



2105 Newpoint Place, Suite 600
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043
P (770) 623-0755
F (770) 623-9628
Terracon.com

February 2, 2022

Atlanta Police Foundation Inc.
191 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 191
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Attn: Mr. Marshall Freeman, Chief Operating Officer
E: mfreeman@atlantapolicfoundation.org

Re: Limited Site Investigation/Phase II Report
Terracon Project No. 49217142A dated December 21, 2021

Dear Mr. Freeman:

Terracon Consultants, Inc. (Terracon) is pleased to provide this response to the following questions regarding the Limited Site Investigation (LSI)/Phase II Report recently completed by Terracon.

As engineers, scientists, and technical professionals, we appreciate the opportunity to reiterate the findings documented in the submitted reports. Our employee-owners work side-by-side with project partners and are committed to delivering quality services. Together, we share the goal of making meaningful impacts to our community.

Question set #1:

1. Why did the development team claim the limited site investigation was a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report when Terracon itself doesn't call it that, it isn't the name of the report, it cannot be seen as a replacement of a full Phase II ESA report and was, as Terracon pointed out in the limited site investigation, not restricted by ASTM E1903-11 professional standards?

As stated in Section 2.1 of the Terracon LSI/Phase II Report, Terracon's services were performed in a manner consistent with generally accepted practices of the profession undertaken in similar studies in the same geographical area during the same time and were not restricted by ASTM E1903-11. The LSI/Phase II scope of services was derived after an evaluation of the site via the completion of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) conducted pursuant to the ASTM E1527-13 standard. The recognized environmental conditions (RECs) identified in the ESA were evaluated during the Terracon the LSI/Phase II pursuant to and/or in exceedance of the ASTM E1903-11 standard.

2. Why was the vicinity of the 20,000 gallon above ground storage tank (AST) not part of the soil and groundwater sampling when this was one of the significant data gaps and potentially an REC pointed out by Terracon in both the Phase I ESA and this limited site investigation?

The lack of historical information associated with the AST was identified as a significant data gap in the Phase I ESA. The AST was observed staged atop concrete supports and was previously decommissioned by others. Based on observations made subsequent to completion of the Phase I ESA, the AST has been

out of use for many years as evidenced by a hole cut into one end and faded graffiti painted on the interior and exterior walls. No indication of aboveground or underground piping was observed in the area surrounding the AST and no evidence of a current or former pump island was observed. Terracon did not observe indications that the AST was formerly used to contain hazardous substances and/or petroleum products. No stained soil, stressed vegetation, or releases were observed in the vicinity of the AST. Based on site observations and given the proximity of the AST to the on-site ponds and the historical farming operations conducted on-site, it appears that the AST was previously used to contain water for agricultural operations. As such, soil sampling adjacent to the AST was not deemed necessary. Terracon also understands the client plans to remove the AST from the site and send to a recycling facility.

3. Why wasn't any soil boring done inside building B2, which contains a fueling island and stained concrete, and was pointed out as a potential REC (an area with a likelihood of pollution) by Terracon in the Phase I ESA and this limited site investigation?

See response to Question #10.

4. The old Atlanta Prison farm has been used as a farm for over 70 years, this is a known fact. So why weren't the soil and groundwater samples checked for pesticides, herbicides and other pollutants related to farming?

While historical operations have included farming, a review of the information detailed in the Phase I ESA did not identify evidence of bulk storage, disposal, mixing or blending, improper storage, emitting, spilling, dumping, or widespread application of agrochemicals. As such, historical farming was not identified as an REC in the Phase I ESA.

The following should also be noted:

According to ASTM E1527-13 Appendix X1.1.1.12 Exclusions from Definition of "Release" (5): the normal application of fertilizer is excluded from the definition of a Release under the conditions observed by Terracon.

Georgia Environmental Protection division (GEPD) Rule 391-3-19.04(2)(f) excludes "Releases of a pesticide which has been registered under the Georgia Pesticide Control Act, O.C.G.A § [2-7-50](#) et seq., when the release consists solely of the use of said pesticide in a manner consistent with its label or labeling;" from GEPD Hazardous Site Response notification requirements.

GEPD Rule 391-3-19.04(2)(k) excludes "Releases arising from the application to soil of fertilizers, liming materials, or soil amendments (unless any are used in a manner constituting disposal as defined and regulated in the Rules for Hazardous Waste Management, Chapter 391-3-11;" from GEPD Hazardous Site Response notification requirements.

