



Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

**Proposed Car Wash
10056 SE 240th Street
Kent, Washington 98031**



Prepared for:

Contour
3200 Park Center Drive, Suite 1240
Costa Mesa, California 92626

Prepared by:

Professional Service Industries, Inc.
6032 North Cutter Circle, Suite 480
Portland, Oregon 97217

February 25, 2022

PSI Project Number: 0581524-1

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carl Purdy".

Carl Purdy
Project Manager

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Elizabeth Noakes".

Elizabeth Noakes
Principal Consultant

Phase I ESA Summary Table

Professional Service Industries, Inc. (PSI), an Intertek company, performed a Phase I ESA of the Proposed Car Wash located at 10056 SE 240th Street, in Kent, Washington 98031. PSI performed the assessment to comply with the contract between Contour (the client) and PSI.

Our assessment did not include evaluation of BERs that are beyond the scope of ASTM E1527 (ASTM non-scope services, such as asbestos, mold, lead-based paint, radon, wetlands, etc.).

Report Section		No Issues Identified	REC	CREC	HREC	VEC	De-minimis	BER Issue	Notes
3.0	USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION	✓							
5.2	SUBJECT PROPERTY OBSERVATIONS						✓		Transient concerns, storm drains
5.3	OFF-SITE OBSERVATIONS	✓							
6.0	HISTORICAL USES	✓							
7.0	ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY RECORDS REVIEW	✓							
8.0	VAPOR ENCROACHMENT SCREENING	✓							

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF COMMONLY USED ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	v
CERTIFICATION	viii
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 FINDINGS	1
1.2 CONCLUSIONS	2
1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS	3
2.0 PHASE I ESA SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 PURPOSE OF SERVICES	4
2.2 PHASE I ESA METHODOLOGY	4
2.3 LIMITATIONS, EXCEPTIONS, DEVIATIONS AND DATA GAP	4
2.4 SIGNIFICANT ASSUMPTIONS	5
3.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION	6
3.1 USER QUESTIONNAIRE	6
3.2 TITLE RECORDS	8
3.3 SUGGESTED INFORMATION	8
3.4 HELPFUL DOCUMENTS AND PRIOR INVESTIGATIONS	8
4.0 PHYSICAL SETTING	9
5.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE	11
5.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND CURRENT USES	11
5.2 SUBJECT PROPERTY OBSERVATIONS	12
5.3 OFF-SITE OBSERVATIONS	14
6.0 HISTORICAL USES	17
6.1 CURRENT AND PRIOR USE INTERVIEWS	17
6.2 SUMMARY OF RESOURCES	18
6.3 SUMMARY HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, ADJOINING AND SURROUNDING PROPERTIES ...	19
7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY RECORDS REVIEW	25
7.1 DATABASE FINDINGS	25
7.2 REGULATORY AGENCY INQUIRIES	28
8.0 VAPOR ENCROACHMENT SCREENING	29



8.1 METHODOLOGY 29

8.2 VES RESULTS 29

8.3 VES LIMITATIONS 29

9.0 WARRANTY AND RELIANCE 30

9.1 STANDARD OF CARE AND WARRANTIES 30

9.2 RELIANCE 30

9.3 THIRD PARTY RELIANCE 31



LIST OF APPENDICES

FIGURES

PHOTOGRAPHS

USER QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

LIEN/AUL DOCUMENTATION

INTERVIEW DOCUMENTATION

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION: TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION: CITY DIRECTORIES

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION: FIRE INSURANCE MAPS

ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REPORT

SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATORY DOCUMENTATION

DATA GAP WORKSHEET

VAPOR ENCROACHMENT SCREENING DOCUMENTATION

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

LIST OF COMMONLY USED ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACM	Asbestos-Containing Material
AHERA	Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act
AMSL	Above Mean Sea Level
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number (also referred to as a PIN)
AST	Above-Ground Storage Tank
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
AUL	Activity & Use Limitation
BER	Business Environmental Risk
Bgs	Below the ground surface
BTEX	Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylenes
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation & Liability Act
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation & Liability Information System (now called SEMS)
CESQG	Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator of Hazardous Waste (now called VSQG)
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COC	Chemical(s) of Concern
CREC	Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
EDR	Environmental Data Resources, Inc.
EIM	Environmental Information Management System
EP	Environmental Professional
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERIS	Environmental Risk Information Services, Inc.
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
HREC	Historical Recognized Environmental Condition



HUD	U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation & Air Conditioning System
LAST	Leaking Above-Ground Storage Tank
LBP	Lead-Based Paint
LLP	Landowner Liability Protection
LQG	Large Quantity Generator of Hazardous Waste
LUST/ LST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MCL	Maximum Concentration Level
mg/kg	Milligrams per Kilogram
mg/L	Micrograms per liter
mg/L	Milligrams per Liter
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet (now called Safety Data Sheet (SDS))
MTBE	Methyl Tert-Butyl Ether
ND	Not Detected
NFA	No Further Action (also called No Further Remediation (NFR))
NOV	Notice of Violation
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List (a.k.a. Superfund)
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
OSHA	U.S. Occupational Safety & Health Administration
PAH	Polynuclear (Polycyclic) Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PCE	Perchloroethylene (also called Tetrachloroethylene)
pCi/L	Picocuries per Liter
PFAS	Per & Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
PFOA	Perfluorooctanoic Acid
PFOS	Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid

ppb	Parts per Billion
ppm	Parts per Million
RBCA	Risk-Based Corrective Action
RCRA	Resource Conservation & Recovery Act
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
RFI	Request for Information
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SF	Square Feet
SQG	Small Quantity Generator of Hazardous Waste
SSURGO	Soil Survey Geographic Database
TCE	Trichloroethylene
TPH	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VEC	Vapor Encroachment Condition
VES	Vapor Encroachment Screening
VIC	Vapor Intrusion Condition
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WSDE	Washington State Department of Ecology

CERTIFICATION

PSI, an Intertek company, has completed a Phase I ESA of the Proposed Car Wash located at 10056 SE 240th Street in Kent, Washington ("the subject property"). PSI performed the Phase I ESA in conformance with ASTM E1527-13, *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process* (the Practice). The assessment was completed at the request of Contour ("the client") in accordance with the scope of work outlined in PSI's Proposal Number 0581-363537, which was authorized by the client on January 28, 2022.

