

REPORT OF PHASE I
ENVIRONMENTAL SITE
ASSESSMENT



Lake View at Fremont
837 North 34th Street
Seattle, Washington

ENTIRE DOCUMENT
IS AVAILABLE ONLINE

PREPARED FOR:

Stockbridge Real Estate Funds
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111

PREPARED BY:

CODA Consulting Group, LLC
3023 S. University Drive, Suite 220
Fort Worth, Texas 76109

*CODA Project No. 10-069
October 2010*

www.codaconsults.com



October 22, 2010

Mr. Mark Carlson
Stockbridge Real Estate Funds
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111

**Subject: Report of Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Lake View at Fremont
837 North 34th Street
Seattle, Washington
CODA Project 10-069**

Dear Mr. Carlson:

CODA Consulting Group, LLC (CODA) is pleased to submit this report of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the referenced site. This report discusses background information, purpose and scope of work, execution of work, conclusions, and recommendations for the subject property. The work was conducted in general compliance with CODA Proposal P10-066, dated September 28, 2010 and authorized by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds on October 4, 2010. Reliance on this report is governed by language included in Section 1.2.

We appreciate your selection of CODA for this project and look forward to assisting you further on other projects. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
CODA Consulting Group, LLC


Lynn Green
Associate

For


Conilee Hennesdorf, P.E. (TX)
Partner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY.....1

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....2

 1.1 Purpose2

 1.2 Detailed Scope-of-Services3

 1.3 Significant Assumptions.....4

 1.4 Limitations and Exceptions4

 1.5 Special Terms and Conditions.....5

 1.6 User Reliance6

2.0 SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.....6

 2.1 Location and Legal Description6

 2.2 Subject Property and Vicinity General Characteristics6

 2.3 Current Use of the Property.....6

 2.4 Descriptions of Structures, Roads, Other Improvements on the Subject Property7

 2.5 Current Uses of the Adjoining Properties7

3.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION.....7

 3.1 Title Records.....9

 3.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations9

 3.3 Specialized Knowledge.....9

 3.4 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues9

 3.5 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information.....9

 3.6 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information.....9

 3.7 Reason for Performing Phase I9

 3.8 Other.....10

4.0 RECORDS REVIEW.....10

 4.1 Standard Environmental Record Sources10

 4.2 Additional Environmental Record Sources13

 4.3 Physical Setting Source(s).....13

 4.4 Historical Use Information on the Subject Property14

 4.5 Historical Use Information on Adjoining Properties16

 4.6 Review of Previous Reports17

5.0 SUBJECT PROPERTY RECONNAISSANCE.....17

 5.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions.....17

 5.2 General Subject Property Setting17

6.0 INTERVIEWS.....20

7.0 FINDINGS.....20

8.0 OPINION.....21

9.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....21

10.0 DATA GAPS AND DEVIATIONS.....22

11.0 REFERENCES.....22

12.0 SIGNATURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL(S).....23

13.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL(S).....23

Appendices

- Appendix A - Figures:
 - Figure 1 - Site/Vicinity Map
 - Figure 2 - Site Plan
 - Figure 3 - 2009 Aerial Photograph
- Appendix B - Photographs
- Appendix C - Historical Research Documentation
- Appendix D - Regulatory Records Documentation
- Appendix E - Interview Documentation & Requests for Public Information
- Appendix F - Qualifications of Environmental Professionals
- Appendix G - Information Requested from Client/Excerpts from Documents Provided by the Client or Others

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lake View at Fremont
837 North 34th Street
Seattle, King County, Texas

Stockbridge Real Estate Funds engaged CODA Consulting Group, LLC (CODA) to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the referenced site. The subject building is a Class A, four-story office building constructed in 2008 with associated parking garage area under the building footprint. The site is approximately 1.79 acres. The subject property operates through a ground lease from Fremont Dock Company. No industrial activities are conducted on site and no hazardous wastes are generated. Historical use of the subject property included a foundry, a lumber storage yard, and an asbestos mill. The subject property is located in an area characterized by office buildings and small commercial shops.

CODA performed the Phase I ESA of Lake View at Fremont building, located at 837 North 34th Street, Seattle, King County, Washington, in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05. Exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 10.0 of this report.

Based upon the information obtained, as reflected in this report, this assessment has revealed no evidence of *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property with the exception of the following:

Historically a "tank farm" was identified on a portion of the subject property in the 1905 Sanborn map. The "tank farm" occupied a footprint area approximately 20 feet by 20 feet in size. The number of tanks and tank contents were not identified on the Sanborn map. The "tank farm" was situated between a foundry and an asbestos grinding mill. Other industrial businesses common of the era were also present in the immediate area. The current improvements are located in a master planned business park known as Quadrant Lake Union Center and the subject property building is one of eight buildings situated on six parcels. Quadrant Lake Union Center leases the land from Fremont Dock Company on an original 55-year ground lease, with extension options. Redevelopment of the subject property parcel (completed 2008) included a three-level subterranean parking garage that covers the entire footprint of the subject property. Any residual impacted soil from former operations would have been discovered and excavated during the construction of the garage. Since the current improvements do not include fuel storage or hazardous materials, the historical business activities in the early part of the 20th century as well as the tank storage is not material to the current use of the property and consequentially CODA does not believe that further assessment is warranted.

No *historical recognized environmental conditions* were identified.

On the basis of information obtained to date, CODA believes that while there is evidence of historic use of the subject property that may have lead to past impacts of the property, based on construction of the subject building with ventilated subsurface garage parking and the soil removal that took place during the construction of this subsurface parking area, residual impacts to the property, if present, would not present a significant risk to the subject property structures. No further assessment is recommended at this time.

This summary is for convenience only and should not be relied upon without first reading the full contents of this report, including appendix materials.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was to identify *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property. As defined by ASTM E 1527-05, "The term *recognized environmental conditions* means the presence or likely presence of any *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* on a *property* under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* into the structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the *property*. The term includes *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include *de minimis* conditions that generally do 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."

The term *historical recognized environmental condition* as defined by ASTM is an "environmental condition which in the past would have been considered a *recognized environmental condition*, but which may or may not be considered a *recognized environmental condition* currently." ASTM further defines a *historical recognized environmental condition* by stating "If a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products has occurred in connection with the property and has been remediated, with such remediation accepted by the responsible regulatory agency... this condition shall be considered a *historical recognized environmental condition*..."

