REMEDIAL ACTION CERTIFICATION OPERABLE UNIT – A, GEORGIA-PACIFIC Fort Bragg, Mendocino County

1.	Certif	fication of Remedial Action:	The same different and the
	knowl	eby certify that the following information is truledge.	May 2,2012
	Brown	ct Manager, Thomas Lanphar ofields and Environmental Restoration Program	Date
	1	7727	5/7/12
		Chief, Denise Tsuji nfields and Environmental Restoration Program	Date
2.		fication Statement: Based upon the informally known to DTSC, DTSC has determined that all appropriate recompleted, that all acceptable engineering and that no further removal/remedial action	esponse actions have been oractices were implemented
	ade la	DTSC has determined, based upon a reme characterization, that the site poses no sign welfare, or the environment and therefore in removal/remedial measures is not necessar	ificant threat to public health, nplementation of
	n na. nem ser areda in ari ine las set win	DTSC has determined that all appropriate repeated been completed and that all acceptable enginplemented: however, the site requires on maintenance (O&M) and monitoring efforts, the "active" site list following (1) a trial operand (2) execution of a formal written settlement responsible parties, if appropriate. However DTSC's list of sites undergoing O&M to ensign	gineering practices were going operation and The site will be deleted from ation and maintenance period nent between DTSC and the r, the site will be placed on

term clean-up efforts.

3. Site Name and Location: (Street address, County, and City)

Georgia-Pacific Former Wood Products Facility, Operable Unit A 90 Redwood Avenue Fort Bragg, Mendocino, California

A. List any other names that have been used to identify this site:

Georgia-Pacific; Coastal Trail and Parkland Zone; Consolidation Cell

- B. Address of site if different from above: N/A
- C. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 008-020-09, 008-010-26, 018-430-01, 018-430-02

4. Responsible Parties:

Georgia-Pacific LLC
133 Peachtree Street, NE
P.O. Box 105605
Atlanta, Georgia 30348-5605
Attn: Mr. David G. Massengill, Senior Director
DGMassen@gapac.com

Relationship to Site: Previous owner of property in Operable Unit A (OU A). OU A is now owned by the City of Fort Bragg

5. Brief Description and History of the Site:

Operable Unit A is one of five operable units of the former Georgia-Pacific mill site. Located along the Pacific Ocean, OU-A is divided into two sections; one north and one south of Soldier Bay (now called Fort Bragg Landing).

Soil removals took place at several locations during the summer of 2009 within two general areas of Operable Unit A, with one general area located in the southern section and the other in the northern section. The remediation of soil in these two areas meets recreational levels and therefore, future land use of these areas, intended for the coastal trail, is restricted to recreational uses by the Operable Unit A Land Use Covenant (LUC). The LUC between Georgia-Pacific and DTSC was recorded with the County of Mendocino on December 10, 2009. The remaining land in Operable Unit A does not require remediation and DTSC has not required any restrictions on future land use.

Approximately 13,000 cubic yards (cy) of dioxin contaminated soil from the five areas was excavated to depths ranging from 2 to 5 feet below ground surface (bgs) and

placed into the 1.5 acre Consolidation Cell located in Operable Unit D of the Georgia-Pacific mill site. Approximately 140 cy of lead contaminated soil was excavated at the Lead Presumptive Remedy Area (PRA) in OU-A North to a depth of approximately 2 feet bgs and removed for offsite disposal. At the Former Scrap Yard area within OU-A North, approximately 990 cy of soil was excavated to a depth of approximately 1 foot bgs.

DTSC approved the OU-A Completion Report on December 9, 2009 and provided partial certification of the Remedial Action. Partial Certification was granted because, although constructed, all remedial actions required to certify the completion of the Consolidation Cell were not completed at that time. An Operation and Maintenance Agreement and a Land Use Covenant for the Consolidation Cell had not been finalized. However, prior to finalizing these documents, excessive amounts of water accumulated in the Consolidation Cell during the winter of 2009/2010 and again in 2010/2011 indicting a failure of the Consolidation Cell cover or drainage system. Georgia-Pacific reconstructed drainage ditches surrounding the Consolidation cell in 2010; however, water continued infiltrating into the Consolidation Cell. Georgia-Pacific submitted, on April 13, 2011, the Consolidation Cell Investigation Conclusions and Phase II Enhancements Plan. Phase II enhancements involved constructing a new cover over the existing cover on the Consolidation Cell. Georgia-Pacific informed DTSC in May 2011of their intention to remove the Consolidation Cell. The Phase II Enhancement Plan was never approved by DTSC.

Georgia-Pacific submitted a work plan for the Consolidation Cell Removal on June 15, 2011. DTSC approved the work plan, issued an Explanation of Significant Differences and completed a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study and Negative Declaration on August 31, 2011.

