Fs: 36181742
CSID: 11817
Kirkland

ROBINSON NOBLE

RECEIVED
FEB 22 2012
DEPT OF ECOLOGY
TCP - NWRO

OB BELLEVUE, LLC
13225 126TH PLACE NE
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON
PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

OCTOBER 2011

by

Richard A. Bieber, LG
Senior Project Geologist

State of Washington
2649
Licensed Geologist
RICHARD A. BIEBER

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
13225 126TH Place NE
Kirkland, Washington

October 2011

Prepared for:

OB Bellevue Properties, LLC
c/o Hansen Real Estate
5712 E Lake Sammamish Parkway Se, Suite 100
Issaquah, WA 98029

Attention: Eric Hansen

Prepared by:

Robinson Noble, Inc.
3011 S. Huson Street, Suite A
Tacoma, WA 98409
(253) 475-7711

DECLARATIONS

"I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in "312.21 of 40 CFR part 312."

"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 performed and/or developed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR part 312."

*A person who does not qualify as an Environmental Professional may assist in the conduct of all appropriate inquiries in accordance with ASTM E1527-05 if such person is under the supervision or responsible charge of a person meeting the definition of an environmental professional when conducting such activities.

John F. Hildenbrand
Associate Environmental Scientist
Environmental Services Manager

APPENDICES

Executive Summary

Robinson Noble, Inc. has prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of tax parcel 2726059061 located in King County, Washington. The address assigned to the property is 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington.

This Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared in general accordance with ASTM Standard E1527-05. It was prepared using generally accepted professional practices, and observations and findings generated for this project are based on information limited to "reasonably ascertainable sources." This ESA was not intended to be an exhaustive search for all possible environmental issues. It was designed to utilize reasonably ascertainable information in order to determine whether recognized environmental conditions (as defined by ASTM) warranting additional investigation are present. The Phase I ESA is intended as a step to qualify the report's user for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser limitations on CERCLA liability. The scope of services for the ESA included reviewing the physical setting of the property, reviewing government databases for potential environmental risks to the property, conducting historical research concerning the property, and conducting interviews with people knowledgeable about the property. The work was completed by, or under, the direction of an environmental professional as defined in ASTM E1527-05.

The current land use of the subject property is commercial. The property is currently occupied by Waste Management, a waste-hauling company. This property is used primarily for vehicle storage and maintenance. Neighboring and adjoining parcels include a mix of commercial and industrial properties. Properties and businesses of note are Graham Steel to the south, a body shop to the southwest, and Western Sheet Metal to the northwest. We inspected the subject and found recognized environmental conditions, which are included on the list below. No recognized environmental conditions were found on adjoining properties during the inspection.

Historical sources indicate the subject property was originally developed with the current office buildings and maintenance bays in 1974. Prior to this development, the property was undeveloped and periodically used for farming.

A database search was conducted to identify known sites within a radius of up to one mile from the subject property that may have the potential to impact the subject with contamination. The subject property is listed on the databases searched indicating the site is listed within the UST, ALLSITES, SPILLS, RCRA-NonGen, FINDS, and NPDES databases. The UST listing is significant since the information reviewed from previous reports has identified that the USTs previously utilized on the property have potentially impacted the underlying soils. Soil sampling conducted during the gasoline tanks' removals identified a release of petroleum hydrocarbons had occurred. No listed sites off the subject property appear to be of concern.

Robinson Noble performed this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-05. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1.2 of this document. This assessment has not revealed evidence of recognized environmental conditions except for:

- Stained soil
- Leaking equipment
- Heavily stained concrete
- Floor drains

- On-site aboveground diesel storage tank, buried product lines, and pump island
- Unknown pipes (possible product lines)
- Electrical transformer possibly containing PCBs
- Historical operation of USTs on the property
- Historical evidence of illegal dumping of potentially asbestos containing material
- Historical evidence of dumped sand blasting grit
- Historical observations of stained soil
- Historical observation of floor drains

We also performed a limited asbestos survey as a non-standard ASTM 1527-05 consideration. Four of the ten samples collected showed evidence of asbestos. Based on these limited results, we recommend a complete AHERA asbestos investigation be performed on the subject buildings to identify, quantify, and determine the location and amount of asbestos containing material (ACM) remaining in the buildings.

Based on the results of our investigation we recommend a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment be completed. The Phase II should be planned to assess for the presence lead and volatile organic compounds related to gasoline dispensing activities in the area surrounding the former USTs. This investigation should target both soil and groundwater. An assessment of the stained soils should also be completed. Soil sampling should assess the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons including but not limited to diesel fuel, waste oil, hydraulic oil and solvents. Additionally, the integrity of the floor drains and oil-water separator system should be investigated along with the diesel AST, associated buried product lines, and pump island. The Phase II investigations should also attempt to identify the use of the undocumented pipes identified on the subject site. The disposition of these utilities may identify additional sources of potential contamination.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Scope of Services and Purpose of Report

This Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared in general accordance with ASTM Standard E1527-05 and the professional services agreement (PSA) between Robinson Noble and OB Bellevue, LLC executed on October 11, 2011. The PSA and a detailed scope of services are attached as Appendix E of this report. The noted scope of services was developed based on standard industry practices and ASTM Standard E1527-05. Unless an item is specifically addressed in the noted scope of services and discussed herein, it should be assumed that it was not included in the scope of work for this project. In addition to the ASTM standard, one non-standard ASTM E1527-05 consideration, a limited asbestos survey, is addressed in this report as agreed in the scope of services signed by both parties. This Phase I ESA was prepared for the subject site located at 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington.

