



FINAL **Phase I Environmental** **Site Assessment**

91 Eglinton Avenue East,
Mississauga, Ontario

Prepared for:

Dr. Jamie Kaukinen

830 – 21 Dallas Road
Victoria, BC V8V 4Z9

Attn: Dr. Jamie Kaukinen

August 8, 2017

Pinchin File: 0208402



Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario
Dr. Jamie Kaukinen

August 8, 2017
Pinchin File: 0208402
FINAL

Issued To: Dr. Jamie Kaukinen
Contact: Dr. Jamie Kaukinen
Issued On: August 8, 2017
Pinchin File: 0208402
Issuing Office: 2470 Milltower Court,
Mississauga, ON L5N 7W5
Primary Contact: Gagan Singh, P.Eng
Project Manager
905.363.1467
gsingh@pinchin.com

Author: Vincent Ng, B.Sc.
Project Technologist
905.363.1352
vng@pinchin.com

Reviewer: Frank DiMaria, B.Sc.H., P.Geo.
Senior Project Manager
905.363.1316
fdimaria@pinchin.com



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pinchin Ltd. (Pinchin) was retained on July 10, 2017 through an Authorization to Proceed signed by Dr. Jamie Kaukinen (Client) to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property located at 91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario (hereafter referred to as the Site).

The Site is developed with four single-storey barns and one single-storey residential building with a basement (hereafter referred to as Site Buildings A to E). Site Building A is comprised of a split-level residential dwelling with a basement, while Site Buildings B and D are comprised of single-storey storage barns. Site Building C includes a two-storey barn (Site Building C), while Site Building E consists of a wood shed (Site Building E). Following the initial Site reconnaissance, Site Buildings B, C, D and E were demolished.

Pinchin was advised by the Client that the purpose of the Phase I ESA was to assess potential issues of environmental concern in relation to the potential disposition of the Site.

The Phase I ESA was completed in general accordance with the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) document entitled "*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, CSA Standard Z768-01*" dated November 2001 (reaffirmed 2016), including a review of readily-available historical records, a review of readily-accessible regulatory records, a Site reconnaissance, interviews, an evaluation of information and reporting, subject to the limitations outlined in Section 8.0 of this report.

Based on the results of the Phase I ESA completed by Pinchin, the following could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site:

- An orchard was formerly present on the central portion of the Site. Pesticides and herbicides were typically applied to orchards. Based on the age of the orchard (from at least 1954 to at least 1975), the potential use of pesticides and/or herbicides could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site; and
- A former Speedy Auto Service repair facility was located adjacent to the southwest of the Site. Based on the suspected age of the operations (from at least 1997 to 2003), this off-Site activity could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

Based on the findings noted above, Pinchin recommends completing a Phase II ESA at the Site.

Pinchin recommends that the potable well observed on-Site be decommissioned in accordance with Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 903/90 (as amended) during any future development activities.

Given the year of construction of the Site Buildings (i.e., approximately 1950s and 1970s), there is a potential for friable and non-friable asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) to be present in the Site Building. Friable and non-friable ACMs including vinyl floor tiles, acoustic ceiling tiles and drywall joint



compound were observed in Site Building A during the Site reconnaissance. Pinchin did not conduct an asbestos survey as part of this Phase I ESA, nor was any destructive or intrusive sampling or inspection conducted as part of this Phase I ESA. The Site Representatives advised Pinchin that prior to the demolition of Site Buildings B, C, D and E, an ACM survey was completed for Site Buildings A to E and no ACMs were identified. The ACM report was not reviewed by Pinchin.

This Executive Summary is subject to the same standard limitations as contained in the report and must be read in conjunction with the entire report.

This report has been issued without having received responses from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change. Once a response from this regulatory body is received, the information will be reviewed by Pinchin and, if there is any information that represents a potential issue of environmental concern, a copy of the response will be forwarded to the Client under separate cover. Our conclusions and recommendations may be amended based on this information.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Scope of Work	1
2.0	SITE DESCRIPTION.....	2
2.1	Site Location and Physical Description	2
2.2	Topographic, Geologic and Hydrogeological Setting	3
2.3	Site Operations	4
3.0	HISTORICAL RECORDS REVIEW	4
3.1	Site Interviews and Records.....	4
3.2	Aerial Photographs and Satellite Imagery	4
3.3	Opta Information	6
3.4	City Directories	7
3.5	Previous Environmental Reports	8
3.6	Historical Summary.....	9
4.0	REGULATORY INFORMATION AND CORRESPONDENCE	10
4.1	Site Regulatory Information	10
4.2	Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change	10
4.3	Technical Standards & Safety Authority	10
4.4	EcoLog ERIS	10
4.5	Regulatory Information Summary.....	12
5.0	SITE RECONNAISSANCE	13
5.1	Hazardous Materials.....	13
5.2	Storage Tanks	13
5.2.1	Aboveground Storage Tanks	13
5.2.2	Underground Storage Tanks.....	14
5.3	Water and Wastewater	14
5.4	Hydraulic Equipment	15
5.5	Polychlorinated Biphenyls	15
5.6	Asbestos-Containing Materials	16
5.7	Lead-Containing Paints	17
5.8	Ozone-Depleting Substances.....	17
5.9	Radon	17
5.10	Mould or Microbial Contamination	18
5.11	Air Emissions	18
5.12	Staining and Stressed Vegetation	18
5.13	Non-Hazardous Wastes	19
6.0	ACTIVITIES ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES.....	19
7.0	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	20
8.0	TERMS AND LIMITATIONS	21
9.0	REFERENCES.....	23



FIGURES

FIGURE 1	Key Map
FIGURE 2	Site and Surrounding Land Use Plan

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	Opta Response
APPENDIX II	Correspondence with Regulatory Agencies
APPENDIX III	EcoLog ERIS Report
APPENDIX IV	Qualifications of Assessor
APPENDIX V	Photographs



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Pinchin Ltd. (Pinchin) was retained on July 10, 2017 through an Authorization to Proceed signed by Dr. Jamie Kaukinen (Client) to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property located at 91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario (hereafter referred to as the Site).

