



LYONS ENGINEERING, DPC.

2024-2025 PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT

April 23, 2024 – April 23, 2025

NYSDEC Site Number: C704060

The EJ Victory Building
59 Lester Avenue
Johnson City, New York

Prepared for:

EJ Victory Building, LLC
225 Wilkinson Street
Syracuse, New York 13204

Prepared by:

Lyons Engineering, DPC
10 Jones Avenue
Rochester, New York 14608

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| 1.1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.2 | EFFECTIVENESS OF REMEDIAL PROGRAM | 1 |
| 1.3 | COMPLIANCE..... | 1 |
| 1.4 | RECOMMENDATIONS | 1 |
| 2.0 | SITE OVERVIEW..... | 2 |
| 2.1 | INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| 2.1.1 | Site Location | 2 |
| 2.1.2 | Site Features..... | 2 |
| 2.1.3 | Nature and Extent of Contamination | 3 |
| 2.2 | REMEDIAL PROGRAM | 6 |
| 2.2.1 | Chronology | 6 |
| 2.2.2 | Vapor Intrusion | 7 |
| 2.2.3 | Components of the Remedial Program..... | 9 |
| 2.2.4 | Cleanup Goals and Site Closure Criteria..... | 9 |
| 2.2.5 | Significant Changes to the Selected Remedy | 10 |
| 3.0 | EVALUATION OF REMEDY PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS | 10 |
| 4.0 | IC/EC PLAN COMPLIANCE..... | 11 |
| 4.1 | IC/EC REQUIREMENTS | 11 |
| 4.1.1 | Description of Controls..... | 11 |
| 4.1.2 | Effectiveness of Controls..... | 13 |
| 4.1.3 | Corrective Measures Performed During the Past Year | 15 |
| 4.1.4 | Conclusions and Recommendations | 15 |
| 4.2 | IC/EC CERTIFICATION | 16 |
| 5.0 | MONITORING PLAN COMPLIANCE | 16 |
| 6.0 | OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE PLAN COMPLIANCE..... | 16 |
| 6.1 | PREVENTATIVE AND ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS | 16 |
| 6.2 | NON-ROUTINE MAINTENANCE | 16 |
| 6.3 | O&M CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 17 |
| 7.0 | OVERALL PRR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 17 |
| 7.1 | COMPLIANCE WITH SMP | 17 |
| 7.1.1 | IC/ECs | 17 |
| 7.1.2 | Monitoring..... | 17 |
| 7.1.3 | O&M | 17 |
| 7.2 | PERFORMANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REMEDY | 18 |
| 7.3 | FUTURE PRR SUBMITTALS..... | 18 |
| 7.4 | RECOMMENDATIONS | 18 |
| 8.0 | DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL AND CLOSING..... | 18 |

FIGURES

| | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|
| FIGURE 1 | SITE LOCATION AND PROPERTY BOUNDARIES |
| FIGURE 2 | ENGINEERING CONTROL – COVER PLAN |
| FIGURE 3 | ENGINEERING CONTROL – GAHS PLAN |

ATTACHMENTS

| | |
|--------------|---|
| ATTACHMENT A | ANNUAL SITE INSPECTION FORM AND PHOTOGRAPHS |
| ATTACHMENT B | MONTHLY GAHS INSPECTION FORMS |
| ATTACHMENT C | CERTIFICATION FORMS |

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BTEX – Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylene

DUSR – Data Usability Summary Report

ECs – Engineering Controls

GWS – Groundwater Standard

ICs – Institutional Controls

IDW – Investigation Derived Waste

MNA – Monitored Natural Attenuation

N/A – Not Applicable

NYSDEC – New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

NYSDOH – New York State Department of Health

O&M – *Operations & Maintenance*

PAH – Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons

ppb – Parts Per Billion

ppm – Parts Per Million

PRR – *Periodic Review Report*

SMP – Site Management Plan

SVOC – Semi-Volatile Organic Compound

TOGS – Technical & Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1 (NYSDEC)

USEPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

UST – Underground Storage Tank

VOC – Volatile Organic Compound

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

EJ Victory Building, LLC entered into a Brownfield Cleanup Agreement (BCA) with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) on September 17, 2020, to investigate and remediate a 4.971± acre site located in the Village of Johnson City, New York. The property was remediated to restricted residential use and is an apartment building, with 156 residential units on upper floors and ground-level parking garage and amenity rooms (gym, facility office, mail room, etc.).

The EJ Victory Building site is a registered NYSDEC Brownfield, identified by Site # C704060. The Site is currently being managed by a NYSDEC-approved Site Management Plan (SMP), dated December 2022. This and future Periodic Review Reports (PRRs) are a required element of the SMP.

The site is in the County of Broome, New York and consists of two parcels in the Central Village Neighborhood and Historic District of Johnson City, totaling 4.971± acres:

- 59 Lester Avenue – Tax Map ID# 143.58-1-19 – 4.799± acres
- 28 Avenue B – Tax Map ID# 143.57-02-44 – 0.172± acres

The BCP area comprises the entire property. Helen Drive bisects the property, running east to west. The Site is bounded by a Norfolk-Southern rail line to the north, Lester Avenue to the east, residential properties to the south, a vacant former industrial building to the southwest, and the Village of Johnson City Justice Building/Police Department to the west (see Figure 1).

The Site contains a historical factory building that was constructed in or about 1921. For the majority of its existence, the building served as a shoe manufacturing facility owned and operated by Endicott-Johnson Corporation. These operations are reported to have utilized various chemicals, including solvents, alcohols, acids, and petroleum-based products.

Following the cessation of the Endicott-Johnson operations in or about 1988, the property had reportedly been used as storage warehouse space (boats, automobiles, and general storage). The property and existing structure had been vacant and unused from approximately 2013 until EJ Victory Building, LLC purchased the property in March 2020.

The site was remediated in 2022 in accordance with the remedy selected by the NYSDEC in the Decision Document dated November 2021.

1.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF REMEDIAL PROGRAM

The remedial strategy that has been adopted at the Site (including all engineering and institutional controls) has thus far been an effective and appropriate method of controlling exposure to remaining contamination in the subsurface.

1.3 COMPLIANCE

The required elements of the SMP have been appropriately observed and the Site remains in compliance.

1.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

At the current time, no changes to the SMP are necessary.

The frequency of inspections and submittal of PRRs will remain on an annual schedule.

However, the following recommendations are provided to address the minor damage / disturbances observed (see Section 7.1.1 and the forms / figures presented within Attachment A):

- The thin areas of lawn should be monitored throughout the growing season, and if necessary, reseeded in the fall.
- The bare areas adjacent to entrance sidewalks should be reseeded. If it is found that winter use of salt continues to kill the grass in these areas, a hardscape border (example: river rock on top of plastic barrier) should be considered.
- Sod should be placed on the small eroded area in the rear of the site to prevent further erosion in the area. If the sod has trouble growing due to the steepness of the area, regrading of the area should be considered.
- The ants in the laundry room should be killed and the associated crack should be sealed.
- As a best management practice, the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby should be sealed.

2.0 SITE OVERVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Site Location

The site is located in the Village of Johnson City, Broome County, New York and consists of two parcels in the Central Village Neighborhood and Historic District of Johnson City, totaling 4.971± acres (see Figure 1):

- 59 Lester Avenue – Tax Map ID# 143.58-1-19 – 4.799± acres
- 28 Avenue B – Tax Map ID# 143.57-02-44 – 0.172± acres

The Site is bounded by a Norfolk-Southern rail line to the north, Lester Avenue to the east, residential properties to the south, a vacant former industrial building to the southwest, and the Village of Johnson City Justice Building/Police Department to the west.

2.1.2 Site Features

The facility has been redeveloped from a historic industrial building to a multi-family residential building containing a total of 343,603 square feet of gross floor area. The building contains five complete above-grade floors, and a partial sixth floor containing seven separate penthouse-level spaces. The penthouse-level spaces contain elevator motor equipment, electrical transformers, and/or stair tower access to the roof level. A single-story masonry block annex building is attached to the exterior northern side of the main building. Most of the area surrounding the building consists of asphalt-paved driveway.

Helen Drive crosses through the site from east to west, south of the existing structure. The portion of the site that is located south of Helen Drive is comprised of two asphalt parking lots that are separated by Avenue A. These include a ±26,500 square foot lot located south of Helen Drive and bounded by Avenue A to the east and Avenue B to the west, and a ±12,500 square foot lot located to the south of Helen Drive and bounded by Avenue A to the west.

The use of the Site and existing building is first floor parking / lobby / amenity rooms, and residential use on the upper floors, with ancillary parking and landscaping features across the remainder of the Site.

The site use is in accordance with existing zoning (General Commercial). The uses of properties adjoining the Site and in the neighborhood surrounding the Site primarily include:

- North: Active rail corridor owned by a Norfolk-Southern rail line, followed by a vacant commercial property (formerly Whipple Lumber)
- Northeast: A retail plaza containing a credit union branch (Visions Federal Credit Union) and a Walmart store
- East: A light manufacturing facility owned by Great Eastern Hemp, LLC
- South: Single-family and two-family residential buildings situated along Laurel Street, Avenue A, and Avenue B
- Southwest: Vacant industrial building
- West: Village of Johnson City Justice Building/Police Department

The Site is situated at an elevation of approximately 860 feet above mean sea level. The southern portion of the Site slopes downward from the south to north, while the northern portion is relatively flat. The surrounding area exhibits a gradual gradient toward the northwest, in the direction of Little Choconut Creek, the nearest surface water feature.

Subsurface soils generally consisted of loose, brown, fine to medium sand and rounded gravel (outwash) with some silt. The gravel component generally increased with depth.

Groundwater was generally encountered between 23 to 32 feet below grade in depth across the site.