1.2 Conditions and Limitations

This project was generally completed within the standard scope defined by ASTM. The contractual agreement between the client and Robinson Noble did not contain any special conditions or limitations. As outlined in ASTM E1527-05, the observations and findings generated for this project were based on information limited to "reasonably ascertainable sources."

This report was prepared using generally accepted professional practices. The nature of the ESA process requires that information generated, managed, and/or controlled by third parties is utilized. We believe that the sources utilized are accurate; however, we cannot guarantee that the third-party information is free of error. While we warrant that the opinions and conclusions drawn from information gathered during this study are based on sound professional judgment, we reserve the right to modify any opinion, conclusion, and/or recommendation in the event new, revised or different information becomes available. Unless specifically stated herein, no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

This ESA is not intended to be an exhaustive search for all possible environmental issues. It was designed to utilize reasonably ascertainable information in order to determine whether recognized environmental conditions (as defined by ASTM) warranting additional investigation are present. However, according to ASTM 1527-05 "no environmental site assessment can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property." This ESA is intended to reduce uncertainty regarding recognized environmental conditions for the subject property, but it cannot eliminate all uncertainty.

The Phase I ESA is intended as a step to qualify the report's user for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser limitations on CERCLA liability. It constitutes a portion of the "all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice" as defined by 42 U.S.C.

§9601. The scope of services noted in Section 1.1 was completed by, or under the direction of, an environmental professional as defined in ASTM E1527-05.

1.3 Client and Right of Reliance

As outlined in the PSA governing this project, the client is OB Bellevue, LLC. An additional right of reliance is granted to Toyota of Kirkland. This report was prepared for the use of the client for the purposes outlined herein and in contract documents under which the project was completed.

Reliance by any party other than OB Bellevue, LLC or Toyota of Kirkland is strictly at their own risk. Additional entities may be granted the right to rely on this report, subject to the approval of the client and agreement by the relying party regarding the scope of services under which this report was prepared. Such additional rights-of-reliance may only be granted in writing either by specific mention in this section or in a letter of reliance prepared and signed by Robinson Noble.

2.0 Previous Reports

Four previous reports were identified for the subject property including two Phase I reports and two UST decommissioning reports. The oldest identified report regarding the subject site is a UST decommissioning letter documenting the excavation and removal of two USTs from the subject site in 1989 by O'Sullivan Construction. The O'Sullivan letter indicates the two steel tanks were 6,000 gallon and 10,000 gallon in capacity, containing unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel. The letter presents the results from five soil samples collected during the tank removal. One of the soil samples was found to contain a (total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) concentration of 248 ppm. Field notes provided within the letter indicate the tanks "floated" out of the hole once the overburden was removed, and a light smell of gas was present.

In 1995, a Phase I environmental site assessment was completed by Enviros. The Enviros report identified several potential on-site and off-site concerns. The on-site concerns consisted of floor drains within the maintenance building, which may provide a potential source of contamination, evidence of a third (still in place) UST used by the site for storage of heating oil, potential sand-blasting grit improperly disposed of, possible illegal dumping of asbestos material on the site, an improperly stored/disposed of metal tank on the western boundary of the property, and potential PCB-containing equipment on site. The off-site concerns are in regard to three neighboring sites, most notable is an adjacent LUST site suspected of having the potential to impact the subject site.

In 2001, a Phase I environmental site assessment report was completed by Amec Consulting for the subject site. In their Phase I report, they identify four potential recognized environmental conditions exist on the subject site including the possible presence of petroleum hydrocarbons associated with historic USTs, possible existence of a third UST still on site, a large diesel aboveground storage tank, and a possible PCB-containing pad-mounted transformer.

In 2002, TechSolv was hired along with Emerald Services to remove the suspected heating oil tank and provide a site assessment and decommissioning report. Their work identified a heating oil tank on the northeast corner of the property. Initial investigation of the tank found the tank contained nearly 2,900 gallons of heating oil and no water. The heating oil was pumped from the tank, the tank was then cleaned, suspected impacted soils were excavated from around the tank, and the tank was removed. The tank and excavated soil (8.3 tons) were removed from the site and disposed of at a regulated facility. Soil samples were collected by field

staff to confirm the remaining soils had not been impacted. Two of the three collected soil samples had concentrations of diesel fuel (170ppm and 190 ppm) above the laboratory detection limit of 20 ppm. Soil samples were collected from seven feet below ground surface. No groundwater was encountered during their site activities.

Reviewing these four reports, specifically the two UST reports, we identified several potential environmental recognized conditions (RECs) including, but not limited to, the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons remaining beneath the site following the removal of the 6,000 and 10,000 gallon USTs by O'Sullivan construction in 1989. Additionally, neither UST report addressed the potential for groundwater impacts at the site. Except for the soil sampling completed during the heating oil tank decommissioning in 2002, none of the previously identified RECs from either the Amec or Enviros assessments have been addressed.

3.0 Physical Setting

3.1 Site Description

3.1.1 Legal and Location

The subject site is comprised of one parcel identified by King County records as parcel number 2726059061. The address assigned to the property is 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington. A general location map is provided as Figure 1 in Appendix A. A site diagram, indicating approximate parcel boundaries, is included in Appendix A as Figure 2. The subject consists of approximately 6 acres.

