

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

Conducted on:

South County Ranch Tract—1,000 ± Acres
Ranch Road and 3000 Valley Road
Hillsborough County, Florida

For

Developer
Tampa, Florida

Issue Date: Summer 2007

Prepared by:



6408 West Linebaugh Avenue
Suite 104
Tampa, Florida 33625
813/908-2233 813/908-3588
Phone Fax

LAS Project No. 07-462-00000
LAS is an affiliate of Mortensen Engineering, Inc. (MEI)

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

Conducted on:

South County Ranch Tract—1,000 ± Acres
Ranch Road and 3000 Valley Road
Hillsborough County, Florida

Issue Date: Summer 2007

Signatures of Environmental Professionals

We declare that, to the best of our professional knowledge and belief, we meet the definition of *environmental professional* as defined in §312.10 of 40 CFR 312, and we have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a *property* of the nature, history, and setting of the subject *property*. We have developed and performed the 'all appropriate inquiries' in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312. See Appendix A for "qualifications of participating environmental professionals."

Project Manager

Signature/Seal

Vice President

Signature/Seal

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

South County Ranch Tract—1000 ± Acres
Ranch Road and Valley Road
Hillsborough County, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 SUMMARY, FINDINGS, OPINIONS, CONCLUSIONS	1
2.0 INTRODUCTION	10
3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION WITH SITE MAP AND PLANS (Figures 1-2).....	13
4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION	15
4.1 Title Records	
4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)	
4.3 Specialized Knowledge	
4.5 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information	
4.6 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues	
4.7 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information	
4.8 Reasons for Performing Phase I ESA	
4.9 Other Information Provided	
5.0 RECORDS REVIEW	16
5.1 Federal and State Regulatory Agency Records Review	
5.2 Tribal Lands Records Review	
5.3 Local Governmental Agency Records Review	
5.4 Current Ownership Records	
5.5 Prior Ownership Records	
5.6 Review of Aerial Photographs	
5.7 City Street Directories	
5.8 Sanborn® Maps	
5.9 History of Property Use	
5.10 Applicable or User Provided Documents	
5.11 Physical Setting Sources	
6.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE	25
6.1 Site Observations	
6.2 AST/UST Systems	
6.3 Transformers and PCB Equipment	
6.4 Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products	
6.5 Drums and Containers	
6.6 Area Reconnaissance	
7.0 INTERVIEWS	29
7.1 Owners	
7.2 Occupants	
7.3 Operators	
7.4 Local Government Officials	
7.5 Others	
Appendix A - Qualifications of Participating Professionals	
Appendix B - Property Information	
Appendix C - Site Photographs	
Appendix D - Regulatory Records Documentation	
Appendix E - Historical Research Documentation	
Appendix F - Physical Setting Resource Documentation	
Appendix G - Interview Documentation	
Appendix H - Glossary of Terms Used in ASTM E 1527-05	

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

South County Ranch Tract—1000 ± Acres **Ranch Road and Valley Road** **Hillsborough County, Florida**

1.0 SUMMARY/FINDINGS/OPINIONS/CONCLUSIONS

1.1 Site Name

South County Ranch Tract—1000 ± Acres

1.2 Site Location (See Figures 1 and 2)

Address: 1975 Ranch Road
Valley Road

North and South of Valley Road /Lofton Road
East and West of Interstate 75
Hillsborough County, Florida

Hillsborough County, Florida
Sections 29-32 of Township 32S, Range 19E

1.3 Inspection Dates

May 21, 30, 31 2007 and June 11 and 15, 2007

1.4 Assessment Team

Land Assessment Services, Inc.

1.5 Summary

Site Description

The property was comprised of mainly grassy fields, woods and wetlands. Many of the grassy areas were former citrus groves (northwest, southwest and southeast areas). Interstate 75 split the site into east-west sections. A TECO easement and Valley and Lofton Roads further subdivided the property. The north-south Ranch Road was in the northwest section. The TECO easement with high tension power lines entered the site at the west-central border and then proceeded northward, parallel with and west of I-75. Valley Road passed over I-75. Curiosity Creek was east of Interstate 75 and ran a course from the southwest corner of the property to the northeast corner of the site. Another smaller creek was present in the northeast corner. Oak hammocks lined the creek basin. The Little Manatee River abutted the northeast corner area of the site. A maintenance compound and former homesteaded area, including a pole barn, work shop/office (metal building with concrete floor), and fuel point/used soil storage shed (concrete floor) was located in the southwest area. An irrigation well with diesel fuel aboveground storage tank (AST) and generator were situated on a concrete slab, just east of the compound. A small well house with potable water well (electric pump) was located south of the compound. A pasture, cattle pen and a reported 150 ± head of cattle grazed in the northwest area. Former borrow pits (ponds) were observed in the northeast, southwest and southeast sections of the site. A cell tower was located in the TECO easement area west of I-75.

North of the property were tomato fields, Ranch Road, pasture, a residence, the Little Manatee River, and a TECO utility easement (which may include underground pipelines). South of the site was Interstate 75, croplands and woods. East of the property were woods, wetlands, residences, and Sunflower Park. West of the site was an irrigation well with tank, Valley Road, farms, woods, wetlands, pasture and Hillsborough County Nature Preserve property.

Site History

A 40 ± acre parcel in the southwest area of the property was initially homesteaded by the "Bonner" and "Holland" families. The earliest aerial photos (1938-1957) confirmed the 40-acre parcel was cleared for agriculture and groves. Otherwise, the remaining acreage was generally open rangeland and wetlands in the 1930s and 1940s.

Reportedly, the vast majority of the property in the area was ultimately owned by Mr. Jimmy Stover (deceased in the early 1990s), who sold 1,200 ± acres to Joseph and Eleanor Guy in the 1950s. In 1990, the property was transferred to Guy family members.

Mr. Guy cleared the property in the 1950s and 1960s. The property was used mainly as a cattle ranch. Cattle numbers on the site ranged from less than 100 to over 900 ± head over the years. Support structures were primary in the southwest section in the homesteaded area.

Citrus groves including Valencia and navel oranges and a 12 ± acre grapefruit plot in the southeast section were planted from the mid 1980s to 1991. In 2005, the USDA ordered all the citrus trees in the area burned due to the threat of citrus canker. This was done from May to July in 2005. Watermelons, cantaloupes and tomatoes were also briefly grown in the northwest area in the early 1990s.

Numerous irrigation wells were reported on-site to support grove and agricultural operations. These wells had power units and fuel storage tanks (all appeared under 550 gallons), and in some cases fertigation systems.

In the 1970s, soils from four (4) borrow pits dug on-site were used to construct Interstate 75 that divided the property into east and west halves.

An old shop for the ranch (circa 1960s) was just northeast of the new shop (2001) in the southwest section. An old cattle pen was located in the southwest area, which was replaced with a new pen in the northwest area in the 1980s or 1990s. A pole barn in the southwest area was upgraded over the years. Tractor maintenance was conducted at the "old shop" or "oil room" in the southwest section, where diesel and gasoline fuel storage tanks have been historically located (also present day fuel point).

An archaeological study was done in the northeast area following rumors of a "mound," but no evidence/artifacts were found. No buildings or structures were located east of I-75.

Off-site, Interstate 75 was added in the 1970s and the overpass (Valley Road) was added in 1980. West of Interstate 75, the general area was known as "Valley" and east of Interstate 75 was known as "Sunflower."

Regulatory Records

According to the selected regulatory listings researched by LAS, the subject site was listed on the state's TANKS list for the prior presence of a 1,000-gallon AST on the property (northwest section), which had no reported contamination. Nine (9) abutting/adjacent properties were listed; however, none of the activities on these sites appeared to pose a material threat to the subject site.

LAS reviewed warning notices and complaints provided by the Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) of Hillsborough County and found one (1) warning notice and one (1) complaint associated with the subject site involving a debris pile in the southeast area. This matter was closed in 1994 after the materials were removed to the satisfaction of the EPC.