The Site is developed with four single-storey barns and one single-storey residential building with a basement (hereafter referred to as Site Buildings A to E). Site Building A is comprised of a split-level residential dwelling with a basement, while Site Buildings B and D are comprised of single-storey storage barns. Site Building C includes a two-storey barn (Site Building C), while Site Building E consists of a wood shed (Site Building E). Following the initial Site reconnaissance, Site Buildings B, C, D and E were demolished.

Pinchin was advised by the Client that the purpose of the Phase I ESA was to assess potential issues of environmental concern in relation to the potential disposition of the Site.

1.2 Scope of Work

The Phase I ESA was completed in general accordance with the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) document entitled "*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, CSA Standard Z768-01*" dated November 2001 (reaffirmed 2016), including a review of readily available historical and regulatory records, a Site reconnaissance, interviews, an evaluation of information and reporting, all subject to the limitations outlined in Section 8.0 of this report.

Pinchin conducted a Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017, and was accompanied by Ms. Christine Danielak, and has been associated with the Site since the early 1970s. Additional information was provided by Mr. Nick Danielak. Ms. Danielak and Mr. Danielak are hereafter referred to as the Site Representatives. An additional Site visit was conducted on August 3, 2017 subsequent to the demolition of Site Buildings B, C, D and E.

In addition, Pinchin reviewed the document entitled "*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario*", prepared by Trow Associates Inc. (Trow) for Cushman & Wakefield Le Page Inc., dated June 5, 2007, as provided by the Client.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Site Location and Physical Description

As indicated on Figure 1 (Key Map), the Site is located on the northwest side of Eglinton Avenue East, approximately 170 m northeast of Hurontario Street, in Mississauga, Ontario. The Site is situated in an area that predominantly consists of residential, agricultural and commercial land uses. Figure 2 illustrates the Site and surrounding area.

A summary of the physical description of the Site, including the Site Buildings, is provided below:

Topic	Details
Approximate Site Area	3.85 hectares (9.5 acres).
Buildings on-Site	<p>Site Building A: Located on the central portion of the Site.</p> <p>Site Building B: Located on the central portion of the Site.</p> <p>Site Building C: Located on the southern portion of the Site.</p> <p>Site Building D: Located on the southwestern portion of the Site.</p> <p>Site Building E: Located on the central portion of the Site.</p> <p>As indicated above, following the initial Site reconnaissance, Site Buildings B to E were demolished.</p>
Approximate Year of Construction and Significant Additions or Renovations	<p>Site Building A: At least 1975.</p> <p>Site Buildings B to E: At least 1954. Following the initial Site reconnaissance, Site Buildings B to E were demolished.</p>
Number of Floors (Including ground level)	<p>Site Building A: Split level with a basement.</p> <p>Site Building B: One.</p> <p>Site Building C: Two.</p> <p>Site Building D: One.</p> <p>Site Building E: One.</p>
Subsurface Levels	<p>Site Building A: Basement.</p> <p>Site Buildings B to E: None.</p>
Approximate Footprint Areas of Buildings	<p>Site Building A: 230 square metres (m²) (2,475.7 square feet (ft²)).</p> <p>Site Buildings B to E: Not applicable since Site Buildings B to E were subsequently demolished following the initial Site reconnaissance.</p>
Approximate Total Areas of Buildings	<p>Site Building A: 460 m² (4,951 ft²).</p> <p>Site Buildings B to E: Not applicable since Site Buildings B to E were subsequently demolished following the initial Site reconnaissance.</p>



Topic	Details
Heating / Cooling	A wood stove associated with Site Building A. Electric baseboard heaters associated with Site Building A. Oil-fired furnace associated with Site Building A.
Elevators	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.
Emergency Generators	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.
Landscaped / Grassed/Bare Ground Areas	The majority of the Site is covered with grass, with a small garden located west of Site Building A.
Paved or Other Sealed Surface Materials	A small paved driveway connects Eglinton Avenue East to an unpaved driveway.

2.2 Topographic, Geologic and Hydrogeological Setting

Topic	Findings
Topography of Site and Surrounding Area	The Site and surrounding areas slope gently towards the south.
Site Grade Relative to the Adjoining Properties	The Site is at a similar grade to the adjoining properties to the east, south and west. The adjoining property to the north-northeast is approximately 0.5 m higher in elevation than the Site.
Subsurface Soils	Sand and silt to approximately 5.79 m below ground surface (mbgs), based on a review of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC; formerly the Ministry of the Environment) well records database.
Fill Materials	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.
Bedrock Type	Shale, limestone, dolostone, siltstone of the Georgian Bay Formation.
Inferred Bedrock Depth	Greater than 6.0 mbgs, based on a review of the MOECC well records database.
Inferred Groundwater Depth	Approximately 4.0 mbgs, based on a review of the MOECC well records database.
Nearest Open Water Body	Cooksville Creek is located approximately 450 m southwest of the Site. Cooksville Creek flows southeast and discharges into Lake Ontario, located approximately 9 kilometres (km) southeast of the Site.
Inferred Groundwater Flow Direction	South-southeast based on topography and/or the nearest body of water.



2.3 Site Operations

According to the Site Representatives, the Site has been used for residential purposes since at least the 1970s. The Site Representatives indicated that the Site had previously been used as a hobby farm, with livestock and an apple and pear orchard for personal consumption. The Site Representatives indicated that the Site had formerly been serviced by a domestic drinking well, located adjacent to Site Building B. Further details regarding on-Site operations are provided in Section 5.0.

3.0 HISTORICAL RECORDS REVIEW

3.1 Site Interviews and Records

The Site Representatives advised Pinchin of the following with respect to the historical occupancy and operations at the Site:

- The family of the Site Representatives have occupied the Site since at the early 1970s. The dates of construction of the Site Buildings are unknown;
- The Site was formerly used as a hobby farm with a small number of livestock and apple and pear trees;
- No dry cleaning operations have historically taken place at the Site; and
- No retail fuel outlets (RFOs) have operated at the Site.