5. Why hasn't there been testing done for (total) petroleum hydrocarbons when the fuel source of the boiler room has been deemed a significant data gap in both the Phase I ESA and the limited site investigation?

The samples collected from this area were submitted for laboratory analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by EPA Method 8260 and semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs) by EPA Method

8270. These EPA analytical methods include the individual petroleum constituents currently regulated by GEPD.

It should also be noted that GEPD Rule 391-3-19.04(2)(h) excludes "Releases of any petroleum-based fuel, lubricant, or hydraulic fluid;" from GEPD Hazardous Site Response notification requirements; and, GEPD Rule 391-3-15 Underground Storage Tank Management does not currently have a threshold or sampling requirement for TPH by EPA Method 9071.

6. Why has there been no testing done for total petroleum hydrocarbons when there is a history of their use, and their remediation from soils surrounding underground storage tanks (USTs) previously found at this site?

The samples collected by Terracon were submitted for laboratory analysis for VOCs by EPA Method 8260 and SVOCs by EPA Method 8270. These EPA analytical methods include the individual petroleum constituents currently regulated by GEPD. As stated in Question #6, the area where UST operations were formerly conducted was previously remediated by others and received NFA by GEPD on February 1, 2006. See response to Question #10 for additional information.

7. Why was no soil sampling/testing done on the grading and excavation sites associated with the farm activity of the prison farm, when this is also named by Terracon as a possible REC site (site of likely pollution or petroleum contamination)?

Soil borings B-5, B-7, B-8, and B-9 were advanced in areas where grading and/or excavation occurred as depicted on historical aerial photographs. Numerous samples were collected from these boring locations and submitted for the same analytical suite as other samples. The metals barium, chromium, lead, and zinc as well as a trace concentration of acetone (in one sample) were detected in several of these samples; however, these constituents were not detected at concentrations above the applicable GEPD thresholds, and the metals detected are consistent with naturally-occurring background concentrations. Therefore, no additional sampling was warranted.

8. Have any test pits been excavated in the areas of debris and possible landfilled areas to further assess the potential for, and nature of, buried materials as was suggested by Terracon in their Phase I ESA report, and if not, why?

Test pits have not been advanced because a physical review of soil conditions and laboratory analytical results from 30 soil samples collected from 18 environmental soil borings and a physical review of soil conditions from an additional 25 geotechnical borings (to depths of 25 feet bgs) have not identified evidence of buried debris. In the event evidence of buried debris is encountered during future activities, these areas would be investigated and remediated as needed.

9. The Phase I ESA report points out that the monitoring well from the key road landfill closest to the site exhibited concentrations of 4 metals significantly above background levels. Those metals are Barium, Cobalt, Mercury and Zinc. If this is a known REC why weren't any soil samples, especially soil samples taken from drills B10 and B11, closest to the landfill, tested for Cobalt?

Soil samples were not submitted for laboratory analysis for cobalt because cobalt was previously detected by others in groundwater at an off-site source (the landfill). Therefore, the media of concern is impacted groundwater migrating to the site from the off-site landfill, not impacted soil. Terracon did

not identify information which would indicate that cobalt was historically used, stored, and/or generated at the site. Additionally, per Appendix I of GEPD Rule 391-3-19, cobalt is not regulated in soil. While cobalt was previously detected by others at a concentration above background concentrations (in groundwater), the concentration at which cobalt was detected was below the Groundwater Protection Standard as reported in the Groundwater and Surfacewater Semi-Annual Monitoring Report, N 29 Monitoring Event, Key Road Landfill, dated September 18, 2013 conducted by Oasis Consulting Services. It should also be noted that the concentration of cobalt detected in groundwater by Oasis is also below the background concentration of 25 parts per million (ppm) for soil provided in Appendix I of GEPD Rule 391-3-19. As such, Terracon has not identified any information indicating that cobalt is a constituent of concern in site soil.

