

Appendix A
Phase I Assessment



AEI Consultants

October 25, 2017

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

Property Identification:

967 Mabury Road
San Jose, Santa Clara County, California 95133

AEI Project No. 378559
Client Provided Site Name: TMC Financing

Prepared For:

TMC Financing
1720 Broadway, 3rd Floor
Oakland, California 94612

Prepared By:

AEI Consultants
2500 Camino Diablo, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, California 94597-3940
(925) 746-6000

Environmental
Due Diligence

Building Assessments

Site Investigation
& Remediation

Energy Performance
& Benchmarking

Industrial Hygiene

Construction
Risk Management

Zoning Analysis
Reports & ALTA
Surveys

National Presence
Regional Focus
Local Solutions



AEI
Consultants

October 25, 2017

TMC Financing
1720 Broadway, 3rd Floor
Oakland, California 94612

Subject: PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT
967 Mabury Road, San Jose, California 95133
AEI Project No. 378559
Client Provided Site Name: TMC Financing

Dear Bruce Whitaker:

AEI Consultants is pleased to provide the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) report of the above referenced address (the "subject property"). This assessment was authorized and performed in accordance with the scope of services outlined in the Service Order, the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13, and the Environmental Protection Agency Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312).

We appreciate the opportunity to provide services to you. If you have any questions concerning this report, or if we may assist you in any other matter, please contact me at (408) 559-7600 or TGolino@aeiconsultants.com.

Sincerely,

Tory Golino
AEI Consultants

PROJECT SUMMARY

967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California 95133
AEI Project No. 378559

	Report Section	REC	CREC	HREC	OEC	Recommended Action
2.1	Site Location and Description					None
2.3	Site and Vicinity Characteristics					None
3.0	Historical Review of Site and Vicinity		✓		✓	None
4.0	Regulatory Agency Records Review		✓		✓	Proper abandonment of MW-3 in accordance with applicable local/state requirements
5.0	Regulatory Database Records Review		✓			None
5.2	Vapor Migration					None
6.3	Previous Reports and Other Provided Documentation		✓		✓	See 4.0, 8.1, 8.2 and 8.4
7.1	Subject Property Reconnaissance Findings					None
7.2	Adjacent Property Reconnaissance Findings					None
8.1	Asbestos-Containing Building Materials				✓	None
8.2	Lead-Based Paint				✓	None
8.3	Radon					None
8.4	Mold/Indoor Air Quality Issues				✓	Correct source of water intrusion, MMP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
Findings	6
Conclusions, Opinions, and Recommendations	9
1.0 INTRODUCTION	10
1.1 Scope of Work	10
1.2 Additional Services	10
1.3 Significant Assumptions	10
1.4 Limitations	11
1.5 Limiting Conditions/Deviations	12
1.6 Data Failure and Data Gaps	12
1.7 Reliance	13
2.0 SITE AND VICINITY DESCRIPTION	14
2.1 Site Location and Description	14
2.2 On-Site Utilities	14
2.3 Site and Vicinity Characteristics	15
2.4 Physical Setting	15
3.0 HISTORICAL REVIEW OF SITE AND VICINITY	16
3.1 Aerial Photographs	16
3.2 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps	17
3.3 City Directories	17
3.4 Historical Topographic Maps	18
3.5 Chain of Title	18
4.0 REGULATORY AGENCY RECORDS REVIEW	19
4.1 Local Environmental Health Department and/or State Environmental Agency	19
4.2 Fire Department	20
4.3 Building Department	21
4.4 Planning Department	22
4.5 Assessor's Office	22
4.6 Other Agencies Searched	23
4.7 Oil and Gas Wells	24
4.8 Oil and Gas Pipelines	25
4.9 State Environmental Superliens and Property Transfer Laws	25
5.0 REGULATORY DATABASE RECORDS REVIEW	26
5.1 Records Summary	26
5.2 Vapor Migration	30
6.0 INTERVIEWS AND USER PROVIDED INFORMATION	31
6.1 Interviews	31
6.2 User Provided Information	31
6.3 Previous Reports and Other Provided Documentation	32
6.4 Environmental Lien Search	34
7.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE	35
7.1 Subject Property Reconnaissance Findings	35
7.2 Adjacent Property Reconnaissance Findings	37
8.0 NON-ASTM SERVICES	38
8.1 Asbestos-Containing Building Materials	38
8.2 Lead-Based Paint	39

8.3 Radon 40
8.4 Mold/Indoor Air Quality Issues 40
9.0 SIGNATURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONALS 42
10.0 REFERENCES 43

TABLE OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FIGURES
APPENDIX B: PROPERTY PHOTOGRAPHS
APPENDIX C: REGULATORY DATABASE
APPENDIX D: HISTORICAL SOURCES
APPENDIX E: REGULATORY AGENCY RECORDS
APPENDIX F: SBA RELIANCE LETTER/CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE
APPENDIX G: PREVIOUS REPORTS
APPENDIX H: OTHER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
APPENDIX I: QUALIFICATIONS
APPENDIX J: LIST OF COMMONLY USED ABBREVIATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AEI Consultants (AEI) was retained by TMC Financing to conduct a Phase I ESA in conformance with the Service Order and the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and the EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312) for the property located at 967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Sections 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6 of this report.

Pertinent subject property information is noted below:

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Site Address	967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California 95133
Property ID (Assessor Parcel Number or Block/Lot)	254-39-012
Location	North side of Mabury Road
Property Type	Office (currently vacant)
SITE AND BUILDING INFORMATION	
Approximate Site Acreage/Source	3.26/Assessor/prior report
Number of Buildings	One
Building Construction Date	1967 Sheds added in 1967 and 1978 (apparent former chemical storage use per building permits) Building renovated in 1984 per prior report
Building Square Footage (SF)/Source	32,275/Assessor/prior report
Number of Floors/Stories	One
Basement or Subgrade Area(s)	None identified
Number of Units	One
Additional Improvements	Asphalt-paved parking areas and associated landscaping
On-site Occupant(s)	None
Current On-site Operations/Use	None
Current Use of Hazardous Substances	None identified
REGULATORY INFORMATION	
Regulatory Database Listings	FINDS (3 listings), ENVIROSTOR, LUST (2 listings), HIST UST (2 listings), HIST CORTESE, RGA LUST (2 listings), HAZNET (2 listings), RCRA-SQG, ECHO

A chronological summary of historical subject property information is as follows:

Date Range	Subject Property Description and Use (Historical Addresses)	Source(s)
1939-1960	Agricultural land	Aerial photographs, prior report
1965	Vacant graded land	Prior report