The conclusions developed herein represent our professional judgment based on information and data available to us at the time of the assessment, and observations made at the time of our site reconnaissance. In accordance with ASTM E1527-13 § 4.6, the report is valid for a period of 180 days from the time of issuance.

Site Assessor:



Carl Purdy
Project Manager

Reviewed by:



Elizabeth Noakes
Principal Consultant

Environmental Professional Certification

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in 312.10 of this part. I have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. I have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Environmental
Professional:



Elizabeth Noakes
Environmental Professional



1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 FINDINGS

A summary of findings is provided below. The report should be read in its entirety to obtain a more complete understanding of the information provided and to aid in any decisions made or actions taken based on this information.

1.1.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND CURRENT USE

The subject property consists of a 0.82 acre parcel located at 10056 SE 240th Street, in Kent, Washington. The property is developed with a 6,407 square-foot (SF) multi-story medical office building with associated parking area and landscaping. The building is currently unoccupied.

1.1.2 ADJOINING PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND USE

Usage of adjoining properties is discussed in the following table.

Direction	Description of Adjoining Property Use
North	Apartment Buildings
East	102nd Avenue SE, Popeye's Louisiana Kitchen, Starbucks
South	SE 240th Street, Fred Meyer
West	Multitenant Commercial Building

1.1.3 HISTORICAL USE OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND SURROUNDING AREA

Historical information sources researched in this assessment allowed the uses of the subject property to be traced from the present back to 1937 when the subject property was undeveloped. The current medical building was developed in 1961 with a separate structure existing on the subject property as well. The building was expanded in 1977 with associated parking area and landscaping. The separate structure was removed prior to 1990. This is the current configuration of the subject property.

Historically the surrounding area was residential structures and agricultural land. SE 240th Street historically existed to the south. The agricultural land to the south was removed prior to 1961 and single-family residences existed until 1990 when the land was developed for a Fred Meyer retail center. The north property was undeveloped until two apartment buildings with associated parking area and landscaping were developed in 1990. The east property was historically agricultural land. 102nd Avenue SE was developed circa 1968. A building with associated parking lot existed from 1990 until 2014 when the property was developed into two retail restaurants. The west property was undeveloped until 1990 when a multitenant retail building with associated parking area and landscaping was developed.



1.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL RECORDS REVIEW

PSI subcontracted with ERIS to provide a review of governmental database records for spill sites, tanks, hazardous waste handlers, and other facilities of potential concern within proximity to the subject property.

The subject property was not identified as a spill site or regulated facility on the regulatory databases that were searched.

One or more off-site facility listings were identified in the database search within the appropriate AMSD and were evaluated by PSI during this assessment. These listings are discussed in Section 7.1 of this report and the regulatory radius map report is appended.

1.1.5 SIGNIFICANT DATA GAPS

The ASTM E1527 Standard Practice defines a significant data gap as a lack of or inability to obtain information required by the practice that would limit our ability to draw conclusions with regard to RECs in connection with the subject property.

- Based on our experience, the information that we gathered and evaluated did not present significant data gaps that affected our ability to identify RECs in connection with the subject property.

1.2 CONCLUSIONS

PSI performed a Phase I ESA of the subject property in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-13. Any exceptions to or deletions from this practice are described in Section 2.3 of this report. The following conclusions have been made with regard to evidence of RECs, HRECs, CRECs, VECs, and de minimis conditions in connection with the subject property, as defined in ASTM E1527-13.

1.2.1 RECOGNIZED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the subject property.

1.2.2 CONTROLLED RECOGNIZED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

This assessment has revealed no evidence of CRECs in connection with the subject property.

1.2.3 HISTORICAL RECOGNIZED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

This assessment has revealed no evidence of HRECs in connection with the subject property.

1.2.4 VAPOR ENCROACHMENT CONDITIONS

This assessment has revealed no VECs in connection with the subject property.



1.2.5 DE MINIMIS CONDITIONS

A de minimis condition is a condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. PSI identified the following issues in connection with the subject property, which were considered to be de minimis in nature, but not considered to be a REC in connection with the subject property:

- Upon access to the interior of the structure evidence of use of the property from transients was evident. Further hazardous materials such as paint products, human excrement, hypodermic needles, unidentifiable trash, batteries, etc were observed. Based on the use of property and observed materials, PSI considers the condition of the use of transients to represent a de minimis condition and by definition not a REC in connection with the subject property.
- PSI observed four storm drains in the paved parking area of the subject property. PSI did not observe any improper disposal in connection with the observed storm drains. The storm drain appeared to be in good condition with minor corrosion of the metal grates. Standing water in the drains appeared to have a slight sheen, possibly indicating the storm drains require cleaning. The storm drains appear to flow into the City of Kent's stormwater system. Based on the observed condition of the storm drains, PSI considers the storm drain a de minimis condition and by definition not a REC in connection with the subject property.

1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

PSI recommends no further assessment for RECs in connection with the subject property at this time.



2.0 PHASE I ESA SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 PURPOSE OF SERVICES

PSI performed the Phase I ESA in conformance with ASTM E1527-13, *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process* (the Practice). The purpose of the Practice was to define good commercial practice for conducting a Phase I ESA and as such, the Practice is intended to permit the user to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the LLPs. The goal of the processes established by the Practice is to identify RECs in connection with the subject property.

Based on the information provided, PSI understands that your purpose for having the Phase I ESA performed is to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for one of the LLPs.

2.2 PHASE I ESA METHODOLOGY

PSI performed a Phase I ESA of the subject property. The scope of our services and general methodology is presented below.

The information sources that PSI used, including published material, material obtained from commercial and other sources, is listed below and cited as it is presented in the report. The information or excerpts thereof is appended.

This assessment included the following components:

- Records review;
- Reconnaissance;
- Interviews;
- VES in accordance with ASTM E2600-15, *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions* [VES Standard Guide]; and
- Preparation of this report, including our evaluation.