10. What substantiated the decision to do boring B12 in the location where it was done (outside of building B2)?

Access limitations (small doorways and dilapidated building conditions) prevented drilling equipment from entering this building. As such, soil boring B-12 was advanced on the exterior wall of the building, immediately adjacent to and downgradient of the area of concern inside the building. Shallow soil samples were collected from depths of 0 to 3 feet bgs and 6 to 8 feet bgs (the appropriate depths for fuel islands and associated underground product piping) and submitted for laboratory analysis. No constituents of concern (including petroleum) were detected above laboratory reporting limits. The metals barium, chromium, and zinc were detected at concentrations consistent with naturally-occurring background concentrations and did not exceed the respective GEPD Notification Concentrations. Therefore, the detections of these metals does not constitute a Release pursuant to GEPD Rule 391-3-19 and do not require reporting to GEPD. As detailed in the Phase I ESA report, additional investigations previously conducted by others included the closure (by removal) of former underground storage tanks (USTs) and exterior product piping and over excavation and off-site disposal of impacted soil previously identified in this area. GEPD granted a No Further Action (NFA) on February 1, 2006. No UST operations or petroleum use has occurred at this location since the NFA was granted by GEPD and there is no regulatory obligation for additional investigation.

11. Why weren't any soil samples collected from the "area of hundreds to thousands of illegally dumped tires"? Was it believed that the soil samples taken from the former boiler room (soil boring B2 and B3) would be satisfactory to also look at that REC and if so, why?

Access limitations (steep hillside) prevented drilling equipment access to some portions of the area where the disposed tires were observed during the completion of the Phase I ESA. Terracon advanced four soil borings in the former boiler room where additional tires were previously stored and were burned (worst case location). The laboratory analytical results did not indicate constituents of concern at concentrations above the laboratory reporting limits in the soil or groundwater samples submitted for laboratory analysis.

It should be noted that, while disposal of used automobile tires is regulated in Georgia, they are neither classified as a hazardous material (for transportation or disposal purposes) nor do they meet the definition of a hazardous substance provided in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). As such, the presence of discarded used automobile tires alone does not meet the definition of a "Release" or REC pursuant to ASTM E1527-13.

12. What substantiated the decision for the location of every soil boring and groundwater well, and why were more not done to address the RECs in the Phase I ESA?

Terracon selected boring locations based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report. The boring locations were placed in locations most likely to identify the presence of hazardous substances and/or petroleum products at the site based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report.

Question set #2:

1. Several of the results indicated that the results were above laboratory limits but not State (regulatory/reporting) limits. What is the significance of the differences between the two entities and their differing limits?

The laboratory reporting limits are the concentrations the analytical method (and analytical instruments) can detect and may be considerably lower than regulatory thresholds. The GEPD regulatory thresholds are the values that, if exceeded, trigger a release reporting requirement of a specific constituent of concern to GEPD. If a constituent of concern is detected above the laboratory reporting limit but below the applicable regulatory threshold (as is the case in the Phase II/LSI report), the detection of that constituent of concern is not required to be reported to GEPD as a release and no further investigation or remediation is required.

Question set #3:

1. Why was the scope of services limited to not identifying every possible chemical identified with the site nor to determine the extent or magnitude of any existing condition? (Pg. 2) Based on Phase I RECs why was the LCI's scope not done within ASTM standards as per Phase I? Not considering the bare minimum requirements or impact of the site's development cost, is it not APF's intention to fully determine the site's contamination and remediate to best standards for public use?

The Phase I ESA prepared by Terracon was completed pursuant to ASTM E1527-13. The purpose of the ESA is to identify Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs - i.e. hazardous substances or petroleum products that have a known release or are likely to have resulted in a release). The scope of services completed during the Phase II/LSI was conducted pursuant to and/or in exceedance of the ASTM E1903-11 standard based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report. The investigation was designed to evaluate whether potential releases associated with the identified RECs had resulted in impact to the site. As such, the investigation was designed to target the areas of most likely impact in the immediate vicinity of each identified issue (including vertical depth of likely impacts). Additionally, the analytical suite selected for the site was chosen based on contaminants typically associated with the RECs identified in the ESA, sometimes referred to as indicator contaminants. Long-term historical operations, as is the case for this site, typically do not maintain detailed lists of every chemical used on the site. As such, industry practice is to target the most likely areas of impact and evaluate the presence of indicator contaminants, which, if present above regulatory thresholds trigger additional investigation to determine the magnitude and extent of the regulatory threshold exceedances.

2. What would it take for APF to certify the site does not contain hazardous substances, toxic materials, petroleum products or other latent conditions, particularly those available to the public where development will not take place? Pg. 3, section 2.2.

The scope of services completed during the Phase II/LSI was conducted pursuant to and/or in exceedance of the ASTM E1903-11 standard based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report for the site (the area intended for use by the PSTC). No constituents of concern were identified exceeding GEPD regulatory thresholds. As such, the RECs identified in the ESA are considered resolved.