Date Range	Subject Property Description and Use (Historical Addresses)	Source(s)
1967-2016	Current commercial building, occupied by: - Computer accessory/disk manufacturing - 1967-1983 - Various labs, including Quest Diagnostics - 1984 - October 2016 Addition of current sheds in 1967 and 1978	Aerial photographs, city directories, agency records, prior report
2017-present	Current commercial building and sheds are vacant	Aerial photographs, city directories, agency records, site visit

The immediately surrounding properties consist of the following:

Direction from Site	Tenant/Use (Address)	Regulatory Database Listing(s)
Northwest	Multi-tenant commercial building (1011 Timothy Drive)	None identified
Northeast	Lotus Patient Center/Pharmacy (752 Commercial Street and 1010 Timothy Drive) Theraleaf Relief Inc/Cannabis store (1014 Timothy Drive)	1010: RCRA-SQG, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET 1014: HIST CORTESE, EMI, HAZNET, HAZMAT
East	C.L. Hann Industries/Machine shop (1020 Timothy Drive) Legacy Sanitation (975 Mabury Road)	1020: CUPA
South	Mabury Road followed by: Highway 101	None identified
West	Timothy Drive followed by: Rosendin Electric Inc/Office (880 Mabury Road) Elemental Wellness Center/Cannabis store (985 Timothy Drive)	880: RCRA-SQG, LUST, HIST LUST, SWEEPS UST, HIST UST, CUPA, HIST CORTESE, HAZMAT, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET

If the surrounding properties are listed in the regulatory database, please refer to Section 5.1 for discussion.

FINDINGS

Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) is defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.

- AEI did not identify evidence of RECs during the course of this assessment.

Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition (CREC) is defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, with hazardous substances

or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls.

- According to a prior report (Section 6.3), GeoTracker, SCVWD and the regulatory database, the subject property has a closed LUST case in relation to a release detected during removal of four USTs, associated with Control Data Corporation tenancy: 1) 200-gallons chemical waste (referred to as a vault, circa 1977), 2) 1,000-gallons waste naphtha (circa 1979), 3) 5,000-gallons waste liquids (circa 1970), and a 4) 10,000-gallon naphtha (circa 1979). The prior report states that the USTs were formerly located east of the single-story shed at perimeter of property (UST1), and east of the main building at the perimeter of the property (USTs 2-4).

AEI reviewed the Remedial Action Completion Certificate, dated January 22, 1997, which states, "In December of 1984, three USTs used for storing Virgin Naptha [sic], Waste Naptha, and Waste Acid, and one Spill Containment Vault were removed from the subject site. Soil samples were collected from beneath the excavations and analysis resulted in the reporting of Naptha concentrations of up to 3,800 parts per million (ppm) below the Waste Naptha Tank [data table also had a asterisk under the After column stating NA, with the asterisk defined as ND] and a depth of 13 feet bgs. Concentrations of Fuel Hydrocarbons from these samples ranged from 6,800 to 8,200 ppm. Beneath the Vault, a concentration 720 ppm Oil and Grease was reported. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 17 feet bgs. Groundwater samples taken in April of 1985 from the 5 monitoring wells installed resulted in the reporting of up to 10 ppb 1,1,1-Trichloroethane [1,1,1-TCA] in well W-1, up to 100 ppb Freon [reported as dichloro-trifluoroethane] in well W-3, and up to 40 ppb total Chromium in well W-3. No Petroleum Naptha was detected in any of the wells." Freon 113 was also detected at a concentration of 72 ppb in groundwater. It was noted that "an undisclosed amount of soil was overexcavated during removal of the tanks." No maps, data tables or sampling reports were located for the closed LUST case.

Based on this information the case was closed by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board in 1997 and no further action was deemed necessary by the agency since they did not consider the residual contamination posed a significant threat to beneficial groundwater use or human health/environment. The destruction of the monitoring wells was requested in accordance with SCVWD requirements, however no information regarding their destruction was noted (See OEC heading below, last bullet point).

Historical Recognized Environmental Condition (HREC) is defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls.

- AEI did not identify evidence of HRECs during the course of this assessment.

Other Environmental Considerations (OEC) warrant discussion, but do not qualify as RECs as defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13. These include, but are not limited to, de

minimis conditions and/or environmental considerations such as the presence of ACMs, LBP, radon, mold, and lead in drinking water, which can affect the liabilities and financial obligations of the client, the health and safety of site occupants, and the value and marketability of the subject property.

- The subject property was historically used for agricultural purposes. There is a potential that agricultural chemicals, such as pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, were used on site. The entire area of the subject property is either paved over or covered by improvements that make direct contact with any potential remaining concentrations in the soil unlikely. Furthermore, the subject property is developed and used for commercial purposes and thus no further action related to the former agricultural use of the subject property is warranted at this time.
- AEI observed interior areas of the subject property building in order to identify the presence of mold. During the on-site reconnaissance, the following obvious visible signs of conditions conducive for suspect mold growth were observed: on the carpet surrounding the outdoor patio area, the ceiling tiles in the prior office area, and floor tiles in the prior lab area. Although typically not included in the scope of work for a Phase I ESA, the presence of the suspect mold identified may pose a health and safety concern to any subsequent occupants and/or construction workers during future renovation activities. Based upon our observations, AEI recommends a mold and water intrusion assessment for the subject property. In order to assist on-site staff with proper methods of mold growth evaluation and remediation, as well as proper training for on-site maintenance personnel, it would be prudent for the property owner to implement a Mold/Moisture Plan (MMP).
- Due to the age of the subject property building, there is a potential that ACMs are present. All observed suspect ACMs at the subject property were in good condition at the time of the site reconnaissance and are not expected to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. In the event that building renovation or demolition activities are planned, a thorough asbestos survey to identify asbestos-containing building materials is required in accordance with the EPA NESHAP 40 CFR Part 61 prior to demolition or renovation activities that may disturb suspect ACMs.
- Due to the age of the subject property building, there is a potential that LBP is present. All observed painted surfaces were in good condition and are not expected to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. Local regulations may apply to LBP in association with building demolition/renovations and worker/occupant protection. Actual material samples would need to be collected or an x-ray fluorescence (XRF) survey performed in order to determine if LBP is present. It should be noted that construction activities that disturb materials or paints containing any amount of lead may be subject to certain requirements of the OSHA lead standard contained in 29 CFR 1910.1025 and 1926.62.
- According to prior reports (Section 6.3) and regulatory file review, five monitoring wells were historically utilized as part of the now closed subject property LUST case. Review of SCVWD documentation indicates that wells 1,2, 4 and 5 have been destroyed, however well 3 remains in "active" status. It appears that well 3 is located adjacent to the northwestern exterior of the main building (Figure 2, appendices). The area of the well may have since been paved over, according to prior reports. The location and

proper destruction of the remaining well, under applicable local and/or state guidelines, is recommended, as previously required as part of LUST case closure guidelines and recommendations made in prior reports.