1.6 Findings ("Environmental" Conditions On-Site)¹ (see Section 1.7 for our opinions)

1. Numerous fuel tanks have been used at well locations across the site; a 1,000-gallon AST was removed from the northwest section July 1, 1995, without reported contamination; and a "permanent" fuel area has been present in the southwest section of the property since 1960s at the old maintenance shop a/k/a "oil room." Guy Ranch, Inc. is listed on the state's tank list for the 1,000-gallon AST. This tank stored fuel for a nearby generator and pump. Other ASTs reported on-site and observed appeared to be less than 550 gallons and used in various agricultural applications.
2. A cattle dip vat (CDV) was reported on-site (southwest section) until removed in 1984 or 1985. The site representative recanted this story after talking to his wife and possibly a previous owner. Arsenical and organochlorine pesticide solutions were typically used in these vats. [See Appendix E for special aerial section.]
3. Citrus groves were located in the northwest, southwest and southeast sections of the site from the 1980s to the 2000s. Valencia and navel oranges were primarily grown, except for a small 12-acre grapefruit grove in the southeast section. Other groves may have been present in the northwest section in earlier years, and a grove was planted in the 40-acre homesteaded area in the 1910s (southwest section). To some extent, agricultural chemicals were applied to these groves while productive to control weeds, insects and disease. According to site representatives, the groves were not heated. Equipment and agricultural chemicals used were stored on-site in the southwest section.
4. A septic tank/drainfield system was installed at the "new" shop for sanitary disposal. A shop sink is connected to this system. In commercial operations, the opportunity exists for improper discharges directly to the environment.
5. A large debris pile was allowed to collect on the property from the 1960s which was subject of an EPC and Sheriff's department enforcement action in 1994.
6. An off-site discharge of potassium from a water purification system occurred near at the border of the property and Lofton Road.
7. A 9,000-gallon fuel spill occurred from a tanker explosion at the I-75/Lofton Road overpass in 1998. Soil and groundwater contamination resulted from this incident.
8. A buried "gas" line is reported present in the TECO easement.

¹ These can include recognized environmental conditions (RECs) (see Footnote 2). Section 1.7 discusses LAS' reasoning for considering or not considering a particular environmental condition a "recognized environmental condition."

1.7 Opinions

1. Existing fuel tank locations associated with water wells did not exhibit evidence of a previous discharge. All were on concrete surfaces. Only one (1) former tank was subject to regulation on-site, the 1,000-gallon AST formerly located in the northwest section. This tank was installed in 1985 and removed in 1995. County tank files did not report contamination associated with this system; however, some inspection reports in the early 1990s mentioned some stained soils and ordered that they be cleaned up. This tank apparently was replaced by a smaller tank (under 550 gallons) that was not subject to regulation. Due to the mention of "contaminated soils," the size of the tank, and its time on the site (10 years), in our opinion, this is a *recognized environmental condition* (REC)² requiring a minimal amount of intrusive testing to confirm or deny the presence of soil and/or groundwater contamination at the location. LAS also observed permanent fueling operations and petroleum product storage at the "old shop" or "oil room" that, in the absence of previous testing data in this area to check for the presence of petroleum product impacts in the localized soil and/or groundwater, cannot be fully assessed without intrusive testing. Therefore, operations in this area are considered a *REC*.
2. During routine inquiries of parties familiar with the site, information was volunteered about the former presence of a CDV in the southwest area. The information was detailed and descriptive with regard to its location, appearance and removal. The following day, this information was recanted. Because the site has been used for cattle operations since the 1910s, particularly in the reported general CDV area, it is within the realm of possibility that a CDV could be on-site. LAS also believes in the veracity of the information initially provided, and that subsequent conversations with the party and a previous owner may have been orchestrated to deflect and downplay what was initially freely offered. In our opinion, enough information has been acquired to consider the possible presence of a CDV on-site a *REC*. Routine shallow soil and shallow groundwater testing performed in the area should provide enough additional data to confirm or deny any adverse impacts from the vat. [See Appendix E for special aerial section.]
3. Citrus was produced in three (3) principal sections of the site (northwest, southwest and southeast) for approximately 20 years (mid 1980s to mid 2000s). Standard operations called for routine and proper application of "legal" agricultural chemicals to the land and trees to control disease, weeds and insects. These chemicals are normally stored in a central location, mixed and diluted at this facility or at satellite locations (irrigation wells), and broadly applied to the fields. Greater environmental risk is typically associated with the storage and main mixing areas; less risk is presumed where the diluted chemicals have been broadly applied to the trees or ground, unless applied over a significant period of time during a time of absent or relaxed environmental controls. Chemicals could have been previously stored at the former old barn or at the existing "old shop," and were stored in the new shop beginning in 2001 before citrus operations were curtailed in 2005. Because citrus operations on-site were *contemporary* in nature (post hard freezes in early 1980s), the trees in grove areas were pushed up and the land reworked into pasture, and the nature of previous storage and mixing operations is not now readily discernable or confirmable except possibly in areas in the southwest section, in our opinion, the factors that would justify identifying this particular general land use as a "REC" relate only to existing storage locations in the southwest section (existing old and new shop areas).

² Recognized environmental conditions or RECs: "The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include 'de minimis' conditions that generally do not present a threat to human health or the environment 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 are not recognized environmental conditions." ASTM E 1527-05.

However, if follow-up shallow soil testing indicates the *material* presence of constituents in typical agricultural chemicals in the existing prime storage and/or prime mixing areas, it may be necessary to screen shallow soils in the previous grove areas.

4. The septic tank/drainfield system attached to the new shop has been operational since 2001. While the potential exists for improper discharges into the system via the shop sink, in our opinion, based on our physical observations and our experience, this is not a material contamination threat to the subject site at this time.
5. The debris pile next to Curiosity Creek was initially described by an anonymous party as a "large scale dump site" containing pesticides. County inspectors made a detailed description of the wastes, which were removed from the site apparently without any specialized treatment and the county file was closed. Based on the county's reports, it does not appear that a material release or the potential for a material release to the shallow soils or shallow groundwater occurred, as the EPC ordered no subsurface evaluation of the area following the removal of the materials. Previous grove managers and owners reported that the debris was routinely dumped there since 1960s from on-site sources and by parties familiar with the property owners. Based on the follow-up activities of the EPC, and our review of the county files, factors that would justify calling this particular land use a "REC" at this time have not, in our opinion, been identified. LAS does consider this an *historical REC* based on our understanding of the ASTM standard.³
6. The off-site "potassium" discharge from a domestic water purifier is not considered a material threat to the soil or groundwater of the property at this time.
7. The tanker spill at I-75 and Lofton Road was subsequently assessed and remediated under the auspices of state and local regulators. A Site Rehabilitation Completion Report (SRCR) was issued for the area in 2001 (approved 8/6/2001). In our opinion, it appears that the FDOT right-of-way was primarily impacted, and that any material impacts to state property or abutting areas were addressed during site assessment and remediation, and that contaminant levels were ultimately contained and brought below cleanup target levels (CTLs).
8. No signage for a buried "gas" line was observed during our visits to the subject site. However, a process was underway to install a pipeline in the easement at the time of our site visit.

1.7.1 Additional Investigation Required to Form Conclusion (in Section 1.8)

Not required.

1.7.2 Data Gaps

None.

³ Per ASTM E 1527-05, Section 3.2.39, a historical REC "is an environmental condition which in the past would have been considered a REC, but which may or may not be considered a REC currently. The final decision rests with the environmental professional and will be influenced by the current impact of the historical REC on the property."

1.8 Conclusions

LAS has performed a Phase I ESA of the **South County Ranch Tract - 1000 ± Acres**, located at 1975 Ranch Road and Valley Road, Hillsborough County, Florida, in general conformance with the scope of work and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.0 of this report.

This assessment has revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in connection with the subject property, except for the following (see also Section 1.7):

- Former 1,000-gallon AST location in the northwest section.
- Former CDV area in the southwest section.
- Agrichemical storage in the southwest section.
- Present fuel/oil storage building in the southwest section.

1.9 Deviations from ASTM E 1527-05

None.

1.10 Additional Services Performed

None.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Phase I ESA Purpose and Scope

This Phase I ESA was performed specifically to identify, to the extent feasible pursuant to the processes prescribed in the *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, ASTM Designation: E 1527-05*, recognized environmental conditions (REC) in connection with the subject property, with respect to the range of contaminants within the scope of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 U.S.C. §9601) and petroleum products. As such, the Phase I ESA is intended to permit a user to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser limitations on CERCLA liability (hereinafter, the "landowner liability protections," or "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).