3.1.2 Current Property Use

The land use of the subject currently is commercial. The property is currently occupied by Waste Management, a waste-hauling company. This property is used primarily for overnight vehicle storage including periodic fueling, washing, and maintenance.

3.1.3 Structures and Improvements

The site is developed with five structures as shown on Figure 2. Building 1 is centrally located on the parcel, covers approximately 10,650 square feet, and is predominantly used as office space. According to assessor records, the building was built in 1974. Building 2, also built in 1974, is a large concrete garage-like structure situated along the eastern boundary of the property, covering approximately 25,872 square feet. It is predominantly used for vehicle maintenance and repair. Building 3 was built in 1982 and is located on the southern half of the property. Building 3 is constructed of steel with a covered fuel island on the east side, covers approximately 1,200 square feet. It is used for vehicle washing and fueling. Within building 3, there is an area set aside in the southeast corner for new and used oil and hydraulic fluid storage. Building 4 is located in the northwestern corner of the property. Building 4 was built in 1987 and is used for office space. This office building covers 3,268 square feet. The fifth building (not listed within the assessor records) is a wood-framed, steel-clad shed located on the northeast corner of the property.

3.2 Regional Characteristics

3.2.1 Current Adjoining Land Uses

The subject is situated in an area that is generally developed with commercial and light industrial properties. The directly adjoining parcels are occupied by the following:

- North: NE 126th Place across NE 126th is undeveloped and forested parcels
- Northeast: NE 126th Place across NE 126th is undeveloped and forested parcels
- East: Waste Management offices
- Southeast: a rail line operated by the Port of Seattle and an automotive glass repair shop
- South: a rail line operated by the Port of Seattle; further to the south is Graham Steel Corporation
- Southwest: a rail line operated by the Port of Seattle further to the south is Graham Steel Corporation
- West: Totem Place Business Park, occupied by EuroTech, a truck bed-liner installation company, office and storage space, and a body shop
- Northwest: NE 126th Place, across NE 126th is undeveloped and forested parcels and Western Sheet Metal

3.2.2 Topography, Geology, and Soils

The subject property is at an elevation of approximately 140 feet above sea level. The area surrounding the subject site is located on a north-south trending ridge adjacent to the Sammamish River valley. Specifically, the subject site and adjacent properties appear to lie within a small, relatively flat drainage extending across the ridge from west to east, eventually intersecting the Sammamish River.

Soils in the area of the subject have been classified as Harstine Gravelly Sandy Loam by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in their 1979 publication. Harstine Gravelly Sandy Loam is formed in glacial till and is described as nearly level to undulating soil that is moderately well drained. However, in weakly cemented compacted parts of the material, the permeability is slow, causing a perched water table to form during rainy winter months.

According to the USGS Geologic Map of the Kirkland Quadrangle, Washington (1983), the subject is mapped as till (Qvt). Qvt is typically described as very dense to hard, glacially transported sub-rounded to well-rounded clasts embedded in silt and clay and deposited under the ice.

3.2.3 Surface Water and Groundwater

There is no surface water on the subject. The nearest surface water body is a small, unnamed creek approximately 1,000 feet to the southeast of the subject site. However, the USGS topographic map for the site and surrounding area suggests there are two small ponds, one to the southeast and one to the southwest. However, neither recent aerial photos nor our site visit identified either of these features. Aerial photos form 1968 and 1977 reveal what appears to be a pond to the southeast of the subject. This feature was either filled in or a new drainage was established. The historic presence of this surface water feature on the neighboring parcel is not considered significant.

The glacial till below the site primarily acts as a confining layer preventing the downward migration infiltration of water. However, coarser lenses in these sediments may contain isolated perched zones. If present, the depth to groundwater within the perched system is typically within 6 to 20 feet below ground surface. Groundwater flow within these coarser isolated zones generally follows local topography. Given that the groundwater gradient is relatively flat (at the scale of the subject property), the groundwater flow direction may vary from this presumed direction. However, the actual groundwater flow direction and depth cannot be fully characterized without performing work beyond the scope of this study. Based upon well logs obtained from the Department of Ecology for sites near to the subject, specifically a monitoring

well installed on the adjacent parcel to the east, the depth to groundwater is generally 16 to 17 feet.

3.3 Site and Surrounding Area Reconnaissance

Richard Bieber, a Robinson Noble geologist, completed a site reconnaissance (inspection) on September 27. The purpose of the reconnaissance was to obtain readily apparent indications of potential recognized environmental conditions as defined by ASTM Standard E1527-05. Selected photographs from the reconnaissance are attached in Appendix A. The inspection included a walkover of the site and a review of the surrounding properties. Also included was an inspection for possible contamination sources, including those noted below, on the site and from adjoining properties.

- storage tanks (underground and above ground)
- wells (water wells, dry wells, irrigation wells, monitor wells, etc.)
- drums or chemical storage areas
- hazardous substances, petroleum products, and unidentified containers
- pools of liquid, ponds, and surface impoundments
- maintenance or shop areas
- waste water systems
- sumps or storm drains
- interior stains or corrosion
- stained soil or pavement
- potentially PCB-containing equipment
- piles of waste or trash; solid waste
- dead or dying vegetation
- unusual odors
- other observations that in the opinion of the field investigator indicate the possible presence of conditions of concern

As described in Section 2.1, the site is currently occupied by Waste Management. The site is used for the overnight storage, periodic fueling, washing, maintenance, and repair of fleet garbage trucks. The site is occupied by five structures and one aboveground diesel fuel storage tank. Various pieces of equipment, dumpsters, garbage cans, and totes are stored at various locations across the property.