CONCLUSIONS, OPINIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We have performed a Phase I ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and the EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312) of 967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California, the *subject property*. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Sections 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6 of this report.

AEI did not identify evidence of RECs or CRECs in connection with the subject property during the course of this assessment. AEI recommends no further investigation for the subject property at this time.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report documents the methods and findings of the Phase I ESA performed in conformance with the Service Order and scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and the EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312) for the property located at 967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California (Appendix A: Figures and Appendix B: Property Photographs).

1.1 SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of the Phase I ESA is to assist the client in identifying potential RECs, in accordance with ASTM E1527-13, associated with the presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products, their use, storage, and disposal at and in the vicinity of the subject property. Property assessment activities focused on: 1) a review of federal, state, tribal, and local databases that identify and describe underground fuel tank sites, leaking underground fuel tank sites, hazardous waste generation sites, and hazardous waste storage and disposal facility sites within the ASTM approximate minimum search distance; 2) a property and surrounding site reconnaissance, and interviews with the past and present owners and current occupants and operators to identify potential environmental contamination; and 3) a review of historical sources to help ascertain previous land use at the site and in the surrounding area.

1.2 ADDITIONAL SERVICES

Other Environmental Considerations such as ACMs, LBP, lead in drinking water, radon, mold, and wetlands can result in business environmental risks for property owners which may disrupt current or planned operations or cash flow and are generally beyond the scope of a Phase I assessment as defined by ASTM E1527-13. Based upon the agreed-on scope of services this ESA did not include subsurface or other invasive assessments, business environmental risks, or other services not specifically identified and discussed herein.

1.3 SIGNIFICANT ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions are made by AEI in this report. AEI relied on information derived from secondary sources including governmental agencies, the client, designated representatives of the client, property contact, property owner, property owner representatives, computer databases, and personal interviews. AEI has reviewed and evaluated the thoroughness and reliability of the information derived from secondary sources including government agencies, the client, designated representatives of the client, property contact, property owner, property owner representatives, computer databases, or personal interviews. It appears that all information obtained from outside sources and reviewed for this assessment is thorough and reliable. However, AEI cannot guarantee the thoroughness or reliability of this information.

Groundwater flow, unless otherwise specified by on-site well data or well data from the subject property or nearby sites, is inferred from contour information depicted on the USGS topographic maps. AEI assumes the property has been correctly and accurately identified by the client, designated representative of the client, property contact, property owner, and property owner's representatives.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

Property conditions, as well as local, state, tribal, and federal regulations can change significantly over time. Therefore, the recommendations and conclusions presented as a result of this assessment apply strictly to the environmental regulations and property conditions existing at the time the assessment was performed. Available information has been analyzed using currently accepted assessment techniques and it is believed that the inferences made are reasonably representative of the property. AEI makes no warranty, expressed or implied, except that the services have been performed in accordance with generally accepted environmental property assessment practices applicable at the time and location of the assessment.

Considerations identified by ASTM as beyond the scope of a Phase I ESA that may affect business environmental risk at a given property include the following: ACMs, radon, LBP, lead in drinking water, wetlands, regulatory compliance, cultural and historical resources, industrial hygiene, health and safety, ecological resources, endangered species, indoor air quality, mold, and high voltage lines. These environmental issues or conditions may warrant assessment based on the type of the property transaction; however, they are considered non-scope issues under ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13.

If requested by the client, these non-scope issues are discussed herein. Otherwise, the purpose of this assessment is solely to satisfy one of the requirements for qualification of the innocent landowner defense, contiguous property owner or bona fide prospective purchaser under CERCLA. ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 and the United States EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312) constitute the "all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice" as defined in:

1. 42 U.S.C. § 9601(35)(B), referenced in the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13.
2. Sections 101(35)(B) (ii) and (iii) of CERCLA and referenced in the EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312).
3. 42 U.S.C. § 9601(40) and 42 U.S.C. § 9607(q).

The Phase I ESA is not, and should not be construed as, a warranty or guarantee about the presence or absence of environmental contaminants that may affect the property. Neither is the assessment intended to assure clear title to the property in question. The sole purpose of assessment into property title records is to ascertain a historical basis of prior land use. All findings, conclusions, and recommendations stated in this report are based upon facts, circumstances, and industry-accepted procedures for such services as they existed at the time this report was prepared (i.e., federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulations, market conditions, economic conditions, political climate, and other applicable matters). All findings, conclusions, and recommendations stated in this report are based on the data and information provided, current subject property use, and observations and conditions that existed on the date and time of the property reconnaissance.

Responses received from local, state, or federal agencies or other secondary sources of information after the issuance of this report may change certain facts, findings, conclusions, or circumstances to the report. A change in any fact, circumstance, or industry-accepted procedure upon which this report was based may adversely affect the findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this report.

AEI's limited radon screening, if included, is intended to provide a preliminary screening to evaluate the potential presence of elevated radon concentrations at the site. The proposed scope is not intended to define the full extent of the presence of radon at the subject property. As such, the results should be used for lending purposes only. The recommendations and conclusions presented as a result of the limited preliminary radon screening apply strictly to the property conditions existing at the time the sampling was performed. The sample analytical results are only valid for the time, place, and condition of the site at the time of collection and AEI does not warrant that the results will be repeatable or are representative of past or future conditions.

1.5 LIMITING CONDITIONS/DEVIATIONS

The performance of this Phase I ESA was limited by the following:

- While additional assessments may have been conducted on the subject property, these documents must be provided for AEI's review in order for the information to be summarized/included in this Phase I ESA. Please refer to Section 6.3 for a summary of previous reports and other documentation provided to AEI during this assessment.
- The User did not complete the ASTM User Questionnaire or provide the User information to AEI. AEI assumes that qualification for the LLPs is being established by the User in documentation outside of this assessment.
- During the site reconnaissance, the sheds were not accessed due to lack of access key. Features may be present that were not observed during AEI's site inspection. However, based on the information obtained from other sources, this limitation is not expected to alter the overall findings of this assessment.
- AEI requested an interview with the subject property owner; however, the subject property owner has not responded as of this report date. Based on the quality of information obtained from other sources, this limitation is not expected to alter the overall findings of this assessment.
- Due to the size of the subject property, AEI performed a site inspection of the property utilizing a field technique of traversing the site in an attempt to provide an overlapping field of view. Due to the size of the property, isolated areas of the site may have not been accessible for direct observation during AEI's inspection.
- As of this report date, a response from the DTSC Berkeley is pending. However, based on the closure of the Permit by Rule (PBR) under SCCEHD documentation, this limitation is not expected to alter the overall findings of this assessment.