3.2 Aerial Photographs and Satellite Imagery

Copies of aerial photographs dated 1954, 1966, 1975, 1980, 1985, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012 and 2017 were obtained from the City of Mississauga Online Mapping Service website (<https://www.mississauga.ca/portal/services/maps>) and reviewed by Pinchin.

A summary of information inferred with respect to the Site is provided in the following table:

Year of Photograph	Site
1954	The Site is developed with three large buildings similar in size and configuration to former Site Buildings B, C and D. Approximately 40 trees (inferred orchard) are present in the central portion of the Site.
1966	Similar to 1954.
1975	A building that was similar in size and configuration to the present-day Site Building A is present on the central portion of the Site. The trees located in the central portion of the Site in the previous aerial photographs appear to have been removed.



Year of Photograph	Site
1980, 1985, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012, 2017	Similar to the present-day Site.

Pinchin notes that based on the age of the former orchard (from at least 1954 to at least 1975), the potential use of herbicides and pesticides could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

A summary of information inferred with respect to the surrounding area is provided in the following table:

Year of Photograph	North/Northeast	East/Southeast	South/Southwest	West/Southwest
1954	Vacant undeveloped/ agricultural land.	Vacant undeveloped/ agricultural land. A roadway similar in orientation to the present-day Eglinton Avenue East is located adjacent to the east/southeast of the Site.	Vacant undeveloped/ agricultural land combined with residential dwellings.	Vacant undeveloped/ agricultural land combined with residential dwellings.
1966, 1975, 1980, 1985	Similar to 1954.	Similar to 1954.	Similar to 1954.	Similar to 1954.
1992	Similar to 1985.	Similar to 1985.	A commercial plaza similar in size and configuration to the present-day plaza is present to the southeast of the Site.	The residential dwelling to the southwest of the Site is no longer present and the property has been redeveloped with an inferred commercial property.
1997	Similar to 1992, with the exception of residential developments similar to the present-day townhomes northeast of the Site.	Similar to 1992.	Similar to 1992, with further development to the commercial plaza identified in the 1992 aerial photograph.	The property adjacent to the southwest of the Site has been redeveloped with buildings similar in size and orientation to the present-day multi-tenant



Year of Photograph	North/Northeast	East/Southeast	South/Southwest	West/Southwest
				commercial plaza, with the exception of a separate building listed as 5033 Hurontario Street.
2002	Similar to 1997.	Similar to 1997.	Similar to 1997.	Similar to 1997.
2007, 2012	Similar to 2002.	Similar to 2002.	Similar to 2002.	Similar to 2002, with the exception of the redevelopment of the property adjacent to the southwest of the Site to buildings similar size and orientation to the present day multi-tenant commercial plaza. 5033 Hurontario Street now appears to be connected to the building identified as 5035 Hurontario Street.
2016	The residential dwellings northwest of the Site are under construction.	Similar to 2016.	Similar to 2016.	Similar to 2016.

3.3 Opta Information

Pinchin contacted Opta Information Intelligence (Opta) to obtain copies of Fire Insurance Plans related to the Site and surrounding area, as well as Property Underwriters' Reports and Property Underwriters' Plans related to the Site. Opta completed a search on July 20, 2017, indicating there were no records for the Site and surrounding properties. A copy of Opta's response is provided in Appendix I.

3.4 City Directories

City directories for the years 1966 to 2001 were reviewed by Pinchin at the Toronto Reference Library, Toronto, Ontario. It should be noted that no city directories were available for the City of Mississauga subsequent to 2001. A summary of information obtained with respect to the Site is provided in the following table:

Year(s)	Occupant Listings for Site Address
1966	Address does not exist
1970/1971	Address does not exist
1976	Address does not exist
1981	Beauty-Wood Industries Nick Danielak
1986	Nick Danielak
1991	Nick Danielak
1996	Nick Danielak
2001	Nick Danielak

Beauty-Wood Industries was listed at the Site in 1981. Based on the information provided by the Site Representatives, no large scale commercial/industrial operations were conducted at the Site. It is Pinchin's opinion that this listing is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

In general, the city directories indicated that the surrounding area has historically consisted of commercial and residential land uses since 1966. No historical dry cleaning operations, RFOs or other operations of potential environmental concern were identified, with the exception of the following:

- An Esso RFO was listed at 5008 Hurontario Street from at least 1977 to 2001. Pinchin notes that this RFO was still in operation at the time of the Site reconnaissance. This property is located approximately 185 m south of the Site and is situated hydraulically downgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. Based on the distance between the RFO and the Site, as well as the inferred groundwater flow direction, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical off-Site operation is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site;

- Speedy Auto Service, an automotive repair facility, was listed in the city directories at 5033 Hurontario Street for the year 2001. This property was formerly located adjacent to the southwest of the Site and was situated hydraulically downgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. Based on a review of historical aerial photographs, this building was present from 1997 until 2003 when the building appears to be connected to the commercial plaza building to the northwest (i.e., 5035 Hurontario Street). This location is now occupied by a retail pharmacy. No additional information regarding the operations of the former Speedy Auto Service facility was provided in the EcoLog ERIS database search. Based on the close proximity of the former Speedy Auto Service operation from the Site, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical off-Site operation could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site; and
- Models Cleaners, was listed in the 2001 City Directory at 5035 Hurontario Street, located adjacent to the southwest of the Site. The Site is currently occupied by Hurontario Cleaners. According to the employees at Hurontario Cleaners, this facility is a drop-off dry cleaner, and no dry cleaning is done on the premises. Further, this adjacent business is not registered as a generator of hazardous wastes (i.e., dry cleaning related chemicals). As such, it is Pinchin's opinion that this current and historical off-Site operation is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

3.5 Previous Environmental Reports

2007 Trow Phase I ESA Report

The Phase I ESA completed by Trow in June 2007 consisted of historical reviews, a review of surrounding properties, a regulatory database search, and interviews as well as an exterior assessment of the Site.