2.3 LIMITATIONS, EXCEPTIONS, DEVIATIONS AND DATA GAP

PSI considers that limitations, exceptions, and deviations from the Practice manifest as a lack of or inability to obtain information required by the Practice. This represents the definition of the 'data gap' contained in the Practice. PSI listed the component objectives of the Practice on the appended Data Gap Worksheet and tracked the information obtained against the objectives. Therefore, the limitations, exceptions and deviations are identified in the Worksheet.



In general, when required information was incomplete, not provided, otherwise not obtained, or indicated a need for additional information, PSI attempted to use information from other sources to meet the Practices' performance objectives. When the data gaps affected the Environmental Professional's ability to identify RECs, PSI considered the data gap(s) to be significant. PSI identified significant data gaps (if any) on the Data Gap Worksheet and reported them in Section 1.1.5.

2.4 SIGNIFICANT ASSUMPTIONS

PSI made the following significant assumptions in developing our Phase I ESA findings and conclusions:

- Regulatory Agency Information - PSI considers all information provided by our environmental database subcontractor regarding the regulatory status of facilities to be complete, accurate and current.
- Other Regulatory Information - PSI considers all information obtained from regulatory or other governmental agencies to be complete, accurate and current.
- Title, Lien and AUL Information - PSI considers all information provided by real estate title record review firms regarding property use or ownership, encumbrances or other limitations, if provided, to be complete, accurate and current.
- Interviews - PSI considers all information provided through interviews to be accurate, complete, unbiased, current, and provided in good faith.
- Groundwater - PSI interpreted and inferred the direction of the shallow groundwater movement based on the information we obtained during this assessment and our experience. Actual groundwater flow may be locally influenced by many factors beyond the scope of this assessment. Subsurface investigation is typically necessary to determine site-specific groundwater flow direction.



3.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION

PSI considers the client to be the 'User' of our assessment, defined in ASTM Practice E1527 as "the party seeking to use ASTM E1527 to complete a Phase I ESA of the property. A User may include, without limitation, a potential purchaser of property, a potential tenant of property, an owner of property, a lender, or a property manager. The User has specific obligations for completing a successful application of this practice...."

3.1 USER QUESTIONNAIRE

The EPA All Appropriate Inquiry Rule (40 CFR Part 312) and ASTM E1527 § 6 require the User to answer certain questions related to the subject property, in order to obtain certain LLPs from CERCLA liability. To facilitate this process, PSI provided the client with a User Questionnaire, which is appended if it has been returned. A summary of the required questions and client responses is provided below.

Question	Yes	No	Unknown	N/A	Client did not respond
Did a review of recorded land title records or other sources identify any environmental liens filed or recorded against the subject property under federal, tribal, state or local law?			✓		
Did a review of land title records or other sources identify any activity use limitations (AULs), such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls that are in place on the subject property?			✓		
Do you have specialized knowledge or experience related to the subject property or nearby properties?		✓			
Does the purchase price being paid reasonably reflect the fair market value of the subject property?				✓	
If you conclude that there is a difference, have you considered whether the lower purchase price is because contamination is known or believed to be present at the property?					✓



Question	Yes	No	Unknown	N/A	Client did not respond
Are you aware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property that would help the environmental professional to identify conditions indicative of a releases or threatened releases? For example:					
Do you know of the past uses of the property?		✓			
Do you know of specific chemicals that are present or were once present at the property?		✓			
Do you know of spills or other chemical releases that have taken place at the property?		✓			
Do you know of any environmental cleanups that have taken place at the property?		✓			
Based on your knowledge and experience related to the subject property are there any obvious indicators that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the subject property?		✓			
Do you know of any pending, threatened, or past litigation or administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or from the property?		✓			
Do you know of any notices from any governmental entity regarding any possible violation of environmental laws or possible liability relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products?		✓			

NOTES

The client returned PSI’s questionnaire indicating ‘UNKNOWN’ to the questions: “Did a review of land title records (or judicial records where appropriate) identify any environmental cleanup liens filed or recorded against the subject property under federal, tribal, state or local law?” or “Did a review of land title records (or judicial records where appropriate) identify any activity and land use limitations (AULs), such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls that are in place at the subject property and/or have been filed or recorded in a registry under federal, tribal, state, or local law?” This is a limitation that is evaluated on the appended Data Gap Worksheet. The completed questionnaire is appended.



3.2 TITLE RECORDS

Based on a review of the local tax assessor's records, the subject property is currently owned by Kent Valley Place, LLC.

3.3 SUGGESTED INFORMATION

The client provided PSI with the following suggested information described by the Practice.

- The reason for performing the Phase I ESA.
- The type of property and type of property transaction.
- The complete and correct address of the subject property or other documentation identifying the location and extents of the subject property.
- The scope of services desired for the Phase I ESA, including any evaluation for BERs or other items that are beyond the scope of ASTM E1527.
- Identification of the parties who will rely upon the report.
- Identification of the key site contact and contact information.

3.4 HELPFUL DOCUMENTS AND PRIOR INVESTIGATIONS

The Practice requires that the environmental professional ask the subject property owner, the key site manager (if any is identified), and the User for certain helpful documents about the property and certain legal proceedings involving hazardous substances and the subject property. PSI mailed or e-mailed questions or performed interviews requesting this information.

The client did not provide prior environmental reports or other similar documents within the performance period of this assessment.



4.0 PHYSICAL SETTING

PSI reviewed USGS topographic (topo) maps, information from the USDA and/or NRCS and/or other information regarding the physical setting of the subject property to assist with the interpretation of subsurface water movement near the subject property. Physical setting information is summarized in the table below.