3.3.1 Interior Observations

Building 1 – As stated above, building 1 is generally used as office space. The building appears constructed with concrete walls, wood framing, and sheet rock. Building heating and cooling appear to be accomplished via electric and natural gas forced air units. No recognized environmental conditions were identified in building 1. An asbestos specific discussion is presented in Section 7.0 below.

Building 2 – As described above, building 2 is a large concrete, garage-type structure. The building is separated into various work bays with large metal roll-up doors. During the site walk, an inspection of the interior of the building identified an area in the southeastern corner of the building which is used for new and used oil and hydraulic fluid storage. The area was relatively clean with the larger tanks contained within secondary containment. Drums and buckets appeared properly labeled and stored. A used-oil storage tank was observed outside of this area near the northwest corner of the building. The 500-gallon (estimated volume) tank was not contained within secondary containment, and slight staining was observed on the floor around the tank. Building 2 employees noted that floor drains within the building were connected to one of two on-site oil-water separators. Observations of the floor drains could not confirm this information; however, several of the drains appeared to have been filled with concrete and were no longer in operation. Within a small attached room on the north side of building 2 is the "boiler"

room. This area previously housed the old boiler which operated on heating oil stored in the former UST. The new heating system appears to be operated by natural gas. In the floor of the "boiler" room, two lines, possible heating fuel product lines or steam-lines associated with the previous boiler, were observed. Specific asbestos discussion is presented in Section 7.0 below. The undocumented pipes in the boiler room, stained concrete, and presence of floor drains in the shop area are considered recognized environmental conditions.

Building 3 – building 3 is a large steel structure used for the washing and fueling of garbage trucks. The building is open on two ends to allow vehicles to pass through. The wash area is bermed to control wash water. According to site personnel, the wash water is directed and collected within adjacent oil-water separators. Outside of the main wash area, a roof extends to the east to cover a pump island. The pump island is connected via buried line to the on-site diesel AST.

Building 4 - building 4 is generally used as office space. The building appears constructed with concrete walls, wood framing, and sheet rock. Building heating and cooling appear to be accomplished via electric and natural gas forced air units. No recognized environmental conditions were identified in building 4. Specific asbestos discussion is presented in Section 7.0 below.

3.3.2 Exterior Observations

During the site walk, various trucks, truck equipment, dumpsters, totes, and garbage cans were observed on the property. Therefore, areas directly beneath the stored equipment could not be observed. However, soil staining was observed in some areas surrounding equipment staged on the east side of building 2. Areas of distressed vegetation/ground cover were also observed on the east side of building 2. Various hydraulic lines and cylinders with associated equipment were observed to be stored uncovered in direct contact with underlying soil. A small fill line/product line was located along the northern wall of building 2. This line is likely associated with the previously installed heating oil UST. In the same area at the northeast corner of building 2, an electrical transformer was observed. It is unknown whether or not this transformer contains PCBs as it is not labeled. Ultimately, if it is determined the transformer is owned by the property owner and not operated by the local utility, any associated leaks of cooling oil are the responsibility of the property owner.

Two compressors were observed under small roofs on the east side of building 2. These air compressors appear to use oil in their operation. Oil staining was observed along the sides of each of the compressors. Each of the compressors rest on small concrete pads and oil staining on the pads was observed.

The 12,000-gallon aboveground diesel tank appears in good condition; no major signs of corrosion were observed. The area surrounding the tank was inspected for signs of spills or leaks. The only area with any indication of a potential release is near the fill port to the tank; a small area of staining was observed, but we considered it to be de minimis. Concrete staining was observed on the west side of the pumps. During the site investigation, we observed "rain water" puddles within the fueling area (pump island) to have a floating sheen. The ultimate discharge point for the observed puddle water is unclear. The contaminated runoff and potentially impacted soils from the observed stained concrete and sheen is considered recognized environmental condition.

During the exterior site inspection, the various observed areas of soil staining, distressed vegetation, stained concrete, and leaking equipment are considered recognized environmental conditions.

3.3.3 Roads

The main parking lot is paved with asphalt. Several storm drains were observed throughout the lot. The southern quarter of the lot appears to slope to the south of the property toward a small vegetation covered area. At the edge of the parking lot, staff have deployed a series of absorbent booms to control parking lot run off. A large concrete vault with a manhole cover was observed within the vegetation swale. This structure is believed to be part of the site's storm-water management.

3.3.4 Utilities

Public water and sewer serve the site. Heating and cooling of the occupied buildings appear to be accomplished by both electric and natural gas.

3.3.5 Adjoining Properties

Adjoining properties were inspected from the adjoining right-of-ways during the site visit. The Waste Management property, to the east of the subject site, was observed to store many of the same pieces of equipment as the subject site. The interiors of buildings on the adjoining properties were not inspected. The adjacent rail line to the south is likely to have associated areas of soil contamination related to the bedding and preservation of the railroad ties. This contamination is likely restricted to the associated rail line property and is, therefore, not likely to impact the subject site. Direct observation of the rail line was not completed.