It is important to note that there may be other environmental issues or conditions at a property that parties may wish to assess in connection with commercial real estate that are outside the scope of this practice (non-scope considerations). These may include the presence of substances in quantities and under conditions that may lead to contamination of the property or of nearby properties but are not included as "hazardous substances" under 42 USC § 9601(14). Additionally, an evaluation of business environmental risk associated with a commercial real estate parcel may necessitate investigation beyond that identified in 1527-05.

Other "non-scope considerations, that the user might elect to address as an "additional issue outside standard practices," are not included or addressed in this Phase I ESA, such as "controlled" substances, asbestos containing building materials; radon gas (indoor and in the soils); indoor air quality (including vapor intrusion); wetlands; industrial hygiene; regulatory compliance; ecological resources; high voltage power lines; health and safety; endangered species; cultural and historic resources; lead in drinking water; lead-based paint; biological agents; or mold. Further, no soil, surface water or groundwater testing was a part of the scope of work performed herein.

It is important to note that by stating the "additional issues" listed above, no implication is intended as to the relative importance of inquiry into such considerations, and no such inquiry is necessary to complete the Phase I ESA in accordance with ASTM E 1527-05.

2.2 Phase I ESA Process, Procedures and Methodologies

The process, procedures, terminology and methodologies for this Phase I ESA were generally consistent with those prescribed in *ASTM E 1527-05*. However, it should be noted that no environmental site assessment can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property. Performance of this practice is intended to reduce, but not eliminate, uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property, and the practice recognizes reasonable limits of time and cost. Further, appropriate inquiry does not mean an exhaustive assessment of a "clean" property. There is a point at which the cost of information obtained or the time required to gather it outweighs the usefulness of the information and, in fact, may be a material detriment to the orderly completion of transactions. One of the purposes of ASTM E 1527-05 is to identify a balance between the competing goals of limiting the costs and time demands inherent in performing an environmental site assessment and the reduction of uncertainty about unknown conditions resulting from additional information.

2.3 Phase I ESA Limitations

2.3.1 Natural Limitations

It is important to note that all but an exhaustive investigation might fail to locate buried, covered over or localized surficial events of hazardous substances or petroleum products on-site that are not reasonably visible or suspected at the ground surface. The client should realize that areas on the subject site, which in our opinion, did not show visual evidence of hazardous substances or petroleum products at the ground surface level at the time of our field work, except as may be qualified herein, could later become contaminated due to natural phenomena, human intervention, or on-site or adjacent site impacts. These possibilities are beyond our control.

2.3.2 Guarantees

Parties relying on this assessment should understand that our failure to identify evidence indicative of RECs related to hazardous substances or petroleum products as a result of completing the ASTM E 1527-05 standard of work does not guarantee that such conditions do not exist on-site in a localized, covered over or buried event.

2.3.3 Comprehensiveness

This report is not a comprehensive site characterization and should not be construed as such. The opinions presented in this report are based on findings derived from completing the ASTM E 1527-05 standard of work. While LAS may not have found indicators that suggest hazardous substances or petroleum products exist at the site at levels likely to warrant mitigation and as such are considered RECs, not finding such indicators does not mean that hazardous substances or petroleum products do not exist at the site. It should also be clearly understood that no matter how much research is accomplished during the "Phase I" process, the only way to know about the actual composition and condition of the subsurface areas of the property is through soil and groundwater testing and/or excavation.

2.3.4 Safety Concerns

This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.

2.3.5 Standard of Care

This practice offers a set of instructions for performing one or more specific operations. This document cannot replace education or experience and should be used in conjunction with professional judgment. Not all aspects of this practice may be applicable in all circumstances. This ASTM standard is not intended to represent or replace the standard of care by which the adequacy of a given professional service must be judged, nor should this document be applied without consideration of a project's many unique aspects. The word "Standard" in the title means only that the document has been approved through the ASTM consensus process.

2.3.6 Third Parties/User Reliance

This report is intended for the sole use of *Developer*, subject to the terms, conditions and limitations found herein, and in LAS' scope of services dated April 30, 2007, which was verbally agreed to by the client on April 30, 2007 (e-mail). Therefore, its contents should not be relied upon by any other parties without the express prior written consent of LAS and its client.

2.4 User Responsibilities

2.4.1 General

Certain tasks were to be performed by the user to help identify the possibility of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property. These tasks did not require the technical expertise of an environmental professional and are generally not performed by environmental professionals performing a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

2.4.2 Review Title and Judicial Records for Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)

Reasonably ascertainable recorded land title records and lien records that are filed under federal, tribal, state, or local law were to be reviewed by the user to identify environmental liens or AULs, if any, that are currently recorded against the property. Environmental liens and AULs that are imposed by judicial authorities may be recorded or filed in judicial records, and, where applicable, such records should be reviewed. **Any environmental liens or AULs so identified were to be reported to the environmental professional conducting a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.** Unless added by a change in the scope of work to be performed by the environmental professional, this practice does not impose on the environmental professional the responsibility to undertake a review of recorded land title records and judicial records for environmental liens or AULs. The user was to either (1) engage a title company or title professional to undertake a review of reasonably ascertainable recorded land title records and lien records for environmental liens or AULs currently recorded against or relating to the property, or (2) negotiate such an engagement of a title company or title professional as an addition to the scope of work to be performed by the environmental professional.

2.4.3 Reasonably Ascertainable

Except to the extent that applicable federal, state, local or tribal statutes, or regulations specify any place other than recorded land title records for recording or filing environmental liens or AULs or specify records to be reviewed to identify the existence of such environmental liens or AULs, environmental liens or AULs that are recorded or filed any place other than recorded land title records are not considered to be reasonably ascertainable.

2.4.4 Specialized Knowledge or Experience of the User

If the user was aware of any specialized knowledge or experience that is material to recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property, it was the user's responsibility to communicate any information based on such specialized knowledge or experience to the environmental professional before the environmental professional conducted the site reconnaissance.

2.4.5 Actual Knowledge of the User

If the user had actual knowledge of any environmental lien or AULs encumbering the property or in connection with the property, it was the user's responsibility to communicate such information to the environmental professional before the environmental professional conducted the site reconnaissance.

2.4.6 Reason for Significantly Lower Purchase Price

In a transaction involving the purchase of a parcel of commercial real estate, the user was to consider the relationship of the purchase price of the property to the fair market value of the property if the property was not affected by hazardous substances or petroleum products. The user was to try to identify an explanation for a lower price which does not reasonably reflect fair market value if the property were not contaminated, and make a written record of such explanation. Among the factors to consider was the information that became known to the user pursuant to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. This standard does not require that a real estate appraisal be obtained in order to ascertain fair market value of the property.

2.4.7 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

If the user was aware of any commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information within the local community about the property that is material to recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property, it was the user's responsibility to communicate such information to the environmental professional before the environmental professional conducted the site reconnaissance.

2.4.8 Other

ASTM 1527-05 states that the user shall make known to the environmental professional the reason why the user wants to have the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed or, if the user does not identify the purpose of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, the environmental professional was to assume the purpose is to qualify for an LLP to CERCLA liability and state this in the report (see Section 2.1). In addition to satisfying one of the requirements to qualify for an LLP to CERCLA liability, another reason for performing a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment might include the need to understand potential environmental conditions that could materially impact the operation of the business associated with the parcel of commercial real estate. The user and the environmental professional might also need to modify the scope of services performed under this practice for special circumstances, including, but not limited to, operating industrial facilities or large tracts of land (large areas or corridors).

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 Site Name

South County Ranch Tract--1000 ± Acres

3.2 Location

Address:

Ranch Road (NW area; former residence and well house were technically off-site) and
Valley Road (SW area)
Hillsborough County, Florida

Hillsborough County, Florida
Sections 29, 30, 31 and 32 of Township 32S, Range 19E

For Site (Vicinity) Map, see Figure 1, next page.

3.3 Legal Description

See Appendix B.

3.4 Property Size

1000 ± Acres

3.5 Zoning

According to the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's office, the site is zoned "AR," which is an "Agricultural, Rural" (one unit per five acres) zoning classification in Hillsborough County, Florida. See Appendix B.