The term suspect *recognized environmental condition* as used throughout this report is cited from Section 12.5 of ASTM E 1527-05. CODA uses this term for conditions that have a potential to be a *de minimis* condition, a *recognized environmental condition*, a *historical recognized environmental condition*, or not a *recognized environmental condition* for the subject property and requires further discussion as presented within the text of this report. Section 7.0 summarizes each of the known or suspect *recognized environmental conditions* associated with the subject property. In Section 8.0, CODA presents its opinion of the potential impact a known or suspect *recognized environmental condition* has on the subject property and whether or not the suspect *recognized environmental condition* is currently a *de minimis* condition, a *recognized environmental condition*, or a *historical recognized environmental condition*, based on site-specific characteristics.

ASTM E 1527-05 states that an ESA "meeting or exceeding" this practice and completed less than 180 days prior to the date of acquisition or intended transaction is presumed to be valid if the report is being relied on by the User for whom the assessment was originally prepared. The components of the practice to be completed within 180 days include: interviews, searches for recorded environmental cleanup liens, the regulatory review, site visit and the declaration by the environmental professional responsible for the assessment. The ASTM E 1527-05 practice also states that within this 180 day period, if the assessment will be used by a different user than the user for whom the assessment was originally prepared, the subsequent user must also satisfy the User's Responsibilities.

1.2 DETAILED SCOPE-OF-SERVICES

The scope of services was performed in general conformance with the ASTM E 1527-05 document *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessment: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*¹ and Client-specified requirements (see Section 1.5).

The Phase I ESA consisted of a historical review of the subject property and area use, regulatory database review, assessment of the physical setting, subject property and area reconnaissance, and a report of CODA's findings, opinions, conclusions, and recommendations. Data gaps or deviations from this standard, if applicable, are described in Section 10.0.

Subject Property and Area Use

Using selected sources of reasonably ascertainable public information, CODA reviewed the current and historical uses of the subject property. The Phase I ESA historical review extends back until 1940 or, for uses prior to that date, back to the time the subject property was undeveloped. Sources of historical use information relating to the subject property and its adjoining properties were acquired and reviewed according to the reasonable availability of the information, the time limits provided for data acquisition and review, as permitted, by the project schedule and cost, and CODA's judgment of the likely value of the information for indicating environmental conditions. Historical sources reviewed by CODA are listed in Section 11.0 and typically include local city directories, aerial photographs, and topographic maps. If available through the database provider, the historical sources reviewed also included Fire Insurance Maps.

Regulatory Status Review

CODA reviewed a report of select regulatory databases published for the local area to identify facilities potentially constituting a suspect *recognized environmental condition* in regard to the subject property. CODA reviewed the databases to identify recorded facilities located on, or in proximity to, the subject property using the ASTM E 1527-05 standard environmental record sources and recommended approximate minimum search distances.

CODA attempted to obtain additional information regarding listed facilities that, in its professional judgment, may constitute *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property. In addition, local agencies were contacted regarding recorded information, incidents, or activities of environmental concern relating to the subject property and its immediate environs.

Subject Property Physical Setting

CODA obtained and reviewed reasonably ascertainable published subject property information to characterize the physical setting of the subject property. Sources reviewed are listed in Section 11.0 of this report. CODA reviewed the current *USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Map* showing the area on which the subject property is located. CODA reviewed one or more physical setting sources at the discretion of the environmental professional to obtain information about the geologic, hydrogeologic, hydrologic, or

¹ ASTM E 1527-05 is incorporated by reference; CODA can assist the Client with obtaining a copy of this standard on request.

topographic characteristics of the subject property. Discretionary physical setting sources may have been sought if (1) conditions had been identified in which hazardous substances or petroleum products are likely to be present on-site or to migrate to the subject property from off-site sources and (2) more information is generally obtained, pursuant to local good commercial or customary practice.

Subject Property and Area Reconnaissance

The subject property reconnaissance consisted of field observations of the subject property and adjoining land areas by CODA personnel experienced in environmental site assessments. CODA observed and documented current uses of the subject property and indicators of hazardous substances, petroleum products, storage tanks, odors, pools of liquid, drums, containers, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), heating and cooling systems, stains, corrosion, drains and sumps, pits, ponds, lagoons, stressed vegetation, wastes, wells, and septic systems. The area reconnaissance was performed on foot within areas that were reasonably accessible and at CODA's discretion by automobile along publicly accessible roads.

Report

CODA prepared this report, which includes the findings concerning known or suspect *recognized environmental conditions* and an opinion as to the potential impact those conditions would have on the subject property. CODA's services also included assessment of *recognized environmental conditions* that may constitute potential *business environmental risks* at the time of the Phase I ESA. Finally, this report concludes whether or not the assessment revealed *recognized environmental conditions*, whether the *recognized environmental conditions* are considered a *business environmental risk*, and provides recommendations, if appropriate.

1.3 SIGNIFICANT ASSUMPTIONS

Information obtained from the Client, the Client's representative, individuals interviewed, and prior environmental reports were considered to be accurate unless CODA's reasonable inquiries clearly revealed otherwise.

Conditions observed were considered to be representative of areas that were not observed unless otherwise indicated.

The primary direction of groundwater flow was assumed to be dictated by topography, unless otherwise indicated by measurement of potentiometric surface or other quantifiable data. For this assessment, groundwater flow was assumed to be toward the south. Additionally, the groundwater flow direction was assumed to control the distribution of impacts, if present.

1.4 LIMITATIONS AND EXCEPTIONS

The findings and opinions presented are relative to the dates the work was conducted and should not be relied on to represent conditions at later dates. The opinions included herein are based on information obtained during the assessment and CODA's experience. If additional information becomes available that may impact CODA's environmental

assessment findings, CODA requests the opportunity to review the information, reassess the potential concerns, and modify CODA's opinions, if warranted.

This assessment included visual observations to identify obvious features or conditions indicative of *recognized environmental conditions*.