1.6 DATA FAILURE AND DATA GAPS

According to ASTM E1527-13, data gaps occur when the Environmental Professional is unable to obtain information required by the Standard, despite good faith efforts to gather such information. Pursuant to ASTM E1527-13, only significant data gaps, defined as those that affect the ability of the Environmental Professional to identify RECs, need to be documented.

Data failure is one type of data gap. According to ASTM E1527-13, data failure occurs when all of the standard historical sources that are reasonably ascertainable and likely to be useful have been reviewed and yet the objectives have not been met. Pursuant to ASTM E1527-13, historical

sources are required to document property use back to the property's first developed use or back to 1940, whichever is earlier, or periods of five years or greater.

1.6.1 DATA FAILURE

The following data failure was identified during the course of this assessment:

Data Failure	The earliest historical resource obtained during this assessment was an aerial photograph from 1939 indicating that the subject property was developed agriculturally. The lack of historical sources for the subject property dating back to first developed use represents historical data source failure. However, as it is assumed that the subject property would have been previously used for agricultural purposes, if not undeveloped, this data failure is not expected to significantly alter the Findings of this assessment.
Information/Sources Consulted	City directories, Sanborn fire insurance maps, aerial photographs, agency records, previous reports, interviews

1.6.2 DATA GAPS

AEI did not identify significant data gaps which affected our ability to identify RECs.

1.7 RELIANCE

All reports, both verbal and written, are for the benefit of TMC Financing, United States Small Business Administration (SBA), ACT Property Acquisition Partners VI, LLC and California Bank & Trust. This report has no other purpose and may not be relied upon by any other person or entity without the written consent of AEI. Either verbally or in writing, third parties may come into possession of this report or all or part of the information generated as a result of this work. In the absence of a written agreement with AEI granting such rights, no third parties shall have rights of recourse or recovery whatsoever under any course of action against AEI, its officers, employees, vendors, successors, or assigns. Reliance is provided in accordance with AEI's Service Order and Standard Terms and Conditions executed by TMC Financing on October 5, 2017. The limitation of liability defined in the Terms and Conditions is the aggregate limit of AEI's liability to the client and all relying parties.

2.0 SITE AND VICINITY DESCRIPTION

2.1 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

PROPERTY INFORMATION	
Site Address	967 Mabury Road, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California 95133
Property ID (Assessor Parcel Number or Block/Lot)	254-39-012
Location	North side of Mabury Road
Property Type	Office (currently vacant)
SITE AND BUILDING INFORMATION	
Approximate Site Acreage/Source	3.26/Assessor/prior report
Number of Buildings	One
Building Construction Date	1967 Sheds added in 1967 and 1978 (apparent former chemical storage use per building permits) Building renovated in 1984 per prior report
Building Square Footage (SF)/Source	32,275/Assessor/prior report
Number of Floors/Stories	One
Basement or Subgrade Area(s)	None identified
Number of Units	One
Additional Improvements	Asphalt-paved parking areas and associated landscaping
On-site Occupant(s)	None
Current On-site Operations/Use	None
Current Use of Hazardous Substances	None identified
REGULATORY INFORMATION	
Regulatory Database Listings	FINDS (3 listings), ENVIROSTOR, LUST (2 listings), HIST UST (2 listings), HIST CORTESE, RGA LUST (2 listings), HAZNET (2 listings), RCRA-SQG, ECHO

2.2 ON-SITE UTILITIES

Utility	Source/System Information
Heating System	Electricity per site visit
Cooling System	Electricity per site visit
Potable Water	San Jose Water Company
Sewage Disposal/Treatment	City of San Jose

Utility source/system information listed in the table above is provided by City of San Jose website, unless otherwise noted above.

2.3 SITE AND VICINITY CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is located in an industrial area of San Jose, California. The immediately surrounding properties consist of the following:

Direction from Site	Tenant/Use (Address)	Regulatory Database Listing(s)
Northwest	Multi-tenant commercial building (1011 Timothy Drive)	None identified
Northeast	Lotus Patient Center/Pharmacy (752 Commercial Street and 1010 Timothy Drive) Theraleaf Relief Inc/Cannabis store (1014 Timothy Drive)	1010: RCRA-SQG, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET 1014: HIST CORTESE, EMI, HAZNET, HAZMAT
East	C.L. Hann Industries/Machine shop (1020 Timothy Drive) Legacy Sanitation (975 Mabury Road)	1020: CUPA
South	Mabury Road followed by: Highway 101	None identified
West	Timothy Drive followed by: Rosendin Electric Inc/Office (880 Mabury Road) Elemental Wellness Center/Cannabis store (985 Timothy Drive)	880: RCRA-SQG, LUST, HIST LUST, SWEEPS UST, HIST UST, CUPA, HIST CORTESE, HAZMAT, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET

If the surrounding properties are listed in the regulatory database, please refer to Section 5.1 for discussion.

2.4 PHYSICAL SETTING

Geology/Source	Marine sedimentary rock formations of the Cenozoic era/USGS and United States Department of the Interior
Soils/Source	Urban land-Still complex, characterized as sandy loam and very fine sandy loam/USDA Soil Survey
Groundwater Gradient Direction/Source	Northwest and east/Groundwater data for subject property closed LUST
Depth to Groundwater/Source	17 to 20 feet bgs/Groundwater data for subject property closed LUST
Surface waters on the subject property or adjacent sites	None

Note: Groundwater flow direction can be influenced locally and regionally by the presence of local wetland features, surface topography, recharge and discharge areas, horizontal and vertical inconsistencies in the types and location of subsurface soils, and proximity to water pumping wells. Depth and gradient of the water table can change seasonally in response to variation in precipitation and recharge, and over time, in response to urban development such as storm water controls, impervious surfaces, pumping wells, cleanup activities, dewatering, seawater intrusion barrier projects near the coast, and other factors.

