the north. Currently, the subject site is occupied by an active landscaping products retailer that also imports and composts landscaping waste for resale.

A review of historical records indicated that the subject site was undeveloped prior to 1929 when it was developed for use as a dairy farm. Further research indicates that around 1978 utilization of the farm transitioned to a landscaping products retailer that included importation of landscaping materials, including yard waste, for on-site composting and resale. The current and historic usage of the subject site as a farm and an importer of landscaping materials including landscaping waste for on-site composting was taken into consideration during our environmental review.

Research of federal and state records was conducted by EDR Inc. of Milford, Connecticut, and is summarized in a database report dated May 7, 2013. The report includes a records search of federal and state database information indicating potential environmental matters within ASTM-established minimum search distances. Based on our review of the EDR report, the subject site is not a DEP-listed MCP Disposal Site. Further, a review of the information provided in the available databases searched by EDR indicated that the majority of the properties located in the immediate vicinity of the subject site did not pose a threat of impact to the subject site and therefore were not considered RECs. However, the search of the DEP online database did identify three (3) MCP release sites located within a 1/8-mile radius of the subject site that warranted further review.

According to files available on the DEP online database, response actions performed at the three above-mentioned release sites included remediation of the source of contamination and/or the released OHM from the release site. Further, records searched indicated that each of these three (3) disposal sites were reported to have achieved either a Class A-1, A-2 or A-3 RAO, indicating that a Permanent Solution was achieved. Therefore, we concluded that the three (3) MCP disposal sites are not RECs with respect to the subject site.

A hazardous materials survey was completed at the site by Smith & Wessel Associates, Inc. (SWA) on May 23, 2013. The scope of the survey was to assess the subject site buildings for the presence of asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint (LBP). The results of the survey identified both LBP and ACBM within the subject site barn structures. The SWA report has been included with this report. The findings and recommendations of the SWA hazardous materials survey has been incorporated into this assessment.

A review of records at the Stoneham Fire Department's Fire Prevention Office relating to the storage of OHM identified a permit to maintain a 500-gallon fuel oil AST at the subject site. A walk over and visual reconnaissance of the subject site was performed by a representative of McPhail Associates, LLC on May 17, 2013. We noted the presence of the permitted 500-gallon AST and observed that it was in good condition. However, during our visual reconnaissance of the interior of the subject site buildings, we



John M. Corcoran & Co. LLC
June 13, 2013
Page 3

observed storage of a relatively large amount of miscellaneous containers likely containing paint, oils and other chemicals in both marked and unmarked drums and containers in various conditions. Furthermore, we observed minor staining on the concrete slabs throughout the former horse barn and the maintenance building and used spill absorbent around several of the oil storage areas within the maintenance garage. The housekeeping practices concerning the storage of OHM in the former horse barn and the maintenance building is considered an REC at the subject site.

The Phase II portion of our environmental site assessment consisted of performance of a subsurface exploration program that included collection of soil and groundwater samples and laboratory analysis of the samples for the presence of contamination that would indicate if the current and historic utilization of the subject site as a farm has impacted the soil and groundwater at the subject site.

Over the period of May 16 through 17, 2013, McPhail conducted a subsurface exploration program at the subject site. The subsurface exploration program consisted of the excavation of thirteen test pits, three hand-dug test pits, and the advancement of three soil borings that were subsequently completion as groundwater monitoring wells. Soil and groundwater samples were submitted to a laboratory for analysis for the presence of a range of contaminants that included arsenic, lead, polychlorinated biphenyls, herbicides, pesticides, semivolatile organics and volatile organic compounds. The analysis of soil and groundwater samples identified the presence of each of the tested compounds at concentrations below the laboratory method detection limits and/or below the applicable RCS-1 standard for soil and the applicable RCGW-2 standard for groundwater in each of the samples analyzed.

Based on the results of the chemical testing of soil and groundwater samples, we identified no evidence that the current and historic use of the subject site as a landscaping products processing facility and dairy farm has resulted in the soil and groundwater at the subject site being significantly impacted by the constituents that were analyzed as part of this study.

We note that the presence of lead and several polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were detected at concentrations that, although below the applicable RCS-1 reporting thresholds, would warrant additional chemical testing and characterization as required per DEP soil management policies if development of the subject site results in generation of excess fill material that requires off-site reuse and/or disposal. These soils generally do not present issues if they are re-used on-site or left undisturbed.

In conclusion, we have performed an Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM E-1527-05 for the property at 170 Franklin Street in Stoneham, Massachusetts. Any exceptions to, or deletions from this practice are described in the Data Gap section of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of *Recognized Environmental Conditions* in connection with the subject site with the exception of the following:

Housekeeping practices concerning the storage of OHM in the former horse barn and the maintenance building.

A summary of our recommendations, as described in our assessment, include removal and legal off-site disposal of all oil and/or hazardous materials contained in the subject site buildings. Further, during demolition of the subject site building slabs, concrete that has been visibly impacted with petroleum should be segregated and legally disposed of off-site. Additionally, we recommend a contingency be maintained during the construction phase of the project to in order to manage the potential of unanticipated USTs or localized contamination related to the historic use of the subject site as a farm, although based upon the



John M. Corcoran & Co. LLC
June 13, 2013
Page 4

sampling and analytical testing performed at the site, such areas, if present, are not anticipated to be widespread.

Finally, we recommend that management or removal of asbestos containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint (LBP) be performed in accordance with recommendations from Smith & Wessel Associates, Inc. as described in their report contained herein.

We trust that the above is sufficient for your present requirements. Should you have any questions concerning this report, please do not hesitate to call us.

Very truly yours,

McPHAIL ASSOCIATES, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Stone", written over a white background.

Andrew D. Stone

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. J. Fennick", written over a white background.

Thomas J. Fennick, P.E., L.S.P.

Enclosures
COVERS\3892 ESA-PH-I-II Cov Letter.wpd
ADS/tjf