Although this assessment has attempted to identify *recognized environmental conditions*, CODA cannot eliminate all uncertainty as to *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property nor represent or warrant that the subject property contains no hazardous substances or petroleum products or other latent conditions beyond those identified through the scope of work identified herein. Other features, conditions, and constituents may have escaped detection due to: (1) the limited scope of this assessment, (2) the inaccuracy of public records, (3) the presence of undetected or unreported environmental incidents, (4) inaccessible areas, and/or (5) deliberate concealment of detrimental information.

Although this assessment has attempted to identify *business environmental risk*, potential *business environmental risk* may have escaped detection due to: (1) the limited scope of this assessment, (2) the inaccuracy of public records, (3) the presence of undetected or unreported environmental incidents, (4) inaccessible areas, (5) deliberate concealment of detrimental information, (6) the subjective nature of materiality to the User with respect to *business environmental risk*, and/or (7) a lack of understanding of the future use of the subject property.

CODA's professional services have been performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar conditions, by reputable environmental consultants undertaking similar studies and practicing in this locality during the same timeframe. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is intended or made with respect to this report or CODA's services. This assessment was not exhaustive and Users of this report should consider the scope and limitations related to these services when developing opinions as to risks associated with the subject property.

This report presents an assessment of the subject property as defined by information provided by the Client, Client's representative, or Key Site Manager. CODA's findings, opinions, conclusions, and recommendations are based on the locations and boundaries of the subject property as evident in the field and on maps or plats provided by the Client, Client's representative, or Key Site Manager.

1.5 SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The work was conducted in general conformance with CODA's Proposal P10-066, dated September 28, 2010. The User is defined as the party seeking to use ASTM E 1527-05 to complete an ESA of the property. The User of this Phase I ESA is CODA's Client, Stockbridge Real Estate Funds.

There are no special contractual conditions between the User and Environmental Professional.

1.6 USER RELIANCE

This assessment and report were prepared on behalf of and for the exclusive use of Stockbridge Real Estate Funds solely for its use and reliance, subject to the terms and conditions agreed upon between CODA and Stockbridge Real Estate Funds.

This report represents CODA's services as of the date hereof. As CODA's final document, it may not be altered after final issuance. The Client and CODA were solely involved in shaping the scope of services. Accordingly, reliance on this report by any other party may involve assumptions leading to an unintended interpretation of findings and opinions. As such, reliance by other parties on the contents of this document is not granted, and any such reliance shall be at the sole risk of the User. With the consent of CODA and the Client and for a fee, CODA may offer reliance to third parties or contract with other parties to develop findings and opinions related to such party's specific risk management objectives. Except as otherwise agreed in writing, any and all third party reliance upon this Phase I ESA shall be subject to the terms in CODA's standard Terms and Conditions; the \$50,000 liability limitation listed in CODA's standard Terms and Conditions (available upon request) constitutes CODA's aggregate liability to any and all relying third parties for any and all claims.

2.0 SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

2.1 LOCATION AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The subject building is located at 837 North 34th Street, Seattle, King County, Washington. The legal description is described below:

"Denny & Hoyts supplemental plat, portion of Block 84; Denny & Hoyts supplemental plat to City of Seattle & Burlington Northern Inc.'s Sumas Branch right-of-way & Lot 1, Block 98 Lake Union Shorelands; also known as Lot C, City of Seattle Lot Boundary Adjustment Number 9700157, Record Number 970605042."

Note that the commercial building on the subject property operates through a ground lease from Fremont Dock Company. Figures depicting the subject property are located in Appendix A of this report.

2.2 SUBJECT PROPERTY AND VICINITY GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property and area reconnaissance, performed on October 12 and 13, 2010, consisted of visual observations made during a foot and vehicular tour of the subject property and adjoining land areas. The area reconnaissance was performed on foot within areas that were reasonably accessible and at CODA's discretion by automobile along publicly accessible roads. CODA's area reconnaissance observations are described in Section 2.5, and subject property observations are described in Section 5.0.

2.3 CURRENT USE OF THE PROPERTY

The subject property is currently used for administrative office functions by two tenants, Institute for Science and Biology and Tableau Software. The remainder of the building is

vacant. Note that the Lake View at Fremont commercial building on the subject property operates through a ground lease from Fremont Dock Company.

2.4 DESCRIPTIONS OF STRUCTURES, ROADS, OTHER IMPROVEMENTS ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

The subject property consists of approximately 1.79 acres of land and is improved with one four-story office building that overlies a three-level subterranean parking garage. The footprint of the lowest level of the parking garage underlies the entire subject tax lot and two adjoining lots to the west and south. No other structures were located on-site.

2.5 CURRENT USES OF THE ADJOINING PROPERTIES

Observed current uses of adjoining properties are discussed below according to their respective geographic relationship to the subject property.

North

The subject property was bordered to the north by Costas Opa, Car Quest Auto Parts, Istanbul Imports, Dragon Fly Acupuncture, a catering company, and History House. No suspect *recognized environmental conditions* were identified.

East

The subject property was bordered to the east by the George Washington Memorial Bridge, Aurora Avenue North, Lake Union and Lake Washington Rowing Club. No suspect *recognized environmental conditions* were identified.

South

The subject property was bordered to the south by a developed office/commercial building containing Adobe Systems, Google, Getty Images, and other office spaces. No suspect *recognized environmental conditions* were identified.

West

The subject property was bordered to the west by an adjoining building that contains restaurants, a dentist, and several office spaces for rent. No suspect *recognized environmental conditions* were identified.

3.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION

ASTM E 1527-05 requires that the environmental professional request from the User of the Phase I ESA, the Client, certain information (discussed below) concerning the subject property that will help identify the possibility of *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property or to request from the User the names of other individuals who can provide this information.

ASTM E 1527-05 assigns to the Client or its representative the responsibility to provide the environmental professional with information pertaining to environmental liens or AULs²

² See ASTM E2091 for additional information about *activity and use limitations* (AULs), their use and function, and standard means to check for existence and evaluate compliance with these controls. CODA can assist the Client with obtaining a copy on request.

(including institutional controls, physical or engineered controls, land use restrictions, restrictive covenants, easements, etc.) applicable to the subject property, whether recorded or not. ASTM E 1527-05 states that the User can engage a title company or title professional as an addition to the scope of work to be performed by the environmental professional. ASTM E 1527-05 and the supporting regulation³ state that the search for environmental liens/AULs by the User may be a significant component in the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) determination of whether a property owner has satisfied the requirements for landowner liability protection against the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) liability.