2.1.3 Nature and Extent of Contamination

The site contains residual contamination of subsurface soils, groundwater and soil vapor. Surface soils were either removed to accommodate the installation of two-feet of clean soil with grass cover or buried under other surface treatments such as paving or landscaping (i.e. – cover system). The following subsections describe the nature of the remaining contamination and its extent. The concentrations of remaining contamination are provided in Tables 2 through 7, and the extents of remaining contamination are graphically shown on Figures 9 through 13.

Soil

During the Remedial Investigation, it was determined that soils in various areas on the site contained contamination that exceeds unrestricted SCOs.

- Soils Directly Beneath Cover (originally 0-1 feet bgs)

PCB contamination is limited to Aroclor 1260 in the north-central portion of the Site.

Metals contamination generally appears to be located in the northern half of the Site (along and north of Helen Drive).

It is likely that discrete areas of gasoline-contaminated soils exist beneath the cover system near the intersection of Helen Drive and Avenue B (see Section 2.3.3.2).

It is likely that discrete areas of historical railroad bedding exist beneath the cover system along Avenue C, north of the building (see Section 2.3.3.2),

- Shallow Subsurface Soils (originally 1-10 feet bgs)

VOC contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use SCOs is limited to acetone in the north-central portion of the Site.

Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon (PAH) contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use and Restricted Residential Use SCOs is present in the north-central and northeastern portions of the Site.

Metals contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use SCOs is limited to arsenic, lead, and zinc in the eastern portion of the Site.

It is likely that discrete areas of gasoline-contaminated soils exist in shallow soils near the intersection of Helen Drive and Avenue B (see Section 2.3.3.2),

It is likely that discrete areas of historical railroad bedding exist in shallow soils along Avenue C, north of the building (see Section 2.3.3.2),

- Deep Subsurface Soils (originally 22-36 feet bgs)

VOC contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use SCOs is limited to the north-central portion of the Site.

PAH contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use and Restricted Residential Use SCOs is limited to an area beneath the central portion of the building slab.

Metals contamination exceeding Unrestricted Use SCOs is limited to chromium and lead, which are present in the central portion of the Site.

No soil sampling occurred during/after the completion of remedial actions, except for “end point” samples collected at the extents of trenching that extended through a discovered gasoline spill (see the Spill Closure Report and/or Final Engineering Report, provided under separate cover), and waste characterization samples associated with interior trenches, gasoline spill remediation, and railroad bedding (see the Spill Closure Report, Railroad Bedding Characterization and Disposal Report, and/or Final Engineering Report, provided under separate cover).

The depth of contamination varies across the site and begins at 1-2 feet below existing grade depending on the type of cover system in place (soil, pavement, landscaping). The starting point of contamination is indicated by the presence of an orange polypropylene demarcation fabric (WinFab 3150) in areas where soils were deemed to be contaminated (see Figures 16A and 16B).

All utility services to the property have been replaced as part of the project. All utility trenches were backfilled with clean material that was excavated from the trench and/or approved imported soils/materials.

Groundwater

During the Phase II ESA, several metals were detected at concentrations exceeding their respective TOGS 1.1.1 standards / guidance values in each of the seven wells. However, high turbidity readings were noted during sample collection.

Due to the high turbidity readings measured during the Phase II ESA, AECC collected groundwater samples from each well as part of the RI. After purging the monitoring wells and collecting ‘raw’ (unfiltered) water quality parameters, groundwater was pulled through a filter by use of a low-flow peristaltic pump to reduce the remaining suspended sediment concentration.

The analytical results of the filtered samples showed significant improvement. Exceedances of TOGS 1.1.1 standards / guidance values were limited to aluminum and iron in monitoring wells MW-1 and MW-2, and sodium in all seven wells.

Soil Vapor

Several VOCs were detected within the sub-slab samples collected throughout the main building and annex:

2024-2025 PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT
The EJ Victory Building (NYSDEC Site #C704060)
59 Lester Avenue, Johnson City, New York

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| • 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | • Ethyl acetate | • Methyl Ethyl Ketone |
| • 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | • Ethylbenzene | • Methyl Isobutyl Ketone |
| • 2,2,4-Trimethylpentane | • Freon 11 | • Methylene chloride |
| • 4-ethyltoluene | • Freon 12 | • Naphthalene |
| • Acetone | • Freon 22 | • o-Xylene |
| • Benzene | • Heptane | • Tetrahydrofuran |
| • Carbon Disulfide | • Hexane | • Toluene |
| • Chloromethane | • Isopropyl Alcohol | • Trichloroethene |
| • Cyclohexane | • m&p-Xylene | |

None of the compound concentrations exceeded the USEPA guidance values or the “sub-slab” screening levels of the NYSDOH decision matrices, except for naphthalene in the western end of the building, and naphthalene and benzene in a discrete area in the eastern end of the building. Of note, the concentration of naphthalene in the discrete area in eastern end of the building was three orders of magnitude greater than the USEPA Residential Sub-Slab Soil Gas Target Value. However, supplemental samples collected in the vicinity of this location during the Pre-Design Vapor Mitigation Investigation did not reveal concentrations that exceeded the USEPA guidance values or the “sub-slab” screening levels of the NYSDOH decision matrices.

Naphthalene and benzene were detected in soil vapor samples along the property border. However, there are no applicable standards for soil vapor samples. Note that the naphthalene concentrations were two orders of magnitude less than that detected beneath the discrete area in eastern end of the building.

Pre-occupation/Post start-up indoor air sampling was performed as part of the SVI evaluation for the Site, and the results indicated no additional actions are needed to address the potential exposure pathway. Three indoor air samples (plus one field duplicate sample) and one exterior air sample were collected and analyzed for VOCs via TO-15 methodology. The results were compared to the NYSDOH Indoor Air Guidance values and the “indoor air” screening levels of the NYSDOH decision matrices.

A total of 17 VOCs were detected within the indoor air samples, of which 4 are halogenated compounds:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| • 1,1,1-Trichloroethane | • Ethyl acetate | • Methyl Ethyl Ketone |
| • 1,1-Dichloroethene | • Freon 11 | • Methylene chloride |
| • Acetone | • Freon 12 | • Tetrachloroethylene |
| • Benzene | • Heptane | • Tetrahydrofuran |
| • Carbon tetrachloride | • Hexane | • Toluene |
| • Chloromethane | • Isopropyl alcohol | • Trichloroethene |
| • Cyclohexane | • m&p-Xylene | • Vinyl chloride |

None of the VOCs exceeded their respective NYSDOH indoor air guidance values:

2024-2025 PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT
The EJ Victory Building (NYSDEC Site #C704060)
59 Lester Avenue, Johnson City, New York

| Analyte | CAS Number | Associated NYSDOH Matrix | NYSDOH Indoor Air Guideline Value [^] | Sample ID / Date of Collection | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | IA-01 | IA-02 | IA-03 | FD-01 | OUT-01 |
| | | | | Indoor Air | | | | Outdoor |
| | | | | 11/26/2022 | 11/26/2022 | 11/26/2022 | 11/26/2022 | 11/26/2022 |
| 1,1,1-Trichloroethane | 71-55-6 | Matrix B (3) | NG | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| 1,1-Dichloroethene | 75-35-4 | Matrix A (0.2) | NG | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Acetone | 67-64-1 | NG | NG | 39 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 12 |
| Benzene | 71-43-2 | NG | NG | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.77 |
| Carbon tetrachloride | 56-23-5 | Matrix A (0.2) | NG | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Chloromethane | 74-87-3 | NG | NG | 0.97 | 0.91 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.78 |
| Cyclohexane | 110-82-7 | NG | NG | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.93 | 1.1 | ND |
| Ethyl acetate | 141-78-6 | NG | NG | 1.2 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 0.79 | ND |
| Freon 11 | 75-69-4 | NG | NG | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| Freon 12 | 75-71-8 | NG | NG | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| Heptane | 142-82-5 | NG | NG | 0.78 | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.78 | ND |
| Hexane | 110-54-3 | NG | NG | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.60 | ND | 0.60 |
| Isopropyl alcohol | 67-63-0 | NG | NG | 14 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 2.2 |
| m&p-Xylene | 179601-23-1 | NG | NG | 1.3 J | 1.1 J | 1.2 J | 1.2 J | 0.61 J |
| Methyl Ethyl Ketone | 78-93-3 | NG | NG | 14 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 0.71 J |
| Methylene chloride | 75-09-2 | Matrix B (3) | 60 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 1.0 | 0.97 | 0.80 |
| Tetrachloroethylene | 127-18-4 | Matrix B (3) | 30 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Tetrahydrofuran | 109-99-9 | NG | NG | 41 | 6.5 | 4.9 | 4.6 | ND |
| Toluene | 108-88-3 | NG | NG | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| Trichloroethene | 79-01-6 | Matrix A (0.2) | 2 | ND | ND | 0.16 | 0.11 J | ND |
| Vinyl chloride | 75-01-4 | Matrix C (0.2) | NG | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |

All units are in µg/m³

[^] - New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) "Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in the State of New York" dated October 2006 (Number is specific to indoor air), and applicable decision matrices (as updated in 2017)

NG - No applicable guidance value

ND - Compound Not Detected at or above method detection limit (MDL)

Thick-Lined Box and Bold Compound concentration exceeds the NYSDOH guidance value or lowest value for the associated matrix table

An Indoor Air Sampling Report (December 2022), including a full discussion and laboratory report for the indoor air sampling event, is attached to the Final Engineering Report. The evaluation concluded:

- Naphthalene and benzene were considered contaminants of concern in vapor beneath the concrete slab of the eastern parking garage. The Pre-Design Vapor Mitigation Investigation revealed that these compounds appeared to be limited to a discrete area beneath the slab. The indoor air sampling did not detect the presence of naphthalene in the eastern parking garage.
- Several of the compounds detected in the interior (including benzene) were also detected in the exterior at similar concentrations. Therefore, an exterior source is likely responsible for the presence of these compounds in the interior.

Although the parking garage air handling system (GAHS) was not specifically designed to be effective at mitigating potential SVI impacts, the results demonstrate the GAHS is effective as a precautionary mitigative measure.