Excavation and removal of the Consolidation Cell was completed on November 8, 2011. About 14,700 cubic yards of both OU-A impacted material and non-OU-A soil was excavated and loaded into trucks for off-site disposal at the Hay Road landfill in Solano County, California (893 total truck trips with an estimated 16 to 17 cubic yards loaded per truck). When direct loading was not possible, material was temporarily stockpiled for subsequent loading and disposal.

The cell was backfilled using material from an onsite stockpile, previously removed cover soil, and about 500 cubic yards of 2,500 cubic yards of soil originally placed under the cover and above the OU-A contaminated soil. This soil was tested and found acceptable for reuse. The excavated area was restored to re-establish pre-cell conditions to the extent possible, tie in to existing surrounding grade, and promote positive drainage and stable conditions. The site was hydro-seeded with native grass and forb species, and a low nitrogen fertilizer and fiber mulch were applied. DTSC approved the March 2012 Consolidation Cell Removal Report on April 11, 2012.

A list of milestone documents and their DTSC approval date is located in Section 11.B.

6.	Type of Site: "U state of all the cool lies not be blocked and a state of the state			
	Is the Site included in the Bond Expenditure Plan?			
	Yes No_X			
	RCRA-Permitted Facility Bond-funded			
	RCRA Facility Closure RP-Funded _X_			
	NPL Federal Facility			
	Other (i.e. walk-in) Explain Briefly:			
7.	Size of the Site:			
	Small Medium Large _X Extra-Large			
8.	Dates of Remedial Action:			
	a. Initiated: May 2009 b. Completed: November 2012			
9.	Response Action Taken on Site: (check appropriate action)			
	X Remedial Action (satisfactory abatement of site)			
	Final Removal Action			
	RCRA enforcement/closure action			
	No action, further investigation verified that no clean-up action at the site was			
	as A-Lin need. In lighted and beliefen beliefen A-Lin need to genevalde 001, 11 bodA . Fths			
	A Type of Remedial or Removal Action: (e.g. excavation and disposal on			

A. Type of Remedial or Removal Action: (e.g. excavation and disposal, onsite treatment, etc.)

The remedial action involved excavation dioxin, lead and PCB contaminated soil from OU-A. Lead and PCB contaminated soil was excavated and disposed off-site. Dioxin contaminated soil was originally disposed of in an on-site Consolidation Cell. The Consolidation Cell, and all contaminated material was removed in the fall of 2011. All dioxin contaminated material was transported and disposed of at the Class II non-hazardous waste Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, California Class II non-hazardous waste landfill.

B. Estimated quantity of waste associated with the site (i.e., tons/gallons/cubic yards) which was:

		treated	amount:		
		Heranure Dato <u>August</u> C			
	_	untreated (capped sites)	amount:		
	<u>X</u>	removed	amount: 10	6,000 cubic yards	
10.	Cleanup Levels/Standards:				
	a.	What were the cleanup standard Final Remedial Action Plan (RAF result of removal action (RA) price) or workpla	n (if cleanup occurred as the	
ŽI 1		Soil cleanup goals:			
	oii	Dioxin: 53 parts per trillion (ppt) or picograms/gram (pg/g) Toxic Equivalent (TEQ). Lead: 80 mg/kg PCB: 1 mg/kg			
	b.	Were the specified cleanup standards met? yes X no			
	C.	If "no", why not			
11.	DTSC	DTSC Involvement in the Removal Action:			
(e))	A.	Did DTSC order the Removal A	Action?	_ Wes <u>A_</u> No	
		Yes X No Date of Order	r: <u>February 1</u>	<u>6, 2007</u>	
	B.	Did DTSC review and approve the following plans/procedures? (indicate date of review/approval, if done):			
		OU A Remedial Investigation Re	port	Date: February 14, 2008	
		OU A Remedial Action Plan		Date: <u>August 28, 2008</u>	
•0	12 13	OU A Remedial Action Completi	on Report	Date: December 14, 2009	
		Consolidation Cell Investigation and Phase II Enhancements Pla			
		Consolidation Cell Removal Wo	rk Plan	Date: <u>August 31, 2011</u>	

	Explanation of Significant Differences	Date: August 31, 2011
	Consolidation Cell Removal Report	Date: <u>March 11, 2012</u>
C.	If site was abated by responsible party, did statement from a licensed professional on Actions? (indicate date of statement)	
	Yes X No	
	OU A Remedial Action Completion Report Consolidation Cell Removal Report	Date: <u>December 14, 2009</u> Date: <u>March 11, 2012</u>
D.	Did a registered engineer or geologist veri engineering practices were implemented?	
٠	Yes <u>x</u> No <u></u> Name: <u>Michael Flieshner, P.E.</u> Date: March 1 Name: <u>Kristo Fabian, P.E.</u> Date: December 1	
E.	Did DTSC confirm completion of all Remed	dial Actions?
	Yes X No Date: January 17, 2012	
F. '	Did DTSC (directly or through a contra Remedial Action?	ctor) actually perform the
	Yes No X	B. Old DTSC revi
G.	Was there a community relations plan in p	lace?
28, 2008 base 12, 3000	Yes <u>x</u> No <u></u> Community Relations Pan for the Georgia including the use of the mailing list.	Pacific Mill Site was used,
H.	Was a removal/remedial action plan develo	oped for this site?
	Yes x (Redial Action Plan) No	and Phase If E
31, 3011	Did DTSC hold public meetings regarding	the draft RAP?