Depending on available information and specific site conditions, CODA may conclude that the failure of the User to provide environmental lien/AUL search documentation does not present a significant Data Gap and therefore, can declare that CODA has developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312. However, failure of the User to provide the information or to engage the environmental consultant or others to obtain and consider that information may separately weaken a defense to CERCLA liability.

If the Client or its representative is aware of specialized knowledge or experience that is material to the identification of *recognized environmental conditions*, or if it has actual knowledge that the purchase price of the subject property is significantly less than the purchase price of comparable properties, ASTM E 1527-05 assigns to the Client the obligation to communicate that information to the environmental professional prior to the subject property reconnaissance. ASTM E 1527-05 requires that an explanation of a significant decrease in purchase price be provided in writing.

ASTM E 1527-05 assigns to the Client or its representative the responsibility to inform the environmental professional of the reason it wants the Phase I ESA performed and to provide commonly known, reasonably available information about the subject property that is material to *recognized environmental conditions*. Absent information to the contrary, the purpose for assessment is assumed to be in preparation for a *commercial real estate transaction*.

As part of CODA's engagement to conduct this work, this information was requested from Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative. In addition, CODA has requested from Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative helpful documents such as those specified in Section 10.8 of ASTM E 1527-05 and as listed in Appendix G. Finally, CODA inquired whether Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative was aware of (1) any pending, threatened, or past litigation relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or from the property; (2) any pending, threatened, or past administrative proceedings relevant to hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on or from the subject property; or (3) any notices from governmental entities regarding possible violations of environmental laws or possible liabilities relating to hazardous substances or petroleum products.

Information provided by others is discussed in Section 6.0. Information and excerpts from reports provided by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds, its representative, or others are included in Appendix G of this report and are listed in Section 11.0.

³ 40 CFR 312 Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries

3.1 TITLE RECORDS

Stockbridge Real Estate Funds did not provide CODA with chain-of-title records. However, upon review of the available information, it was CODA's opinion that a chain-of-title document was not required.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL LIENS OR ACTIVITY AND USE LIMITATIONS

No information regarding environmental liens, AULs, or governmental notification relating to past or recurrent violations of environmental laws with respect to the subject property was reported to CODA by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative. CODA was provided with a copy of a preliminary commitment for title insurance dated October 9, 2010. The subject property owner was listed as Stockbridge Real Estate Funds Cordillera, LLC. No environmental liens or AULs were identified. A copy of the document is included in Appendix H.

3.3 SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE

No specialized environmental knowledge or experience concerning the subject property was reported to CODA by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative.

3.4 VALUATION REDUCTION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

No information indicating that the purchase price of the subject property was significantly less than the purchase price of comparable properties was reported to CODA by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative.

3.5 COMMONLY KNOWN OR REASONABLY ASCERTAINABLE INFORMATION

No commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the subject property within the local community that was material to *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject property was reported to CODA by Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative.

3.6 OWNER, PROPERTY MANAGER, AND OCCUPANT INFORMATION

The owner of the property is Quality Properties Asset Management Company. The Property Manager and key site manager is Mr. Chad Lenchuk, an employee of Pinnacle Commercial, has been associated with the subject property since March 2010. The building occupants are Institute for Science and Biology and Tableau Software. Information obtained from interviews with the Key Site Manager is presented in relevant sections of this report.

3.7 REASON FOR PERFORMING PHASE I

CODA understands this assessment was required prior to the proposed purchase of the subject property. CODA understands that the purpose of this assessment was to complete an evaluation that meets the applicable standard of "all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the subject property consistent with good commercial or customary practice" with the objective of assembling documentation that may help to support one of the

threshold criteria for satisfying one or more defenses to CERCLA liability (LLPs⁴) and to assist Stockbridge Real Estate Funds in understanding potential environmental conditions that could materially impact the operation of the business associated with the subject property (*business environmental risk*).

3.8 OTHER

Other information that was provided is listed in Section 11.0 and is discussed throughout this report in applicable sections.

4.0 RECORDS REVIEW

4.1 STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD SOURCES

CODA reviewed selected federal and state regulatory lists in an attempt to identify recorded information concerning environmental impacts or conditions or concerns associated with the subject property. CODA reviewed the regulatory lists included in the following table as obtained from Environmental Data Resources (EDR), Milford, Connecticut. A copy of the database report is included in Appendix D, including a listing of the databases, an explanation of each database, and figures depicting the approximate locations of regulated facilities in the near vicinity of the subject property.

Regulatory listings are limited and include only those facilities or incidents that are known to the regulatory agencies at the time of publication to be contaminated, in the process of evaluation for potential contamination, or to store/generate potentially hazardous substances, waste, or petroleum.

Federal, State, and Tribal Lists

The following table includes the approximate minimum search distances and a list of the databases reviewed. These databases were selected based on minimum requirements of ASTM E 1527-05. The number of facilities indicates the number of regulated facilities identified by CODA to be present within the approximate minimum search distance for a particular database.

ASTM FEDERAL, STATE, & TRIBAL DATABASE LISTS		
Database	Approximate Minimum Search Distance	No. of Facilities⁵
NPL/ State Equivalents	One Mile	8
Delisted NPL	One-half Mile	0
CERCLIS/State Equivalents	One-half Mile	30
CERC-NFRAP Sites	One-half Mile	4
CORRACTS or Violators/ Enforcement	One Mile	0
RCRA Generators	One Quarter Mile	14
RCRA TSD Facilities	One-half Mile	0

⁴ Innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser; see CERCLA (1980), SARA (1986), "Lender Liability Act" (1996), and "Brownfields Amendments" (2001).

⁵ Facilities field verified to be within the approximate minimum search distance.

ASTM FEDERAL, STATE, & TRIBAL DATABASE LISTS		
Database	Approximate Minimum Search Distance	No. of Facilities ⁵
ERNS	Subject Property	0
ENVIROSTOR	One Mile	0
SWF/LF Report	One-half Mile	1
Open Dump Inventory	One-half Mile	0
LUST List and equivalent	One-half Mile	9
UST List	Subject Property and Adjoining	12
HIST UST and equivalent	Subject Property and Adjoining	0
VCP List	One-half Mile	9
HAZNET	Subject Property and Adjoining	0
AST	Subject Property and Adjoining	0
LIENS	Subject Property	0
Drycleaners	One-half Mile	0
Institutional Control/Engineering Control Registries/Activity Use Limitations (AULs)	Subject Property and Adjoining	3
Brownfields Sites	One-half Mile	0

CODA reviewed the regulatory information provided in the database report to identify listed facilities located within the above approximate minimum search distances. Significant facilities, if any, are discussed in detail below.