3.6 Description of Current Improvements and Site Uses

The property was comprised of mainly grassy fields, woods and wetlands. Many of the grassy areas were former citrus groves (northwest, southwest and southeast areas). Interstate 75 split the site into east-west sections. A TECO easement and Valley and Lofton Roads further subdivided the property. The north-south Ranch Road was in the northwest section. The TECO easement with high tension power lines entered the site at the west-central border and then proceeded northward, parallel with and west of I-75. An overpass for Valley Road was in the approximate center of the site. Curiosity Creek was east of Interstate 75 and ran a course from the southwest corner of the property to the northeast corner of the site. Another smaller creek was present in the northeast corner. Oak hammocks lined the creek basin. The Little Manatee River abutted the northeast corner area of the property. I-75's southbound bridge over the river offered a panoramic view of the site. A maintenance compound and former homesteaded area, including a pole barn, work shop/office (metal building with concrete floor), and fuel point/used oil storage shed (concrete floor) was located in the southwest area. An irrigation well with diesel fuel AST and generator were situated on a concrete slab, just east of the compound. A small well house with potable water well (electric pump) was located south of the compound. A pasture, cattle pen and a reported 150 ± head of cattle grazed in the northwest area. Former borrow pits (ponds) were observed in the northeast, southwest and southeast sections of the site. A cell tower was located in the TECO easement area west of I-75.

North of the property were tomato fields, Ranch Road, pasture, a residence, the Little Manatee River, and a TECO utility easement (pipeline being installed). South of the site was Interstate 75, croplands and woods. East of the property were woods, wetlands, residences (Sundance community), and Sundance Park. West of the site was Valley Road, farms (Sunnyside Growers), woods, wetlands, pasture and Hillsborough County Nature Preserve property.

For Site Plan with aerial, see Figure 2, next page.

4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

4.1 Title Records

The client/user supplied title records to LAS for review. While not a “chain of title,” public records were searched back at least 30 years to produce a “title commitment,” and recorded documents were provided dating back to the 1950s (see Appendix B).

4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)

The client/user reported no environmental liens or AULs (see Section 2.4.2) to LAS. No such liens or AULs were found in the title documentation provided to LAS (see Appendix B). Environmental data acquired for this Phase I ESA by LAS included the state’s listing of those sites subject to *institutional and engineering controls* and none were listed within 0.25 ± miles of the property (property also not included). These controls are matters of public record if properly disclosed. See Sections 5.1.1 and 5.10 and Appendix D.

4.3 Specialized Knowledge

The client/user reported no “specialized knowledge” pertaining to the subject site to LAS, except for information contained in a Phase I ESA report for the property prepared by Environmental, Inc. (EI) dated October 21, 2004.

4.4 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

The client/user reported no “commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information” pertaining to the property to LAS.

4.5 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

The client/user did not report or provide to LAS an explanation of any reduction in the property’s value due to contamination. See Section 2.4.6.

4.6 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information

LAS conducted inquiries with representatives of the site owner and previous owners and operators with regard to the subject site. An attempt was also made to contact knowledgeable local sources in the area. See Section 7.0 and Appendix G.

4.7 Reasons for Performing Phase I ESA

See Section 2.4.8. The client/user is in the process of purchasing the subject property.

4.8 Other Information Provided

Not applicable.

5.0 RECORDS REVIEW

5.1 Federal and State Regulatory Agency Records Review

5.1.1 Current Regulatory Lists and Records Consulted

LAS reviewed the following selected environmental regulatory records for registered/listed sites (see Table 1 below) in *general* accordance with ASTM 1527-05 using Environmental Data Management (EDM) data (see Appendix D). LAS expanded its search to include five (5) parcels in a pending transaction, of which the subject site is one. The sites found below were within ASTM search distances around the five (5) sites as a whole.

TABLE 1--ENVIRONMENTAL/REGULATORY REVIEW SUMMARY

Environmental Regulatory Listing	Search Distances (in miles)	Number of Sites Found Recorded
EPA DATABASES		
National Priority List (NPL) <i>(includes delisted sites)</i>	1.00	0
Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act Information System (CERCLIS) List	0.50	0
Archived CERCLIS Sites (NFRAP)	0.50	0
Emergency Response Notification System List (ERNS)	0.25	1
RCRIS Handlers with Corrective Action (CORRACTS)	1.00	0
RCRA-Treatment, Storage and/or Disposal Sites (TSD)	1.00	0
RCRA-LQG, SQG, CESQG and Transporters (NONTSD)	0.25	0
FDEP DATABASES		
State Funded Action Sites List (STNPL)	1.00	0
State Sites List (STCERC)	0.50	0
Solid Waste Facilities List (SLDWST)	0.50	0
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks List (LUST)	0.50	6
Underground Storage Tanks (TANKS)	0.25	11
State Designated Brownfield Areas (BRWNFLDS)	0.50	0
State Brownfields Sites with Site Rehabilitation Agreement (BRWNBSRA)	0.50	0
Florida Institutional/ Engineering Controls Registry (INSTENG)	0.25	0
SUPPLEMENTAL DATABASES		
Florida Dry Cleaners List (DRY)		0
Facility Index System List (FINDS)	0.25	2
Toxic Release Inventory System (TRIS)	0.25	0

5.1.2 Summary and Discussion

According to the selected regulatory listings researched by EDM, the subject site was listed on the state's TANKS list for the prior presence of a 1,000-gallon fuel AST on the property (northwest section), which had no reported contamination. The nearest listed facilities within the prescribed ASTM search radius as modified for this report were:

<u>EDM No.</u>	<u>Facility</u>	<u>FDEP No.</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Lists</u>	<u>Direction/Distance ± Feet</u>	<u>Comments</u>
8	Guy Ranch Inc.	299046821	Ranch Rd.	TANKS	Subject Site	Facility status: closed. 1,000-gallon diesel fuel AST installed 6/1/85, removed 7/1/95.
9 and 10	JH Williams Oil Co. JH Williams Tanker Spill	29578100 299800873	I-75 MM 236 Lofton Rd. Overpass	ERNS LUST TANKS	I-75 Right-of-Way through Site	Tanker exploded, spilled 9000 ± gals. unleaded gasoline on 4/18/1998. SRCR dated 8/6/2001. Facility Status: closed.
5	Elsberry Brothers—Piney Point	298625481	Valley Road	TANKS	Abutting W (.5 +/- miles, off Valley Road)	Two (2) USTs removed 10/31/91. Two (2) in-service USTs. No contamination reported.
6	Sunnyside Growers, Inc.	299807666	3737 Valley Road	TANKS	Abutting W (.5 +/- miles, off Valley Road)	One (1) double-walled 1,000 AST in service since 2005. No contamination reported.
7	B W Elsberry Tomato Farms	298733875	2520 Stover Road	TANKS	.5 +/- miles NW	No contamination reported. (3) small tanks under 550 gallons. Removed 6/31/91.

SRCR=site rehabilitation completion report

The most problematic of the sites listed above would be the spill of 9,000 gallons of fuel in the I-75 right-of-way. According to available information, a Site Remediation Completion Order (SRCO) was issued for this case, indicating cleanup to the satisfaction of state rules and cleanup target levels.

EDM listed no "proximal sites," and no "non-mapped" sites (without complete addresses) which appeared to involve the subject property.

The state's 1934 listing of cattle dip vats (CDV) identified a CDV named "Hillsborough County"; however, Hillsborough County is a broad area and it would be difficult to determine where this vat is or was without actually identifying the CDV in the field, or obtaining collaborating evidence that one existed at a particular location. In this case, a former ranch manager reported that a CDV was on-site who was also present at removal. Another listing, "Walker" was possibly associated with the former "Walker" community located approximately three miles east of the property near U.S. Highway 301 and the county line.

5.2 Tribal Lands Records Review

LAS checked EDM's report of tribal lands in Hillsborough County and the subject site was not property controlled by tribal interests. See Appendix D.

5.3 Local Governmental Agency Records Review

LAS contacted or visited the offices of the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser (see Appendix B), the Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) of Hillsborough County (see Appendix D), the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (see Appendix D), the Tampa Bay History Center (see Appendix E), and Hillsborough County Fire Marshal's office (see Section 7.4 and Appendix G). Information from these inquiries is provided below or throughout this report as appropriate. Appendix G contains an index of inquiries made for this report.