3.0 HISTORICAL REVIEW OF SITE AND VICINITY

Reasonably ascertainable standard historical sources as outlined in ASTM Standard E1527-13 were used to determine previous uses and occupancies of the subject property that are likely to have led to RECs in connection with the subject property. A chronological summary of historical data found, including but not limited to aerial photographs, historical city directories, Sanborn fire insurance maps, and agency records, is as follows:

Date Range	Subject Property Description and Use (Historical Addresses)	Source(s)
1939-1960	Agricultural land	Aerial photographs, prior report
1965	Vacant graded land	Prior report
1967-2016	Current commercial building, occupied by: - Computer accessory/disk manufacturing - 1967-1983 - Various labs, including Quest Diagnostics - 1984 - October 2016 Addition of current sheds in 1967 and 1978	Aerial photographs, city directories, agency records, prior report
2017-present	Current commercial building and sheds are vacant	Aerial photographs, city directories, agency records, site visit

The subject property was historically used for agricultural purposes. There is a potential that agricultural chemicals, such as pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, were used on site. The entire area of the subject property is either paved over or covered by improvements that make direct contact with any potential remaining concentrations in the soil unlikely. Furthermore, the subject property is developed and used for commercial purposes and thus no further action related to the former agricultural use of the subject property is warranted at this time.

If available, copies of historical sources are provided in the report appendices.

3.1 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

AEI reviewed aerial photographs of the subject property and surrounding area. A search was made of the Environmental First Search collection of aerial photographs. Aerial photographs were reviewed for the following years:

Year(s)	Subject Property Description	Adjacent Site Descriptions
1939	Agricultural land (orchards)	Agricultural land
1948*, 1956, 1960*	No significant changes In 1956 and 1960 two sheds, outbuildings or signage were located on the southeastern corner	NORTHWEST: Agricultural land NORTHEAST: Agricultural land EAST: Agricultural land SOUTH: Highway 101 WEST: Agricultural land

Year(s)	Subject Property Description	Adjacent Site Descriptions
1968	Current commercial structure, surrounded by paved parking and vacant land on northern third of parcel	NORTHWEST: One of current commercial structures and vacant land NORTHEAST: Current commercial structure and vacant land EAST: One of current commercial structures and vacant land SOUTH: Road followed by highway WEST: Commercial structures
1981, 1987, 1993, 1999, 2008	Current commercial structure and addition of two outbuildings/sheds	NORTHWEST: No significant changes (both current structures by 1993) NORTHEAST: Current commercial structures EAST: Current commercial structures SOUTH: Current commercial structures WEST: No significant changes

Due to poor image quality and/or scale, detailed observation of site features was not possible.

*Obtained from www.HistoricAerials.com.

Environmental concerns associated with the use of the subject property as agricultural land from at least 1939 to 1960 are discussed in detail in Section 3.0.

Historical tenancy is discussed in Sections 4.6 and 5.1.

3.2 SANBORN FIRE INSURANCE MAPS

Sanborn Fire Insurance maps were developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s for use as an assessment tool for fire insurance rates in urbanized areas. A search was made of the EDR collection of Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.

Sanborn map coverage was not available for the subject property.

3.3 CITY DIRECTORIES

A search of historical city directories was conducted for the subject property utilizing EDR and the prior report (Section 6.3).

Directories were reviewed in approximate five-year increments from 1922 to 2014. The first listing for the subject property appeared in 1968.

Year(s)	Address - Occupant Listed
1968, 1970, 1972	967 Mabury Road - Caelus Memories computer accessories
1975	967 Mabury Road - Accessories, Caelus Memories Inc, EMM Computer Products
1977	967 Mabury Road - I SS Sperry Univac Inc.
1981	967 Mabury Road - no listing
1986, 1988, 1991	967 Mabury Road - Laboratory Services
1992	967 Mabury Road - Metwest Clinical Labs
1996	967 Mabury Road - Pathlab Unilab
1998, 2000, 2002	967 Mabury Road - Unilab Business office and main lab
2006	967 Mabury Road - Diagnostics Inc, Quest, Unilas Quest

Year(s)	Address - Occupant Listed
2008, 2010, 2014	967 Mabury Road - Arup, Quest Diagnostics Clinical Labs Inc

If listed above, XXXX indicates that the address is valid but there is no occupancy information available.

The tenant named Ye Olde Print Shop was listed at 965 Mabury Road in 1980. It is unknown if this listing is also associated with the subject property, however historical/agency records and prior reports did not identify this address or this tenant to be located at the property.

The closed LUST case associated with historical tenancies is discussed in Section 4.6.

3.4 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS

In accordance with our approved scope of services, historical topographic maps were not reviewed as a part of this assessment.

3.5 CHAIN OF TITLE

In accordance with our approved scope of services, a chain of title search was not performed as part of this assessment.

4.0 REGULATORY AGENCY RECORDS REVIEW

Local and state agencies, such as environmental health departments, fire prevention bureaus, and building and planning departments are contacted to identify any current or previous reports of hazardous substance use, storage, and/or unauthorized releases that may have impacted the subject property. In addition, information pertaining to AULs, defined as legal or physical restrictions, or limitations on the use of, or access to, a site or facility, is requested.

4.1 LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT AND/OR STATE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY

Agency	Date Contacted	Method of Contact	Name & Title of Contact	Agency Response
Santa Clara County Environmental Health Department (SCCEHD)	October 11, 2017	Email	Ms. Somira Pech	Response received, records discussed below

Records Summary

Date	Occupant	Document Type	Document Notes/Violations
2004	Quest Diagnostics	Certificate of Analysis-Final Report	Results are illegible- it is unclear what was sampled and why, however it appears to reference sampling of 1 VOA for methanol content (likely related to PBR unit or lab waste)
2011	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	No significant violations
2012	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	No significant violations. Stain waste and vials observed in hazardous materials storage shed
2012	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	Need Waste Analysis Plan and Closure Plan for vial crusher
2012	Quest Diagnostics	PBR Renewal	References DTSC for any questions
2015	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	No significant violations
2015	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	Repeat Class II violation for lack of closure for vyleater unit Several violations for lack of corrective actions and failure to submit paperwork Compliance later achieved
January 2016	Quest Diagnostics	Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment Program-2016 PBR Annual Renewal	States that the site is a Tiered Permit facility and needs an annual renewal of information required of facilities who treat waste on site under Permit By Rule (PBR).
2016	Quest Diagnostics	Closure Application for Aboveground Hazardous Materials Storage Facility	States closure plan and timeline

Date	Occupant	Document Type	Document Notes/Violations
2016	Quest Diagnostics	Notice of Inspection	Property was in the process of closure. No staining or indications of a release were observed. Timeline of closure activities noted, including project completion on 8/16/16. Included mention of decontamination in various areas and waste removal by Clean Harbors.
June 2016	Quest Diagnostics	Memorandum	Memorandum summarizing the closure activities and inspections of a tiered permit unit (PBR - vial shredding machine)

Refer to Section 5.1 for more information on hazardous waste generated at the subject property.