No subsequent soil vapor sampling occurred after the completion of remedial actions.

2.2 REMEDIAL PROGRAM

2.2.1 Chronology

The site was remediated in accordance with the Remedial Action Work Plan and Decision Document (both dated November 2021). Remedial activities were performed throughout the 2022 calendar year. A certificate of completion was issued in December 2022.

2.2.2 Vapor Intrusion

The Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) proposed the installation and operation of a Vapor Intrusion Mitigation System (VIMS) as an engineering control.

A pilot study was performed in order to obtain a general overview of the conditions, prior to acceptance of a formal VIMS work plan, knowing that specifics could change.

- Two extraction points were installed in the eastern half of the northern annex, and one within the main building (future location of the lobby). The communication testing was performed in accordance with the general protocols detailed below.
- Sub-slab soils consisted of a dense sandy silt with few pebbles. There was no gravel base material.
- Communication testing (see general protocols, below) obtained no negative pressures, even from distances of 2-3' from the extraction point. Both a GP501 radon fan and a 3.5 HP shop vac were used to provide negative pressure. Upon sealing of the extraction point, observed air flow from both was severely reduced from normal/unimpeded (and motors were audibly strained).
 - Suction pits were installed by drilling an approximate 12" diameter core through the slab. Approximately one foot of sub-slab soil was removed beneath the core. The hole was backfilled with loose #2 angular stone, and sealed with hydraulic cement.
 - A 3" diameter core was drilled through the hydraulic cement seal at each extraction point. A shop vac was used to clean the hole and remove some of the underlying base material in order to create a void.
 - Shop vacs are typically used to create the suction during sub-slab communication testing. A shop vacuum, however, produces static pressure from 60 to 80 inches of water column at zero flow while radon fans typically have a maximum suction of 1.5 to 4.0 inches of water column. Paradigm and NEU-VELLE have installed vapor mitigation / radon systems in buildings of similar size and construction, and in these cases, it had been determined that a Radon Away© GP501 Pro Series Radon fan was the proper-sized fan. Therefore, NEU-VELLE used a Radon Away© GP501 fan during the sub-slab communication testing to emulate this real-world application instead of inferring appropriate pressure differentials created by a shop vac.
 - The GP501 fan/pipe was placed in the extraction hole and sealed with plumber's putty. Approximately 2-3 feet from the extraction point (in one of the cardinal directions), an approximate 3/4" diameter" test hole was drilled through the slab. A shop vac was used to clean this hole, then the test kit apparatus was installed and sealed with plumber's putty.
 - The fan was powered on, and the pressure differential at the test hole was noted by utilizing a Radon Away© Sub-Slab Communications Test Kit with Magnahelic Differential Pressure Gage.
 - If the pressure differential was at least -0.004 inches of Water Column (WC) between the sub-slab environment and the ambient air space, the test was deemed "passing".
 - At the conclusion of the testing, each extraction point and test hole was sealed.
- Although it was considered possible that moisture beneath the annex slab was frozen (slab is exposed to the elements) and thus was restricting air flow, the fact that the same results were observed within the main building made that scenario unlikely. LYONS concluded that the soils beneath the slab had been so compacted over the past 100 years, that no sub-slab air flow was occurring.
- The creation of sub-slab suction pits in the dense soils at each extraction point was not feasible with the equipment on-hand.

Due to the issues associated with sub-slab communication observed during the pilot study, LYONS submitted a Vapor Mitigation Investigation Work Plan, which consisted of pressure-field extension testing (also known as sub-slab communication testing), and chemical testing of sub-slab vapors. The following scope of work was proposed:

- Sub-slab air samples were collected in the following areas (see also Figure 2). Samples were collected using a summa canister (with helium tracer) calibrated for a 24-hour sampling period. Samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds via TO-15 methodologies.
 - Since the annex was not investigated during the Phase II ESA/Remedial Investigation, six samples were collected in the annex (SSG-11 to SSG-16).
 - Since the lobby will be the only occupied space on the first floor of the main building, one sample was collected from the future lobby area (SSG-06).
 - In order to determine if the elevated concentration of naphthalene is localized to SSG-05, or more widespread, four samples were collected in the vicinity of SSG-05 (SSG-07 to SSG-10).
- Due to proposed construction schedules, it was deemed to be beneficial to install suction pits prior to receipt of the results of chemical testing. The suction pits (about the size of a 5-gallon bucket) were installed in the future lobby area and near the center of the eastern parking garage (in the vicinity of SSG-05). Sub-slab communication testing then proceeded in accordance with the general protocols detailed above.

The NYSDEC approved the Work Plan with modifications on February 18, 2022.

The investigation revealed:

- Pressure differential testing determined that air is not communicating beneath the slab
- Several VOCs were detected within the sub-slab samples collected throughout the main building and annex:

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | Ethyl acetate | Methyl Ethyl Ketone |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | Ethylbenzene | Methyl Isobutyl Ketone |
| 2,2,4-Trimethylpentane | Freon 11 | Methylene chloride |
| 4-ethyltoluene | Freon 12 | Naphthalene |
| Acetone | Freon 22 | o-Xylene |
| Benzene | Heptane | Tetrahydrofuran |
| Carbon Disulfide | Hexane | Toluene |
| Chloromethane | Isopropyl Alcohol | Trichloroethene |
| Cyclohexane | m&p-Xylene | |
- None of the compound concentrations exceeded the USEPA guidance values or the “sub-slab” screening levels of the NYSDOH decision matrices.

The report concluded:

- Based on the fact that no sub-slab vapor compounds were detected at concentrations that exceeded applicable guidance / decision matrices values, and that pressure differential testing determined that air is not communicating beneath the slab, sub-slab vapors are not expected to infiltrate into indoor air spaces at concentrations that could negatively impact human health.
- Mitigation was not required by the Decision Document. However, it was decided that the proposed Garage Air Handling System (designed to remove vehicle exhaust, see Figure 3) could also double as a precautionary mitigation measure to prevent potential exposure to contaminants via the soil vapor intrusion pathway (namely, the elevated concentrations of naphthalene in sub-slab vapor identified during the RI).

2.2.3 Components of the Remedial Program

The following are the components of the selected remedy:

- Portions of the site were excavated for installation of new underground utilities, building addition foundations, and to accommodate installation of a cover system (see Figure 2). A vast majority of excavated soils were reused onsite in order to implement the remedy. Soils that were excavated and disposed off-site were limited to two areas of discrete contamination:
 - Gasoline-Contaminated Soils: During excavations associated with the installation of new water lines near the intersection of Helen Drive and Avenue B, grossly-contaminated soil was observed (sheens, stains, and odors). The NYSDEC BCP Project Manager and the NYSDEC Spill Hotline were notified of the petroleum release, and Spill #22-01296 was assigned to the Site. Samples of segregated/staged soils were collected and analyzed for the parameters requested by Broome County Landfill. Ten truckloads of gasoline-contaminated soils, totaling 208.08 tons, were removed from the Site, and transported to Broome County Landfill for disposal.
 - Stained soils indicative of historical railroad bedding were removed from an the area of a new loading dock in the back of the annex building. In subsequent weeks, pockets of rail bedding and rail ties were removed while excavating trenches for underground utilities along Avenue C. Samples of segregated/staged bedding material were collected and analyzed for the parameters requested by Broome County Landfill. Railroad ties did not require characterization (analytical) testing. One truckload of railroad bedding and two truckloads of railroad ties were removed from the Site, and transported to Broome County Landfill for disposal.
- Clean backfill (quarried virgin stone material) meeting the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 375-6.7(d) was brought to the site.as needed for utility bedding, foundation subbase, road/parking lot subbase, and to meet design grades throughout the site.
- A cover system was installed, which was comprised of hardscape (asphalt pavement, concrete-covered sidewalks, and concrete building slabs) or a minimum of 2-feet of clean soil (in landscaped areas), placed over a demarcation barrier (see Figures 3 and 4). The soil cover was a minimum of two feet of soil, with the upper six inches of soil of sufficient quality to maintain a vegetative layer. Soil cover material, including any fill material brought to the site, met the Restricted Residential SCOs for cover material as set forth in 6 NYCRR Part 375-6.7(d).
- Execution and recording of an Environmental Easement to restrict land use and prevent future exposure to any contamination remaining at the site.
- Implementation of a Site Management Plan for long term management of remaining contamination as required by the Environmental Easement.

2.2.4 Cleanup Goals and Site Closure Criteria

Cleanup Goals

The Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) for the Site as listed in the Decision Document dated November 2021 are as follows:

Groundwater

RAOs for Public Health Protection

- Prevent ingestion of groundwater with contaminant levels exceeding drinking water standards.

Soil

RAOs for Public Health Protection

- Prevent ingestion/direct contact with contaminated soil.
- Prevent inhalation of or exposure from contaminants volatilizing from contaminants in soil

RAOs for Environmental Protection

- Prevent migration of contaminants that would result in groundwater or surface water contamination.

Soil Vapor

RAOs for Public Health Protection

- Mitigate impacts to public health resulting from existing, or the potential for, soil vapor intrusion into buildings at a site.

Site Closure Criteria

Generally, remedial processes are considered completed when monitoring indicates that the remedy has achieved the remedial action objectives identified by the decision document. The framework for determining when remedial processes are complete is provided in Section 6.4 of NYSDEC DER-10. Unless waived by the NYSDEC, confirmation samples of applicable environmental media are required before terminating any remedial actions at the site. Confirmation samples require Category B deliverables and a Data Usability Summary Report (DUSR).

The remedial party will also conduct any needed site restoration activities, such as asphalt patching and decommissioning treatment system equipment. In addition, the remedial party will conduct any necessary restoration of vegetation coverage and will comply with NYSDEC regulations and guidance. Also, the remedial party will ensure that no ongoing erosion is occurring on the site.