SUBJECT PROPERTY LISTINGS

There was one listing for the subject property:

- Lake View Building, North 34th Street and Fremont Avenue – Although the listing does not have the current subject property address, CODA believes the listing is related to the subject property. The site is listed in the Department of Ecology's Allsites database, described as the Agency's listing of facilities and sites of interest to the Department of Ecology. The listing indicates the interaction start date was July 12, 2007. The program associated with the listing is Water Quality. According to the DOE's Internet site, construction site operators are required to be covered by a Construction Stormwater General Permit if they are engaged in clearing, grading, and excavating activities that disturb one or more acres and discharge stormwater to surface waters of the state. It is our opinion that the Allsite listing is associated with a stormwater general permit and no further assessment is recommended.

OFF-SITE FACILITIES

The hydraulic relationship of the off-site facilities to the subject property was made by CODA after reviewing the latest topographic map and observations made during the site/area reconnaissance. The assumption for this assessment is that the groundwater flow direction is toward Lake Union, to the south of the subject site. The actual groundwater flow direction may vary for a given area.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Priority List (NPL)/Equivalents: There were no federal NPL sites located within one mile radius of the subject property. The State equivalent to the federal NPL, the Hazardous Sites List (HSL), is actually a subset of Washington State's Confirmed & Suspected Contaminated Sites List (CSCSL). Ranking is provided by the Department of Ecology. Eight sites are listed on the HSL list, but all are located in a crossgradient hydraulic position with respect to the subject property.

EPA Comprehensive Environmental Recovery, Compensation and Liability (CERCLIS)/Equivalents: There is one Federal CERCLIS listed site. The site is over 0.25 miles to the east, and therefore is crossgradient relative to the subject property. The site is unlikely to impact the Lake View at Fremont site.

Washington Department of Ecology (DOE) Allsites database: Three nearby addresses were identified on the EDR database. Harmon Contract, 760 North Northlake Way, Speakerlab, 735 North Northlake Way, and Growing Green Gardens, 711 North Northlake Way. At the time of CODA's area reconnaissance, these businesses were not identified on North Northlake Way. Since the facilities no longer conduct business in the area, they do not represent *recognized environmental conditions*.

DOE Solid Waste Facility / Landfill Facility database: One facility was identified within one-half mile of the subject site. Upon further review the facility is a recycling facility and a solid waste transfer station that is hydraulically crossgradient of the subject site. The facility does not represent a *recognized environmental condition*.

DOE Institutional Control / Engineering Control database: Three facilities are listed within the search distance. However, upon further review, the three sites are located in crossgradient or downgradient positions to the subject property and do not pose a concern to the subject site.

There are 29 sites listed in Washington State's Confirmed & Suspected Contaminated Sites List (CSCSL): The nearest site is over 0.125 miles to the northwest and is crossgradient relative to the subject property. After reviewing the locations and distances of the CSCSL listed sites, the listed sites are unlikely to impact the Lake View at Fremont site.

EPA CERCLA-No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP) Sites: All four sites appear to be crossgradient relative to the subject property and therefore unlikely to cause impacts to the subject site.

There are 10 CSCSL NFA (No Further Action) sites listed within the search radius. These sites have been reviewed by the Department of Ecology and do not require further investigation or cleanup.

EPA Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Generators of Hazardous Waste: Three Large Quantity Generators (LQGs) are identified by within the search radius. However, upon further review, the three sites are not located on adjoining properties. Four Small Quantity Generators (SQG) were identified by EDR within the search radius. However, upon further review the four sites are not located on adjoining properties. Seven Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators (CESQG) were identified on the EDR database. However, upon further review, the CESQG were not located on adjoining properties.

DOE Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) List and equivalent: There were nine sites identified in the DOE's LUST database. After reviewing the locations and distances of the CSCSL listed sites as well as reported regulatory status of the sites, the listed sites are unlikely to impact the Lake View at Fremont site.

State of Washington Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP): The Voluntary Cleanup Program includes sites that have agreed to perform cleanups under the oversight of the Washington DOE. There were nine sites listed in the VCP within a 0.5 mile radius. The sites are crossgradient or at a sufficient distance from the subject property that impacts would be unlikely to impact the Lake View at Fremont.

DOE Registered Underground Storage Tank (UST) List: There are 14 sites identified in the UST database. Listing in the database does not indicate a release has occurred or will occur in the future. Review of the locations and distances from the subject property indicates the site is unlikely to be impacted by the listed sites.

4.2 ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD SOURCES

CODA conducted the following local inquiries to enhance and supplement the ASTM E 1527-05 standard environmental record sources when, in the judgment of the environmental professional, such additional records were deemed to be reasonably ascertainable; were sufficiently useful and accurate, and complete in light of the objective of the records review; and were generally obtained pursuant to local good commercial or customary practice.

Additional Environmental Record Sources/Local Inquiries				
Database/Source	Entity	Facility	Response Received Y/N	Pertinent Information Available Y/N
Municipal Inquiry	Seattle Fire Dept.	Subject Property	Y	N
Municipal Inquiry	Seattle Health Dept.	Subject Property	Y	N

Based upon review of other regulatory information discussed above and in Section 4.1, findings indicating suspect *recognized environmental conditions* to the subject property were not anticipated from the City of Seattle.

Copies of the requests and records of communication for these inquiries are included in Appendix E of this report.

4.3 PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE(S)

Physical setting sources specified in Section 11.0 of this report were reviewed to provide information about the geology and hydrogeology of the subject property. The subject property is located in the Puget Sound physiographic province, a lowland between the Cascade Range on the east and the Olympic Mountains to the west. Elevation at the site is approximately 33 feet above mean sea level.

Surface Drainage and Soil

Based upon the topographic map reviewed, the subject site slopes gently to the south (see topographic maps in Appendix C).