The results of the 2007 Trow Phase I ESA Report identified several areas of potential environmental concerns associated with the current and historical use of the Site. The following summarizes the findings of the 2007 Trow Phase I ESA Report:

- The Site was occupied by a two-storey brick residential house with basement, a long rectangular shed, a two-storey barn and a single-storey barn;
- A private well was located to the southwest of the long rectangular shed;
- Aerial photographs from 1954 indicated that a residential dwelling was present on the central portion of the Site. The 1978 aerial photograph showed that the residential dwelling in 1954 was no longer present, and a new residential house was located west of the previous dwelling;



- A land title search was conducted for the Site, and indicated that the Site was owned by Nicolas and Maria Danielak, and was acquired on July 29, 1966. The Site has been owned by private individuals since March 11, 1825;
- Based on the age of the residential dwelling (i.e., early 1970s), Trow noted the potential presence of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), asbestos, lead in paint and mercury to be present within the dwelling;
- One aboveground storage tank (AST) was observed by Trow in the basement of the residential house. The AST was noted to be in excellent condition, while the concrete floor below the AST was also observed to be in excellent condition with no staining or cracks. Trow concluded that no adverse impacts to the Site associated with the operation of the AST were suspected;
- The Site was serviced by an existing potable drinking water near the southwest corner of the long rectangular shed;
- Staining was noted under cars stored in the barn near northwest corner of the Site. Cracks were noted in the concrete floor of that area;
- Based on the results of the 2007 Trow Phase I ESA Report, Trow recommended that if renovations or demolition of the Site buildings were planned, it was recommended that the any presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury and lead be assessed and managed; and
- Cracking was observed on the concrete floor in the barn where vehicles were being stored. Trow noted that although there was a potential for contaminants associated with surficial staining of reaching the underlying soils, any impacted soils could be addressed through localized excavation at the time of the demolition of the buildings.

3.6 Historical Summary

Based on the results of the historical review, the following could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site:

- Speedy Auto Service, an automotive repair facility was listed in the City Directories as being located at 5033 Hurontario Street for 2001. This building is located adjacent to the southwest of the Site and was situated hydraulically downgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. The property was connected to the adjacent building to the northwest (i.e., 5035 Hurontario Street) in approximately 2003 and has since been converted to a retail pharmacy. Based on the close proximity of the former Speedy Auto Service operation from the Site, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical off-Site operation could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site; and

- Based on a review of the historical aerial photographs, a former orchard was present in the central portion of the Site from at least 1954 to at least 1975.

4.0 REGULATORY INFORMATION AND CORRESPONDENCE

4.1 Site Regulatory Information

Pinchin requested copies of permits, approvals and registrations from the Client and was advised that there is no regulatory information with respect to the Site.

4.2 Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

A Freedom of Information request was submitted to the MOECC for information on file with respect to the Site. Specifically, the MOECC was asked what information it has regarding historical spills, orders, investigations/prosecutions, waste generator numbers/classes, Certificates-of-Approval (Cs-of-A) and Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECAs). At the time of writing this report, no response had been received from the MOECC. When a formal response is received, it will be reviewed by Pinchin. If there is any information that represents a potential issue of environmental concern, a copy of the response will be forwarded to the Client under separate cover. Our conclusions and recommendations may be amended based on this information. A copy of Pinchin's request submitted to the MOECC is provided in Appendix II of this report.

Pinchin conducted a search of the MOECC *Brownfields Environmental Site Registry*. Based on the results of Pinchin's search, a Record of Site Condition (RSC) has not been filed for the Site or neighbouring properties within a 200 m radius of the Site.

4.3 Technical Standards & Safety Authority

The Technical Standards & Safety Authority (TSSA) was contacted to establish the status of the with respect to its files, to identify outstanding instructions, tank registrations, incident reports, fuel/oil spills or contamination records associated with the Site. Based on an email correspondence with Ms. Sherees Thompson of the TSSA on August 11, 2017, no information was on file with respect to the Site. A copy of Pinchin's requests submitted to the TSSA and their responses are provided in Appendix II of this report.

4.4 EcoLog ERIS

Pinchin submitted a request to EcoLog Environmental Risk Information Service Ltd. (ERIS) for a review of the following databases, as they pertain to the Site and surrounding properties:

- "Anderson's Storage Tanks";
- "Inventory of PCB Storage Sites";
- "Ontario Regulation 347 Waste Generators Summary";



- “Ontario Spills”;
- “Commercial Fuel Oil Tanks”;
- “List of TSSA Expired Facilities”;
- “Fuel Storage Tank”;
- “Fuel Storage Tank – Historic”;
- “TSSA Historic Incidents”;
- “TSSA Incidents”;
- “TSSA Pipeline Incidents”;
- “Retail Fuel Storage Tanks”;
- “Private and Retail Fuel Storage Tanks”;
- “TSSA Variances for Abandonment of Underground Storage Tanks”;
- “Waste Disposal Sites - MOE CA Inventory”; and
- “Waste Disposal Sites – MOE 1991 Historical Approval Inventory”.

In addition, Pinchin reviewed the following publications prepared by Intera Technologies Inc. for the MOECC:

- “Inventory of Coal Gasification Plant Waste Sites in Ontario”, dated April 1987; and
- “Inventory of Industrial Sites Producing or Using Coal Tar and Related Tars in Ontario”, dated November 1988.