Summary of Physical Setting Information

Physical Setting Attributes	Description	Source
Subject property elevation:	Approximately 407 feet AMSL	Topo Map "Auburn, Washington; Renton, Washington" 7.5 minute Quadrangle, 2017
Topographic gradient:	The subject property and surrounding area slopes downward gently to the north-northeast	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Closest surface water:	An unnamed creek lies approximately 1,000 feet to the north	ERIS Physical Setting Report, Google Earth
Other resource or physical characteristics mapped on the subject property?	No	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Is a flood hazard zone mapped on the subject property?	No	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Predominant soil type(s) mapped on the subject property:	Alderwood gravelly sandy loam, a Class B soil, is moderately well drained with water transmission through the soil unimpeded. Arents, Alderwood material, a Class B/D soil, is moderately well drained with low runoff potential when undrained.	ERIS Physical Setting Report



Physical Setting Attributes	Description	Source
Geology/Hydrogeology:	Younger glacial drift is a hard, blue-gray mixture of clay, silt, sand and gravel.	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Estimated depth to first groundwater:	Groundwater is estimated to be greater than 50 feet bgs	Washington State Well Logs, ERIS Physical Setting Report
Anticipated regional groundwater flow direction:	Groundwater is anticipated to flow to the north-northeast	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Oil and Gas Resources:	None mapped on or adjacent to the subject property	ERIS Physical Setting Report
Mining Resources:	None mapped on or adjacent to the subject property	ERIS Physical Setting Report



5.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

The location and approximate boundaries of the subject property are illustrated on the appended figures. The legal description of the subject property, if provided to PSI, is appended.

Lauren Martin, Real Estate Broker, granted PSI access to the subject property. Our assessor was unescorted during the site reconnaissance.

The ground reconnaissance consisted of observing the periphery of the subject property and viewing the subject property from accessible adjoining public access areas. Visual reconnaissance of adjoining properties was limited to areas and facilities that were readily observable from the subject property or from public access areas. PSI also systematically toured the interior portions of the subject property to provide an overlapping field of view.

The peripheries of surface features and/or structures, where present on the subject property, were observed along with accessible interior common areas.

PSI photographed selected features. The captioned photographs collected during the site reconnaissance are appended.

5.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND CURRENT USES

General Subject Property Information	
Subject Property Address	10056 SE 240th Street, Kent, Washington 98031
Parcel Identification Number(s)	172205-9130
Parcel Size (acres)	0.82±
Subject Property Contact/Escort	Lauren Martin / No escort
Date of Reconnaissance	February 7, 2022
Utilities	
Water	City of Kent
Wastewater/Sewer	City of Kent
Electricity	Puget Sound Energy
Natural Gas	Puget Sound Energy
Building Information	
Building Description	Medical Office, wood framed
Size (square feet)	6,407



Number of Stories	Two
Approx. Construction Date	1960, remodeled 1988
Heating Source	Forced air unit

5.2 SUBJECT PROPERTY OBSERVATIONS

A summary of the subject property uses and conditions is tabulated below. Detailed information is discussed following the summary for any "yes" answers, along with an opinion about the significance of the observation.

Identified? (check if Yes)	Item Description
Equipment/Activities/Uses	
	Medical/Dental Offices - Biomedical Wastes
	Dry Cleaners/Laundromats
	Automotive/Equipment Repair
	Emergency Generators
	Elevators
	Hydraulic Lifts
	Photo Processing
	Grease Traps and Oil/Water Separators
	Wastewater Treatment Systems
	Septic or Sewage Tanks
	Air Compressors
	Transformers or Other Mechanical/Electrical Equipment That Could Contain PCBs
✓	Pipeline Markers
	Oil and Gas Wells
	Stormwater Retention/Detention Systems
	Quarries, Pits, Lakes, Ponds, or Lagoons
✓	Use, Storage, or Disposal of Hazardous Substances
	Use, Storage, or Disposal of Petroleum Products
	ASTs/USTs



Identified? (check if Yes)	Item Description
	Drums or Other Bulk Chemical Containers
	Suspect Containers/Unidentified Contents
✓	Drains or Sumps
	Drinking Water, Irrigation, or Monitoring Wells
	Agrochemical Use/Application
	Railroad Spur, Siding, or Right-of-Way
	Interior/Pavement Stains or Corrosion
	Stained Soil/Stressed Vegetation
	Chemical Odors
	Surface Water Sheen or Discoloration
	Exterior Pipe Discharges/Unknown Pipes/Effluent Discharges
	Pools of Liquid or Standing Water
	Solid Waste Dumping/Landfilling/Suspect Fill Material
	Construction Debris/Material Stockpiles
	Other Uses or Conditions of Concern

5.2.1 PIPELINE MARKERS

PSI observed access points of a fiberoptic underground cable along the east portion of the subject property. The fiberoptic underground cable was operated by CenturyLink, a local provider of residential internet, TV and phone services. The underground cable access points appeared to be in good working condition at the time of reconnaissance. Fiber optic cables do not represent a potential harm to environmental factors, as such PSI does not consider the presences of the fiberoptic cables to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

5.2.2 USE, STORAGE, OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

Upon arrival to the site the site was locked with an exterior fence around the property and the exterior doors were secured. During the initial exterior site walk, PSI observed evidence of transients use of the property including various trash including hypodermic needles. PSI noted locations that exterior windows and doors had been opened. Upon access to the interior of the structure further evidence of use of the property from transients was evident. Further hazardous materials such as paint products, human



excrement, hypodermic needles, unidentifiable trash, batteries, etc where observed. Access to a majority of the interior was restricted. Based on the use of property and observed materials, PSI considers the condition of the use of transients to represent a de minimis condition and by definition not a REC in connection with the subject property.

5.2.3 DRAINS OR SUMPS

PSI observed four storm drains in the paved parking area of the subject property. PSI did not observe any improper disposal in connection with the observed storm drains. The storm drain appeared to be in good condition with minor corrosion of the metal grates. Standing water in the drains appeared to have a slight sheen, possibly indicating the storm drains require cleaning. The storm drains appear to flow into the City of Kent's stormwater system. Based on the observed condition of the storm drains, PSI considers the storm drain a de minimis condition and by definition not a REC in connection with the subject property.

5.3 OFF-SITE OBSERVATIONS

A summary of the adjoining property uses and conditions is tabulated below. Detailed information is discussed following the summary for any "yes" answers, along with an opinion about the significance of the observation.