The subject property soil is identified as Fill. Based on a review of the historic Sanborn maps, the majority of the subject property was part of Lake Union until around the turn of the 20th century at which time fill operations were conducted to create a landmass suitable for development. The nature of the fill material was not readily available. A copy of the geotechnical investigation report was not provided for our review. At least 20 feet of soil were removed beneath the footprint of the subject property to construct the parking garage. There was no historical use of the subject property identified that would indicate a soil vapor issue could be present.

Geologic Setting

King County is underlain by the Vashon Stage of Fraser age, consisting of mainly continental glacial till. These deposits were emplaced by the processes associated with the continental ice sheet that advanced through the area in the late Pleistocene.

The native deposits are overlain by fill materials imported from an unknown location. The 1893 Sanborn map shows most of the site as a part of Lake Union with the northern portion being a rail line; however, by 1905 the site had been filled in to above the water level of Lake Union, creating developable land area.

Groundwater

The depth to shallow groundwater (vadose zone) at the subject property was listed as 10 feet below ground surface (December 2009 Environmental Site Assessment report prepared by Property Solutions Incorporated). The EDR database listed several wells in the area that verify depth-to-groundwater at approximately 10 feet below ground surface.

Shallow groundwater generally flows consistent with the topographic down-slope direction. Based upon review of the topographic map, it appeared that the ground-water flow direction in the uppermost water-bearing unit across the subject property would be to the south.

4.4 HISTORICAL USE INFORMATION ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

Historical sources specified in Section 11.0 of this report were reviewed to assess on-site historical activities. Copies of historical aerial photographs and topographic maps reviewed are included in Appendix C.

Aerial Photographs

CODA reviewed aerial photographs dated 1936, 1956, 1965, 1968, 1977, 1985, 1990, 2000, 2002, 2006, 2007, and 2009. The 1956 photographs show a large warehouse-type building on site. The 1977 through 1990 photographs depict a "complex" of attached warehouse-type buildings that are unlike the building configuration depicted in the 1956 photograph. The subject property had been redeveloped on the 2000 photograph. The western side of the site was covered with an elevated plaza, the central portion was covered with lawn, and the north and east sides were developed with a parking lot. The subject property appeared

unchanged on the 2002 and 2006 photographs as compared to the 2000 photograph. The 2007 photograph depicted the subject site in the process of redevelopment. The area previously occupied by lawn and the parking lot areas were depicted as graded land. The 2009 photograph shows the subject property developed much as it was during CODA's October 2010 site visit with one commercial office building. No structures, mounding, or excavations of environmental concern were identified on the available photographs.

Sanborn Maps

CODA reviewed Certified Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps dated 1893, 1905, 1919, 1950, and 1968. The 1893 map shows the majority of the site as part of Lake Union with a rail line running east to west along the northern site boundary. The 1905 map depicts the majority of the site developed with Pacific Iron and Steel Works (foundry) and Magnesia Asbestos Supply Company as occupants. The two story foundry building was used as a machine shop, storage area and bench work, pattern shop, and blast furnace powered by coking coal. A 20 foot by 20 foot "tank farm" was depicted between the businesses. The type of product and number of tanks was not identified on the map. Wharfs are present along the south side of the businesses. The rail line still occupies the northern portion of the site and a small south-eastern portion of the site is Lake Union. The 1919 map depicts the site as part of Bryant Lumber and Shingle Mill. The subject site is used for lumber storage only. The railway still occupies the northern portion of the site. The 1950 map shows the site occupied by two dry-kilns, a lumber storage shed, and the railway to the north. The 1968 map shows the site occupied by a plumbing supplies warehouse, a roofing material warehouse, and a general storage warehouse. The railway is still present to the north. The presence of a "tank farm" on the site in 1905 represents a *recognized environmental condition* in connection with the subject property. However, since the tank storage area was relatively small, was not present 14 years later, and at least 30 feet of soil was excavated from this area during the construction of the current parking garage, CODA does not believe that further assessment is warranted. The proposed purchase of the subject property does not include the land.

Topographic Maps

CODA reviewed topographic maps dated 1897, 1909, 1949, 1968, and 1983. The 1897 map shows the subject site as being part of Lake Union. The 1909 map depicts the site as part of Lake Union. The 1949 map shows the site as vacant land with a rail line present along the northern site boundary. The 1968 map shows the site with a commercial-sized structure and a rail line along the north boundary. The 1983 map depicted a large building on the subject site. No symbols or text of environmental concern were identified on the available topographic maps.

City Directories

A city directory abstract was ordered from EDR, but the subject site address did not return any results on North 34th Street. Based on a review of the 1968 Sanborn Map, the on-site business would have had addresses on North Northlake Way. Results for adjoining addresses indicated adjacent commercial property uses, including:

- 724 North 34th Street (1935-1975)
 - Lakeview Hotel Lodgings
 - Probably professional offices (numerous single person listings)
 - Roofer

- Auto painter
- Shoemaker
-
- 730 North 34th Street (1935-1975)
 - Vacant
- 740 North 34th Street (1930)
 - Sheet metal works
- 744 North 34th Street (1925-2005)
 - Carquest Auto Parts
 - Fremont Electric Company (equipment and supplies)
 - Seattle Marine Equipment Company
- 754 North 34th Street (2005)
 - Istanbul Imports

Chain-of-Title

Stockbridge Real Estate Funds or its representative did not provide CODA with title records for review. However, King County indicates the current property owner is Quality Properties Asset Management Company, which acquired the property on March 12, 2010, as a foreclosure. The previous owner was Regional Trustee Services Corporation. Another transaction recorded in the county records was Bedford Property Investors, Inc. granting the property to Quadrant Corporation on December 14, 2004 by quit claim deed. There is no listing showing transfer from Quadrant Corporation to Regional Trustee Services.

No other historical property ownership data was easily ascertainable. The lack of a complete chain-of-title document does not prevent CODA from rendering an opinion as to the potential for *recognized environmental conditions* at the subject property.

4.5 HISTORICAL USE INFORMATION ON ADJOINING PROPERTIES

Nearby property usage could potentially impact the surface and subsurface conditions at a subject property. Developing a history of past uses or occupancies can provide an indication of the potential for *recognized environmental conditions* associated with the subject property. Historical information specified in Section 11.0 of this report was reviewed to assess off-site activities. CODA's findings are presented below.