- The composite cover system is a permanent control and the quality and integrity of this system will be inspected at defined, regular intervals in accordance with this SMP in perpetuity.
- The air handling system should continue to operate in perpetuity as long as this space is used as a parking garage; and that in the event of a change of use in this portion of the building from parking garage to occupied space, the system may be discontinued pending further SVI evaluation, in accordance with the SMP.
- Institutional Controls identified in the Environmental Easement may not be discontinued without an amendment to or extinguishment of the Environmental Easement.

2.2.5 Significant Changes to the Selected Remedy

No significant changes have been made to the selected remedy since remedial activities were completed in December 2022.

3.0 EVALUATION OF REMEDY PERFORMANCE & EFFECTIVENESS

The Site remedy is currently being evaluated via observations of the cover system and GAHS.

Since there are currently no active systems employed at the Site, there are no more quantitative means of correlating and evaluating the effectiveness of the current remedy.

From a qualitative perspective, it is observed that the cover system (engineering control) remains in-place and in good condition, the GAHS remains operational, and institutional controls continue to be followed (See Section 4 below).

4.0 IC/EC PLAN COMPLIANCE

4.1 IC/EC REQUIREMENTS

The following subsections describe the Engineering and Institutional Controls currently implemented at the Site, their status, and effectiveness.

4.1.1 Description of Controls

Engineering Control - Cover System

Exposure to remaining contamination at the site is prevented by a cover system placed over the site. This cover system is comprised of a minimum of 24 inches of clean soil or impervious surfaces such as asphalt pavement, concrete-covered sidewalks, and concrete building slabs. Figure 2 shows the location of each cover type built at the Site. An Excavation Work Plan, which outlines the procedures required in the event the cover system and/or underlying residual contamination are disturbed, is provided as an Appendix to the Site Management Plan (separate document).

Engineering Control – Garage Air Handling System

The Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) proposed the installation and operation of a VIMS as an engineering control. However, based on sub-slab “communication” and chemical testing performed at the beginning of remedial activities (tight soils / no communication and acceptable concentrations of VOCs), it was determined that an active VIMS was not feasible.

In lieu of a VIMS, it was decided that a Garage Air Handling System would serve as a mitigation measure (see Figure 5). The following conditions were required as part of this measure:

- “a pre-startup inspection is to be performed, consisting of visually observing the operation of the intakes and blowers, alarms, and confirmation of sufficient electrical loading
- the air handling units are required to be in operation at all times
- the system components shall remain intact”

The system is comprised of a fan and louver that operates continuously. In the event that the carbon monoxide sensor is tripped, two additional fans/louvers will operate until carbon monoxide concentrations decrease to satisfactory levels. Each fan is equipped with an audible alarm that will sound in the event the fan stops working.

Procedures for operating and maintaining the Garage Air Handling System are documented in the Operation and Maintenance Plan (Section 5.0) of the SMP.

The system was activated on November 21, 2022.

Institutional Controls

A series of ICs is required by the [Decision Document to: (1) implement, maintain and monitor Engineering Control systems; (2) prevent future exposure to remaining contamination; and, (3) limit the use and development of the site to restricted residential, commercial, and industrial uses only. Adherence to these ICs on the site is required by the Environmental Easement and will be implemented under this SMP. ICs identified in the Environmental Easement may not be discontinued without an amendment to or extinguishment of the Environmental Easement. The IC boundaries are shown on Figure 14. These ICs are:

- The property may be used for: restricted residential, commercial, and industrial use;
- All ECs must be operated and maintained as specified in this SMP;
- All ECs must be inspected at a frequency and in a manner defined in the SMP;
- The use of groundwater underlying the property is prohibited without necessary water quality treatment as determined by the NYSDOH or the Broome County Department of Health to render it safe for use as drinking water or for industrial purposes, and the user must first notify and obtain written approval to do so from the Department;
- Environmental or public health monitoring must be performed as defined in this SMP;
- Data and information pertinent to site management must be reported at the frequency and in a manner as defined in this SMP;
- All future activities that will disturb remaining contaminated material must be conducted in accordance with this SMP;
- Monitoring to assess the performance and effectiveness of the remedy must be performed as defined in this SMP;
- Operation, maintenance, monitoring, inspection, and reporting of any mechanical or physical component of the remedy shall be performed as defined in this SMP;
- Access to the site must be provided to agents, employees or other representatives of the State of New York with reasonable prior notice to the property owner to assure compliance with the restrictions identified by the Environmental Easement;
- The potential for vapor intrusion must be evaluated for any new buildings developed in the area within the IC boundaries (i.e. – property boundary) noted on Figure 1, and any potential impacts that are identified must be monitored or mitigated;
- Vegetable gardens and farming on the site are prohibited; and
- An evaluation shall be performed to determine the need for further investigation and remediation should large scale redevelopment occur, if any of the existing structures are demolished, or if the subsurface is otherwise made accessible.

Methods of Evaluation

The IC/ECs are evaluated by performance of regular monitoring events and annual site-wide inspections. During these inspections, an inspection form is completed. The inspection collects sufficient information to assess the following:

- Compliance with all ICs, including site usage;
- An evaluation of the condition and continued effectiveness of ECs;
- General site conditions at the time of the inspection;
- The site management activities being conducted including, where appropriate, confirmation sampling and a health and safety inspection;
- Compliance with permits and schedules included in the Operation and Maintenance Plan; and
- Confirmation that site records are up to date.

Monitoring of the cover system is performed on an annual basis. In addition, inspections of the cover system are also to be performed after all severe weather conditions that may affect the integrity of the system.

Monitoring of GAHS components is performed on a routine basis, as identified in the table below.

GAHS Monitoring Requirements and Schedule

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Monitoring Schedule |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | Monthly |
| Alarm | Visual - Function | Pass/Fail | Monthly |
| Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | Yearly |

4.1.2 Effectiveness of Controls

The annual site inspection of the cover system (including the building slab) occurred on May 1, 2025.

No severe condition (erosion, flooding event, or similar) has occurred since the implementation of the SMP. As such, no severe condition inspection has occurred to date.

Engineering Control - Cover System

On May 1, 2025, LYONS personnel inspected the cover system and determined that it remains in good condition. The completed annual inspection form and photographs are presented as Attachment A (Site Inspection Form and Photographs). No significant damage or disturbance to the cover system was noted, and as such, it remains an effective engineering control. However, the following minor damage / disturbances were noted:

- Lawn cover was thin in various areas throughout the Site:
 - Generally across the Site, thin areas where lawn growth was interspersed with tufts of thick / lush lawn growth. Given the difference in growth of grass in the same general areas, it appears the thin areas are warm-season grasses that have not emerged from winter dormancy. This is substantiated by the fact that the same condition was observed last year, and that by the fall, the lawn areas appeared to be fully grown-in.
 - Discrete bare areas were observed adjacent to some entrance sidewalks. No erosion of the cover topsoil was observed. It is likely that the thin / bare areas along sidewalks are due to salt usage during the winter.
- One small (30-50 SF) area of bare soil and minor erosion was noted adjacent to a parking space in the rear of the building. The minor erosion has not diminished the effectiveness of the cover, and the demarcation barrier could not be seen. The bare / eroded area is relatively steep, compared to the remainder of the parcel.
- In a discrete area along the northern wall of the laundry room, ants were actively emerging from a small crack in the slab and creating hills from excavated material.
- Gaps in the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby were observed.

Engineering Control - GAHS

The GAHS appeared to be in good operating condition. It remains in-place, operational, and effective. The parking garage slabs appeared to be in good condition, with only minor surface cracks observed.

The completed monthly monitoring forms are presented as Attachment B (GAHS Inspection Forms). Note that photographs of the parking garage fans and slabs are presented in Attachment A.

2024-2025 PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT
The EJ Victory Building (NYSDEC Site #C704060)
59 Lester Avenue, Johnson City, New York

Institutional Controls

The following table includes a list of all site restrictions that apply to the Site, and an assessment as to their adherence and effectiveness to date:

| Site Restriction | Assessment | Compliant / Effective? |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| The property may be used for restricted-residential, commercial or industrial use | The property is currently used as an apartment building with ground-level commercial areas | Yes |
| All ECs must be operated and maintained as specified in this SMP | All ECs are being operated and maintained as specified in this SMP | Yes |
| All ECs must be inspected at a frequency and in a manner defined in the SMP | All ECs are being inspected at a frequency and in a manner defined in the SMP | Yes |
| The use of groundwater underlying the property is prohibited without necessary water quality treatment as determined by the NYSDOH or the Onondaga Department of Health to render it safe for use as drinking water or for industrial purposes, and the user must first notify and obtain written approval to do so from the Department | Groundwater underlying the property is not being used | Yes |
| Environmental or public health monitoring must be performed as defined in this SMP | No monitoring of media (soil, groundwater, soil vapor, etc.) is required under the SMP | Yes |
| Data and information pertinent to site management must be reported at the frequency and in a manner as defined in this SMP | This PRR satisfies this requirement | Yes |
| All future activities that will disturb remaining contaminated material must be conducted in accordance with this SMP | Not applicable at this time, but Owner is aware of this requirement | Yes |
| Monitoring to assess the performance and effectiveness of the remedy must be performed as defined in this SMP | This PRR satisfies this requirement | Yes |
| Operation, maintenance, monitoring, inspection, and reporting of any mechanical or physical component of the remedy shall be performed as defined in this SMP | Owner is aware that the operation of the GAHS is required. No maintenance of the cover or GAHS systems was necessary during the reporting period. This PRR satisfies the monitoring and inspection requirements. | Yes |

2024-2025 PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT
The EJ Victory Building (NYSDEC Site #C704060)
59 Lester Avenue, Johnson City, New York

| Site Restriction | Assessment | Compliant / Effective? |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Access to the site must be provided to agents, employees or other representatives of the State of New York with reasonable prior notice to the property owner to assure compliance with the restrictions identified by the Environmental Easement | Owner is aware that access to the site must be provided to agents, employees or other representatives of the State of New York. | Yes |
| The potential for vapor intrusion must be evaluated for any buildings developed in the area within the IC boundaries (i.e. - property boundaries) noted on Figure 1, and any potential impacts that are identified must be monitored or mitigated | No buildings were developed in the area within the IC boundaries during the reporting period | Yes |
| Vegetable gardens and farming on the site are prohibited | There are no vegetable gardens or farming occurring at the property | Yes |
| An evaluation shall be performed to determine the need for further investigation and remediation should large scale redevelopment occur, if any of the existing structures are demolished, or if the subsurface is otherwise made accessible | No large-scale development, demolition, or subsurface disturbance is planned for the Site, but Owner is aware of the requirement | Yes |

4.1.3 Corrective Measures Performed During the Past Year

Since no deficiencies were noted in the IC/ECs, no corrective measures were necessary. However, as a Best Management Practice, the 2024 PRR recommended that lawn areas with thin cover be overseeded. By the fall of 2024, the lawn had grown-in, and the facility’s lawn service stated that overseeding was not necessary. It is likely that the thin areas were comprised of warm-season grasses that had not yet emerged from winter dormancy.