EPC Complaint Files and Warning Notices

LAS reviewed warning notices and complaints provided by the EPC and found one (1) warning notice and one (1) complaint associated with the subject site:

A anonymous complaint dated 9/6/1994 for "Guy Groves" indicated a "large scale land disposal site/dump site" encompassing "many acres" which included "MSW," pesticides and other agricultural related products. On 10/28/94, An HCEPC representative investigated the area and found a debris pile, 319 feet x 125 feet in size with materials including, but not limited to 55-gallon drums, 5-gallon buckets, tires, appliances, oil containers, paint cans, roofing materials, antifreeze jugs, "lead acid" batteries, etc. on-site. Warning Notice #14892 was issued on 10/28/1994 and the complaint was closed on 11/2/1994.

On 10/17/95, an HCEPC representative conducted an inspection and verified that the debris had been removed from the location. A site representative reported twelve (12) truck loads of materials were removed and receipts were verified by the HCEPC representative.

According to site representatives, this debris began to accumulate from on-site and off-site sources as early as the 1960s.

No complaints or warning letters were found concerning immediately adjoining properties.

See Appendix D.

5.4 Current Ownership Records

5.4.1 Current Ownership Information

According to the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's office, the property was owned by:

Land Reserve (June 2007)
(recent transfer from South County Ranch Corp., Williamstown, MA)

See Appendix B and Section 5.5.1.

5.5 Prior Ownership Records

5.5.1 Summary and Discussion

See Appendix B for chart summarizing title records supplied to LAS by the client. Historic atlases indicated *Consolidated Land Co.* owned the vast majority of the property in 1916, while "Bonner & Holland" owned a 40-acre portion (on-site south of Valley Road) in 1946, *J.D. Stover* owned most of the site, while *Louis Thomas* owned the 40-acre tract. *Joseph B. Guy* and *Jackson D. Moore, III* (southeast) owned the property in 1976, 1982 and 1986 according to other atlases LAS checked. Some available deeds acquired from the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser and attached to a title commitment submitted to LAS for review are provided in see Appendix B:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Grantor</u>	<u>Grantee</u>
2/14/90	Joseph B. and Eleanor B. Guy	Guy Ranch, Inc.
12/2/04	Guy family, et al.	South County Ranch Corp.
6/13/07	South County Ranch Corp.	Land Reserve, Inc.

LAS noted a number of easements granted to Tampa Electric Company, as well as releases. Of note, an Environmental Inspection Agreement from Florida Land Partners and South County Ranch Corp. to Colonial Bank, N.A. was recorded at the time of the sale to South County Ranch Corp. (12/2/04). Also in the public records was a Bill of Sale dated 12/2/04 listing various items of equipment, tanks (9 fuel tanks; 2 chemical tanks), power units (7), and 70 head of cattle (see Appendix B).

5.6 Review of Aerial Photographs

5.6.1 Summary of Selected Aerial Photographs (see Table 2 below)

TABLE 2 - AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH REVIEW CHART

Year	Scale	Subject Site	Abutting/Adjacent Sites
1938	*	Rangeland, woods, creek. NE and SE: man-made ditches. SW: cleared land, small grove and one (1) structure. Clearing south of creek on branch.	N: Little Manatee River, rangeland and wetlands. S: rangeland, wetlands, creek. E: rangeland, wetlands, creek. W: trails, rangeland and wetlands.
1947	*	Possibly cleared for pasture.	Surrounding areas: possibly cleared for pasture.
1951	*	NW: one (1) structure, trails, agriculture, ditches and N-S dirt road added. NE: partially cleared. SW: possible fenced pasture. SE: partially cleared and trails added.	W: agriculture added. Further W: dirt road added.
1957	*	More trees and trails in NW. Otherwise, No significant visible changes noted.	Powerline easement added. NW and S: agriculture added.
1965	*	Seepage irrigation swales added. NW: one (1) structure gone, one (1) structure added. Groves possible. SW Blowup: possible ten (10) structures, groves, fenced pastures, dirt road to N.	Further N: clearing, road added. Further E: agriculture added.
1973	*	NW: small clearing along river. SE: clearing (disturbed soil) and creek crossing. Seepage drain system more evident NE section.	N: more agriculture and development (roads).
1984	*	NE: pond added. SE: pond, groves and trail added, low area reworked. SW: four (4) low areas reworked, pond excavated. Small grove gone and three (3) structures gone.	Interstate 75, Valley Rd. and Lofton Rd. added. E: residential development and more agriculture added. W: more agriculture added.
1995	*	NW and SW: groves and ditches added. NW: cattle pen added.	E: more development.
2006	1"=1,900	SW: three (3) structures gone.	Cell tower added W of I-75.

*obtained in digital format; viewed at various scales.

5.6.2 Source of Aerial Photos

LAS reviewed selected reasonably ascertainable historical aerial photographs from two (2) sources: the *University of Florida Website* for years 1938, 1947, 1951 and 1957; and the *Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)* for years 1965, 1973, 1984, 1995 and 2006. See Appendix E.

5.6.3 Current and Selected Aerial Photographs

See Figure 2, Appendices B, E and F.

5.7 City Street Directories

LAS did not check city street directories because of the rural nature of the property. Other resources, such as historical atlases and plat maps were checked instead.

5.8 Sanborn® Maps

No Sanborn® fire insurance map coverage exists for the subject area according to an Environmental Data Resources (EDR) data report included in a Phase I ESA of the property prepared by Edwards & Belyea, Inc. dated October 21, 2004. See Appendix E.

5.9 History of Property Use

An historic document, "Hillsborough's Communities" indicated Atlantic Coast Line railroad (to the west) and a crate veneer mill brought people to the general area in 1917. The Ross post office was started in 1919 and changed its name to South City in 1926. U.S. Highway 41 to the west was called "Bayshore Road" in 1916, and lands in the vicinity were owned by "Consolidated Land Co.," of Jacksonville, Florida, except a 40 ± acre parcel in the southwest area of the property owned and apparently homesteaded by the "Bonner" and "Holland" families. Descendants of the Holland family exist today with interests in "Dover Groves" north and west of the site. The earliest aerial photos (1938-1957) confirmed the 40-acre parcel was cleared for agriculture. Mr. Holland reported his father helped plant a variety of orange trees as a child, but the grove faded after his family sold the property in the 1940s. The Hollands/Bonnors also ran cattle on the property. In 1946, Louis Thomas owned the 40-acre parcel. Otherwise, the acreage was generally open rangeland and wetlands in the 1930s and 1940s.

Reportedly, the vast majority of the property in the area was ultimately owned by Mr. Jimmy Stover (deceased in the early 1990s), who sold 1,200 ± acres to Joseph and Eleanor Guy in the 1950s. In 1990, possibly on the death of Mr. Joseph Guy, the property was transferred to Guy family members. The name "GEE Ranch" was used because there were seven family members who owned the ranch as of 1990. A Mr. Moore was also involved with property, but only as an attorney and trustee. Mr. Guy cleared the property in the 1950s and 1960s. A barn was located in the northwest area in 1951 that was gone by 1965. Approximately 10 ± structures were located in the southwest area in 1965. The property was used as a cattle ranch and for private hunting. Cattle numbers on the site ranged from less than 100 to over 900 ± head of cattle over the years. A 2-story barbecue shack in the southwest section was leased out to large corporations for barbecues. An old wood-frame house was nearby.

Eight (8) irrigation wells were reported on-site (although the EDM report says eleven): 2 in NE area were never used and never had fuel tanks; three (3) were located in the northwest area; two (2) were located in the southwest area; one (1) was located in the southeast area. All six (6) active irrigation wells had diesel fuel tanks, right-angle drives and diesel engines on concrete pads and fertigation systems at some time. All fuel storage tanks were under 550-gallons.

In the 1970s, soils from four (4) borrow pits dug on-site were used to construct Interstate 75 that divided the property into east and west halves. Valley Road is a dirt road "built up" with a "drag line." Citrus groves including Valencia and navel oranges and a 12 ± acre grapefruit plot in the southeast section were planted in 1986 and 1991. In 2005, after strong winds from storms spread citrus canker into the area, the USDA ordered all the citrus trees in the area burned, including those in the Guy and Dover groves. This was done from May to July in 2005. A citrus tree burn pile was located just south of the shop area.