3.3.6 Data Gaps

The interiors of neighboring buildings were not inspected. However, based on the observed uses of these properties, we interpret this data gap to be not significant. There are no other data gaps to the site and area reconnaissance.

3.3.7 Site and Surrounding Area Summary

The site is developed with office space and structures used primarily for the maintenance of fleet vehicles. During the site visit, several recognized environmental conditions were identified including stained soil, leaking equipment, stained concrete, floor drains, and undocumented pipes (possible product lines).

The visual inspection of the adjoining properties did not reveal any concerns defined by ASTM as a recognized environmental condition.

4.0 Government Agency Information

4.1 EDR Database Search

A database search was conducted through a private, third-party firm, Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR), to identify sites of known or potential contamination within varying radii as defined by ASTM. These radii range from the target property only to up to one mile from the subject property. The database search results, including the search radii, are included in the EDR report, which is attached as Appendix B. A complete list and descriptions of the databases searched may be found in the Government Records Search/Data Currency Section of the EDR report. The absence of records should not be used as conclusive evidence that conditions do not exist. Sites may not have been reported or registered and/or may pre-exist the requirement to report or register.

The subject site is located at 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington. The EDR report lists the subject site on the UST, ALLSITES, SPILLS, RCRA-NonGen, FINDS, and NPDES databases. These listings are related to historic storage tanks at the property. The site formerly operated three underground storage tanks which have since been decommissioned and removed from the site. A 12,000-gallon aboveground diesel tank (AST) is still in operation. The historic operation of two gasoline USTs and one heating fuel UST are considered significant listings. A review of previous site activities, including the removal of the three tanks, identified a release from one or two of the gasoline tanks had occurred. During the previous work, soil impacts were identified associated with the gasoline tanks' decommissioning, however, no groundwater investigation was accomplished. According to field notes taken during the tank removal, the USTs "floated" out of the excavation as the soil covering the tanks was removed. This suggests that groundwater was in contact with the tanks and, therefore, likely in contact with impacted soil. The presence of confirmed soil contamination and potential groundwater impacts is a recognized environmental condition.

The EDR report lists 62 properties/businesses with a total of 91 listed conditions falling within the ASTM standard search radii. In addition, the EDR report lists 23 unmappable (orphan) sites with listed conditions. As part of this study, where reasonably ascertainable, we determined the locations of the unmapped listed sites.

We assessed the risk to the subject property from both the mapped and unmapped listed sites. For all sites other than the PSE site discussed below, we were able to determine without further research that the listed sites pose little risk to the subject. We made this determination by reviewing site locations in relation to the estimated groundwater flow direction, reviewing the types of listings, and reviewing the reported status of the listed sites.

One of the listed sites needed some additional research, the PSE Totem Lake Operating Base, 12454 135th Avenue NE (EDR site B6). The EDR report lists the site on the ALLSITES, UST, CSCSL, and LUST databases. However, based on information included in the previous reports made available by the current property owners, the impacted material was limited to the subject site. Subsequent cleanup activities have addressed several of the identified conditions, and the site is moving toward closure. Considering the site's status, it is not likely to impact the subject site.

4.2 Local Government Records

4.2.1 County Assessor Records

According to King County Assessor records, the owner of tax parcel 2726059061 is JEBA Associates NW Properties, LLC. These records indicate previous owners include JEBA Associates and Northwest Properties.

4.2.2 County Auditor Records

We reviewed King County Auditor records for the subject property. No environmental liens or activity and use limitations were identified in the records, nor did we find other information on potential recognized environmental conditions.

4.2.3 Title Records and Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations

OB Bellevue, LLC did not provide a copy of title records for the property. Title records can provide information on past owners and can potentially contain environmental liens or activity and use limitations not revealed by other sources. Without provided records, we did not review ti-

tle records for the property. The owner of the subject property indicated they have reviewed title records for the subject. However, they reported the records do not show any environmental liens or activity and use limitations.

4.3 Tribal Records

This property is not located within the historical boundary of an Indian reservation. Therefore, tribal records most likely do not exist. However, the inability to review tribal records is a data gap.

4.4 Data Gaps

Neither title nor tribal records were reviewed for this assessment. However, the owner has indicated they have reviewed title documents and found no liens or encumbrances related to environmental conditions existing on the subject. Our review of county records also found no concerns. The subject is not within the historic boundary of an Indian reservation, so tribal records likely do not exist. Therefore, we interpret both of these data gaps to be insignificant.

5.0 Historical Research

A critical part of the ESA process is the consultation of historical sources to develop a history of the previous uses of the subject property and surrounding area. The purpose is to identify the likelihood of past uses causing recognized environmental conditions that could potentially impact the subject property. According to ASTM, the goal of historical research is to develop an assessment of chronological site and area land use from the first development. The historical information reviewed includes available sources that are reasonably ascertainable and relevant (as defined in ASTM E1527-05). Aerial photographs, fire-insurance maps, USGS 7.5-minute topographic maps, local street directories, County records, Polk's directories, and historical atlases were reviewed for this project. Relevant historical findings are given below.

5.1 Aerial Photographs

Aerial photographs (aerials) were searched through a third-party firm, EDR. A copy of the *EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package* is attached in Appendix B. Additionally, we reviewed an aerial photograph from King County GIS - iMap website. Aerials dated from 1936, 1952, 1965, 1973, 1977, 1981, 1985, 1990, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2006, and 2007 were reviewed.