Aerial Photographs

The 1936 through 2010 photographs show the majority of the surrounding land as developed for industrial usage. No significant changes to the adjoining areas were identified on the remaining aerial photographs. No structures, pits, or mounds of environmental concern were identified on the adjoining properties on the available aerial photographs.

Sanborn Maps

The 1893 map shows properties to the west as being Fremont Milling Company's Plant with stores and domiciles further west. To the north is a mixture of open lots, stores and domiciles. To the east is Lake Union. The 1905 map has Bryant Lumber and Shingle Mill to the south and west, with some two-story domiciles and lumber storage further west. To the north is a mixture of open lots, stores, and domiciles. The 1919 map shows Bryant Lumber and Shingle Mill as covering the entire south and west portions of the map. To the north,

the lots are more consolidated with larger shops and fewer domiciles. The 1950 map shows the areas to the south and west mostly vacant except for some buildings relating to a lumber mill. To the north are mostly shops including an auto parts store and a large private garage. The 1968 map shows the area to the south containing several buildings that may be a tile and floor company. To west are several buildings that appear to be industrial in nature. To the north are mostly shops including an auto parts store and electrical supplies. No recognized environmental conditions were identified on the available Sanborn maps.

Topographic Maps

Due to the small scale of the 1897 and 1909 maps, no details were visible except city streets. The 1949 map depicted the surrounding area as undeveloped land to the south and "built up" area to the north, across the street. The George Washington Bridge is present along the eastern site boundary. The 1968 and 1983 maps depicted the surrounding areas as "built up" areas and commercial-sized structures are present to the west and south of the subject site. No symbols or text of environmental concern were identified on the surrounding properties.

4.6 REVIEW OF PREVIOUS REPORTS

CODA was provided with a copy of one previous environmental report.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of The Lakeview Building, 837 North 34th Street, Seattle, Washington, prepared by Property Solutions Inc, dated December 2009.

The report was prepared on behalf of Bank of America as a part of pre-purchase due diligence. The subject property was developed with one four-story office building with two tenants that conducted general administrative office functions in support of computer software. No *historical recognized environmental conditions* or recognized environmental conditions were identified. No further assessment was recommended.

5.0 SUBJECT PROPERTY RECONNAISSANCE

5.1 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

CODA visually and physically observed accessible areas of the subject property. The periphery of the subject property was visually and/or physically observed, as well as the periphery of structure on the subject property. The subject property was viewed from adjacent public thoroughfares. In the interior of the structure, CODA observed accessible common areas expected to be used by occupants or the public, as well as maintenance and repair areas. Limitations imposed by physical obstructions or other limiting conditions included:

- None.

5.2 GENERAL SUBJECT PROPERTY SETTING

The subject property reconnaissance was performed by Mr. Lynn Green, an Environmental Professional experienced in environmental site assessments, in an attempt to identify apparent visual indications of present or past activities that have or could have

contaminated the subject property. Mr. Green was accompanied through the building by the Investment Manager, Mr. Chuck Lenchuk. Mr. Lenchuk has been associated with the subject property since March 2010. A Site Plan has been included as Figure 2.

The current use of the subject property was discussed in Section 2.3. A description of structures, roads, and other improvements on the subject property, if any, was presented in Section 2.4.

Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products in Connection with the Property

No hazardous substances or petroleum products were detected onsite.

Storage Tanks

No USTs or ASTs were detected onsite.

Strong, Pungent or Noxious Odors

No strong, pungent or noxious odors were detected.

Pools of Liquid Likely to Contain Hazardous Substances or Petroleum Products

Pools of liquid were not identified.

Drums

No drums were detected onsite.

Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products Containers (Not Necessarily in Connection with Identified Uses)

No hazardous substances or petroleum products not connected to site use were identified.

Unidentified Substance Containers

Unidentified substance containers were not identified.

Potential Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB)-Containing Equipment

One pad mounted transformer was identified at the northeast corner of the building. The transformer was labeled as having <1ppm of PCBs. Fluorescent lights are located through the building, but given the age of the building (circa 2008), PCB-containing equipment is not suspected.

Hydraulic Equipment

The elevators in the building are all cable operated and do not contain any hydraulic fluid. No evidence of hydraulic equipment was detected onsite.

Source of Heating and Cooling

The buildings are heated and cooled by electrical-powered units.

Stains or Corrosion

Staining and/or corrosion were not identified onsite.

Drains or Sumps

Sump pumps were found on the lowest level of the parking garage. The sumps collect stormwater from the upper levels of the parking garage. Mr. Lenchuk stated that they are rarely used and the water is discharged into the city sewer system.

Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons

Pits, ponds, or lagoons were not identified on the subject property.

Stained Soil or Pavement

Stained soil or pavement was not identified.

Stressed Vegetation

Stressed vegetation was not identified.

Solid Waste

No areas that were apparently filled or graded by non-natural causes (or filled by fill material of unknown origin) suggesting trash, construction debris, demolition debris, or other solid waste disposal was identified. No mounds or depressions suggesting trash or other solid waste disposal were identified.

Waste Water

Two sources of waste water were identified; sanitary sewer waste water and storm water. The sanitary sewer waste water is discharged into the municipal system.

Stormwater runoff flows via sheetflow to the street and then to the city stormwater system.

Wells

No evidence of the presence of wells, potable or monitoring, was identified. According to Mr. Lenchuk, there are no wells on the subject property.

Septic Systems

No on-site septic systems or cesspools were identified.

6.0 INTERVIEWS

ASTM E 1527-05 requires that a reasonable attempt be made to interview past and present owners, operators, and occupants who are likely to have material information about uses and conditions that could present a suspect *recognized environmental condition* to the subject property. ASTM E 1527-05 requires that the owner or its representative be asked to identify a person with good knowledge of the uses and physical characteristics of the subject property who is defined as the Key Site Manager. The interviews were conducted in person, by telephone, or in writing and are discussed in the following table.

Owner(s)

CODA was unable to obtain contact information for the previous owner. CODA interviewed a representative of the current property management company, Pinnacle, Mr. Chad Lenchuk, Investment Manager. Mr. Lenchuk has been the Investment Manager since March 2010. Mr. Lenchuk was not aware of any incidents of environmental concern during his tenure as Investment Manager.