4.1.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

IC/ECs remain compliant and effective. However, the following minor damage / disturbances were noted (see also the forms / figures presented within Attachment A):

- Lawn cover was thin in various areas throughout the Site:
 - Generally across the Site, thin areas where lawn growth was interspersed with tufts of thick / lush lawn growth. Given the difference in growth of grass in the same general areas, it appears the thin areas are warm-season grasses that have not emerged from winter dormancy. This is substantiated by the fact that the same condition was observed last year, and that by the fall, the lawn areas appeared to be fully grown-in.
 - Discrete bare areas were observed adjacent to some entrance sidewalks. No erosion of the cover topsoil was observed. It is likely that the thin / bare areas along sidewalks are due to salt usage during the winter.
- One small (30-50 SF) area of bare soil and minor erosion was noted adjacent to a parking space in the rear of the building. The minor erosion has not diminished the effectiveness of the cover, and the demarcation barrier could not be seen. The bare / eroded area is relatively steep, compared to the remainder of the parcel.

- In a discrete area along the northern wall of the laundry room, ants were actively emerging from a small crack in the slab and creating hills from excavated material.
- Gaps in the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby were observed.

Therefore, the following recommendations are provided:

- The thin areas of lawn should be monitored throughout the growing season, and if necessary, reseeded in the fall.
- The bare areas adjacent to entrance sidewalks should be reseeded. If it is found that winter use of salt continues to kill the grass in these areas, a hardscape border (example: river rock on top of plastic barrier) should be considered.
- Sod should be placed on the small eroded area in the rear of the site to prevent further erosion in the area. If the sod has trouble growing due to the steepness of the area, regrading of the area should be considered.
- The ants in the laundry room should be killed and the associated crack should be sealed.
- As a best management practice, the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby should be sealed.

4.2 IC/EC CERTIFICATION

The completed forms certified by the Owner and Professional Engineer for the Owner/Remedial Party are presented as Attachment C.

5.0 MONITORING PLAN COMPLIANCE

No monitoring of media (soil, groundwater, soil vapor, etc.) is required under the SMP.

6.0 OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE PLAN COMPLIANCE

Operations & Maintenance Plan compliance is limited to the GAHS. The goal of the O&M Plan is to ensure that the GAHS is operating continuously.

If any equipment readings are not within their specified operation range, any equipment is observed to be malfunctioning, or the system is not performing within specifications; maintenance and repair, as per the Operation and Maintenance Plan, will be immediately implemented.

6.1 PREVENTATIVE AND ROUTINE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS

The need for preventative maintenance will depend upon the life expectancy and warranty for the specific part as well as visual observations over time. The need for repairs and/or adjustments will depend upon the observation of system operation compared to observation obtained when system operations were initiated.

6.2 NON-ROUTINE MAINTENANCE

In the event of unusual fan noise, failure to start, physical damage or repeated circuit breaker trip, the affected fan will be turned off for service or replacement. Any changes in the structure, slab conditions, etc. will require re-evaluation of the Garage Air Handling System.

Non-routine maintenance event reporting forms will include, at a minimum:

- Date of event;
- Name, company, and position of person(s) conducting non-routine maintenance/repair activities;
- Description of non-routine activities performed;
- Where appropriate, color photographs or sketches showing the approximate location of any problems or incidents (included either on the form or on an attached sheet); and
- Other documentation such as copies of invoices for repair work, receipts for replacement equipment, etc. (attached to the checklist/form).

6.3 O&M CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The GAHS remains in-place, operational, and effective.

7.0 OVERALL PRR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 COMPLIANCE WITH SMP

7.1.1 IC/ECs

Requirements of the SMP as it pertains to IC/ECs were met during the reporting period. At the current time, no changes to the SMP are necessary.

However, the following minor damage / disturbances were noted (see also the forms / figures presented within Attachment A:

- Lawn cover was thin in various areas throughout the Site:
 - Generally across the Site, thin areas where lawn growth were interspersed with tufts of thick / lush lawn growth. Given the difference in growth of grass in the same general areas, it appears the thin areas are warm-season grasses that have not emerged from winter dormancy. This is substantiated by the fact that the same condition was observed last year, and that by the fall, the lawn areas appeared to be fully grown-in.
 - Discrete bare areas were observed adjacent to some entrance sidewalks. No erosion of the cover topsoil was observed. It is likely that the thin / bare areas along sidewalks are due to salt usage during the winter.
- One small (30-50 SF) area of bare soil and minor erosion was noted adjacent to a parking space in the rear of the building. The minor erosion has not diminished the effectiveness of the cover, and the demarcation barrier could not be seen. The bare / eroded area is relatively steep, compared to the remainder of the parcel.
- In a discrete area along the northern wall of the laundry room, ants were actively emerging from a small crack in the slab and creating hills from excavated material.
- Gaps in the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby were observed.

The next PRR report will pertain to the April 24, 2025 – April 23, 2026 reporting period.

7.1.2 Monitoring

No monitoring of media (soil, groundwater, soil vapor, etc.) is required under the SMP.

7.1.3 O&M

The GAHS remains in-place, operational, and effective. No routine or non-routine repairs were necessary during the reporting period.

7.2 PERFORMANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REMEDY

The remedial strategy (including all engineering and institutional controls) continues to be an appropriate method of controlling exposure to remaining contamination in the subsurface.

Continuing performance of the remedy will be documented per the SMP.

7.3 FUTURE PRR SUBMITTALS

The requirements for site closure have not been met, as contamination of subsurface soil and groundwater remains at the Site. At this time, the frequency of PRRs will remain unchanged (annual). It is anticipated that the next PRR will be completed in May 2026.

7.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

At the current time, no changes to the SMP are necessary. However, the following recommendations are provided to address the minor damage / disturbances observed (see Section 7.1.1 and the forms / figures presented within Attachment A):

- The thin areas of lawn should be monitored throughout the growing season, and if necessary, reseeded in the fall.
- The bare areas adjacent to entrance sidewalks should be reseeded. If it is found that winter use of salt continues to kill the grass in these areas, a hardscape border (example: river rock on top of plastic barrier) should be considered.
- Sod should be placed on the small eroded area in the rear of the site to prevent further erosion in the area. If the sod has trouble growing due to the steepness of the area, regrading of the area should be considered.
- The ants in the laundry room should be killed and the associated crack should be sealed.
- As a best management practice, the joints in the floor and around the columns in the main lobby should be sealed.

8.0 DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL AND CLOSING

All site-related documents and data, including the PRR, must be submitted in electronic format to the NYSDEC. The required format for documents is an Adobe PDF file with optical character recognition and no password protection. Data must be submitted as an electronic data deliverable (EDD) according to the instructions on the following webpage: <https://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/62440.html>

Documents may be submitted to the project manager either through electronic mail or by using the Department's file transfer service at the following webpage: <https://fts.dec.state.ny.us/fts/>

If you should have any questions regarding the information presented in this report, please feel free to contact our corporate office (844) 688-3553 at your convenience.

Sincerely,
LYONS ENGINEERING, DPC


Albert G. Lyons, Jr., P.E.
President



Richard D. McKenna
Senior Project Manager

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site and Location Plan

Figure 2 – Engineering Control - Cover Plan


Figure 3 – Engineering Control - GAHS Plan




SITE PLAN

LEGEND:

----- APPROXIMATE PROPERTY LINE



SITE LOCATION



NOTES:

1. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH FROM GOOGLE EARTH WEBSITE (PHOTO TAKEN 2015).
2. APPROXIMATE PROPERTY LINE BASED ON BROOME COUNTY GIS MAPS.
3. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE.
4. BASED ON DRAWING WITHIN REMEDIAL ACTION WORK PLAN PREPARED BY ASBESTOS & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING CORPORATION

Consultant:

Revision:

Architect of Record:

Drawn: RDM

Checked:

Scale:

Key Plan:

Project Name:

**SITE
MANAGEMENT
PLAN**

EJ VICTORY BUILDING
59 LESTER AVENUE
JOHNSON CITY, NEW YORK 13790

Sheet Name:

**SITE AND
LOCATION
PLAN**

Project Number:

2022067

Issue Date:

October 2022

FIGURE:

FIG 1



FOR COVER
SYSTEM DESIGN



| MK | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|----|----------|---------------------|
| 4 | 04.11.22 | NYSEDEC UPDATES |
| 3 | 09.18.22 | WATER UPDATES |
| 2 | 11.22.21 | RFI UPDATES |
| 1 | 10.01.21 | CONSTRUCTION SET |
| 0 | 08.09.21 | BUILDING PERMIT SET |

NY PROJECT NO. 2022057
FILE NAME
DRAWN BY RDM
CHECKED BY AGL



© 2021 - VIP ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATES, PLLC
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
This document and the design solutions contained herein represent proprietary information of VIP Architectural Associates, PLLC and may not be reproduced nor disclosed in whole or in part by any party receiving this document without prior written consent.