4.2 FIRE DEPARTMENT

Agency	Date Contacted	Method of Contact	Name & Title of Contact	Agency Response
San Jose Fire Department (SJFD)	October 12, 2017	Office visit	N/A	Response received, records discussed below

Records Summary

Date	Occupant	Document Type	Document Notes/Violations
1994	Path Lab	Hazardous Materials-Permit category was entered as: Metal Plating/Finishing Line	The document was not available for review
2005	Quest Diagnostics	Hazardous Materials-Other HazMat System	Permit for Vyleater II-XE
2005	Quest Diagnostics	Fire Inspection -Hazardous Materials	No violations
2005	Quest Diagnostics	Hazardous Material Storage Permit	Permit to store 5 gallons of methanol

Refer to Section 5.1 for more information on hazardous waste generated at the subject property.

4.3 BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Agency	Date Contacted	Method of Contact	Name & Title of Contact	Agency Response
San Jose Building Department (SJBD)	October 12, 2017	Office visit	N/A	Response received, records discussed below

Records Summary

Year(s)	Owner/Applicant	Description of Permit and Building Use
1969	Carl Swenson Co	Plumbing permit- use of building is a parking lot Electrical permit- use of building is office/ manufacturing - Caelus Memories, notes hazardous material use (no details)
1967	Caelus Memories	Culligan water treatment equipment - use manufacturing facilities
1967	Janu Research	Building permit - manufacturing plant Gas permit - manufacturing and research use Plumbing permit - area drains, 11 floor drains, acid sink, wash sinks, note from inspector re: "...clarifier left" (largely illegible)
1968	Caelus Memories	Electrical permit - offices and manufacturing Building permit - finish interior
1969	Carl Swenson Co	Building - computer disc manufacturing and offices (add and finish interior)
1973	Caelus Memories, Inc	Building permit- to be used as polyurethane storage Electrical permit
1976	I.S.S.	Mechanical permit - to be used as light industrial "Ball Mill Boom" Plumbing permit Building permit to be occupied by a chemical lab
1978	ISS	Electrical permit- to be used as offices and test rooms
1978	Not stated	Building permit- to be occupied as a chemical storage building
1982	Sperry Univac-Manufacturing	Mechanical permit
1983	Sperry Univac-Manufacturing	Electrical permit

Year(s)	Owner/Applicant	Description of Permit and Building Use
1985	Laboratory Service	Plumbing permit Electrical permit Certificate of Occupancy Mechanical permit Alter interior
1990	Laboratory Service	Certificate of Occupancy
1990	Laboratory Service	Electrical permit
1993	Met West	Install generator
1994	Path Labs	Alteration permit
2004	Quest Diagnostic	Permit to operate a Vyleater. This machine separates vial from the liquid contents and disposes of each material separately.

Refer to Section 5.1 for more information regarding hazardous waste generated at the subject property.

4.4 PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Agency	Date Contacted	Method of Contact	Name & Title of Contact	Agency Response
San Jose Planning Department (SJPD)	October 12, 2017	Office visit	N/A	No evidence indicating the existence of AULs on file for the subject property

Copies of planning permits were not available for review, however descriptions under the permits indicate that the site was rezoned from LI industrial zoning to HI industrial zoning.

An undated generator enclosure permit was noted.

Additionally, a 2017 planning consultation is listed to determine if a waste transfer facility is appropriate for the site and what the required process would consist of.

4.5 ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

According to the Santa Clara County Assessor's Office, the current building was constructed in 1967 and is situated on one irregular shaped parcel identified as Parcel Number 254-39-012. The subject property parcel is noted as 3.26 acres while the current subject property building is noted as totaling 32,275 square feet.

4.6 OTHER AGENCIES SEARCHED

Agency	Date Contacted	Method of Contact	Name & Title of Contact	Agency Response
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker	October 11, 2017	Website	N/A	Response received, records discussed below
CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS)	October 11, 2017	Website	N/A	Response received, records discussed below
CA DTSC Envirostor	October 11, 2017	Website	N/A	Response received, records discussed below
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)	October 11, 2017	Email	Ms. Rochelle Reed	Response received, records discussed below
Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) Fuel Leaks and Solvents Database	October 19, 2017	Website	N/A	Response received, records discussed below
SCVWD Wells	October 20, 2017	Email	Ms. Barbara Murray, Hydrologic Systems Analyst II	Response received, records discussed below
DTSC Berkeley	October 25, 2017	Email	N/A	Response pending, refer to Section 1.5

According to **GeoTracker**, the subject property has a closed LUST case in relation to a release detected during removal of four USTs, associated with Control Data Corporation tenancy: 1) 200-gallons chemical waste (referred to as a vault, circa 1977), 2) 1,000-gallons waste naphtha (circa 1979), 3) 5,000-gallons waste liquids (circa 1970), and a 4) 10,000-gallon naphtha (circa 1979). The prior report states that the USTs were formerly located east of the single-story shed at perimeter of property (UST1), and east of the main building at the perimeter of the property (USTs 2-4).

AEI reviewed the Remedial Action Completion Certificate, dated January 22, 1997, which states, "In December of 1984, three USTs used for storing Virgin Naptha [sic], Waste Naptha, and Waste Acid, and one Spill Containment Vault were removed from the subject site. Soil samples were collected from beneath the excavations and analysis resulted in the reporting of Naptha concentrations of up to 3,800 parts per million (ppm) below the Waste Naptha Tank [data table also had a asterisk under the After column stating NA, with the asterisk defined as ND] and a depth of 13 feet bgs. Concentrations of Fuel Hydrocarbons from these samples ranged from 6,800 to 8,200 ppm. Beneath the Vault, a concentration 720 ppm Oil and Grease was reported. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 17 feet bgs. Groundwater samples taken in April of 1985 from the 5 monitoring wells installed resulted in the reporting of up to 10 ppb 1,1,1-Trichloroethane [1,1,1-TCA] in well W-1, up to 100 ppb Freon [reported as dichloro-trifluoroethane] in well W-3, and up to 40 ppb total Chromium in well W-3. No Petroleum Naptha was detected in any of the wells." Freon 113 was also detected at a concentration of 72 ppb in groundwater. It was noted that "an undisclosed amount of soil was overexcavated during removal of the tanks." No maps, data tables or sampling reports were located for the closed

LUST case.