Occupants

The occupants are the Institute for Science and Biology on the second floor and Tableau Software on the fourth floor. The two tenants conduct general administrative office functions only in their respective tenant spaces. At the request of the Key Site Manager, CODA did not interview tenant represents. This does not pose a data gap and does not affect CODA's ability to identify *recognized environmental conditions*.

Records of communication for the interviews conducted are provided in Appendix E.

7.0 FINDINGS

These findings are specific to the structure at the site; although historical occupancy and physical characteristic of the land on which the subject building is constructed are discussed herein, the land is not part of the scope of this assessment. In 2008, the subject building (Lake View at Fremont) was constructed at the site. This construction entailed excavation of some of the fill materials and development of a three levels of parking under the building. To address vehicular emissions, the parking facilities are equipped with ventilation to remove vehicular exhaust (carbon monoxide and any incidental volatile organics and petroleum hydrocarbons that may be present). The current tenants of the building do not use any hazardous materials or generate hazardous wastes.

Historical tenant use included a foundry, asbestos grinding mill, lumber storage yard, plumbing supply storage, and general warehouse storage.

Historically a "tank farm" was identified on a portion of the subject property in the 1905 Sanborn map. The "tank farm" occupied a footprint area approximately 20 feet by 20 feet in size. The number of tanks and tank contents were not identified on the Sanborn map. The "tank farm" was situated between a foundry and an asbestos grinding mill. Other industrial businesses common of the era were also present in the immediate area.

The current improvements are located in a master planned business park known as

Quadrant Lake Union Center and the subject property building is one of eight buildings situated on six parcels. Quadrant Lake Union Center leases the land from Fremont Dock Company on an original 55-year ground lease, with extension options. Redevelopment of the subject property parcel (completed 2008) included a three-level subterranean parking garage that covers the entire footprint of the subject property, and consequentially CODA does not believe that further assessment is warranted.

A "tank farm" was identified on the 1905 Sanborn map. The "tank farm" occupied an area approximately 20 feet by 20 feet. The number of tanks and tank contents were not identified on the Sanborn map. The "tank farm" was situated between a foundry and an asbestos grinding mill.

8.0 OPINION

In the process of the site assessment CODA discovered possible historical environmental conditions associated with the land on which the Lake View at Fremont commercial structure has been developed. (The building and the property are owned by different parties.) In the late 1800s, historical maps indicate the site was largely under the water level of Lake Union. By 1905, placement of fill had raised the site above the water level of Lake Union, and subsequent industrial development of the site location was indicated, including a metals foundry as well as an asbestos grinding plant. The filling and subsequent industrial activities may have lead to impacts to soil and groundwater. However, as previously discussed, the current 2008 development entailed construction of a ventilated three level parking facility under the four-story commercial building. Based on this, even if the underlying soil and/or ground water have been impacted from historical use soils, this risk of an unacceptable health risks from the vapor intrusion exposure pathway is very low.

The presence of a "tank farm" on the site in 1905 represents a *recognized environmental condition* in connection with the subject property.

The current tenants of the building do not use hazardous materials and do not generate hazardous wastes. Since the scope of this Phase 1 ESA pertains to the office building and parking garage, it is our opinion that the Lake View at Fremont does not have any *recognized environmental conditions* relating to a past release or potential imminent release to land or potential unacceptable exposures to potential human receptors.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CODA has performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of The Lakeview Building, located at 837 North 34th Street in Seattle, King County, Washington, in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05. Exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 10.0 of this report.

The historical "tank farm" represents a *recognized environmental condition* in connection with the subject property. Any residual impacted soil from historical operations would have been discovered and excavated during the construction of the garage. Since the current improvements do not include fuel storage or hazardous materials, the historical business activities in the early part of the 20th century as well as the historical tank storage are not material to the current use of the property. CODA does not believe that further assessment is warranted. The proposed purchase of the subject property does not include the land.

Based upon the information obtained, as reflected in this report, this assessment has revealed no evidence of *historical recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the subject building.

10.0 DATA GAPS AND DEVIATIONS

Data gaps are defined as a lack of or inability to obtain information required by ASTM E 1527-05 despite good faith efforts. Significant data gaps that affected the ability of the environmental professional to identify *recognized environmental conditions* were not identified.

Known deviations or deletions from the scope of work defined by ASTM E 1527-05 were not intentionally made.

11.0 REFERENCES

- *Seattle, Washington Quadrangle*, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 30 minute series topographic map, dated 1897;
- *Seattle, Washington Quadrangle*, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 15 minute series topographic map, dated 1909;
- *Seattle North, Washington Quadrangle, USGS 7.5 minute series topographic map, dated 1949 (photorevised in 1968, 1983)*;
- *Soil data obtained from EDR GeoCheck*;

Groundwater information was obtained from EDR Geocheck and previous ESAs;

- *Geologic Map of The Wolcott Quadrangle, King County, Washington, USTS, David J. Lidke, 1998*;
- *EDR-The Radius Map™ with GeoCheck®, Inquiry Number 2885818.2s, dated October 5, 2010*;
- *Aerial photographs purchased from EDR, dated 1956, 1965, 1968, 1977, 1985, 1990, 2006, and 2007*;
- *Aerial photographs obtained from TerraServer.com, dated 2002 and 2009*;
- *Aerial photographs dated 1936, 2000, and 2007 were obtained from the King County IMAF system on the King County World Wide Web site*;
- *City Directory Abstract, provided by EDR, dated October 5, 2010, Inquiry Number 2885818.6*;

- *Historical Fire Insurance Maps were purchased from EDR, dated 1893, 1905, 1919, 1950, and 1963;*
- *Preliminary Commitment for Title Insurance, prepared by Chicago Title Insurance Company, dated October 18, 2010;*
- *Report of Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, The Lakeview Buildings, 837 North 34th Street, Seattle, King County, Washington, prepared by Property Solutions Inc, dated December 2009.*

12.0 SIGNATURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL(S)

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of an Environmental Professional as defined in Section 312.10 of 40 CFR 312, and 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.



Joe Maulsby
Environmental Professional

13.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL(S)

In accordance with ASTM E 1527-05, this report includes the qualifications of the environmental professional, and the qualifications of the personnel conducting the site reconnaissance and interviews, if conducted by someone other than an environmental professional. These qualifications are documented in Appendix G.