Direction	Description of Adjoining Property Use
North	Apartment Buildings
East	102nd Avenue SE, Popeye's Louisiana Kitchen, Starbucks
South	SE 240th Street, Fred Meyer
West	Multitenant Commercial Building

Identified? (check if Yes)	Item Description
Equipment/Activities/Uses	
✓	Medical/Dental Offices - Biomedical Wastes
	Dry Cleaners/Laundromats
	Automotive/Equipment Repair
	Emergency Generators
	Elevators
	Hydraulic Lifts



Identified? (check if Yes)	Item Description
	Photo Processing
	Grease Traps and Oil/Water Separators
	Wastewater Treatment Systems
	Septic or Sewage Tanks
	Air Compressors
✓	Transformers or Other Mechanical/Electrical Equipment That Could Contain PCBs
	Pipeline Markers
	Oil and Gas Wells
	Stormwater Retention/Detention Systems
	Quarries, Pits, Lakes, Ponds, or Lagoons
	Use, Storage, or Disposal of Hazardous Substances
	Use, Storage, or Disposal of Petroleum Products
✓	ASTs/USTs
	Drums or Other Bulk Chemical Containers
	Suspect Containers/Unidentified Contents
✓	Drains or Sumps
	Drinking Water, Irrigation, or Monitoring Wells
	Agrochemical Use/Application
	Railroad Spur, Siding, or Right-of-Way
	Interior/Pavement Stains or Corrosion
	Stained Soil/Stressed Vegetation
	Chemical Odors
	Surface Water Sheen or Discoloration
	Exterior Pipe Discharges/Unknown Pipes/Effluent Discharges
	Pools of Liquid or Standing Water
	Solid Waste Dumping/Landfilling/Suspect Fill Material
	Construction Debris/Material Stockpiles



Identified? (check if Yes)	Item Description
	Other Uses or Conditions of Concern

5.3.1 MEDICAL/DENTAL OFFICES - BIOMEDICAL WASTES

The west adjoining property is developed with a multitenant building with numerous medical offices ranging from dental work to spinal rehabilitation. These businesses likely generate small amounts of biomedical waste as part of their daily operations. As part of the waste proper precaution for storage and disposal is required. These operations typically use off site recyclers and are inspected for compliance. PSI did not observe apparent improper storage or disposal practices in connection with the observed medical and dental offices. Based on this, PSI does not consider the presence of the medical and dental offices to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

5.3.2 TRANSFORMERS OR OTHER MECH./ELEC. EQUIPMENT THAT COULD CONTAIN PCBs

PSI observed two pole-mounted electrical transformers on the north adjoining property and one pad-mounted electrical transformer on the east adjacent property. PSI did not observe non-PCB labeling on the transformers at the time of the site reconnaissance. The identified electrical equipment appeared to be in good condition, with no apparent evidence of staining, leakage, or corrosion noted. Based on their observed condition and the local utility ownership, the observed transformers are not considered to be evidence of a REC in connection with the subject property.

5.3.3 ASTS/USTS

PSI a Fred Meyer fuel station to the southeast of the subject property. These USTs are discussed in detail in Section 7.1 of this report. Please refer to that section for those additional details and conclusions regarding the observed USTs. Please note, however, given the nature of USTs, the potential of an undetected release associated with the USTs cannot be completely eliminated.

5.3.4 DRAINS OR SUMPS

PSI observed storm drains along SE 240th Street to the south of the subject property. PSI did not observe evidence of unusual staining or improper disposal in connection with the observed storm drains, and the storm drains appeared to be in a generally good condition. The drains appear to flow into the City of Kent stormwater system. Based on this information, the observed storm drains are not considered to be evidence of a REC in connection with the subject property.



6.0 HISTORICAL USES

PSI utilized readily ascertainable historical data resources in order to research the history of the subject property and surrounding area. The intent of this review was to identify historical tenancies or uses of the subject property and surrounding area, which might be considered evidence of a REC. Generally, PSI reviewed the following readily ascertainable historical data resources, where they were available:

- Readily available historical topographic maps were reviewed to evaluate land development in the area over time. It should be noted that the scale of topographic maps in some cases does not allow for mapping of individual structures and developed areas may be shown by shading only.
- Selected historical aerial photographs were reviewed at 5-10 year intervals to obtain information concerning the development and history of the subject property and surroundings.
- PSI reviewed readily ascertainable historical city directories at 5-10 year intervals in order to obtain information on tenancies on the subject property and adjoining properties.
- PSI requested available historical fire insurance maps from ERIS. The Sanborn® Map Company and other regional providers historically mapped urban areas for use by insurance underwriters. In some cases, these maps provide useful information in evaluating previous tenancies and uses of the subject property and surrounding area. "Sanborn", "Sanborn Map", "Sanborn Map Company", and "Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps" are recognized trademarks of the Sanborn Map Company, a subsidiary of Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

Copies of select historical documents are provided in the report appendix; however, it should be noted that some of the resources used by PSI may be copyrighted and PSI has summarized these resources herein, but we have not included copies of these resources in the appendix.

6.1 CURRENT AND PRIOR USE INTERVIEWS

PSI conducted or attempted to conduct interviews with persons who are knowledgeable of the current use and history of the subject property. The following individuals were interviewed.

Name	Title/Role	Date Interviewed	Summary
David Bonanni	Client	January 28, 2022	Mr. Bonanni completed the User Questionnaire.



Name	Title/Role	Date Interviewed	Summary
Michael K Austin	Public Records Department, Washington State Department of Health	February 4, 2022	Mr. Austin located historic records for the subject property previously containing X-ray machines. No violations are associated with the historic X-ray machines.
Kristen Rodal	Fire Admin I, Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority	February 3, 2022	Ms. Rodal supplied PSI with documentation concerning an electrical fire and a natural gas leak associated with the subject property. Both incidences were resolved. Ms. Rodal did not locate any responsive records concerning code violations or AST/USTs in connection with the subject property.
Michael Hart	Central Records, Washington Department of Ecology	February 2, 2022	Mr. Hart did not locate any responsive records in regards to the subject property.
Chris Zanassi	Administrator II, King County	February 1, 2022	PSI contacted King County for any records concerning the subject property. See section 7.2.5 for further discussion.

No evidence of RECs was identified as a result of the interviews conducted during this assessment. Complete records of communication detailing information obtained and reviewed, have been appended to this report.

6.2 SUMMARY OF RESOURCES

PSI reviewed the following resources in order to evaluate the historic uses of the subject property, adjoining and/or surrounding area.

