

**PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT**  
**PETERS CREEK INVESTMENTS PROPERTY**  
**ALONG COUNTY ROAD 315**  
**GREEN COVE SPRINGS, CLAY COUNTY, FLORIDA**



**PREPARED BY:**



Aerostar SES LLC  
11181 St. Johns Industrial Parkway North  
Jacksonville, Florida 32246  
904-565-2820

**PREPARED FOR:**

Mr. Jerry Agresti  
Peters Creek Investment  
1845 Town Center Boulevard, Suite 100  
Fleming Island, Florida 32003

Aerostar Project Number: M3010.1220.0001.02

December 11, 2014

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Aerostar has performed a Phase I ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard E 1527-13 of the Peters Creek Investments (PCI) property, located along County Road 315 (CR 315) in Green Cove Springs, Clay County, Florida, hereafter referred to as the site. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 9 of this report. The Executive Summary serves as a summary of this report and presents the significant findings and conclusions of this assessment. The Executive Summary should not be considered a stand-alone document and must be evaluated in conjunction with the discussions, supporting documentation, and limitations within this ESA report.

Aerostar conducted the site reconnaissance on December 1, 2014. The site is located west of the intersection of CR 315 and Shedd Road in Green Cove Springs, Clay County, Florida. According to assessment maps reviewed at the CCPAO website, the parent tract of the subject site consists of 2,464.81 acres (parcel identification number 31-05-26-014455-000-00). The subject site consists of 20.9 acres of pasture land located within the central-eastern portion of the parent parcel. During the site inspection, the use and storage of hazardous materials and petroleum products was not observed.

Historical resources were available from 1943 until the present. In summary, the site appears to have been sparsely wooded land from at least 1943 to at least 1953, and pasture land since at least 1969. According to a review of a previous Phase I ESA report and interviews, the western half of the site was utilized as a spray field for wastewater generated from the dairy farm facility located on the northern adjoining property from at least 1994 to at least 2004. The dairy farm conducted industrial spray activities under an industrial wastewater facility permit.

Potential on-site concerns were noted from the historical use of the site as a spray field from wastewater generated from the former dairy farm; however, according to regulatory information listed in the previous environmental investigations, there were no deficiencies associated with the facility operations and groundwater quality exceedances for nitrate observed in a nearby compliance well (CW-5) was not associated with effluent disposal operations monitored under the wastewater permit. Based on the regulatory information reviewed, the historical use of the site as a spray field is not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

Potential off-site concerns were noted from the RECs identified in the 1999 Phase I ESA (identified as REC 1 – Dairy Farm Petroleum Fuel Storage Tanks; REC 2 – Former Maintenance Barn; REC 3 – Former Landfill; REC 4 – Former Sawmill; and REC 5 – Indiscriminant Dumping Area); however, soil and groundwater quality was evaluated at each location in a Phase II ESA, conducted in January 2000 and a Supplemental Phase II ESA, conducted in April 2000. Based on the findings of the previous investigations, the distance of the RECs in relation to the site, and the direction of groundwater flow in the site vicinity (towards the north-northwest), the RECs identified in the 1999 Phase I ESA are not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

The site was not listed in the EDR report for any of the ASTM-specified databases. No concerns were noted from the CERCLIS NFRAP facility (Rosemary Hill Landfill) identified in the EDR report due to its distance from the site.

Potential off-site concerns were noted from two cattle dipping vats (CDVs) associated with the former Wright's Dairy Farm that are located on the east side of CR 315 and west of Peters Creek; however, based on interviews, distance of the CDVs in relation to the site, and direction of groundwater flow in the site vicinity (towards the north-northwest), these facilities are not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

## **1.1 Findings and Opinions**

Potential on-site concerns were noted from the historical use of the site as a spray field from wastewater generated from the former dairy farm; however, according to regulatory information listed in the previous environmental investigations, there were no deficiencies associated with the facility operations and groundwater quality exceedances for nitrate observed in a nearby compliance well (CW-5) was not associated with effluent disposal operations monitored under the wastewater permit. Based on the regulatory information reviewed, the historical use of the site as a spray field is not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

Potential off-site concerns were noted from the RECs identified in the 1999 Phase I ESA (identified as REC 1 – Dairy Farm Petroleum Fuel Storage Tanks; REC 2 – Former Maintenance Barn; REC 3 – Former Landfill; REC 4 – Former Sawmill; and REC 5 – Indiscriminant Dumping Area); however, soil and groundwater quality was evaluated at each location in a Phase II ESA, conducted in January 2000 and a Supplemental Phase II ESA, conducted in April 2000. Based on the findings of the previous Phase II ESA and Supplemental Phase II ESA, the distance of the RECs in relation to the site, and the direction of groundwater flow in the site vicinity (towards the north-northwest), the RECs identified in the 1999 Phase I ESA are not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

Potential off-site concerns were noted from two cattle dipping vats (CDVs) associated with the former Wright's Dairy Farm that are located on the east side of CR 315 and west of Peters Creek; however, based on interviews, distance of the CDVs in relation to the site, and direction of groundwater flow in the site vicinity (towards the north-northwest), these facilities are not suspected of negatively impacting the site at this time.

## **1.2 Conclusions**

This assessment has revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions associated with the site.

## **1.3 Recommendations**

Based on the information reviewed as part of this investigation, no additional assessment is recommended at this time.