Based on this information the case was closed by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board in 1997 and no further action was deemed necessary by the agency since they did not consider the residual contamination posed a significant threat to beneficial groundwater use or human health/environment. The destruction of the monitoring wells was requested in accordance with SCVWD requirements, however no information regarding their destruction was noted. This closed case is therefore representative of a CREC.

According to the **DTSC HWTS**, the tenant Quest Diagnostics was listed for generating various quantities of hazardous waste during the years 2004 to 2016. Notable wastes include oxygenated solvents and unspecified solvent mixture.

The tenant Unilab Corp was listed for generating various quantities of hazardous waste during the years 1993 to 2004. Notable waste includes unspecified solvent mixture.

The tenant Control Data Corporation was listed in the database, however no records pertaining to hazardous waste were provided.

Refer to appendixes for full list of hazardous wastes and quantities generated, and refer to Section 5.1 for more information regarding hazardous waste generated at the subject property.

According to **Envirostor**, the subject property is a Tiered Permit site. The current status is Inactive-Needs Evaluation. A Tiered Permit indicates that the site uses hazardous materials, however it is not indicative of a release, and therefore is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern. The associated former PBR unit was discussed in Section 4.1.

PBR FOIA DTSC BERKELEY

According to the **BAAQMD**, the subject property is listed as a "General Source" under Control Data Corp, ceasing operations in 1985, however no other pertinent information is provided. Quest Diagnostics is also listed for utilization of a vial shredder. Refer to Section 4.1 and 5.1 regarding historical on-site operations.

The **SCVWD Fuel Leaks and Solvents Database** provides a copy of the 1997 Remedial Action Completion Certificate (previously discussed under GeoTracker).

According to **SCVWD Wells Division**, five wells are located on the subject property. Four are decommissioned and one is active (W-3). The wells were installed in connection with the subject property closed LUST case, as discussed above. According to a prior report, W-3 was not destroyed because it could not be located, presumably because it was located under pavement. Refer to Section 6.3 and the Findings segment for more information regarding W-3.

4.7 OIL AND GAS WELLS

According to the California Department of Conservation's Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources (CA DOGGR) map, oil or gas wells are not located within 500 feet of the subject property. AEI did not identify evidence of environmental concerns during the map review.

4.8 OIL AND GAS PIPELINES

According to the NPMS Public Map Viewer, one active subterranean petroleum pipeline is located approximately 390 feet northwest of the subject property. No stressed vegetation was observed near the pipeline during AEI's reconnaissance and subject property staff reported no known environmental concerns associated with the pipeline. Releases from this pipeline (other than those caused by a third party) would be the responsibility of the operator. Based on this information, and the lack of a documented release identified in the regulatory database, no further action regarding the pipeline is warranted at this time.

4.9 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL SUPERLIENS AND PROPERTY TRANSFER LAWS

In accordance with our approved scope of services, AEI did not assess whether the subject property is subject to any state environmental superliens and/or property transfer laws.

5.0 REGULATORY DATABASE RECORDS REVIEW

AEI contracted Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR) to conduct a search of publicly available information from federal, state, tribal, and local databases containing known and suspected sites of environmental contamination and sites of potential environmental significance. Data gathered during the current regulatory database search is compiled by EDR into one regulatory database report. Location information for listed sites is designated using geocoded information provided by federal, state, or local agencies and commonly used mapping databases with the exception of "Orphan" sites. Due to poor or inadequate address information, Orphan sites are identified but not geocoded/mapped by EDR, rather, information is provided based upon vicinity zip codes, city name, and state. The number of listed sites identified within the approximate minimum search distance from the federal and state environmental records database listings specified in ASTM Standard E1527-13 is summarized in Section 5.1, along with the total number of Orphan sites. A copy of the regulatory database report is included in Appendix C of this report.

The subject property was identified in the regulatory database report as follows: FINDS (3 listings), ENVIROSTOR, LUST (2 listings), HIST UST (2 listings), HIST CORTESE, RGA LUST (2 listings), HAZNET (2 listings), RCRA-SQG, ECHO. Refer to Section 5.1 for additional discussion.

In determining if a listed site is a potential environmental concern to the subject property, AEI generally applies the following criteria to classify the site as lower potential environmental concern: 1) the site only holds an operating permit (which does not imply a release), 2) the site's distance from, and/or topographic position relative to, the subject property, and/or 3) the site has recently been granted "No Further Action" by the appropriate regulatory agency.

5.1 RECORDS SUMMARY

Database	Search Distance (Miles)	Subject Property Listed	Listings Within Search Distance	Listings Determined To Warrant Additional Discussion Below
NPL	1.0	No	0	0
DELISTED NPL	0.5	No	0	0
SEMS/CERCLIS	0.5	No	0	0
SEMS-ARCHIVE/CERCLIS NFRAP	0.5	No	2	1
RCRA CORRACTS	1.0	No	3	1
RCRA-TSDF	0.5	No	1	0
RCRA LQG, SQG, CESQGs, NLR	SP/ADJ	Yes	3	3
US ENG CONTROLS	SP	No	0	0
US INST CONTROLS	SP	No	0	0
ERNS	SP	No	0	0
STATE/TRIBAL HWS	1.0	Yes	25	2
STATE/TRIBAL SWLF	0.5	No	3	0
STATE/TRIBAL REGISTERED STORAGE TANKS	SP/ADJ	No	0	0
STATE/TRIBAL LUST	0.5	Yes	30	4
STATE/TRIBAL EC and IC	SP	No	0	0

Database	Search Distance (Miles)	Subject Property Listed	Listings Within Search Distance	Listings Determined To Warrant Additional Discussion Below
STATE/TRIBAL VCP	0.5	No	1	0
STATE/TRIBAL BROWNFIELD	0.5	No	0	0
ORPHAN	N/A	No	2	0
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD SOURCES	SP/ADJ	Yes	28	28