Watermelons, cantaloupes and tomatoes were also briefly grown in the northwest area in the early 1990s. Some 20 domestic pigs were kept on-site for food at an old barn in the southwest area. A new home was added by the Guy family along the river (north, off-site) for the caretaker in the 1990s. The old shop for the ranch (circa 1960s) was just northeast of the new

shop and had a dirt floor, wooden sides (barn-like), and tin roof. Equipment repair was conducted at the old shop before the new metal shop was added in the southwest area in the 1990s. The old cattle pen was located in the southwest area. A new cattle pen was added in the northwest area in the 1980s or 1990s.

The pole barn in the northwest area was upgraded over the years. Tractor maintenance was conducted at the old shop in the "oil room" where diesel and gasoline fuel storage tanks (fuel point) are currently located. The fuel point has always been located at its current location and has been used for trucks and tractors operating on-site. New oil, used oil, and hydraulic fluid are also stored at this location. The new shop has an office, restrooms and an agrichemical storage area with a concrete lip. Agrichemicals have generally included herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. The ranch had mostly 2-gallon containers or smaller, but some were in bags, 30-gallon drums or 55-gallon drums.

An archaeological study was done in the northeast area following rumors of a "mound," but no evidence/artifacts were found. No buildings or structures were located east of I-75.

Off-site, Interstate 75 was added in the 1970s and the overpass (Valley Road) was added in 1980. West of Interstate 75, the general area was known as "Valley" and east of Interstate 75 was known as "Sundance."

See Appendix E.

5.10 Applicable and User Provided Documents

The client provided a previous Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) by Environmental, Inc. (EI), dated October 21, 2004. EBE found "several" aboveground fuel storage tanks on concrete slabs with "no soil staining." EBE did not identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in its Phase I ESA. EBE did not recommend "Phase II" ESA activities. This report was prepared for Land Partners, LLC. During its site reconnaissance activities, EBE observed citrus groves, pasture, ASTs and a residence (next to river) in the northwest section; pasture and ASTs in the northeast section; citrus groves, offices, maintenance shops, and ASTs in the southwest area; and citrus groves and ASTs on the southeast parcels. EBE did not report Guy Ranch, Inc. as a listed site for the 1,000-gallon AST formerly in the northwest section (not on EDR report). Mr. Weiner was the grove manager at the time. EBE did not purport to prepare its Phase I ESA in accordance with any ASTM standard.

5.11 Physical Setting Sources

5.11.1 Site Topography

LAS reviewed the actual USGS topographic maps for the Ruskin, Fla. Quadrangle (7.5 Minute Series), dated 1956 and photorevised in 1981. The map indicated the following:

Northwest

Mostly agricultural (cleared land, crops or pasture) with an unimproved road, a barn, two (2) small wooded areas, power transmission line, three (3) seasonal ponds, three (3) intermittent streams or narrow washes, and two (2) marsh or swamp areas. Between 1956 and 1981, a wetland, a man-made pond, and a light duty road were added.

Northeast

Mostly agricultural with mangroves, a stream, Curiosity Creek, and five (5) wooded areas. Between 1956 and 1981, a man-made pond and light duty road were added.

Southwest

Mostly agricultural with an unimproved road, one (1) dwelling, one (1) barn, two (2) small wooded areas, and two (2) swamp or marsh areas. Between 1956 and 1981, four (4) man-made ponds and six (6) structures were added.

Southeast

Mostly agricultural with Curiosity Creek, four (4) intermittent streams or narrow washes, three (3) wooded areas, and five (5) swamp or marsh areas. Between 1956 and 1981, one (1) man-made pond was added.

LAS also reviewed a USGS topographic map dated 1988 (TerraServer website) and found no obvious changes.

5.11.2 Designated Wetlands

The scope of work for this Phase I ESA did not include a formal wetland delineation. However, the USGS topographic and USFWS National Wetlands Inventory maps (see Appendix F) indicated numerous wetlands, including Curiosity Creek on-site. The site also bordered Little Manatee River to the northeast.

5.11.3 Geotechnical Soils Investigation Report

LAS' affiliate Mortensen Engineering, Inc. (MEI) was in the process of completing a preliminary soils study of the site at this writing. Preliminary boring logs (to 40 feet below land surface) indicated fine sands to silty fine sands underlain by clayey materials and shells.

5.11.4 General Stratigraphy

The stratigraphy and lithology of the upper sediments in the general region consist of a sequence of sands, clays, shell beds, limestone, sandstones, and dolomite. The ages of these sediments range from Pliocene to recent. The limestone sequence typically associated with the Upper Floridan aquifer system could be within 100 ± feet of land surface in the region.

5.11.5 Shallow Soil Survey

The USDA Soil Survey of Hillsborough County, Florida indicated twelve (12) soil types and water (No. 99) on the subject site. The most prevalent soil type on the property was Myakka fine sand (No. 29) at 62 percent. Appendix F.

5.11.6 Area Hydrologic/Hydrogeologic Maps Charts

The subject site is located in the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). Applicable potentiometric maps and charts were available in the technical publication, "*Ground-Water Resource Availability Inventory: Hillsborough County, Florida*" and other information/maps published by SWFWMD and others. Copies of selected maps and charts pertaining to the subject site area are included in Appendix F.

5.11.7 Primary and Secondary Aquifers

According to SWFWMD maps and other hydrogeological information, three (3) aquifer systems are present in the study area: the Surficial aquifer system; the Intermediate aquifer system; and the Upper Floridan aquifer system.

5.11.8 On-site Water Wells

LAS observed two (2) water wells on-site: a potable water well (electric, well house) in the southwest area, and one (1) 12-inch diameter water well (capped, no pump or tank, just concrete slab) in the northeast area on-site. Reportedly, there were two (2) 12-inch diameter wells in the northeast area that were never used. Reportedly, eight (8) total water wells were located on the Guy Ranch property. A site representative stated six (6) wells were for irrigation and all six (6) had diesel fuel tanks on concrete slabs at one time. A bill of sale dated December 2, 2004 between Guy Ranch, Inc. and South County Cattle Co. and South County Ranch Corp. indicated two (2) out-of-service wells on the property, seven (7) power units that would have been stationed at the wells, and nine (9) fuel storage tanks that would have been placed at each well location.

EDM's report indicated approximately thirteen (13) water wells under the current ownership (South County Ranch Corp.) within the legal sections comprising the subject site, and eleven (11) were pictured on EDM's map. See Appendix D.

5.11.9 Groundwater Depth

The scope of services for this Phase I ESA did not include measurement of the shallow groundwater depth. However, MEI measured shallow groundwater at 2 to 4 ± feet at its boring locations.

5.11.10 Groundwater Flow

Groundwater flow direction within the Surficial aquifer system typically follows localized topographical relief patterns and is not determinable without site specific testing, which was not included in the scope of this Phase I ESA. Based on available potentiometric maps, the groundwater flow direction in the Intermediate aquifer system was generally toward the *northwest* in the region. Based on available potentiometric maps, the groundwater flow direction in the Upper Floridan aquifer system was generally toward the *west-northwest* in the region. See Appendix F.

6.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

6.1 Subject Site Observations

6.1.1 Inspection Dates

LAS visited the subject site on May 21, 30, 31, 2007, and June 11 and 15, 2007.

6.1.2 Site Inspector

Land Assessment Services, Inc. employee

6.1.3 Site Representative Present

Mr. William Rodderick, owner's representative, and Mr. Vaughn Rayner, grove manager, were present during LAS' May 21, 2007 site visit.

6.1.4 Inspection Process and Procedures

LAS viewed the subject site by 4-wheel drive truck and on foot. *All observations below were made on the date of LAS' site visits. LAS is not responsible to report changes in site conditions in the intervening period between our last site visit and the report issue date.*

6.1.5 Surface Access and Egress

LAS accessed the property from five (5) gates located along Valley and Lofton Roads.

6.1.6 Site Vegetation

Site vegetation included grass and weeds; oak, pine, cypress and palm trees; aquatic vegetation; and Brazilian pepper bushes. Some ornamental plants were observed near the former homesite in the southwest area.

6.1.7 Surface Water

LAS observed water in the ponds and ditches, Curiosity Creek and Little Manatee River.

6.1.8 Drainage

Stormwater drainage appeared directed toward ponds (and former borrow pits), ditches, Curiosity Creek and other low areas, on and off-site.

6.1.9 Railroad Spurs

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.10 Utilities, Drains, Vent Pipes, Water Wells, Heating and A/C Systems, and Septic Systems

Three (3) septic systems were reported on-site: two (2) at former homesites and one (1) at the "new" shop. The septic system in the shop was connected to a shop sink (see Site Photographs in Appendix C). A window A/C unit was located in the new shop (office area).