	Yes <u>x</u> No		
	Two public meetings were held during the public comment period for the OUA RAP. The first was held on March 26, 2008 and the second on April 11, 2008 at the Redwood Elementary School in Fort Bragg.		
	A Community Workshop was hell Cell Removal and the Explanation		
J.	Were public comments address	ssed?	
	Yes x No _		
	Dates of DTSC analyses/respond A RAP is Appendix E of the final		
	Response to Public Comments of - Consolidation Cell Removal and included as Attachment F of the	d draft Initial Study/Negativ	e Declaration is
K.	Are all of the facts cited above adequately documented in the DTS files?		
	Yes <u>x</u> No	ry Health & warrenii Gillerin	
	If no, identify areas where docur	mentation is lacking:	
EPA I	nvolvement in the Remedial Ac	tion;	
A.	Was EPA involved in the site of	cleanup?	
	Yes No _x_		
В.	If yes, did EPA concur with all		
	Yes No	a meved off site and site	
C.	EDA comments		
886	EPA staff involved in cleanup: (r		

13. Other Regulatory Agency Involvement in the Cleanup Action:

12.

Agency:	Activity:			
X RWQCB	Reviewed and co	Reviewed and commented on draft documents		
X City of Fort Bragg	Concurred OUA R	Concurred OUA RAP and ESD as a Polanco Agency		
CHP Caltrans	i su gust es felos sun q regringliste nolferolare	odelnove procesa cO A. Octoborga socialnos		
 X Other	California Coastal	Commission		
Name of contact pers	ons and agency:			
Ms. Linda Ruffing City Manager City of Fort Bragg	ranggi, nga raiganri nang Bad VAP and aw			
Mr. Bob Merril California Coastal Co Northern District	mmission	Responde to Public Co - Constitution of a Particular Induced as estadoman		
Mr. Craig Hunt	Water Quality Control I			
14. Post Closure	Post Closure Activity:			
A. Will there be post-closure activities at this site? (e.g. Operation and Maintenance)				
Yes <u>X</u> No	- Paramento esta sett			
owner of the C responsible for report is to con- not moved of	ection report is required Coastal Trail and Parkla submitting the annual in firm that land use restric	by the Land Use Covenant. The new and Zone, the City of Fort Bragg, is aspection report. The purpose of the tions have not been violated, soil has sing activities have not uncovered		
B. Have post-clo Not Applicable		ared and approved by DTSC?		
C. What is the es Maintenance) Not Applicable	activities?	st-closure (including Operation and		

D.	Are d	eed restrictions proposed or in place?
	Yes _	X_No
l Inc Siber	If "yes	s", have deed restrictions been recorded with the County recorder?
	Yes _	X No come Gazard and Air Side Association and X No Co-A supported to a second and the company of
		", who is responsible for assuring that the deed restrictions are ded? NA
	Who i	is the Division contact?
E.	Has c	cost recovery been initiated?
	Yes _	<u>x</u> No
	recov	gia-Pacific is an ongoing remediation project with continuing cost ery. Georgia-Pacific is current on paying DTSC and, as of February 12, has a zero balance.
F.	Were	local planning agencies notified of the cleanup action?
	Yes _	x No If "yes", the name and address of the agency:
	Plann 416 N	of Fort Bragg hing Department North Franklin Street Bragg, California 95437
		e of Funds and Sources: (Information to be supplied by Toxicalit.) funding source and amount expended:
	IWCA	\$ HSA \$
+	ISCF	\$ RCRA \$
R	RP.	\$ 2.5 million Other \$
		(estimate RP has not provided actual costs)
F	ederal	Cooperation Agreement \$

15.

- **16. Problems Encountered Which Caused Major Delays:** The failure of the Consolidation Cell resulted in two year delay in certifying the completion of the OU-A Remedial Action Plan.
- 17. Accomplishments Unique to this Project: The removal of contaminants from OU-A, Coastal Trail and Parkland Zone was the first Operable Unit remediated at the former Georgia-Pacific Mill Site. Remediation and partial certification of the OU- A supported the sale of the Coastal Trail and Parkland Zone to the City of Fort Bragg for the development of the Coastal Trail.

Although the removal of the Consolidation Cell was in response to a failure of the cover/drainage system, the removal of the Consolidation Cell eliminated a long term environmental liability and legacy for Georgia-Pacific. Cell removal also allows for unrestricted reuse of the property once occupied by the Consolidation Cell.

18. Final Use of Site: OU-A, Coastal Trail and Parkland Zone will be developed by the City of Fort Bragg into a park. The future Coastal Trail will provide public access to an area of the Mendocino Coast that was in private ownership for over 100 years.