A copy of the EcoLog ERIS report is provided in Appendix III. Based on a review of the information obtained from the above-noted sources, Pinchin notes the following:

- The Site was not listed in any of the above-noted databases reviewed by Pinchin;
- Color Your World, a retail paint company, located at 2035 Hurontario Street, had been registered with the MOECC as a generator (Generator #ON0058804) of aromatic solvents from 1996 to 2001. Based on a review of Pinchin’s in-house MOECC Waste Generator database, approximately 2,945 kilograms (kg) of aromatic solvents were generated at this property between 1996 and 2001. This property is located adjacent to the southwest of the Site and is situated hydraulically down/transgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. Based on the limited average annual quantities of hazardous waste generated, as well as the inferred groundwater flow direction from the Site, it is Pinchin’s opinion that the historical generation of hazardous wastes at this property is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site;

- The Ontario Spills database indicated that on June 1, 1990, approximately 225-L of diesel fuel was spilled to the ground surface and into the sewers near the intersection of Eglinton Avenue and Hurontario Street. The spill was located approximately 140 m south of the Site and occurred downgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. Based on the distance from the Site and age of the spill, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical spill is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site;
- The Ontario Spills database indicated that on May 14, 1991, an unknown volume of fuel oil was spilled to the ground from a leaking fuel oil underground storage tank (UST) from a housing project near the intersection of Hurontario Street and Sorrento Drive. Pinchin notes that although no volume of fuel released and no address was provided relating to this fuel release, Sorrento Drive is located at least 45 m southeast of the Site and is situated downgradient of the Site relative to the inferred groundwater flow direction. Based on the distance from the Site and duration of time since this fuel release, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical spill is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site;
- The Ontario Spills database indicated that on November 7, 1992, approximately 450 L of diesel fuel was spilled to the roadway between on Eglinton Avenue East between Hurontario Street and Kennedy Road. The Ontario Spill listing noted that environmental impacts were not anticipated from this spill. Based on the location of the spill (i.e., roadway), catchbasins located on Eglinton Avenue East, and the higher elevation of the Site property compared to Eglinton Avenue East, it is Pinchin's opinion that this historical spill is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site; and
- Additional surrounding properties were registered with the MOECC as waste generators, identified as the location of fuel storage tanks or historical fuel storage tanks and identified in the Ontario Spills database; however, based on the information provided within the EcoLog ERIS report, the locations/distances between these properties and the Site, as well as the inferred groundwater flow direction, it is Pinchin's opinion that the potential issues of concern associated with these listings are unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

4.5 Regulatory Information Summary

Based on the regulatory information reviewed, nothing was identified that is likely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

5.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

Pinchin (see Appendix IV for assessor qualifications) conducted a Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017, and was accompanied by Ms. Danielak. The Site reconnaissance included a walk-through of accessible areas of the interior of the Site Buildings and exterior areas. At the time of the Site reconnaissance, the ground surface was dry and the weather was sunny. An additional Site reconnaissance was completed on August 2, 2017 after the demolition of Site Buildings B to E. The Site reconnaissance was documented with notes and photographs. The results of the Site reconnaissance are discussed below. Photographs of some of the features noted during the Site reconnaissance are attached in Appendix V.

5.1 Hazardous Materials

Topic	Findings
Chemicals	Chemicals typically used for general purpose cleaning, body aesthetics and home renovation maintenance (e.g., window and all-purpose cleaners, hair dye, bleach, paints, deodorizers, etc.) were noted in Site Building A at the time of the initial Site reconnaissance. Chemicals observed on-Site were stored within their original containers in various locations throughout the Site Buildings. Oils, spray paints, lubricants and other maintenance chemicals, engine oil and transmission fluids of various volumes (approximately 0.5 L to 20 L) were observed in Site Building B.
Compressed Gases	None observed or reported.
Hazardous Waste	No hazardous wastes were observed.

No spills or evidence of historical spills (i.e., staining) were observed in the chemical storage areas noted above. The interior floor slabs were observed to be in good condition (i.e., no cracking or pitting) and the chemicals appeared to be stored in an orderly fashion. No floor drains or catch basins were present in the vicinity of the chemical storage areas.

5.2 Storage Tanks

5.2.1 Aboveground Storage Tanks

The following ASTs were observed on-Site:

Size (litres)	Construction Material	Single or Double Wall	Age	Product Stored	Location
Unknown	Steel	Single	Unknown	Fuel Oil	Basement of Site Building A.



Size (litres)	Construction Material	Single or Double Wall	Age	Product Stored	Location
Unknown	Plastic	Single	Approximately 10 – 15 years	Water	Basement of Site Building A.
Unknown	Plastic	Single	Approximately 10 – 15 years	Water	Basement of Site Building A.
Unknown	Plastic	Single	Approximately 10 – 15 years	Water	Basement of Site Building A.

The ground floor condition in the vicinity of the above-listed ASTs was inspected and was noted in good condition with no signs of deterioration (i.e. cracks) or staining.

5.2.2 Underground Storage Tanks

No evidence of USTs (i.e., fill/vent pipes) was observed on-Site, and none were reported by the Site Representatives. Although USTs may have been associated with the former buildings located at the Site, Pinchin was unable to confirm or refute the presence of former on-Site USTs. No evidence of former USTs was observed by Pinchin.

5.3 Water and Wastewater

Topic	Findings
Water Supply Source	<p>Domestic water is purchased in bulk and stored in plastic ASTs located in the basement of Site Building A. Groundwater is not used as a source of potable water.</p> <p>A former drinking water well is located adjacent to Site Building B and was formerly used as the principal water source for the Site. According to the Site Representatives, the drinking water well has been dry and out of use for the past 10-15 years. Although the well is currently not in use, the well has not been decommissioned as was still present during the August 2, 2017 Site reconnaissance.</p>
Water Use	Water is primarily used for domestic-related activities.
Sanitary/Process Wastewater Receptor	A septic tank and associated septic bed are located southwest of Site Building. The septic bed encompasses a portion of the grassed area located southwest of the Site Building and the septic tank is reportedly situated within the northeast portion of the septic bed. The Site Representative(s) advised Pinchin that the septic system is strictly utilized for sanitary effluent.



Topic	Findings
Pits, Sumps or Lagoons	A storm water sump is located in the basement of Site Building A. The sump was observed to be in good condition with no sheens or odours. No additional sumps, pits or lagoons were observed and none were reported by the Site Representatives.
Grease Traps	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.
Oil/Water Separators	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.
Storm Water Flow and Receptor	Storm water runs overland to percolate naturally through the soil or stored in rainwater barrels.
Wells	An inactive drinking water well is located adjacent to the east of Site Building B. A cistern for the well was located within Site Building B.
Watercourses, Ditches or Standing Water	None observed and none reported by the Site Representatives.