6.1.11 Buildings

See Section 3.7.

6.1.12 Heavy Equipment, Tankers or Spray Rigs

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.13 Unusual Odors

Not physically or visually observed. However, LAS detected petroleum odors near the fuel storage tanks in the southwest area.

6.1.14 Disturbed Soils

LAS observed some disturbed soil on-site consistent with demolition activity (southwest area), cattle and wild hogs, recent clearing and silt screen installation, and "pushed up" areas where burn piles were located.

6.1.15 Surface Impoundments or Holding Ponds

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.16 Air Emissions or Wastewater Discharges

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.17 Industrial or Manufacturing Activities

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.18 Monitoring Wells or Remedial Activities

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.19 Stained or Discolored Soil

LAS observed "de minimis" patches of stained soil and stressed vegetation at the pole barn and east of the pole barn in the southwest area.

6.1.20 Leachate or Seeps

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.21 Stressed Vegetation

See Section 6.1.19.

6.1.22 Chemical Spills or Releases

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.23 Groundwater or Surface Water Contamination

LAS did not perform intrusive groundwater or surface water quality chemical testing to confirm the presence or absence of contamination on-site during this Phase I ESA.

6.1.24 Oil or Gas Well Exploration

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.25 Farm Waste Concerns

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.26 Evidence of Prolonged Use or Misapplication of Pesticides, Herbicides, or Fertilizers

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.27 Other Environmentally Suspect Conditions

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.28 Discharges, Leachate, Migration, or Run-off from Off-Site Pollution Sources

Not physically or visually observed.

6.1.29 Color Photographic Documentation

See Appendix C.

6.2 AST/UST Systems

LAS observed three (3) aboveground fuel storage tanks on-site. All three (3) ASTs were located in the southwest quadrant, skid-mounted, situated on concrete slabs, and had 1 ± foot or less contents in the bottom of the tanks. These three (3) ASTs did not exceed 550 gallons in capacity. Although LAS detected petroleum odors in the vicinity of these tanks, LAS did not observe obviously stained soil or stressed vegetation at the tank locations, or any obvious signs of leaks. No underground fuel storage or heating oil tanks were observed or reported. Reportedly, two (2) of the tanks were diesel and one (1) was for gasoline.

One (1) 200 ± gallon waste oil AST was located inside of the “old” shed at the fuel point. It was situated on a heavily stained concrete floor.

6.3 Transformers and PCB Equipment

LAS observed numerous transformers near structures and former structures located in the SW area. All appeared to have blue “non-PCB” labels and no apparent discharges.

6.4 Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products

LAS observed relatively small quantities of petroleum products, insecticides, hydraulic fluid, etc. in both the shed and shop in the southwest area. Containers included 55-gallon drums, 5-gallon buckets and other smaller containers.

6.5 Drums and Storage Containers

See Section 6.4.

6.6 Area Reconnaissance

6.6.1 Description and Contamination Potential of Adjoining Properties (see Table 3 below)

TABLE 3—OFF-SITE AREA RECONNAISSANCE SUMMARY

Proximity to Site	Observations	Environmental Conditions
Abutting/Adjacent North	Crops, pasture, wetlands, residence, Little Manatee River	Not physically or visually noted.
Abutting/Adjacent South	Woods, wetlands, Interstate 75, crops	Not physically or visually noted.
Abutting/Adjacent East	Woods, wetlands, Curiosity Creek, residences, Lofton Rd.	Potassium discharge (from water well purification system) on and off-site from residence on Long Rifle Rd.
Abutting/Adjacent West	Nature Preserve, woods, wetlands, croplands, pasture, TECO easement, AST at well	Not physically or visually noted. No apparent leaks at well/AST location.

6.6.2 Summary and Discussion

LAS observed no obvious off-site conditions that posed a material contamination threat to the subject site at this time. In our opinion, a 500-gallon aboveground diesel fuel storage tank located approximately 200 ± west of the subject site was far enough from the subject site to not be considered a material contamination threat at this time.

7.0 INTERVIEWS

7.1 Owners

Mr. William H. Rodderick, owner's representative, Deerfield Properties of Ruskin, 5/21/07

Worked here 1 ± year. Represents all five (5) tracts. Previous manager was Mr. Gary Reynolds at (813) 633-8585 (home). No one lives on-site; no residences or worker houses. No burn pits, trash pits, buried debris or drums, cattle dip vats (CDV) or fuel discharges on-site. Nearest CDV was located further north along Wolf Branch. Previous Phase I ESA was done in June 2006 on the South County Ranch Corp. tract; contact Mr. Jones for a copy. Not aware of any other environmental studies on-site. Previous geotechnical studies done on several tracts, including the area west of U.S. Hwy 41. West of U.S. Highway 41 was tested for possible "shell mine." In the process of purchasing the South County Ranch Corp. land. Three (3) septic tanks on-site: two (2) former residences and one at the shop just west of I-75. Has a "3-inch binder" with core samples (geotechnical) from on-site. 150 ± head of cattle on-site on the South County Ranch property. A "gas" line runs along the TECO easement.

7.2 Occupants

See Section 7.1. Not applicable.

7.3 Operators

See Section 7.1.

7.4 Local Government Officials

LAS acquired tank, and complaint and warning notice file data from the Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) of Hillsborough County, and inquired regarding excavation/borrow pits with the Planning and Growth Management Department of Hillsborough County. Information was also obtained from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). LAS also contacted the office of the Hillsborough County Fire Marshal. No fire incidents were reported for the subject site. See Sections 5.3 and 7.5 and Appendix G.

7.5 Others (Including past owners, occupants, and operators)

Mr. Vaughn Rayner, Deerfield Properties of Ruskin, 5/21/07

Worked as Deerfield's grove manager for 10 ± years. Deerfield currently has no shop. Agrichemicals are stored north of "gate 4" and Valley Road (off-site). No CDV on-site; was likely further north on Mr. Stover property. Fuel storage tanks: Geronimo has one; Billy has two; I have four; Stover has 2. All the tanks are above ground, less than 550-gallons in size, and no fuel spills or discharges. No buried debris, trash or burn pits, or CDV on-site. Dr. Guy (Bradenton, FL) used to own the "Guy Ranch" which was 1,100 ± acres and was the South County Ranch Corp. property. He used to have a large grove, cattle, dove hunting field, and leased his 2-story barbeque shack out to large corporations for BBQs. There used to be an old wood-frame house near the barbeque shack. Attended some of the BBQs. Curtis used to be the old ranch/grove manager of the Guy Ranch. "Kovar" and "Roundup" are the only herbicides used in the 10 ± years Mr. Rayner has worked on-site. Is a native Floridian who grew up in the Gillette/Rubonia area in Manatee County. Grows two (2) types of oranges: Valencia and Naval. No grapefruit or other citrus. Groves were planted in 1986 and 1991. Used to work for

Gardinier (abutting N). Dover Groves and Spencer Farms abut the north boundary. No dairies ever on-site. Mr. Stover was historically a large cattle rancher and had vast land holdings in the area. The eldest Mr. Stover has "Imperial Horse Farms" further south in Manatee County. Six (6) gates on the north side of Valley Rd. are referred to as "Gate 1" through "Gate 6" from west to east; all are west of I-75 and TECO easement. Citrus canker was the reason the groves on the South County Ranch property were destroyed. A citrus tree burn pile was located just south of the shop.

Mr. Jim Moore, Hillsborough County Planning & Growth Management, 5/29/07

Found one (1) file for the subject site. Anderson Construction Co. excavated the borrow pit in 1979 under permit #3-1279. Requested file from archives, but not found.

Mr. Charlie Stump, Site Representative, May 29, 2007

We (Anderson Construction Co.) excavated about 50% of the borrow pits & shell mines south of S.R. 674, and south to the county line. No buildings or structures on-site. No temporary offices or water wells associated with the borrow pits. Was originally called "GEE Ranch," later changed to "Guy Ranch" after groves were planted in the late 1980s. No hunting leases or target shooting berms.