The subject site first appears developed in the 1977 aerial photo. Prior to that photo, the site is undeveloped and possibly used for row crop or livestock grazing. The site appears as currently developed in the 1998 aerial photo, with all of the existing structures completed. Graham Steel, to the south of the subject site, first appears in the1973 aerial. The 1973 aerial also appears to show site clearing and construction underway on the subject site and an increase in residential development to the north and northwest. A majority of the surrounding properties are not observed as developed until the 1985 aerial. It appears as though much of the commercial development in the area was completed in the early 1980s. We did not find any historical environmental conditions from the aerial photo review.

5.2 USGS Topographic Maps

A topographic (topo) map search was completed through a third-party firm, EDR. A copy of the EDR Historical Topographic Map Report is attached in Appendix B. Coverage was available for years 1895, 1897, 1950, 1968, 1973, 1982. The topographic maps suggest the area has in-

creased in property development density in the late 1960s. No specific historical recognized environmental conditions were revealed through the topographic map search.

5.3 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps

A Sanborn map search was completed through a third-party firm, EDR. A copy of the *EDR Sanborn Map Report* is attached in Appendix B. Sanborn fire-insurance map coverage was not available for the subject and surrounding area.

5.4 City, County, and Suburban Directories

A directory search was completed through a third party, EDR. Their report, *EDR City Directory Abstract,* is attached in Appendix B. This source shows available directory coverage for the area surrounding subject property. Pertinent results of the directory research are detailed below. The directory search identified the property as being operated by Deernad Construction in 1996. Earlier in 1983, the directory research indicates the property was occupied by multiple tenants: Commonwealth Electric Company, Elder Equipment Company, and Tyee Construction. Prior to that entry, no additional directory information is available. Considering the already identified site activities, it is unlikely additional research would identify any additional recognized environmental conditions. No specific historical recognized environmental conditions were revealed through the directory research.

5.5 Other Historical Sources

No specific historical recognized environmental conditions were revealed through the research of the other historical sources researched.

5.6 Summary of Historical Findings

The historical research indicates the subject property was first developed in 1974 as a commercial property. Prior to this time, the aerial photos reveal the site was undeveloped land, possibly utilized for crops or livestock grazing. Following this initial development, the property has remained relatively unchanged in development and use with the addition of a few ancillary structures. Adjoining properties have shown a similar development pattern in both time and use. The area is dominated by light industrial and commercial development with limited residential development on the periphery.

The historical research revealed evidence of historical environmental conditions associated with the operation of three underground storage tanks as documented above in the previous reports section.

5.7 Historical Data Failure Summary

No historical data failure was identified in the research.

6.0 Client and Owner Provided Information and Interviews

6.1 Reason for Conducting the Phase I ESA

OB Bellevue, LLC did not indicate to us the purpose of this Phase 1 ESA. Therefore, we assume this report is required to provide landowner liability protections provided under CERCLA.

6.2 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

Ronald E. Bayley, a representative of the current property owner, indicated the value of the property has not been reduced due to environmental issues.

6.3 Interviews

Interviews, both actual and attempted, for this Phase 1 ESA were conducted by Richard Bieber, a Robinson Noble geologist.

6.3.1 Agencies

Based on the information researched for this study, agency interviews were determined unnecessary and were not conducted.

6.3.2 Owner/Site Manager

We conducted an interview with Ronald E. Bayley, a representative of the current property owner. However, the interview did not reveal any significant environmental issues or recognized environmental conditions. We also submitted a detailed questionnaire to Ronald E. Bayley. The questionnaire includes questions concerning the subject property's current use and history; whether the person answering the questionnaire has any specialized knowledge or experience, or are aware of any "commonly known information," in connection with potential environmental conditions; whether they have any actual knowledge of environmental liens or activity use limitations (AULs) for the subject; whether the value of the property has been affected by environmental issues; and concerning the reason why the Phase I ESA is needed. The questionnaire is attached in Appendix D. The answers to the questionnaire did not reveal any significant environmental issues or recognized environmental conditions.

6.3.3 Previous Owners

Through our research on this project, we were able to identify at least one previous owner of the subject property, Mr. Robert E. Bayley, father of the current owner representative. We did not interview Mr. Robert E. Bayley directly; however, we did conduct a telephone interview with Jim Lansciardi, a member of the current ownership group. He informed us of the relationship between the two Bayleys. Mr. Lansciardia also indicated the property was first developed by Mr. Robert Bayley in 1974 and that, prior to that time, the site was undeveloped farm land.

6.3.4 Others

During our site investigation, a brief interview was conducted with Waste Management's site representative, Ms. Sarah Emerson. Ms. Emerson did not reveal any significant environmental issues or recognized environmental conditions.

6.4 Data Gaps

No significant data gaps were found.

7.0 Non-Scope Considerations

7.1 Limited Asbestos Investigation

The asbestos investigation was completed by Michael Brady (asbestos building inspector certification no. 109951) on September 27. The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) define asbestos-containing material (ACM) as any

material containing at least one percent (1%) asbestos as determined by polarized light microscopy (PLM).

We collected ten samples from the subject property and submitted them to EMC Laboratories for asbestos analysis. EMC (NVLAP Accreditation #101926-0) analyzed the samples on September 29 using PLM methods.