Source Type	Years Reviewed	Source
Topo Maps	1949, 1968, 1973, 1994, 2017	ERIS
Aerial Photographs	1937, 1944, 1961, 1965, 1968, 1972, 1977, 1981, 1990, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021	ERIS
Aerial Photographs	2021, 2022	The Google Earth Application



Source Type	Years Reviewed	Source
City Directories	1958, 1961, 1970/71, 1975, 1980/81, 1984/85, 1990, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2008, 2012, 2016, 2020	ERIS
Fire Insurance Maps	Unmapped Property	ERIS
Property Cards	Current Cards	The King County Assessor's Office website

6.3 SUMMARY HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, ADJOINING AND SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

A chronological summary of the history and use of the subject property, adjoining and surrounding properties is provided in the following tables.

6.3.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY

Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1937-1949	The subject property appears to be undeveloped.
1961-1975	A building now exists on the central portion of the subject property with an associated out building on the southwest portion of the subject property. City Directories indicate the following: <u>10056 SE 240th Street:</u> 1970/71: There is a listing for a doctor 1975: Multi Tenant Professional
1977-1985	The previous central building has been expanded and associated parking area and landscaping now exist on the subject property. City Directories indicate the following: <u>10056 SE 240th Street:</u> 1980: Multi Tenant Professional 1984/85: There are multiple listings for doctors, Kent Accounting Sv, Kent Cnslting Ctr



Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1990-2022	<p>The previous southwestern out building has been removed. This is the current configuration of the subject property.</p> <p>City Directories indicate the following:</p> <p><u>10056 SE 240th Street:</u></p> <p>1990, 1994: There are multiple listings for doctors, Planned Parenthood</p> <p>1998: Kent Footcare Center, Planned Parenthood Clinics Kent</p> <p>2002: There are multiple listings for doctors, Planned Parenthood</p> <p>2008, 2012: Kent Footcare Center, Planned Parenthood</p> <p>2016: Planned Parenthood</p> <p>2020: There is a listing for a doctor, Planned Parenthood</p>

PSI did not identify any evidence of heating oil USTs on the property. Heating oil tanks are exempt from registration requirements, so no permit records of heating oil USTs are available. However, it should be noted that heating oil has been commonly used as a heat source in this area. Based on the historical presence of former and present buildings on the property, PSI cannot rule out the possibility that latent heating oil USTs may be present which were not removed when the building(s) were demolished. Based on the lack of any direct evidence of the presence of latent heating oil tanks or any associated releases, we do not consider the possible presence of heating oil tanks to be evidence of a REC. However, the possible presence of heating oil USTs cannot be entirely ruled out. If USTs are encountered during construction, we recommend that you contact an environmental professional to assist with the proper closure of the tank(s).

No evidence of RECs was identified as a result of the historical review of the subject property that was conducted during this assessment.

6.3.2 IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING AND/OR SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

NORTH	
Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1937-1949	A structure exists on the north adjoining property.
1961-1981	The previous structure has been removed.



NORTH	
Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1990-2022	Two structures with associated parking area and landscaping now exist on the north adjoining property. This is the current configuration of the north adjoining property. City Directories indicate the following: <u>23929 102nd Avenue SE:</u> 2008: James Court Townhomes

EAST	
Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1937-1949	The east adjoining property appears to be used as agricultural land.
1961-1965	The previous agricultural land has been removed.
1968-1981	Present day 102nd Avenue SE now exists.
1990-2013	To the east lies 102nd Avenue SE, beyond which a building now exists on the north portion with associated parking area and landscaping on the east adjacent property.
2015-2022	To the east lies 102nd Avenue SE, beyond which the previous building has been replaced with a building in the northwest and southeast portion with associated parking area and landscaping. This is the current configuration of the east adjacent property. City Directories indicate the following: <u>23920 102nd Avenue SE:</u> 2016: Popeye's Chicken Biscuits 2020: Popeye's Chicken Biscuits <u>23930 102nd Avenue SE:</u> 2020: Starbucks

SOUTH	
Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1937-1949	To the south lies present day SE 240th Street, beyond which the south adjacent property appears to be used as agricultural land.



WEST	
Year(s)	Interpreted Use/Observations
1990-2022	<p>A building now exists on the northeast portion with associated parking area and landscaping. This is the current configuration of the west adjoining property.</p> <p>City Directories indicate the following:</p> <p><u>10024 SE 240th Street:</u></p> <p>1990: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Windmere RI Est</p> <p>1994: There are listings for multiple Doctors, relators and construction companies</p> <p>1998: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Automated Accounting System, Bains Raj Law Offices, Coastal Building Corp, Time Data Services Bureau, Unishippers Associations, Vetrotex Certain Ted Corp,</p> <p>2002: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Kronos Inc, Staaleson Engrg,</p> <p>2006: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Automated Time Accounting, Coastal Building Corp, Internet Wizards</p> <p>2008: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Coastal Building Corp, Staaleson Engineering</p> <p>2012: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Krono's Inc</p> <p>2020: There are listings for multiple Doctors, Staaleson Engineering</p>

The east and south properties appear to have been previously used for agricultural purposes. Although no information or observations indicating the misuse or misapplication of pesticides, herbicides, or fertilizers was obtained during the historical resources review, in certain instances, the chemicals historically applied to the property, or their breakdown products, could be persistent and not biodegrade. As with any agriculturally developed land, there exists the possibility that pesticides, herbicides, or fertilizers have been applied that may still be present at residual concentrations. Therefore, although some potential exists that you should be aware of, PSI does not consider this occurrence to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

PSI did not identify any evidence of heating oil USTs on the property. Heating oil tanks are exempt from registration requirements, so no permit records of heating oil USTs are available. However, it should be noted that heating oil has been commonly used as a heat source in commercial buildings in this area. Based on the historical presence of former buildings on surrounding properties, PSI cannot rule out the possibility that latent heating oil USTs may be present which were not removed when the building(s) were demolished. Based on the lack of any direct evidence of the presence of latent heating oil tanks or any associated releases, we do not consider the possible presence of heating oil tanks to be evidence of a



REC. However, the possible presence of heating oil USTs cannot be entirely ruled out. If USTs are encountered during construction, we recommend that you contact an environmental professional to assist with the proper closure of the tank(s).

