Initial Site Screening (ISS)

Site Name: Former Red Star Yeast

Project Manager: Andrew Carver Date: 2/5/26

☐ **3931 - Phase II Assessment Review – Brownfield Funded**
Phase II submitted as part of standard real estate development, pre-purchase agreement, or other due diligence, not a part of a community grant project, or

☐ **3837 - Phase II Assessment – Brownfield Grant Funded**
Phase II submitted as part of an EPA grant funded community-wide or targeted assessment project – see Mel Pins if questions on this determination, or

☒ **3321 - Phase II Assessment Review – CERCLA Pre-Remedial Funded**
Phase II submitted that is not part of a real estate transaction

Location: (Decimal Degree format)

Latitude: 41.9204 Longitude: -91.6798 **County**: Linn

USGS Quadrant:

Site Size: 3.87 **Site Dimension:** ☒ Acres ☐ Square Feet ☐ Feet ☐ Square Miles ☐ Miles

Site Alias Name(s):

Congressional District: IA – 2nd

Grant Recipient Name:

Grant Recipient Address:

Grant Recipient Phone: **Grant Recipient Email:**

Current Owner(s): Mark Bertelli

Current Owner Address: 6634 8th St. SW, Cedar Rapids, IA 52404

If different from current owner:

Responsible Party Name(s):

Responsible Party Address:

Site Street Address or Tier, Range, Section & Subsections (if street address is unknown)

800 60th Ave SW, Cedar Rapids, IA 52404

Directions to site: Heading east on US Hwy 30 in Cedar Rapids take exit 252A on to Waconia Ave SW. Turn west and travel 700', then turn south on to Waconia Ln SW until you reach 60th Ave SW. The site is on your left.

Summarize the site history (past usages, past ownerships, wastes, known or suspected contamination pathways such as tanks, septic tank/tile field, lagoon, land applications, SW burial, etc.)

Site History:

The site was developed for agricultural use by at least 1936. By 1952, residences had been developed on the site and remained until around 2008 when buildings were demolished and the site was structurally vacant but utilized as equipment and machine storage. The site remains structurally vacant.

Near surface geology at the site includes primarily engineered fill including sandy lean clay with crushed concrete/limestone to approximately 12' bgs. Native lithology consists of sandy lean clay followed by well sorted sand from approximately 30-40' bgs. Stiff clay was found past 40' bgs to termination depth. Bedrock depth is variable at the site from approximately 25' bgs to over 50' bgs, and is Silurian or Devonian aged limestone.

Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC):

Onsite:

- Historical agricultural use
- Utilized as equipment and machine storage from at least 2008 through the present
- During a 2025 site visit, 13 metal drums were located at the site with one of the 13 drums leaking an unknown material.
- During the same 2025 site visit, distressed vegetation and areas of stained soil were observed at the property. The stained soil discovered to have a petroleum odor. Additionally, fill dirt and other debris were observed at the site with unknown origins.
- A white foam of unknown composition was observed in an onsite retention basin.

Offsite:

- A car-wash is located north of the site since at least 1985. Car wash facilities are often associated with per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) use.
- A trucking company is located to northeast of the site.
- A scrap yard and recycling center located southwest and east of the site, respectively.

Briefly describe the site assessment that was conducted (number of borings, monitoring wells, number of samples, depth of soil samples and monitoring wells, analysis, etc.)

For the Limited Site Investigation (LSI), a total of 15 borings were installed at the site, of which seven were converted into temporary monitoring wells for groundwater sample collection. Eight of the borings were shallow, completed to a depth of approximately 2' bgs. Samples collected from the shallow borings focused on the unknown fill material located throughout the site. The other seven borings were installed deeper utilizing a mounted hollow stem auger drill rig with continuous flight augers for sample collection. The deep borings were typically installed to approximately 50'. The borings were field screened at 1' intervals utilizing a photoionization detector (PID). Samples were collected at the high PID depth, at the assumed soil/groundwater interface, or at the discretion of field personnel.

The deeper soil borings were converted into temporary 1" PVC wells for groundwater sample collection. However, both TMW-1 and TMW-7 were found to be dry after installation and therefore the soil sample from bottom of each boring was submitted for analysis. Groundwater wells were purged and allowed to recharge prior to sampling. Groundwater samples were generally analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and

total extractable hydrocarbons (TEH) while other samples were also analyzed for semi-VOC (SVOC), RCRA metals, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB), and PFAS (EPA method 1633). Soil was similarly sampled for a combination of the same analysis.

Summarize the findings and conclusions regarding the contaminants found and their extent and concentrations. Relate those values to known criteria such as statewide standards, MCLs, water quality standards, background levels or other benchmarks used to determine site priority.

Soil Findings

VOC – Several VOCs were detected in multiple samples; however, all concentrations were below applicable standards.
SVOC – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.
TEH – Concentrations for waste oil exceeded the Iowa Statewide Standard (SWS) of 9,400 mg/kg at three sample locations, SB-1, SB-3, and SB-7.
PCB – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.
RCRA Metals – Multiple metals were detected above reporting limits, but only arsenic exceeded the SWS of 1.9 mg/kg.
PFAS – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels at the one sampling location (B-9).

Groundwater Findings:

VOC – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.
SVOC – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.
TEH – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.

PCB – No concentrations above laboratory detection levels.
RCRA Metals – Arsenic slightly exceeded the US EPA MCL of 0.01 mg/L at TMW-4 (0.0153 mg/L). Barium, cadmium, and lead were also detected but were well below applicable standards.
PFAS – Multiple PFAS compounds were detected in sample TMW-9, with perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) exceeding the US EPA MCL of 4 ng/L with a concentration of 13.5 ng/L.

Identify on-site or off-site potential and actual targets (e.g., municipal wells, private wells, drinking water intakes). What is known of the neighboring area, i.e., are there residences, businesses, public use areas, etc.? Are there utility lines that could be impacted by site contaminants? Identify any other use/location issues that deserve consideration.

The site is currently vacant with no onsite wells. The nearest know wells are production wells belonging to Red Star Yeast approximately 800' northwest of the site. While Linn County has an Iowa DNR approved ordinance that restricts installation of wells in areas with known contamination, the restrictive language is not sufficient to clear associated risk. The site currently has no other actual targets.

Rate the site on a scale of 1 to 4, in decreasing order of severity or priority.

3

Summarize the reasoning, knowledge or any other information used in determining your recommendation regarding the priority assigned to this site.

EPA MCLs and/or Iowa SWS are exceeded for TEH, RCRA Metals, and PFAS at the site. No known actual receptors are present at the site. Proposed redevelopment of the site would be as a wastewater treatment facility. Potential groundwater risk may be mitigated at the site by establishment of an Environmental Covenant (EC) which restricts the installation of drinking and non-drinking water wells at the site.

Furthermore, while arsenic soil concentrations may be within naturally occurring background levels for area, waste oil exceedances will need to be addressed to clear risk at the site. The inclusion of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP) requirement in the EC may be utilized to mitigate risk for future development. No additional sampling will be required at this time and establishment of the EC with the aforementioned restrictions would close out DNR interest for the site.

Site recommended for:

- ☐ No further action under CERCLA Pre-Remedial
- ☐ Additional investigation under state program (activity code 2824)
- ☒ Additional investigation under CERCLA (Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment)
- ☐ Transfer to LUST/UST

Form Reviewed: Digitally signed by Michael Sullivan Date: 2026.02.06 10:00:10 -06'00' **Date Reviewed:** February 6, 2026