5.4 Hydraulic Equipment

No evidence of hydraulic equipment (i.e., hydraulic hoists, elevators, compactors, dock levels, etc.) was identified at the Site during the Site reconnaissance.

5.5 Polychlorinated Biphenyls

The use of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as dielectric fluids in electrical equipment such as transformers, fluorescent lamp ballasts, and capacitors was common up to about 1980. The Federal PCB Regulations, SOR/2008-273, regulate the manufacture, import, export, sale, use and processing of PCBs. In addition, these regulations aim to eliminate the use of high level PCBs (greater than 500 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)), as well as low level PCBs (50-500 mg/kg) on or within 100 m of a "Sensitive Site" (e.g., drinking water treatment facility, feed/food processing plant, child care facility, schools, hospitals, etc.), by December 31, 2009. Light ballasts, pole top transformers, and other electrical equipment with low level PCBs (50-500 mg/kg) in non-sensitive sites are aimed to be eliminated by December 31, 2025.

Given the years of construction of the Site Buildings (i.e., at least 1950s and 1970s)(i.e., approximately 1950s and 1970s), there is a potential that the light ballasts observed on-Site may contain PCBs Typical buildings of this age may contain PCBs in mastics, caulking and window putties. Testing for the presence of PCBs in these materials is beyond the scope of this Phase I ESA. The potential presence of PCBs in these materials could result in future costs if extensive renovation requiring removal of these materials or demolition activities are undertaken at the Site. The extent of such potential issues could not be assessed as part of this Phase I ESA.



According to the Client, a hazardous building materials survey was completed for the Site by Teperman Demolition and found no PCBs at the Site. A copy of the survey was not provided to Pinchin for review at the time of this Phase I ESA. As indicated previously, Site Buildings B, C, D and E were demolished subsequent to the initial Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017.

5.6 Asbestos-Containing Materials

Asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) are commonly found in building construction materials (particularly in older buildings constructed prior to 1985). Friable asbestos (friable is defined as a material that can be crumbled, powdered or pulverized by hand pressure) was widely used in sprayed fireproofing until 1973, and in decorative or finishing plasters, and thermal systems insulation until the early 1980s. Non-friable or manufactured asbestos products were widely used in building construction including in vinyl floor tiles, sheet flooring, ceiling tiles, pipe gaskets, roofing materials, asbestos cement boards, and numerous other products until the mid-1980s. A very limited number of non-friable asbestos products in limited quantities are still in use currently in building construction. The application of friable asbestos was banned by Ontario Regulation 654/85, which came into effect March 1985. On November 1, 2005, this regulation was most recently updated and changed to Ontario Regulation 278/05.

Given the years of construction of the Site Buildings (i.e., at least 1950s and 1970s), there is a potential for friable and non-friable ACMs to be present in the Site Buildings, including vinyl floor tiles, acoustic ceiling tiles and drywall joint compound.

Pinchin did not conduct an asbestos survey as part of this Phase I ESA, nor was any destructive or intrusive sampling or inspection conducted as part of this Phase I ESA. The Site Representatives advised Pinchin that no asbestos surveys have been previously conducted at the Site, and that an Asbestos Management Program (AMP) has not been developed for or implemented at the Site. In accordance with Ontario Regulation 278/05, an asbestos survey should be performed in buildings that are known or suspected of containing ACMs. If an asbestos survey confirms the presence of ACMs, an AMP should be developed and implemented, as per the requirements of Ontario Regulation 278/05. The Site Representatives indicated that an AMP has not been developed for or implemented at the Site.

According to the Client, a hazardous building materials survey was completed for the Site by Teperman Demolition and found no ACMs at the Site. A copy of the survey was not provided to Pinchin for review at the time of this Phase I ESA. As indicated previously, Site Buildings B, C, D and E were demolished subsequent to the initial Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017.

5.7 Lead-Containing Paints

Lead was commonly used as an additive in paints with no restricted level up until the mid-1970s. This included architectural paints used on interior and exterior surfaces, primers and coatings for anti-corrosive purposes, consumer paints, and paint on furniture and other household items. Beginning in 1976, the federal government limited the amount of lead in consumer paints to 5,000 parts per million (ppm) and steadily reduced the lead content, primarily in the interest of public safety. As of 2010, the current limit set by the federal government is 90 ppm, however, there is no restriction on lead in paints used for anti-corrosion purposes (e.g., steel primers and exterior coatings) and road and line markings. Therefore, the potential for lead in paint may exist in any building.

Pinchin did not conduct an assessment of lead in painted surfaces as part of this Phase I ESA, and the Site Representatives advised Pinchin that no surveys have been previously conducted at the Site. Prior to any demolition or renovation activities, a designated substance survey [hazardous materials assessment] (including lead) would be required. During Pinchin's Site reconnaissance, painted surfaces (where observed), were in good condition (i.e., no peeling or flaking).

According to the Client, a hazardous building materials survey was completed for the Site by Teperman Demolition and found no lead-containing paints at the Site. A copy of the survey was not provided to Pinchin for review at the time of this Phase I ESA. As indicated previously, Site Buildings B, C, D and E were demolished subsequent to the initial Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017.

5.8 Ozone-Depleting Substances

Air-conditioning units and residential refrigeration units, were observed within the Site Building A. These units may include refrigerants, such as R22 or R12, that are noted within the phase-out schedules for elimination in both Provincial and Federal regulations. No other sources of ODSs were observed at the time of the Site reconnaissance.

5.9 Radon

Radon is a radioactive gas formed by naturally occurring radioactive breakdown of uranium in soil, rocks and even groundwater. Radon is invisible and odourless and, as such, cannot be detected by humans. Furthermore, radon escapes from the ground and mixes with outdoor air forming concentrations that are too low to be of concern; however, if radon enters a building the concentrations can accumulate to higher levels. Health Canada has developed guidelines for acceptable levels of radon in buildings and has indicated that radon levels should not exceed 200 Becquerel per cubic metre (Bq/m³); however, there are currently no regulations governing acceptable levels of radon within buildings, and no requirements for

testing or mitigation if levels are found to exceed the current Health Canada guidelines. Testing for radon in the Site Buildings was beyond the scope of this Phase I ESA. The Site Representatives reported that no radon surveys have been carried out at the Site.