The south adjoining property was developed into a commercial retail center in 1988. As part of this retail center a fuel center was developed circa 2009. Please see section 7.1.2 below for further discussion.

No evidence of RECs was identified as a result of the historical review of adjoining and surrounding properties that was conducted during this assessment.



7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY RECORDS REVIEW

7.1 DATABASE FINDINGS

PSI retained ERIS to provide environmental database information attributed to the subject property and its surroundings. ERIS obtains environmental databases published by local, state, tribal, and federal agencies and maps the information for electronic searches. ERIS's service includes reporting Standard Environmental Records Sources as listed in the Practice.

The search, where applicable, was performed to AMSDs listed in ASTM E1527-13. The search radius required by ASTM varies by database.

ERIS also provides data for searches of other regulatory databases they believe may have useful information. The AMSDs for those databases are determined by ERIS.

Unplottable (orphan) sites (if any were listed) having insufficient address information to be mapped were evaluated for potential location within the applicable AMSD. Those that could be determined to be within the AMSD are discussed, as appropriate.

The distribution of listed sites with respect to the subject property is tabulated and mapped in ERIS's Database Report, which is appended. The reader is referred to the table, which can be found near the front of ERIS's report. The full names of the database abbreviations and acronyms used below and in ERIS's report can be found in the Database Descriptions appendix of that report.

7.1.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY

The subject property was not listed on the searched governmental databases as a spill site or regulated facility.

7.1.2 ADJOINING PROPERTIES

ERIS identified an adjoining regulated spill sites within the search radius. This sites is are summarized and discussed in the table(s) below.

Facility Name(s):	N/A
Address(es):	10024 SE 240th Street Kent, WA
Distance/Direction:	71 feet to the southwest
Elevation:	7 feet above the subject property



Database(s):	ERTS, SPILLS
---------------------	--------------

Comments: This site is listed on the ERTS and SPILLS database as the location of an anonymous caller requesting the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) to inspect a storm drain at the location on 12/10/96. The WDOE referred the report to the City of Kent. The City attempted to contact the caller to pursue further investigation. No response was received and the site was listed as NFA. Based on the duration of time elapsed and the NFA status of the site, PSI does not consider this site to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

7.1.3 SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

ERIS identified a number of regulated facilities and/or spill sites within the search radius. Those non-adjoining sites that warranted further discussion are summarized and discussed in the table(s) below. PSI considered the remaining database listings unlikely to impact the subject property based upon factors including (but not limited to):

- The nature of the listing;
- The use of the facility;
- When the facility was listed and its current listed status;
- The developmental density of the setting;
- The potential for vapors to encroach from the property to the subject property;
- The distance between the listing and subject sites related to whether releases are likely to migrate based on local surface and subsurface drainage conditions; and/or
- The presence of intervening drainage divides; and/or inferred groundwater movement.

Facility Name(s):	El Charro
Address(es):	10218 SE 240th Street Kent, WA
Distance/Direction:	281 feet to the east-southeast
Elevation:	7 feet above the subject property
Database(s):	ERTS, SPILLS

Comments: This site is listed on the ERTS and SPILLS databases as the location of a 5-gallon spill of fats, oil, grease and cleaner on 2/27/13. The restaurant's drains clogged causing a backup and the wash water was pumped into the alley affecting two nearby catch basins. The catch basins were cleaned by local spill response team. A NFA determination was issued for this site. Based on the current regulatory status, PSI does not consider this site to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.



Facility Name(s):	Fred Meyer, Fred Meyer #172, Fred Meyer Shopping Center, Fred Meyer Store, Fred Meyer - 240th, Fred Meyer 172 FM Fuel, Storm Drain
Address(es):	10201 SE 240th Kent, WA
Distance/Direction:	414 feet to the south-southwest
Elevation:	13 feet above subject property
Database(s):	ALL SITES, ALT FUELS, ERTS, RECYCLERS, SPILLS, UST

Comments: This site is listed under the ALT FUELS under Fred Meyer as the location of an electric vehicle charging station beginning on 7/16/21. It is also listed under the RECYCLERS database as the location for drop off residential recycling of plastic wrap and film. No reports of violations, enforcement or compliance issues are associated with these listings. Based on the current regulatory status, PSI does not consider these listings to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

This site is listed under the ERTS and SPILLS databases as the location of a reported release of sewage and sludge. On 9/13/02 a blockage was reported to have created a manhole to release sludge into the City's stormwater system. A follow up by the WDOE reported that the activities were part of routine, normal operations associated with Fred Meyer. No reports of violations, enforcement or compliance issues are associated with this incident. Based on the current regulatory status, PSI does not consider these listings to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

This site is listed under the ALL SITES and UST databases as the location of a Fred Meyer fueling station. Three USTs are currently onsite. One two compartment UST with 9,000-gallon capacity of unleaded gasoline and 9,000-gallon capacity of diesel. One 20,000-gallon UST containing unleaded gasoline. One 1,000-gallon UST containing diesel for power generation. The most recent inspection of the USTs was completed on 1/12/21 and found that all USTs are compliant with WDOE standards. No reports of violations, enforcements or compliance issues are associated with the USTs. Based on the current regulatory status, PSI does not consider the presence of the USTs to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

Facility Name(s):	East Hill Elementary
Address(es):	9825 S 240th St Kent, WA 98042
Distance/Direction:	811 west-southwest
Elevation:	19 feet below the subject property
Database(s):	ALL SITES, PCB



Comments: This site is listed under the ALL SITES and PCB databases as the current location of East Hill Elementary School. The ALL SITES database lists this site as the location of a Underground Injection Control Program under the WDOE. The PCB database lists this site as the location of reported PCB storage, transporting or disposal activities as a generator. No reports of violations, enforcement or compliance issues are associated with this site. Based on the lack of regulatory action, PSI does not consider this site to represent a REC in connection with the subject property.

7.2 REGULATORY AGENCY INQUIRIES

PSI sought information about the subject property and/or surrounding area from the governmental agencies listed in the following sections. Information was requested by telephone, in person, via e-mail, through an RFI, or through a written FOIA or equivalent request, as appropriate.

7.2.1 WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

In response to a FOIA request by PSI, the Washington Department of Ecology did not locate any responsive records concerning the subject property.