Mr. Curtis W. Weiner, former GEE/Guy Ranch Manager, 6/20/07

Was the ranch manager from 1984 until 2005. The Guy's had 1,200 ± acres since at least the 1950s or 1960s. Interstate 75, the overpass, Valley Road and the borrow pits/ponds were already in place when I arrived. Guy sold the property in 2004. The cattle dip vat (CDV) was located between the ditch along the interstate and just south of the three (3) houses under the trees in the southwest area. [See Appendix E for special aerial section.] There was no barn near the three (3) houses, just a barbeque shack. The old cattle pen was located there. The CDV was not used since at least 1984 and we "got rid of it" around 1984 or 1985. It was concrete with no liquid inside; no roof covering or wooden rails at the time he saw it. In prime time, we had a "cow and calf" operation with 190 ± head of cattle on-site. We then sent them to market in Tampa. Originally called the "GEE Ranch," later called "Guy Ranch" in the late 1980s. Planted citrus groves from 1984 through the early 1990s. Used "micro sprinklers" for irrigation. Citrus canker ended the groves in 2005. We pushed up the trees and burned them above ground from May to July in 2005. No burn or trash pits, smudge pots or buried drums or debris. Eight (8) irrigation wells on-site: two (2) in NE area were never used and never had fuel tanks; three (3) were located in the northwest area; two (2) were located in the southwest area; one (1) was located in the southeast area. All six (6) active irrigation wells had diesel fuel tanks, right-angle drives and diesel engines on concrete pads and fertigation systems at some time. All fuel storage tanks were under 550-gallons. No fuel or hazardous substance leaks, spills or discharges on-site. The former structure, just northeast of the new shop was an old barn with dirt floor, wooden sides, and tin roof from circa the 1960s. The pole barn in the northwest area was not new, it has been upgraded over the years. Tractor maintenance was conducted at the old shop we called an "oil room" where the diesel and gasoline fuel storage tanks (fuel point) are currently located. The fuel point has always been located at its current location at the "oil room." New and used oil, and hydraulic fluid was stored in the old "oil room." The new shop had no floor drains; we used "dry sweep" to clean up any spills. Equipment repairs were conducted at the "oil room" until the new shop was built in the 1990s. The new shop had an office, restrooms and an agrichemical storage area with a concrete lip. Agrichemicals generally included herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. We mostly had 2-gallon containers or smaller, but some were in bags, 30-gallon drums and some 55-gallon drums. Fuel was used for trucks and tractors on-site. "Guy Transport" was not affiliated with this Guy

family and was spelled differently. No fish kills, sheen, drums or debris in or along the river or creek on-site. No septic sprayfields or sludge dispersion on-site. Two (2) septic tanks were located on-site. One (1) was at the Guy's house along the river in the northwest area; another was located on the south side of the new shop in the southwest area. An archaeological study was done in the northeast area following rumors of a "mound" but no evidence/artifacts were found. I lived in the Guy's house along the river. No buildings or structures were located east of I-75. The dirt from the borrow pits on-site was used for I-75 and Valley Road. Curiosity Creek flowed to the north, toward the river. Briefly grew vegetables including tomatoes, watermelons and cantaloupes on-site; but that didn't work too well. One (1) new powerline was added and a gas pipeline was supposed to be added along the TECO easement since 1984. No other underground utilities on the powerline easement. Contact Dr. Jim Guy in Bradenton.

6/21/07

Mr. Weiner returned my call from the previous evening at 10:40 a.m.

LAS: "Has there been any previous environmental testing anywhere on-site or at the cattle dip vat?"

Mr. Weiner: "Well, I have to restate myself on that; I have to amend my position. After speaking with my wife, she did not recall me ever calling it a 'cattle dip vat,' it was probably a 'water trough.' They had lots of them concrete water troughs around then. But it was a good sized one. I cannot say 100% that it was a cattle dip vat."

No fill dirt or materials brought on-site. The old house and old barn were taken down, the wood burned above ground, concrete went into dumpsters and metal hauled off-site for scrap. Contents of the old barn included hay, irrigation parts and domestic pigs used for food. Has been asked questions of this nature previously, but not sure if they were for a Phase I ESA or environmental studies. Vegetable crops were circa 1991. Watermelons were grown in the plot west of the electric gate (northwest area). Tomatoes were grown in the northwest area along Valley Road, west of the dirt road and south of the powerline easement. Citrus included oranges and a 12 ± acre plot of grapefruit. The grapefruit were in the southeast area, along Valley Road. The concrete slab and 12-inch diameter pipe were for an irrigation well that was never used (no fuel storage tank at that location). The debris noted in 1994/1995 (warning notice, complaint) included trash from parties held on-site dating back to the 1960s by the old (deceased) owner. Someone in an airplane spotted the debris and turned it in. About 4 or 5 sheriffs came out with a helicopter. "They were loaded for bear." There was "no acid, no batteries." Owners may have paid a litter fine. I have a record in my background check for "litter." There were no roads or trash collection out here; that's how it was handled back then.

Dr. Joseph B. Guy, Jr., former Guy Ranch owner, 6/20/07

Left message with secretary

Dr. Jim Guy, former owner, 6/21/07

Father purchased 1,100 or 1,200 ± acres from Jimmy Stover in the 1950s. Mr. Stover used the property for cattle ranching. Father cleared the property. Cattle numbers ranged from less than 100 to over 900 ± head of cattle. Was strictly a beef cattle operation, no dairy. Mr. Moore was an attorney and trustee who never owned the property, was just the trustee. No septic sprayfields, sludge dispersion, buried debris or trash pits, underground fuel storage tanks, or cattle dip vat (CDV) on-site. All the irrigation wells had concrete slabs with diesel fuel storage tanks. "A fuel tank" for the equipment was located at the shop. No agricultural or fuel discharges. Was an old house, 1 or 2 old barns, an old cattle pen, and a barbecue shack in the

southwest area. An old farm worker lived in the old house in the southwest area. Soil from about four (4) borrow pits was used for Interstate 75 construction. The name "GEE Ranch" was used because there were seven family members who owned the ranch. No buildings or structures on-site at the time of purchase. Groves were added in the 1980s. Watermelons and tomatoes were also grown on-site for about one year. Agrichemicals used on-site were legal and allowed by the government. We built a new house about 6-8 years ago for our farm manager by the river. No fish kills, sheen or environmental concerns with any water bodies on-site. Archaeological study was conducted in which native American artifacts were found, but no evidence of a burial ground, mound or temple. No fill materials brought on-site. Was some "paper" on-site I had to get rid of and disposed off-site. We got a certificate from the regulators saying it was cleaned up. The old house and barn were either burned or hauled off-site. No hunting leases or shooting berms, just private hunting over the years.

Mr. J.E. Holland, former owner's family, 6/22/07

Was a physicist with Westinghouse, born in Orlando. Spent most of his adult life in the South City area. Nickname is "Dover." Father's name was Dover (Dover Groves, further north, off-site). In 2005, after strong winds from storms spread citrus canker in the area, the USDA mandated burning all the citrus trees in the area, including Guy Groves and Dover Groves. IFAS taught us how to grow citrus. "We're trying to figure out how to recover." Great grandfather settled the 40-acre parcel south of Valley Road. Was a house on the property built circa 1920. No cattle dip vat (CDV) on-site. Family ran cattle on the property; may have been fenced to keep cattle out during the "open range" days. Father helped plant a variety of oranges (no grapefruit or other crops) on the 40-acre plot by hand, with a water bucket as a kid. The grove faded out after he sold the property in the 1940s. Helped run cattle through a dip vat located further south and west "as a kid." Agrichemicals on Guy's property would have been legal; Guy's grove manager "knew what he was doing." Guy did not have any underground fuel storage tanks. Father had 80 ± acres along Stover Road. Mr. Stover's kids moved to Jacksonville. Mr. Jimmy Stover deceased 15 ± years ago; about 90 years old at the time. Council family had a lemon grove on the west side of U.S. Highway 41. Mr. Lofton had property east of Interstate 75 and south of the river. Valley Road was a dirt road "built up" with a "drag line."

Ms. Amy Shiner, Manatee RV Park, 6/22/07

42 ± years old, born and raised just south of the Hillsborough/Manatee county line. Father is 79 ± years old, but out of town. Was familiar with cattle dip vats (CDVs). Not aware of any in the area. Will ask her father and call us back. The whole area was citrus groves, cattle ranches and fish farms. Is a member of another Shiner family, but not the owners (Shiner family) of the RV park and property on Valley Road.