5.10 Mould or Microbial Contamination

The presence of mould or other microbiological contamination in buildings has become a concern to building tenants and owners due to potential health effects on occupants and users. Provincial Ministries of Labour have recently issued guidelines on enforced regulations to protect the health of construction workers who are exposed to mould in the course of building renovation. The presence of water leaks or high humidity can cause the growth or amplification of mould within building environments.

A comprehensive inspection for mould, which would require intrusive testing, was not performed as part of this Phase I ESA. Visible mould or water-damaged areas were not observed at the time of the Site reconnaissance. The Site Representatives were not aware of the presence of mould in the Site Buildings. In addition, the Site Representative were not aware of any historical leaks in the Site Buildings or past flooding events.

5.11 Air Emissions

Topic	Findings
Washroom Vents	Washroom vent exhausts are discharged through roof vents.
Kitchen Vents	Kitchen exhausts are discharged through an exterior wall vent.
Heating/Cooling	A wood stove and an oil fired furnace are located in the basement of Site Building A.
Emergency Generators	None observed or reported by Site Representatives.
Process Vents	No process vents were observed.
Odours	No strong, pungent or noxious odours were identified.
Permits / Approvals	The Site Representatives advised Pinchin that Dr. Jamie Kaukinen does not hold any permits/approvals for the Site, as related to air emissions or discharges.

5.12 Staining and Stressed Vegetation

Black (likely petroleum hydrocarbon) staining (measuring less than 1 m²) was initially observed under the tractors on the concrete floor of Site Building C. The concrete floor was observed to be in fair condition with minor cracking and pitting. No floor drains were observed in the vicinity of the staining. No other



evidence of historical chemical discharges or releases (i.e., staining or stressed vegetation) was observed during the Site reconnaissance. The Site Representatives reported that no known historical chemical spills have occurred on-Site.

Pinchin notes that Site Building C was demolished subsequent to the initial Site reconnaissance on July 17, 2017. A supplementary Site reconnaissance was conducted on August 3, 2017 and found no stained soils or odours in the location of the former concrete slab of Site Building C where the staining was previously noted. It is Pinchin's opinion that the observed staining is not considered a potential issue of environmental concern.

5.13 Non-Hazardous Wastes

Topic	Findings
Non-hazardous Wastes	Domestic refuse is deposited in a plastic garbage pails along the eastern portion of Site Building A. The domestic refuse is removed for off-Site disposal weekly by the City of Mississauga as part of the normal household waste stream.
Recyclables	Recyclables (i.e., cans, bottles, newsprint, plastics, and cardboard) are stored in plastic bins located along the eastern portion of Site Building A and are removed to an off-Site recycling facility weekly by the City of Mississauga.

6.0 ACTIVITIES ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES

The Site is located in an urban area that predominantly consists of residential and commercial land uses. A description of the adjacent properties is summarized in the following table, based on Pinchin's observations from the Site and publicly accessible locations:

	North/Northeast	East/Southeast	South/Southwest	West/Northwest
Operation or Activity	Residential townhomes, followed by Forum Drive and residential dwellings.	Vacant land to the northeast, followed by Eglinton Avenue East, a multi-tenant commercial plaza at 4559 Hurontario Street, residential dwellings and vacant land.	Multi-tenant commercial property to the southeast, followed by Eglinton Avenue East and a multi-tenant commercial plaza at 5035 Hurontario Street.	Residential dwellings under construction, beyond which is Armdale Road and Preston Meadow Avenue.
Direction with Respect to Inferred Groundwater Flow	Upgradient.	Transgradient.	Downgradient.	Transgradient.



	North/Northeast	East/Southeast	South/Southwest	West/Northwest
Visible Emissions	None observed.	None observed.	None observed.	None observed.
Visible Outdoor Storage of Hazardous Materials	None observed.	None observed.	None observed.	None observed.

Hurontario Cleaners was identified as one of the tenants within the plaza located directly southwest of the Site at 5035 Hurontario Street. This tenant has reportedly operated solely as a dry cleaning drop-off depot throughout their occupancy at this property. In addition, this facility was not listed in Pinchin's search of the EcoLog ERIS waste generators database as a generator of halogenated solvent waste, a waste typically generated by active dry cleaning operations. Based on the aforementioned information, it can be assumed that this current off-Site dry cleaning depot has not operated as an active dry cleaning facility and as such, it is Pinchin's opinion that this current off-Site operation is unlikely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

Based on Pinchin's observations of the adjacent properties, nothing was observed that is likely to result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

7.0 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the Phase I ESA completed by Pinchin, the following could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site:

- An orchard was formerly present on the central portion of the Site. Pesticides and herbicides were typically applied to orchards. Based on the age of the orchard (from at least 1954 to at least 1975), the potential use of pesticides and/or herbicides could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site; and
- A former Speedy Auto Service repair facility was located adjacent to the southwest of the Site. Based on the suspected age of the operations (from at least 1997 to 2003), this off-Site activity could result in potential subsurface impacts at the Site.

Based on the findings noted above, Pinchin recommends completing a Phase II ESA at the Site.

Pinchin recommends that the potable well observed on-Site be decommissioned in accordance with Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 903/90 (as amended) during any future development activities.

Given the year of construction of the Site Buildings (i.e., approximately 1950s and 1970s), there is a potential for friable and non-friable asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) to be present in the Site Building. Friable and non-friable ACMs including vinyl floor tiles, acoustic ceiling tiles and drywall joint compound were observed in Site Building A during the Site reconnaissance. Pinchin did not conduct an



asbestos survey as part of this Phase I ESA, nor was any destructive or intrusive sampling or inspection conducted as part of this Phase I ESA. The Site Representatives advised Pinchin that prior to the demolition of Site Buildings B, C, D and E, an ACM survey was completed for Site Buildings A to E and no ACMs were identified. The ACM report was not reviewed by Pinchin.