7.2 Material Description

Five buildings were inspected with samples being withdrawn from three of the buildings (buildings 1, 2, and 4). The wash basin and fuel shed (building 3) and the container bin storage shed (building 5) were not sampled due to the lack of suspect materials. Samples of suspect materials were collected from the first office building (building 4), the former customer service center and office building (building 1), and the maintenance warehouse (building 2).

The interiors of buildings 1 and 4 consisted primarily of commercial office-type materials. The suspect materials in these buildings were predominantly floor tiles, ceiling tiles, carpets and glue, various mastics, wallboard, wall texture, cove base, and other miscellaneous materials. Building 2 had limited suspect materials and primarily consisted of concrete and steel (maintenance warehouse-type materials).

7.3 Asbestos Analysis

The ACM survey was limited. We conducted the limited survey with the assistance of procedures contained in 40 CFR 763.86 (asbestos sampling). The complete EMC laboratory results are attached. EMC reports asbestos by type of material and percent of fibrous asbestos (non-fibrous asbestos is not identified in the PLM method). Table 1, below, summarizes the results of the asbestos analyses.

Table 1. Asbestos Analysis

Sample No.	Sample location	Material type	Material description	Asbestos Found
A1	Front entry building 4	Miscellaneous	Floor tile	No
A2	Front entry building 4	Miscellaneous	Ceiling tile	No
A3	North side of building 4	Surfacing	Wallboard/texture	No
A4	South side of building 4	Surfacing	Ceiling glue	**Yes, see below**
A5	West side of building 1	Surfacing	Wallboard/texture	**Yes, see below**
A6	South side of building 1	Miscellaneous	White/blue floor tile	**Yes, see below**
A7	South side of building 1	Miscellaneous	White/yellow floor tile	**Yes, see below**
A8	South side of building 1	Miscellaneous/ Surfacing	Cove base mastic/texture	No
A9	North side of building 2	Surfacing	Wallboard/texture	No
A10	North side of building 2	Miscellaneous	Wall joint/gasket	No

7.3.1 Sample A4 – Brown Ceiling Glue

The laboratory identified less than 1% asbestos in the form of tremolite within the ceiling glue. The lab noted the properties were consistent with winchite. Although, this sample was report-

ed below the 1% asbestos threshold, we recommend further sampling of the material. The limited nature of this investigation does not meet the sampling criteria to confirm or disconfirm whether the material as a whole is defined as asbestos-containing. Therefore, we recommend further investigation of the material.

7.3.2 Sample A5 – Wallboard/texture

There are three layers distinguished by the laboratory. It appears the main off-white wallboard compound (chalk-type material) contains 4% chrysotile asbestos. The tape and texture of the samples did not contain asbestos. Based on these results, it appears there may be widespread use of asbestos within the wallboard of the building. We recommend further investigation of the material.

7.3.3 Sample A6 – White/blue floor tile and Sample A7 White/yellow floor tile

There are two layers to the A-6 sample. The main white/blue floor tile does not contain asbestos; however, the black mastic beneath the tile contains 4% chrysotile asbestos.

There are three layers to the A-7 sample. The main floor tile contains 10% chrysotile asbestos, and the black mastic beneath contains 4% chrysotile asbestos. The leveling compound beneath the mastic did not contain asbestos.

Based on these results, it appears the use of asbestos in the floor tile of building 1 is widespread. We recommend further investigation of the materials.

7.3.4 Assumed ACM

The inspector assumed older thermal system insulation (TSI) in the warehouse (building 2) was asbestos-containing as defined by EPA40.CFR.763.85.IV/WAC 296062-07703. There are two types of TSI in the building. The newer type appeared to be primarily fiberglass wrapping materials. However, the older TSI was consistent with asbestos-containing pipe wrap in poor to moderate condition. The TSI was observed within the northern portion of building 2 along the eastern wall. A photograph of the TSI is attached.

7.3.5 QA/QC Summary

Standard sampling equipment such as hammers, chisels, knives, and scrapers were utilized. Each piece of equipment was cleaned with an alcohol wipe prior to collection of each sample. Samples were placed in laboratory-supplied, clean containers and plastic bags.

There were no problems or deviations reported by the laboratory during analysis. Each analytical results sheet indicates the analyst and lab director. Each individual sheet also indicates any laboratory notes from the analyst that may or may not impact the interpretive results.

7.3.6 Conclusions

Four of the ten samples were found to contain asbestos. Three of these four samples are defined as asbestos-containing materials. The ACM includes floor tiles, mastics, and wallboard. These are some of the more common material types within buildings 1 and 4, indicating the likelihood of widespread use. In addition to the laboratory determined ACM, older TSI material located in building 2 was assumed to be asbestos containing by the building inspector. Based on these limited results, we recommend a complete AHERA asbestos investigation be performed on the subject buildings to identify, quantify, and determine the location and amount of ACM remaining in the buildings prior to any remodeling or demolition.

8.0 Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

8.1 Findings

The subject site is comprised of one parcel identified by King County records as parcel number 2726059061. The address assigned to the property is 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington. This parcel is currently used primarily for commercial uses, and is occupied by Waste Management, a waste-hauling company. This property is used primarily for vehicle storage and maintenance.

The site is developed with office space and structures used primarily for the maintenance of fleet vehicles. During the site several recognized environmental conditions were identified including stained soil, leaking equipment, stained concrete, floor drains, an electrical transformer (possibly containing PCBs), and undocumented pipes (possible product lines).