3. Since the site was known to, or potentially, be contaminated resulting in a lower sales price, what was that exactly and are there plans to remediate conditions outside of the LSI? This was a finding from the Phase I report and I'm wondering why it wasn't expanded upon in the LSI.

The client-provided ASTM User Questionnaire reported an affirmative response to the question: "Actual knowledge of a lower purchase price because contamination is known or believed to be present at the site" due to the client's observations of the site conditions (dumped tires, staged paint cans, historical farming, etc.). These areas were evaluated during the completion of the Phase I ESA and are identified as RECs in that report. These same areas were further evaluated during the completion of the Phase II/LSI report. The scope of services completed during the Phase II/LSI was conducted pursuant to and/or in exceedance of the ASTM E1903-11 standard based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report. No constituents of concern were identified at concentrations which warrant additional investigation.

Question set # 4:

1. It is my understanding that some areas were inaccessible for testing because of the refuse. Now the tires and unlabeled cans have been removed, can these areas, now accessible, be tested?

At the time of the completion of the Terracon Phase II/LSI, the refuse had been relocated and did not impede access to sampling locations.

2. Were the tires and paint cans PROPERLY disposed? How?

Terracon understands the City of Atlanta Keep Atlanta Beautiful department is working with the State under their Scrap Tire Abatement Reimbursement (STAR) program to remove the tires. Terracon also understands the paint cans will be removed and sent to a recycling facility.

3. Significant Data Gaps: are these being investigated? Assessment 1 deemed this to be a significant issue.

See response to Question #2 in Question set #1.

4. Why was the LSI "not intended to identify every chemical associated with the site or to determine the extent or magnitude of any existing contamination"? Isn't that the entire point of an environmental assessment?

The Phase I ESA prepared by Terracon was completed pursuant to ASTM E1527-13. The scope of services completed during the Phase II/LSI was conducted pursuant to and/or in exceedance of the

ASTM E1903-11 standard based on the RECs identified in the Phase I ESA report. See response to Question #1 in Question set #3.

5. Why were additional samples not taken when some encountered 'drilling refusal' leading to shallow sample sites?

Drilling refusal is an industry terminology used to indicate that drilling equipment could not be advanced deeper due to subsurface conditions, typically due to the presence of bedrock and/or partially weathered rock (PWR). Additional samples could not be collected due to the likely presence of bedrock and/or PWR.

6. Water samples were only taken from groundwater wells, why were the lakes not also tested? And why were ONLY 3 groundwater samples taken? This does not seem acceptable.

Numerous groundwater monitoring wells were installed at the site; however, groundwater was only present in three of the groundwater monitoring wells installed. This is a typical occurrence in the Atlanta area with shallow bedrock. Groundwater was not present in the remaining wells and, therefore, could not be collected. The ponds were not identified as a REC in the Phase I ESA and the identified RECs were not in close proximity to the ponds such that surface water was likely impacted by potential releases from the identified RECs. Therefore, testing the ponds was not warranted.

7. GAEPD states groundwater turbidity should be tested, where are those results?<https://epd.georgia.gov/compliance-status-report-description-delineation-groundwater-contamination-391-3-19-063b3>

The GEPD Rule section and subparagraph cited in the question applies to Corrective Action sites where a release has been identified and Corrective Action is required by GEPD. The results of the Terracon Phase II/LSI did not identify constituents of concern above GEPD regulatory thresholds in the samples collected. Therefore, Corrective Action is not required.

8. Why were different borings drilled to different depths other than drill resistance?

Soil borings were advanced at appropriate locations and depths of the area most likely to be impacted to facilitate the collection of soil and/or groundwater samples based on the REC being investigated and to most likely identify releases on the site, if present.

9. Ga EPD compliance states there should be a minimum of 5 samples from each soil horizon. How many horizons were tested? All 6? Can you show where the results show this? Compliance Status Report Description of Delineation of Soil Contamination 391-3-19-.06(3)(b)2

See response to Question #7. The GEPD Rule section and subparagraph cited in the question does not apply since the results of the Terracon Phase II/LSI did not identify constituents of concern in the samples collected and Corrective Action is not required.

10. The Topographic map (appendix A) shows only a small portion of the proposed development area was included in the testing, WHY??? Additionally, why were all the test samples taken from only the areas of KNOWN possible contamination? Knowing the topography should have prompted taking samples of the areas downhill at the

south end of the property. The samples taken are showing small amounts of contamination...it could be that the chemical pollution has leached downhill to the south end. This should also be tested, can we make this happen?