SHEET TITLE
COVER SYSTEM
AS-BUILT - WEST

SHEET NUMBER
FIGURE 2A

-  EXTENT OF DEMARCATION BARRIER
-  BUILDING SLAB
-  2' SOIL / VEGETATED COVER
-  ~~VEGETATED ON HARDSCAPE COVER~~

| TYPICAL COVER THICKNESSES | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| COVER TYPE | THICKNESS |
| PARKING LOT | 1' 4.5" |
| ROAD/DRIVEWAY | 1' 5.5" |
| SIDEWALKS | 9.5" |
| PATIO | 3' 6" |
| SERVICE DOCK FOUNDATION | 3' 8" |
| COOLING TOWER FOUNDATION | 3' 8" |



I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT
WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.

Don Beckley
DON BECKLEY
LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC

11/10/22
DATE

1
L400
PLANTING PLAN - WEST



FOR COVER
SYSTEM DESIGN



| TYPICAL COVER THICKNESSES | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| COVER TYPE | THICKNESS |
| PARKING LOT | 1' 4.5" |
| ROAD/DRIVEWAY | 1' 5.5" |
| SIDEWALKS | 9.5" |
| PATIO | 3' 6" |
| SERVICE DOCK FOUNDATION | 3' 8" |
| COOLING TOWER FOUNDATION | 3' 8" |

| MK | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|----|----------|---------------------|
| 4 | 04.11.22 | NYSE/EC UPDATES |
| 3 | 09.28.22 | WATER OWNERS |
| 2 | 11.22.21 | RPI UPDATES |
| 1 | 10.01.21 | CONSTRUCTION SET |
| 0 | 08.09.21 | BUILDING PERMIT SET |

| NO | PROJECT NO. | DATE | ISSUES |
|----|-------------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2022057 | | |


© 2021 - VIP ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATES, PLLC
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
This document and the design solutions contained
herein represent proprietary information of
VIP Architectural Associates, PLLC and may not be
reproduced nor disclosed in whole or in part by any party
receiving this document without prior written consent.

SHEET TITLE

COVER SYSTEM
AS-BUILT - EAST

SHEET NUMBER
FIGURE 2B

-  EXTENT OF DEMARCATION BARRIER
-  BUILDING SLAB
-  2' SOIL / VEGETATED COVER
-  ~~VEGETATED ON HARDSCAPE COVER~~




1 PLANTING PLAN - EAST
L401



I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT
WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.

Don Beckley 11/10/22
DON BECKLEY DATE
LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC




- A. EXHAUST FAN EF-1 AND EF-2:**
1. SHALL BE INDEXED TO RUN CONTINUOUSLY TO PROVIDE MINIMUM REQUIRED VENTILATION.
 2. WHENEVER THE FAN IS CALLED TO RUN, ITS ASSOCIATED EXHAUST AND INTAKE DAMPER SHALL BE OPEN.
- B. EXHAUST FAN EF-1 AND EF-2:**
1. WHENEVER ANY CARBON MONOXIDE (CO) DETECTOR ASSOCIATED WITH ITS RESPECTIVE FAN SENSES A CO LEVEL OF 35 PPM, ALONG WITH A PROGRAMMABLE DELAY OF ONE MINUTE, THE EXHAUST FAN SHALL MODULATE AS REQUIRED TO REDUCE CO LEVELS.
 2. FAN SPEED SHOULD START AT 20% (ADJUSTABLE) AND INCREASE IN 10% INCREMENTS EVERY FIVE MINUTES.
 3. ONCE CO LEVELS FALL BELOW 30 PPM FOR A PERIOD OF 5 MINUTES (ADJUSTABLE), THE FANS SHALL STOP AND ASSOCIATED DAMPERS SHALL CLOSE.
- C. EXHAUST FAN EF-3:**
1. WHENEVER ANY CARBON MONOXIDE (CO) DETECTOR ASSOCIATED WITH ITS RESPECTIVE FAN SENSES A CO LEVEL OF 35 PPM, ALONG WITH A PROGRAMMABLE DELAY OF ONE MINUTE, THE EXHAUST FAN SHALL MODULATE AS REQUIRED TO REDUCE CO LEVELS.
 2. FAN SPEED SHOULD START AT 20% (ADJUSTABLE) AND INCREASE IN 10% INCREMENTS EVERY FIVE MINUTES.
 3. ONCE CO LEVELS FALL BELOW 30 PPM FOR A PERIOD OF 5 MINUTES (ADJUSTABLE), THE FANS SHALL STOP AND ASSOCIATED DAMPERS SHALL CLOSE.
- D. CO AUDIO/VISUAL ALARM NOTIFICATION:**
1. IF CO LEVELS RISE TO 150 PPM OR HIGHER, INDICATE AN ALARM CONDITION AT THE BCS OPERATORS WORKSTATION AND ACTIVATE ENUNCIATOR IN PARKING AREA.
- E. MONITORING:**
1. FAN STATUS
 2. FAN SPEED
 3. CO LEVELS
 4. CO SENSOR STATUS
- F. ALARMS:**
1. FAN FAILURE
 2. CO SENSOR FAILURE
 3. HIGH CO LEVEL (>150 PPM)
- G. OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**
1. CO SENSORS TO BE USE ELECTROMECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY.
 2. CO SENSORS TO HAVE 1 PPM SENSITIVITY LEVEL.
 3. MAX SPACING OF CO SENSORS BASED ON 50' RADIUS.
 4. PROVIDE PERMANENT PLACARDS TO EXPLAIN ALARM PLACED AT EACH AV DEVICE.
 5. DESIGN BASIS HONEYWELL 301C CONTROLLER

EQUIPMENT NOTES:

1. EXHAUST FAN EF-1: GREENCHECK MODEL SE-1
2. EXHAUST FANS EF-2 AND EF-3: GREENCHECK MODEL SBE-3
3. GAS MONITORING AND FAN/DAMPER OPERATION WILL CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING: FIVE CO AND NO2 SENSORS LOCATED PER THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS. SENSORS WILL BE TIED BACK TO THE MAIN CONTROLLER VIA A COMMUNICATION MODULE. THE MAIN CONTROLLER WILL MONITOR CO AND NO2 LEVELS TO OPERATE EXHAUST FANS AND MOTORIZED DAMPERS. THE MAIN CONTROLLER WILL ALSO ENABLE AUDIO AND VISUAL ALARM SIGNALS (HORN AND STROBES).

LEGEND:

- APARTMENTS
- STAIRS / ELEVATORS
- LOBBYS / CIRCULATION
- COMMON / MECHANICAL
- FUTURE
- PARKING
- DEMO
- NET TO GROSS
- EXTENT OF INTERIOR ENGINEERING CONTROL (GARAGE AIR HANDLING SYSTEM)



- GENERAL NOTES:**
1. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH FROM GOOGLE EARTH WEBSITE (PHOTO TAKEN 2015).
 2. APPROXIMATE PROPERTY LINE BASED ON BROOME COUNTY GIS MAPS.
 3. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE.
 4. BASED ON DRAWING WITHIN REMEDIAL ACTION WORK PLAN PREPARED BY ASBESTOS & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING CORPORATION

DISCLAIMER: THE INFORMATION MUST SOLELY AND ONLY BE USED FOR THE COORDINATION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CURRENT PROJECT. NEU-VELLE, LLC DOES NOT WARRANT OR TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THE INFORMATION ISSUED MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE USED OTHER THAN BY THE INTENDED RECIPIENTS. NEU-VELLE, LLC ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE SUFFERED BY THE RECIPIENT ARISING OUT OF, OR IN CONNECTION WITH, THE USE OR MISUSE OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THE COPYRIGHT OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS BELONGS TO NEU-VELLE, LLC. INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS NOT TO BE DISCLOSED OR REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF NEU-VELLE, LLC. DO NOT SCALE OFF THE DRAWINGS. ANY DIMENSIONS OBTAINED BY MEASURING OFF THE DRAWING ARE AT THE RISK OF THE RECIPIENT. THE RECIPIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING THE CORRECTNESS AND COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THIS SHOULD BE DONE BY CONSULTING ALL RELEVANT DOCUMENTS SUPPLIED DURING THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT AND BY CONFIRMING DIMENSIONS ON SITE.

I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.

Don Beckley
DON BECKLEY
LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC

11/10/22
DATE

Consultant:

Revision:

Architect of Record:



Drawn: RDM

Checked:

Scale:

Key Plan:

Project Name:

**SITE
MANAGEMENT
PLAN**

EJ VICTORY BUILDING
59 LESTER AVENUE
JOHNSON CITY, NEW YORK 13790

Sheet Name:

**GARAGE AIR
HANDLING SYSTEM**

Project Number:





2022067

Issue Date:

December 2022

FIGURE:

FIGURE 3A



Consultant: _____

Revision: _____

Architect of Record: _____



Drawn: RDM

Checked: ALG

Scale: _____

Key Plan: _____

Project Name: **SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN**
EJ VICTORY BUILDING
59 LESTER AVENUE
JOHNSON CITY, NEW YORK 13790

Sheet Name: **GARAGE AIR HANDLING SYSTEM LAYOUT**

Project Number: **2022067**

Issue Date: **November 2022**

FIGURE: **FIGURE 15B**

DISCLAIMER: THE INFORMATION MUST SOLELY AND ONLY BE USED FOR THE COORDINATION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CURRENT PROJECT. NEU-VELLE, LLC DOES NOT WARRANT OR TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THE INFORMATION ISSUED MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL AND MUST NOT BE USED OTHER THAN BY THE INTENDED RECIPIENTS. NEU-VELLE, LLC ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE SUFFERED BY THE RECIPIENT ARISING OUT OF, OR IN CONNECTION WITH, THE USE OR MISUSE OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THE COPYRIGHT OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS BELONGS TO NEU-VELLE, LLC. INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS NOT TO BE DISCLOSED OR REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF NEU-VELLE, LLC. DO NOT SCALE OFF THE DRAWINGS. ANY DIMENSIONS OBTAINED BY MEASURING OFF THE DRAWINGS ARE AT THE RISK OF THE RECIPIENT. THE RECIPIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING THE CORRECTNESS AND COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION ISSUED. THIS SHOULD BE DONE BY CONSULTING ALL RELEVANT DOCUMENTS SUPPLIED DURING THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT AND BY CONFIRMING DIMENSIONS ON SITE.