8.0 TERMS AND LIMITATIONS

This Phase I ESA was performed in order to identify potential issues of environmental concern associated with the Site located at 91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario, at the time of the Site reconnaissance. This Phase I ESA was performed in general compliance with currently acceptable practices for environmental site investigations, and specific Client requests, as applicable to this Site. The scope of work completed by Pinchin, as part of this Phase I ESA, is not sufficient (in and of itself) to meet the requirements for the submission of an RSC in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended). If an RSC is an intended end product of work conducted at the Site, further consultation and/or work will be required.

This report was prepared for the exclusive use of Dr. Jamie Kaukinen, subject to the terms, conditions and limitations contained within the duly authorized work plan for this project. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, is the sole responsibility of such third parties. Pinchin accepts no responsibility for damages suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions conducted.

If additional parties require reliance on this report, written authorization from Pinchin will be required. Such reliance will only be provided by Pinchin following written authorization from Client. Pinchin disclaims responsibility of consequential financial effects on transactions or property values, or requirements for follow-up actions and costs. No other warranties are implied or expressed. Furthermore, this report should not be construed as legal advice. Pinchin will not provide results or information to any party unless disclosure by Pinchin is required by law.

The information provided in this report is based upon analysis of available documents, records and drawings, and personal interviews. In evaluating the Site, Pinchin has relied in good faith on information provided by other individuals noted in this report. Pinchin has assumed that the information provided is factual and accurate. In addition, the findings in this report are based, to a large degree, upon information provided by the current owner/occupant. Pinchin accepts no responsibility for any deficiency, misstatement or inaccuracy contained in this report as a result of omissions, misinterpretations or fraudulent acts of persons interviewed or contacted, or contained in reports that were reviewed. The scope of work for this Phase I ESA did not include an intrusive investigation for designated substances (i.e., asbestos, mould, etc.) and, therefore, these materials may be present in concealed areas.



Pinchin makes no other representations whatsoever, including those concerning the legal significance of its findings, or as to other legal matters touched on in this report, including, but not limited to, ownership of any property, or the application of any law to the facts set forth herein. With respect to regulatory compliance issues, regulatory statutes are subject to interpretation and these interpretations may change over time.

The CSA document entitled "*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, CSA Standard Z768-01*" dated November 2001 (reaffirmed 2016), does not apply to environmental auditing or environmental management systems. Therefore, with respect to Site operations and conditions, compliance with applicable Federal, Provincial or Municipal acts, regulations, laws and/or statutes was not evaluated as part of the Phase I ESA.



9.0 REFERENCES

The following documents, persons or organizations provided information used in this report:

1. Mr. Nick Danielak [Site Representative].
2. Ms. Christine Danielak [Site Representative].
3. EcoLog ERIS report entitled "91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario", dated July 18, 2017 (ERIS Project # 20170713012).
4. Opta Information Intelligence "91 Eglinton Avenue E, Mississauga, Ontario", and dated July 20, 2017 (Opta Order ID: 20170713012).
5. Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines – Bedrock Geology:
<https://www.mndm.gov.on.ca/en/mines-and-minerals/applications/ogsearth>
6. Toporama – Topographic Maps:
<http://atlas.gc.ca/site/english/maps/topo/map>.
7. Canadian Centre for Occupational Health & Safety:
http://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/phys_agents/radon.html.
8. Canadian Standards Association (CSA) Standard. *CSA Z768-01, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Canadian Standards Association International, November 2001, reaffirmed in 2016.
9. City of Mississauga On-Line Archives.
10. Toronto Reference Library.
11. Technical Standards & Safety Authority.
12. Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.
13. MOECC Brownfields Environmental Site Registry.
14. Google Earth™ Satellite Imagery.
15. Health Canada. "Cross-Canada Survey of Radon Concentrations in Homes – Final Report", dated March 2012.
16. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, Ontario", prepared by Trow Associates Inc. for Cushman & Wakefield Le Page Inc., dated June 5, 2007.

\\pinchin.com\Miss\Job\208000s\0208402.000 Jamie,91eglington, EDR, SA1\Deliverables\208402_FINAL_Phase I ESA_91 Eglinton Avenue East, Mississauga, ON_August 8, 2017_Updated.docx

Template: Master Report for Phase I ESA - Ontario, EDR, June 6, 2017

FIGURES

APPENDIX I
Opta Response

APPENDIX II
Correspondence with Regulatory Agencies

APPENDIX III
EcoLog ERIS Report

APPENDIX IV
Qualifications of Assessor

APPENDIX V
Photographs



Photo 1 – Site Building A (northeast elevation).



Photo 2 – Site Building B (southwest elevation) prior to demolition.



Photo 3 – Site Building C (southeast elevation) prior to demolition.



Photo 4 – Site Building D (southeast elevation) prior to demolition.



Photo 5 – Site Building D (southwest elevation) prior to demolition.



Photo 6 – Fuel oil AST located in the basement of Site Building A.



Photo 7 – Plastic domestic water totes located in the basement of Site Building A.



Photo 8 – Storage of small quantities of household chemicals formerly located in Site Building B.



Photo 9 – Abandoned drinking water well in Site Building B.



Photo 10 – Items formerly stored on the second floor of Site Building C.



Photo 11 – Surficial staining under a tractor in Site Building D prior to demolition.



Photo 12 – Multi-tenant commercial plaza southwest of the Site.



Photo 13 – Residential properties and properties under development north of the Site.



Photo 14 – Townhomes northeast of the Site.



Photo 15 – Multi-tenant commercial plaza southeast of the Site.



Photo 16 – Pear trees located near the central portion of the Site.



Photo 17 – View of the former location of Site Building B after its demolition.



Photo 18 – View of the former location of Site Building C after its demolition.



Photo 19 – View of the former concrete pad of Site Building D.



Photo 20 – Former location of Site building E.