7.2.2 WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

PSI submitted a Public Records Request (PRR) to the Washington State Department of Health (WDOH). The WDOH located historic records of multiple X-ray machines in use on the subject property. No violations of use of the historic X-ray machines are associated with the subject property.

7.2.3 PUGET SOUND REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY

The Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority provided PSI with records concerning the subject property for a historic natural gas leak and a historic electrical fire. Both incidences were resolved to regulatory standards. The Fire Authority did not locate any records concerning code violations or ASTs/USTs in relation to the subject property.

7.2.4 REGULATORY AGENCY MAINTAINED WEBSITES

PSI reviewed the following information obtained from a website maintained by the WDOE regarding surrounding properties. The information reviewed is appended.

7.2.5 KING COUNTY

PSI submitted a FOIA request to King County. However, a response has not been received from the County as of the date of this report. This is a limitation and evaluated on the appended Data Gap Worksheet. When a response is received, it will be reviewed and if changes to the findings or conclusions of this report are warranted, an addendum will be issued.



8.0 VAPOR ENCROACHMENT SCREENING

8.1 METHODOLOGY

The ASTM E1527-13 process requires the Environmental Professional to evaluate the potential for vapor encroachment onto the subject property, and to determine if such vapor encroachment constitutes evidence of a REC in connection with the subject property. The Practice does not specifically state the methods that must be used to screen for potential vapor encroachment issues. PSI utilized the VES Standard Guide as a basis to conduct a VES for the subject property. PSI used the Tier I procedure from the VES Standard Guide during this assessment. Where Tier II information is readily available during the normal course of conducting the Phase I ESA, PSI has combined the Tier I and Tier II steps.

The VES process utilizes information regarding the potential presence of releases on or near the subject property that were collected as a normal part of the Phase I ESA process. If the User Questionnaire was returned, PSI also reviewed the answers to the vapor encroachment screening questions. No additional data was collected specifically for the purpose of the VES. In order to identify potential sites of concern within the VES AMSDs, PSI reviewed, as available and appropriate, governmental database records, regulatory agency files, topo maps, aerial photography, fire insurance maps, and other information.

The AMSDs were expanded or reduced in the up-gradient, down-gradient, or cross-gradient directions by the environmental professional based on experience in the local area and applying professional judgment to factors such as: where a well-defined regional groundwater flow direction is identified; or whether other geologic features such as low permeability soils or hydrogeologic boundaries (such as rivers or streams) exist which would tend to limit the potential for migration of groundwater or vapors in a particular direction.

If a VEC was identified, the environmental professional determined whether the VEC represented evidence of a REC in connection with the subject property within the context of the Phase I ESA Standard Practice. It should be noted that the identification of a VEC in connection with the subject property does not necessarily indicate that a potential for migration of vapors into existing or proposed structures on the subject property is likely.

8.2 VES RESULTS

PSI identified four (4) sites of potential concern within the VES search radii. These sites were evaluated using the ERIS Vapor Screening Tool and the results of the VES are included in the ERIS Vapor Screening Report, which is appended. Based on that evaluation, no VECs were identified.

8.3 VES LIMITATIONS

The VES process is not intended to be an exhaustive screening and cannot wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the presence of VECs in connection with the subject property. In addition, to the limitations inherent in the ASTM Standard Guide, the screening is intended to reduce, but not eliminate uncertainty regarding whether or not a VEC exists in connection with the subject property.



9.0 WARRANTY AND RELIANCE

9.1 STANDARD OF CARE AND WARRANTIES

Our services were not intended to be technically exhaustive. There is a possibility that with the proper application of methodologies, conditions may exist on the property that could not be identified within the scope of the assessment(s) or that were not reasonably identifiable from the available information.

No ESA can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for RECs in connection with the property. The ESA was intended to reduce, but not eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for RECs in connection with a property.

Our report is based on commonly known and reasonably ascertainable information, including limited, ground-level visual inspection of the property except where otherwise explicitly indicated, in general conformance with ASTM E1527-13. Findings and conclusions derived from the methodologies described in the Practice contain all of the inherent limitations in the methodologies that are referred to in the Practice.

PSI has assumed that factual information provided to us by the client, or obtained from governmental and historical research firm, the public domain, interviews, and other sources is accurate and unbiased. PSI assumes no liability for the accuracy of data provided to us by others.

PSI did not perform any exploratory probing or discovery, perform tests, operate any specific equipment, or take measurements or samples to perform the ESA scope. The ESA was not a building code, safety, regulatory or environmental compliance inspection. The ESA is not intended to reduce the risk of the presence of mold and physical deficiencies conducive to mold nor the risk that mold or physical deficiencies conducive to mold may pose to the buildings and building occupants.

The methodologies include reviewing information provided by other sources. PSI treats information obtained from the record reviews and interviews concerning the property as reliable and the ASTM protocol does not require PSI to independently verify the information. Therefore, PSI cannot and does not warrant or guarantee that the information provided by these other sources is accurate or complete.

PSI has performed the services in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by other members of our profession currently practicing in the same locality and under similar conditions, within the limitations of ASTM E1527-13 standard, and the All Appropriate Inquiries Rule established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (40 CFR Part 312).

The observations and/or recommendations presented in this report are time dependent, and conditions will change. This report speaks only as of its date.

No other warranties are implied or expressed.

9.2 RELIANCE

Contour, PSI's client, may rely on this report.



9.3 THIRD PARTY RELIANCE

This report was prepared pursuant to a contract between PSI and its client. That contractual relationship included an exchange of information about the subject property that was unique and serves as the basis upon which this report was prepared. Because of the importance of these understandings, our assessment may not be sufficient for the intended purposes of another party.

Reliance or any use of this report by anyone other than those parties identified above for which it was prepared, except with express written permission, is prohibited and therefore not foreseeable to PSI. Any unauthorized reliance on or use of this report, including any of the information or conclusions contained herein, will be at the third party's risk. No warranties or representations expressed or implied in this report are made to any such third party.

Third party reliance letters may be issued:

- upon timely request;
- subject to the permission of our original client; and
- payment of the then-current fee for such letters.

All third parties relying on our report, by such reliance, agree that such reliance is limited by our proposal and/or General Conditions, as applicable.