I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.

Don Beckley
DON BECKLEY
LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC

11/10/22
DATE



ATTACHMENT A

ANNUAL SITE INSPECTION FORMS AND PHOTOGRAPHS

ANNUAL / SEVERE CONDITION SITE INSPECTION FORM

Site Name: The EJ Victory Building
Address: 59 Lester Avenue
 Johnson City, New York
Tax ID: 143.58-1-19, 143.57-02-44
Area: 4.971± acres
NYSDEC Site #: C704060

Inspection Date: MAY 1, 2025
Type of Inspection:
 Annual Severe Condition
Weather During Inspection:
 Temperature: 70 °F
 Conditions: SUNNY, DRY, HIGH CLOUDS

Description of Engineering Control(s) to be Inspected:

Hybrid cover system consisting of the following over limited portions of the Site (see attached figures):

- 2-foot soil cover over an orange demarcation barrier
- Hardscape surfaces (concrete sidewalks, asphalt parking, etc.) over an orange demarcation barrier
- Hardscape surfaces in the area between the main building and annex (no demarcation barrier)
- Concrete building slab (no demarcation barrier)

Walk and inspect the:

- Perimeter of the Site
- Exterior portions of the cover system within the Site boundaries
- Exposed concrete slab within the parking garages
- Exposed concrete slab within the 1st floor common areas

Conditions:

Describe deficiencies/remedies in the Comments section, and mark up Site Plan on Page 2 as needed

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|--------|
| 1. | Has there been a change in use of the Site? | Y | (N) |
| 2. | Has any material been removed? | Y | (N) |
| 3. | Has anything been newly constructed on the Site? | Y | (N) |
| 4. | Are there any signs of significant settlement or deterioration of the cover? | Y | (N) |
| 5. | Are there any signs of erosion? | (Y) | (N) |
| 6. | Is the cover material being tracked onto adjacent sidewalks/streets by vehicular traffic? | Y | (N) |
| 7. | Has the cover material sloughed onto adjacent sidewalks or parking lots? | Y | (N) |
| 8. | Are there any signs of intrusive activities (drilling, excavation, etc.)? | Y | (N) |
| 9. | Are there signs that snow plowing has altered the surface of the cover? | Y | (N) |
| 10. | Is the perimeter fence damaged? | Y | (N) |
| 11. | Is the demarcation barrier visible in any locations? | Y | (N) |
| 12. | Is any staining of the cover material visible (other than typical vehicle leaks on pavement, etc.)? | Y | (N) |
| 13. | Have previously recommended remedies/repairs been implemented? | (N/A) | Y N |

Comments:

If an inspection identifies damage to the cover, it shall be reported to the NYSDEC by noon the following business day (if an emergency) or within 5 business days (if a non-emergency)

VERY MINOR EROSION IN ONE SMALL AREA IN THE NORTH-CENTRAL PORTION OF THE SITE, ADJACENT TO A PARKING SPACE. SEE ASSOCIATED NOTES ON SITE DRAWINGS.

Attachments:

Photographs: (Y) N
 Other (Describe): (Y) N ANNUAL COVER INSPECTION FORM, SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLAN

RICHARD D MCKENNA
Name of Inspector (Print)

Richard D McKenna
Signature of Inspector

Inspector: **RICHARD D MCKENNA**
 Date: **MAY 1, 2025**

Annual Cover Inspection Form
 EJ Victory Building (NYSDEC #C704060)
 For Period: April 23, 2024 - April 23, 2025

| | Location | System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Notes |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| EXTERIOR | Northwestern Cover Area | Mix of Hardscape (Asphalt and Concrete) and Soil Cover | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | DEAD GRASS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO SIDEWALK. LIKELY DUE TO SALT USE. NO EROSION. |
| | Northeastern Cover Area | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GRASS A LITTLE THIN ALONG DRIVE/BORDER. SOME "SPLOTCHY" AREAS ALONG BUILDING. NO EROSION. |
| | Southwestern Cover Area | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | DEAD GRASS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO ROAD. LIKELY DUE TO SALT USE. NO EROSION. |
| | Southeastern Cover Area | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | DEAD GRASS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO SIDEWALK, LIKELY DUE TO SALT USE. NO EROSION. |
| | Western "Courtyard" | Hardscape (Broken Asphalt over Concrete) | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | OK |
| | West-Central "Courtyard" | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| | East-Central "Courtyard" | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| | Eastern "Courtyard" | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | OK |
| INTERIOR - ACCESS | 100 - Stair (STAIR A) | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS |
| | 111 - Corridor | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS OUTSIDE OF SOUTH TECH RM DOOR. SOME REPAIR? |
| | 120 - Stair (STAIR B) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 121 - Corridor | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SURFACE CRACKS |
| | 131 - Corridor | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SURFACE CRACKS |
| | 140 - Stair (STAIR C) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 160 - Stair (STAIR D) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS |
| | 180 - Stair (STAIR E) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS |
| INTERIOR - CENTRAL LOBBY | 112 - Vestibule (WEST GARAGE) | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 114 - Vestibule (MAIN ENTRANCE) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 115 - Package | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 117 - Mail | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | 120L - Lobby | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | REPAIR CAULK + SEAL AROUND COLUMNS |
| | 123 - Vestibule (EAST GARAGE) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |

Inspector: RDM
 Date: 5/1/25

| Location | System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Notes |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|--|
| 100U - Utility | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | VACANT. |
| 100 - Tech Center (BUSINESS CENTER) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | FINISHED FLOOR |
| 119 - Comm Rm (LOUNGE) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | FINISHED FLOOR |
| 121L - Lobby | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| 122 - Electric | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| 125 - Man Office (MANAGEMENT OFFICE) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SURFACE CRACK WEST WALL GOOD ← NEAR |
| 127 - Toilet (RESTROOM) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| 129 - Storage | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| 131 - Vending (LAUNDRY ROOM) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS |
| 135 - Pet Spa (DOG WASH) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS AT JOINTS. ANTS TUNNELING THROUGH JOINT IN ONE AREA NEAR N WALL |
| 137 - Mech Rm | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| 140T - Telecom | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| 145 - Janitor (CUSTODIAN) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| 151 - Tenant Storage (STORAGE UNITS) | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | MINOR CRACKS |
| 156 - Electric | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS |
| 161 - Lobby | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SURFACE CRACKS | |
| 167 - Fitness | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | RUBBER MAT FLOOR | |
| 169 - H2O Service | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | NO ACCESS | |
| 100S - Bike Storage | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| Stall Area W1 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| Stall Area W2 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| Stall Area W3 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| Stall Area W4 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |

ACCESS FROM EXTERIOR? →

MOVE TO ACCESS →

ACCESS FROM STAIRS + GARAGE? →

ACCESS FROM GARAGE? →

ACCESS FROM GARAGE? →

ACCESS FROM EXTERIOR? →

INTERIOR - ROOMS

INTERIOR - WEST GARAGE

Inspector: RDM
 Date: 5/1/25

| Location | | System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Notes |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| INTERIOR - WEST GARAGE | Stall Area W5 | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| | Stall Area W6 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area W7 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area W8 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area W9 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area W10 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SOME SPALLING IN SPACE 98 |
| | Stall Area W11 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | SOME SPALLING IN SPACE 99 |
| | Stall Area W12 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD |
| INTERIOR - EAST GARAGE | Stall Area E1 | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD, MINOR CRACKS. |
| | Stall Area E2 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E3 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E4 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E5 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E6 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E7 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E8 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E9 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E10 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E11 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E12 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E13 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E14 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E15 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |

Inspector: RDM
 Date: 5/1/25

| Location | | System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Notes |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| INTERIOR - EAST GARAGE | Stall Area E16 | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD. MINOR CRACKS. |
| | Stall Area E17 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E18 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E19 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E20 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E21 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E22 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E23 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E24 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E25 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E26 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E27 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E28 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E29 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E30 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E31 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E32 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E33 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E34 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| | Stall Area E35 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | |
| Stall Area E36 | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | | | |
| Stall Area E37 | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | | | |
| Stall Area E38 | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | | | |

Inspector: RDM
 Date: 5/1/25

| Location | | System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Notes |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| INTERIOR - EAST GARAGE | Stall Area E39 | Exposed Slab | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD. MINOR CRACKS |
| | Stall Area E40 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E41 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E42 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E43 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E44 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E45 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E46 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E47 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | Stall Area E48 | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | " |
| | 180S - Bike Storage | | Visual - Integrity | Good Condition | GOOD. |

Actions performed during the past year:
 LANDSCAPER CALLED ABOUT THIN AREAS OF LAWN. SAID WILL RE-VISIT IN FALL TO PLACE SEED WHERE NECESSARY. IN FALL, AREAS HAD GROWN IN, AND SEEDING WASN'T NECESSARY.