The surrounding properties are generally developed with commercial and light industrial properties. The site is bound to the south by a rail line and further to the south is Graham Steel Corporation. The visual inspection of the adjoining properties did not reveal any concerns defined by ASTM as a recognized environmental condition.

The historical research indicates the subject property was first developed in 1974 as a commercial property. Following this initial development, in 1974 the property has remained relatively unchanged in development and use. Minor changes as additional buildings were constructed have altered the sites appearance, but throughout its development, the site has been operated as a commercial property with owners each utilizing the building 2 for fabrication, vehicle maintenance, and storage. Prior to 1974, the site appears to have been undeveloped with periodic use as farm land. Four previous reports were identified during our research. As summarized above, our review of those reports identified several historical environmental conditions. The historic identified conditions, along with those identified during our site visit, are described below.

We reviewed standard environmental databases and found the subject on UST, ALLSITES, SPILLS, RCRA-NonGen, FINDS, and NPDES databases. The site formerly operated three underground storage tanks which have since been decommissioned and removed from the site. The historic operation of three USTs and impacts documented during their removal are significant. The site still operates a 12,000-gallon aboveground diesel tank (AST). The database search did indicate a number of nearby properties listed. However, none of these appear to be of concern.

We submitted a questionnaire to the subject property owner and interviewed people knowledgeable about the property. This information did not provide evidence of any recognized environmental conditions.

At the request of the client, we have conducted a limited asbestos survey. This asbestos survey is beyond the scope of a Phase I as described in ASTM Practice E1527-05. Results of our survey identified four of the ten collected samples contain asbestos. Three of these four samples are defined as asbestos-containing materials. The ACM includes floor tiles, mastics, and wallboard. These are some of the more common material types within buildings 1 and 4, indicating the likelihood of widespread use. In addition to the laboratory determined ACM, older TSI material located in building 2 was assumed to be asbestos containing by the building inspector.

8.2 Data Gap Summary

Significant data gaps affect an environmental professional's ability to identify recognized environmental conditions. However, data gaps in and of themselves are not inherently significant. Though data gaps were found during this study, we do not believe any of them are significant.

8.3 Conclusions

We have performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-05 of 13225 126th Place NE, Kirkland, Washington. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1.2 of this document. This assessment has not revealed evidence of recognized environmental conditions except for:

- Stained soil
- Leaking equipment
- Heavily stained concrete
- Floor drains
- On-site aboveground diesel storage tank, buried product lines, and pump island
- Undocumented pipes (possible product lines)
- Electrical transformer possibly containing PCBs
- Historical operation of USTs on the property
- Historical evidence of illegal dumping of potentially asbestos containing material
- Historical evidence of dumped sand blasting grit
- Historical observations of stained soil
- Historical observation of floor drains

Our limited asbestos survey identified materials within the subject property as containing asbestos-containing materials.

8.4 Recommendations

A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment is recommended to assess for the presence lead and volatile organic compounds related to gasoline dispensing activities in the area surrounding the former USTs. This investigation should target both soil and groundwater. An assessment of areas of observed stained soil from historical references as well as the current site visit is also recommended. Stained soil should be assessed for the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, including but not limited to, diesel fuel, waste oil, hydraulic oil and solvents. Additionally, the integrity of the floor drains and oil-water separator system should be investigated along with the diesel AST, associated buried product lines, and pump island. The Phase II investigations should also attempt to identify the use of the undocumented pipes identified on the subject site. The disposition of these utilities may identify additional sources of potential contamination.

Based on the results of our limited asbestos survey, we recommend a complete AHERA asbestos investigation be performed on the subject buildings to identify, quantify, and determine the location and amount of ACM remaining in the buildings should any remodeling or demolition occur.

9.0 References

Federal, State, and Local Agency Records

King County Assessor's Office

King County Health Department

U.S. Geological Survey - 7.5 - Minute Series - Kirkland Quadrangle

U. S. Department of Agriculture - Soil Survey, 1979 King County, Washington

Library Research Tools

Metsker's Historical Atlas

Polk's City Directory

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps

Other Sources

O'Sullivan Construction, UST decommissioning letter, 1989

Enviros, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 1995

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Waste Management Facility, 13225 NE 126th Place, Kirkland, Washington, February 5, 2001

TechColv, Emerald Services, Site assessment and decommissioning report, 2002

EDR Radius Map, September 21, 2011

EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package, September 22, 2011

EDR-City Directory Abstract, EDR, Inc. September 26, 2011

EDR Sanborn Map Report, EDR, Inc. September 21, 2011

EDR Topographic Map Report, September 22, 2011Google Maps: http://maps.google.com/

Google Earth: http://www.google.com/earth/

10.0 Closing

Questions regarding the contents of this report should be addressed to the project manager. The professional qualifications of the preparers of the report are listed in Appendix E to this document. If you have questions regarding this report or require further discussion of any portion of this project, please contact Robinson Noble.

The statements, conclusions, and recommendations provided in this report are to be exclusively used within the context of this document. They are based upon generally accepted environmental and hydrogeologic practices and are the result of analysis by Robinson Noble, Inc. staff. This report, and any attachments to it, is for the exclusive use of OB Bellevue, LLC. Unless specifically stated in the document, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

Figures Missing