The topographic map illustrates the boundary of the site Terracon was tasked with evaluating in the Phase I ESA. The RECs identified in the Phase I ESA were evaluated during the Phase II/LSI and no constituents of concern were identified which require additional investigation and/or remediation. As such and given that soil and groundwater samples were collected from worst-case locations most likely to be impaired from historical site operations, additional sampling at topographically downgradient locations is not warranted.

11. Can you please explain the contents of the AES Case Narrative; it states some Samples were held outside of holding times for Semi-Volatiles and additional samples were found to hold contaminants outside control limits? Chemical samples found to be 'outside control limits': 1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4 - disinfectant, deodorant, and pesticide; Pentafluorobenzene- is a fluorinated benzene with anesthetic properties; Pentafluorobenzene has been shown to potently and reversibly inhibited human $\alpha\beta$ 2 neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine receptor dependent on drug hydrophobicity in *Xenopus laevis* oocyte. <https://www.alfa.com/en/catalog/A13948/>; Chlorobenzene-d5 - is a precursor to deuterated dyes, rubbers, and herbicides. It can be also be used to create DDT by reaction with chloral(trichloroacetaldehyde). It is used as a high-boiling solvent in industrial applications; and Chlorobenzene-d5 | CAS 3114-55-4.

See response to Question #12 regarding sample holding time.

The constituents of concern cited in the question as "outside control limits" are internal standards which are added to each sample pursuant to the requirements of the analytical methods used (in this case, EPA analytical Methods 8260 and 8270). Internal standards are compounds which are chemically similar to the constituents of concern for which the samples are being analyzed. Pursuant to the analytical method requirements, they are added to the sample at the laboratory to act as an additional (but not conclusive) standard check of the analysis for Quality Assurance/Quality Control. It is common for these internal standards to fall outside of percent recovery limits due to a suspected matrix interference. As stated in the analytical laboratory results: "All other internal standard recoveries were within control limits." As such, the analytical laboratory results are valid pursuant to the analytical methods followed.

12. Could you please explain why samples were allowed to 'being extracted and/or analyzed outside holding time of 7 days for Semi-Volatiles. Also why 'Analysis was requested by client after holding time had expired'. '?!?!?!?!?!' Obviously these chemicals are the result of historical herbicide and pesticide use on the property, these types of chemicals are known to leach through the soil. I would ask for fresh samples to be extracted and sent to the lab in a more timely manner in order to get accurate levels of contamination. Additionally, the Sample Cooler Receipts seem to be contradictory to the Case Narrative. The receipt states, 'Were all samples received within holding time?' receipt is marked 'yes'? And what is the significance of if seals were present on sample containers?

One groundwater sample for one analytical method was extracted outside of the recommended holding time at the laboratory due to a laboratory timing constraint. Based on the absence of detections of constituents of concern in the remaining samples, this is not deemed to constitute a concern and is

logged appropriately in the laboratory analytical report. The samples were delivered to the laboratory in a timely manner and within holding time with seals intact. As such, additional sampling and analysis is not warranted.

Several methods may be used to ensure sample integrity following sample collection and transit to the laboratory. Terracon fills out a chain of custody for each sampling event logging the name of the sample, time and date of collection, the type of sample, and analyses requested for completion by the laboratory. The chain of custody documents each person who retained the samples in their possession from time of collection to transit to the laboratory along with the date and time of their possession. Terracon field staff collect samples and place them in a cooler with ice to preserve the samples prior to transport to the laboratory. Once the sample cooler is full or sampling for the day is complete field staff secure the cooler with a custody seal documenting the time in which the cooler was sealed and provides proof that the samples were not tampered with during transport. This protects the integrity of the samples once custody is released to a third party for transport or to the laboratory. An alternate method is placing an individual custody seal on the lid of each individual sample container to provide evidence of sample integrity.

13. Can you provide a document that compares the result values to the EPA and GAEPDs acceptable levels?

The applicable GEPD thresholds are provided in the table on page 7 of the Phase II/LSI report. EPA thresholds do not apply to this property (Georgia maintains primacy for their environmental programs and publishes contaminant thresholds as stringent or more stringent than EPA standards). Therefore, they were not included in the report appendices; however, those values can be located on the EPA website. The laboratory analytical results did not identify constituents of concern at concentrations exceeding either the applicable GEPD thresholds or the EPA thresholds.

Sincerely,

Terracon Consultants, Inc.