Recommendations:

TRM
5/1/25



| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--------|
| NO. | REVISION | DATE |
| 1 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 2 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 3 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 4 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 5 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 6 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 7 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 8 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 9 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 10 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 11 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 12 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 13 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 14 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 15 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 16 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 17 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 18 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 19 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 20 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 21 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 22 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 23 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 24 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 25 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 26 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 27 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 28 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 29 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 30 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 31 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 32 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 33 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 34 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 35 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 36 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 37 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 38 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 39 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 40 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 41 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 42 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 43 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 44 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 45 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 46 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 47 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 48 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 49 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 50 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 51 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 52 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 53 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 54 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 55 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 56 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 57 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 58 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 59 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 60 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 61 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 62 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 63 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 64 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 65 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 66 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 67 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 68 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 69 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 70 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 71 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 72 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 73 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 74 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 75 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 76 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 77 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 78 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 79 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 80 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 81 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 82 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 83 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 84 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 85 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 86 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 87 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 88 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 89 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 90 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 91 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 92 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 93 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 94 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 95 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 96 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 97 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 98 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 99 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |
| 100 | ISSUED FOR PERMIT | 5/1/25 |

| COVER TYPE | TYPICAL COVER THICKNESSES | THICKNESS |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| PARKING LOT | | 1' 4.5" |
| ROAD / DRIVEWAY | | 1' 5.5" |
| SIDEWALKS | | 9.5" |
| PATIO | | 5.5" |
| SERVICE DOCK FOUNDATION | | 3' 8" |
| COOLING TOWER FOUNDATION | | 3' 8" |

- EXTENT OF DEMARCATION BARRIER
- BUILDING SLAB
- 2' SOIL / VEGETATED COVER
- VEGETATED-ON-HARDSCAPE COVER


DEAD GRASS IMMEDIATELY
ADJACENT TO SIDEWALK/ROAD
LIKELT DUE TO SALT USE.
NO EROSION

THIN GRASS
COVER BUT
NO EROSION.
OK.

SOUTHWESTERN COVER AREA

SOUTHWESTERN COVER AREA

THIN GRASS
COVER BUT
OK. NO
EROSION.




I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT
WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.
Don Beckley
DON BECKLEY
LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC
11/10/22
DATE

- EXTENT OF DEMARCATION BARRIER
- BUILDING SLAB
- 2' SOIL / VEGETATED COVER
- VEGETATED-ON-HARDSCAPE COVER

VERT MINOR EROSION

GRASS IS "SPRATCHY" - MONITOR. NO EROSION.

GRASS A WHOLE BORDER BETTER. NO EROSION.




| TYPICAL COVER THICKNESSES | THICKNESS |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| COVER TYPED | 1" 4" |
| PARKING LOT | 1" 4" |
| ROAD DRIVEWAY | 9" 3" |
| SIDEWALKS | 9" 6" |
| PATIO | 9" 8" |
| SERVICE DOCK FOUNDATION | 9" 8" |
| COOLING TOWER FOUNDATION | 9" 8" |

I DO HEREBY VERIFY PROJECT WAS CONSTRUCTED PER PLAN.

Don Beckley
 DON BECKLEY
 LECHASE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC

11/10/22 DATE



1 PLANTING PLAN - EAST

Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025





Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025




Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025





Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



Photo Log - Annual Inspection - EJ Victory Building - 2025



ATTACHMENT B

MONTHLY GAHS INSPECTION FORMS

Date: 5/21/24

Inspector: Sarah McKeacher

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)

GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

annual inspection next week

Date: 4/11/24

Inspector: Sarah McKechnis

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)

GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 7/23/24

Inspector: Sarah McKeeth

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 8/7/24

Inspector: Sarah McKeever

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)

GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 9/27/24

Inspector: Sarah McKechnie

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 10/15/24

Inspector: Sarah Mc Kercher

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 11/12/24

Inspector: Sarah McKezner

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)

GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 12/20/24

Inspector: Sarah McKezher

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 1/22/25

Inspector: Sarah McKezher

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | F |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 2/1/12

Inspector: Sarah McKeever

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 3/24/25

Inspector: Sarah McKechnie

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:

Date: 4/16/25

Inspector: Sarah McKeever

EJ Victory Building (BCP# C704060)
GAHS Monthly Monitoring Report

| System Component | Monitoring Parameter | Operating Range | Item | Notes |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Mitigation Fans | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | EF-1 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-2 | ✓ |
| | | | EF-3 | ✓ |
| Louvers | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | L-2 | ✓ |
| | | | L-3 | ✓ |
| | | | L-4 | ✓ |
| CO/NO Sensors | Visual - Operation | Operational / Inoperable | 1 | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | ✓ |
| | | | 3 | ✓ |
| | | | 4 | ✓ |
| | | | 5 | ✓ |
| Alarm - Fans | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - Sensors | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |
| Alarm - High CO Level (>150 ppm) | Horn / Strobe | Pass/Fail | N/A | P |

Actions performed during the past month:

Recommendations:
Annual review coming due?

ATTACHMENT C

CERTIFICATION FORMS



Enclosure 2
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
Site Management Periodic Review Report Notice
Institutional and Engineering Controls Certification Form



| | Site Details | Box 1 | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Site No. | C704060 | | | |
| Site Name EJ Victory Building | | | | |
| Site Address: 59 Lester Avenue Zip Code: 13790 | | | | |
| City/Town: Johnson City | | | | |
| County: Broome | | | | |
| Site Acreage: 4.971 | | | | |
| Reporting Period: April 23, 2024 to April 23, 2025 | | | | |
| | | YES | NO | |
| 1. | Is the information above correct? | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | If NO, include handwritten above or on a separate sheet. | | | |
| 2. | Has some or all of the site property been sold, subdivided, merged, or undergone a tax map amendment during this Reporting Period? | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | |
| 3. | Has there been any change of use at the site during this Reporting Period (see 6NYCRR 375-1.11(d))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | |
| 4. | Have any federal, state, and/or local permits (e.g., building, discharge) been issued for or at the property during this Reporting Period? | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | |
| | If you answered YES to questions 2 thru 4, include documentation or evidence that documentation has been previously submitted with this certification form. | | | |
| 5. | Is the site currently undergoing development? | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | |
| | | Box 2 | | |
| | | YES | NO | |
| 6. | Is the current site use consistent with the use(s) listed below? Restricted-Residential, Commercial, and Industrial | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 7. | Are all ICs in place and functioning as designed? | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER QUESTION 6 OR 7 IS NO, sign and date below and DO NOT COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS FORM. Otherwise continue. | | | | |
| A Corrective Measures Work Plan must be submitted along with this form to address these issues. | | | | |
| XXXX | | XXXX | | |
| _____ Signature of Owner, Remedial Party or Designated Representative | | _____ Date | | |

Box 2A

YES NO

8. Has any new information revealed that assumptions made in the Qualitative Exposure Assessment regarding offsite contamination are no longer valid? YES NO

If you answered YES to question 8, include documentation or evidence that documentation has been previously submitted with this certification form.

9. Are the assumptions in the Qualitative Exposure Assessment still valid? YES NO
(The Qualitative Exposure Assessment must be certified every five years)

If you answered NO to question 9, the Periodic Review Report must include an updated Qualitative Exposure Assessment based on the new assumptions.

SITE NO. C704060**Box 3****Description of Institutional Controls**ParcelOwnerInstitutional Control**143.57-2-44**

EJ Victory Building, LLC

Ground Water Use Restriction
Soil Management Plan
Landuse Restriction
Building Use Restriction
Monitoring Plan
Site Management Plan
IC/EC Plan

Site remedy requires that an environmental easement be placed on the property to prevent exposure to remaining subsurface contamination by controlling ground disturbances and limiting the use and development of the site to industrial, commercial, and/or restricted residential use.

143.58-1-19

EJ Victory Building, LLC

Ground Water Use Restriction
Soil Management Plan
Landuse Restriction
Building Use Restriction
Monitoring Plan
Site Management Plan
O&M Plan
IC/EC Plan

Site remedy requires that an environmental easement be placed on the property to prevent exposure to remaining subsurface contamination by controlling ground disturbances and limiting the use and development of the site to industrial, commercial, and/or restricted residential use.

Box 4**Description of Engineering Controls**ParcelEngineering Control**143.58-1-19**

Cover System

A cover system and garage air handling system are the primary engineering controls at the site to protect human health and the environment from remaining soil, groundwater, and soil vapor contamination.

Periodic Review Report (PRR) Certification Statements

1. I certify by checking "YES" below that:

a) the Periodic Review report and all attachments were prepared under the direction of, and reviewed by, the party making the Engineering Control certification;

b) to the best of my knowledge and belief, the work and conclusions described in this certification are in accordance with the requirements of the site remedial program, and generally accepted engineering practices; and the information presented is accurate and complete.

YES NO
X

2. For each Engineering control listed in Box 4, I certify by checking "YES" below that all of the following statements are true:

(a) The Engineering Control(s) employed at this site is unchanged since the date that the Control was put in-place, or was last approved by the Department;

(b) nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of such Control, to protect public health and the environment;

(c) access to the site will continue to be provided to the Department, to evaluate the remedy, including access to evaluate the continued maintenance of this Control;

(d) nothing has occurred that would constitute a violation or failure to comply with the Site Management Plan for this Control; and

(e) if a financial assurance mechanism is required by the oversight document for the site, the mechanism remains valid and sufficient for its intended purpose established in the document.

YES NO
X

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS NO, sign and date below and DO NOT COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS FORM. Otherwise continue.

A Corrective Measures Work Plan must be submitted along with this form to address these issues.

XXXX

XXXX

Signature of Owner, Remedial Party or Designated Representative

Date

IC CERTIFICATIONS
SITE NO. C704060

Box 6


SITE OWNER OR DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

I certify that all information and statements in Boxes 1, 2, and 3 are true. I understand that a false statement made herein is punishable as a Class "A" misdemeanor, pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.

I Matthew Paulus on behalf of Paulus Capital, LLC at 225 Wilkinson Street, Syracuse, New York,
print name print business address

am certifying as EJ Victory Building, LLC (Owner or Remedial Party)

for the Site named in the Site Details Section of this form.



Signature of Owner, Remedial Party, or Designated Representative
Rendering Certification

5/19/25
Date

BY: EJ VICTORY BUILDING, LLC

EC CERTIFICATIONS

Box 7

Signature

I certify that all information in Boxes 4 and 5 are true. I understand that a false statement made herein is punishable as a Class "A" misdemeanor, pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.

I Albert G. Lyons, Jr. at 10 Jones Avenue, Rochester, New York,
print name print business address

am certifying as a Qualified Environmental Professional for the Owner
(Owner or Remedial Party)

Albert G. Lyons, Jr.



May 21, 2025

Signature of , for the Owner or Remedial Party,
Rendering Certification

Stamp
(Required for PE)

Date