Facility Name	Quest Diagnostics, Control Data Corporation, Unilab Corp/Path Lab
Address	967 Mabury Road
Distance & Direction	Subject Property
Hydrologic Position	N/A
Databases Listed	FINDS (3 listings), ENVIROSTOR, LUST (2 listings), HIST UST (2 listings), HIST CORTESE, RGA LUST (2 listings), HAZNET (2 listings), RCRA-SQG, ECHO
Comments	<p>The ENVIROSTOR listing states that the site is a Tiered Permit site and the status is Inactive- Needs Evaluation. This listing was previously discussed in Section 4.6.</p> <p>The HIST UST listing states that four USTs were installed on the subject property from 1970 to 1979.</p> <p>The LUST listings state that in 1984 a release of "Stoddard solvent/Mineral Sprits/Distillates" impacted groundwater. As of 1997 the case status has been Completed-Case Closed.</p> <p>The subject property LUST case was previously discussed in Section 4.6.</p> <p>The HAZNET listings state that in 2015 the site generated 0.024 ton of laboratory waste chemicals, 0.0055 ton of alkaline solution without metals pH \geq 12.5, 0.231 ton of oxygenated solvents, 0.026 ton of laboratory waste chemicals, and 0.227 ton of other inorganic solid waste. In 2004 the site generated 0.4 ton of unspecified solvent mixture, 0.05 ton of other organic solids, 0.62 ton of other organic solids, 4.33 ton of unspecified solvent mixture, and 2.5 ton of unspecified solvent mixture.</p> <p>The remaining listings are associated with the above listings. No additional significant information is provided. Quest undertook facility closure in 2016.</p> <p>Based on the proper closure of the property with agency oversight, and lack of evidence of mismanagement, the remaining listings are not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	Maxxim Medical
Address	1010 Timothy Drive
Distance & Direction	Northeast adjacent property
Hydrologic Position	Cross-gradient

Databases Listed	RCRA-SQG, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET
Comments	<p>These listings indicate that the site generates hazardous waste.</p> <p>Based on the lack of a documented release, the review of regulatory agency files for this site was not deemed necessary, and the site is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	Rosendin Electric
Address	880 Mabury Road
Distance & Direction	West southwest adjacent property, beyond Timothy Drive
Hydrologic Position	Up- to cross-gradient
Databases Listed	RCRA-SQG, LUST, HIST LUST, SWEEPS UST, HIST UST, CUPA, HIST CORTESE, HAZMAT, FINDS, ECHO, HAZNET
Comments	<p>The LUST and UST listings state that in 1991 a release of diesel impacted groundwater. As of 1996 the case status has been Completed- Case Closed.</p> <p>According to the Case Closure letter on GeoTracker, for the soil sampling data point closest to the subject property (H-8, 9, 10), located approximately 300 feet west of subject property, all contaminants were either ND or detected in trace concentrations. Over-excavation of impacted areas was undertaken.</p> <p>The remaining listings indicate that the site generates hazardous waste.</p> <p>Based on the remaining contaminant levels and case closure, these listings are not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	Sign Classics Inc
Address	1014 Timothy Drive
Distance & Direction	Northeast adjacent property
Hydrologic Position	Cross-gradient
Databases Listed	HIST CORTESE, EMI, HAZNET, HAZMAT
Comments	<p>These listings indicate that the site generates hazardous waste and hazardous air pollutants and is in the class "Printing/Painting". It appears that the HIST CORTESE listing was related to a former UST (no information provided).</p> <p>Based on the lack of a documented release and gradient, the review of regulatory agency files for this site was not deemed necessary, and the site is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	C.L. Hann Industries
Address	1020 Timothy Drive
Distance & Direction	East northeast adjacent property
Hydrologic Position	Down- to cross-gradient
Databases Listed	CUPA

Comments	<p>This listing indicates that the site generates hazardous waste.</p> <p>Based on the lack of a documented release, the review of regulatory agency files for this site was not deemed necessary, and the site is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>
-----------------	---

Facility Name	Bruin Electronics Inc, Sanmina
Address	1015 Timothy Drive
Distance & Direction	0.063 mile east northeast (possibly an alternate address for the northwest adjacent property beyond Timothy Drive, based on area addressing)
Hydrologic Position	Down- to cross-gradient
Databases Listed	SEMS-ARCHIVE, HIST LUST, HIST UST, HIST CORTESE, SJ HAZMAT, LUST, CUPA, EMI
Comments	<p>This listing states that the site does not qualify for the NPL and has NFRAP status as of 1986 (after a preliminary assessment and archival).</p> <p>The site was listed as a closed LUST case as of 1996. AEI reviewed closure information on Geotracker. Impacts were localized around the former tank area.</p> <p>Based on the regulatory status, and the inferred direction of groundwater, this listing is not represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	Elcon Precision LLC
Address	1009 Timothy Drive
Distance & Direction	0.04 mile north
Hydrologic Position	Down- to cross-gradient
Databases Listed	ENVIROSTOR
Comments	<p>This listing states that the site is a Tiered Permit site as of 2016. The case status is Certified O&M- Land Use Restrictions Only (related to an investigated release regarding the former plating operations). Based on the case status, distance and gradient, this listing is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

Facility Name	Moore Material Handlers
Address	875 Mabury Road
Distance & Direction	0.087 mile west southwest
Hydrologic Position	Up- to cross-gradient
Databases Listed	LUST

Comments	<p>This listing states that in 1985 a release of gasoline impacted groundwater. As of 2002 the case status has been Completed- Case Closed.</p> <p>According to the Case Closure letter on GeoTracker, for the monitoring well closest to the subject property (MW-2), located approximately 400 feet west of the subject property, all contaminants were below detection limits with the exception of 2.1 ug/L MTBE.</p> <p>Based on the contaminant levels, case closure, and relative distance from the subject property, this listing is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>
-----------------	---

Facility Name	Safety-Kleen Systems
Address	1147 N 10th Street
Distance & Direction	0.95 mile west
Hydrologic Position	Up-gradient
Databases Listed	CORRACTS
Comments	<p>According to this listing, a release of VOCs occurred on site, which impacted groundwater. Groundwater monitoring is on-going, however no sampling data was available for review.</p> <p>Based on the distance from the subject property, this listing is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.</p>

5.2 VAPOR MIGRATION

AEI reviewed reasonably ascertainable information for the subject and nearby properties, including a regulatory database, files for nearby release sites, and/or historical documentation, to determine if potential vapor-phase migration concerns may be present which could impact the subject property.

Based on a review of available resources as documented in this report, AEI did not identify significant on-site concerns and/or regulated listings from nearby sites which suggest that a vapor-phase migration concern currently exists at the subject property.

6.0 INTERVIEWS AND USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

6.1 INTERVIEWS

Pursuant to ASTM E1527-13, the following interviews were performed during this assessment in order to obtain information indicating RECs in connection with the subject property.

6.1.1 OWNER AND KEY SITE MANAGER

Relation to Property	Name	Date Interviewed	Method of Contact	Year First Associated w/ Property	Notes
Owner/Owner Representative	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not interviewed; refer to Section 1.5
Key Site Manager	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No Key Site Manager identified

6.1.2 PAST OWNERS, OPERATORS, AND OCCUPANTS

AEI did not attempt to interview past owners, operators, and occupants of the subject property because information from these sources would likely be duplicative of information already obtained from other sources.

6.1.3 INTERVIEW WITH OTHERS

Information obtained during interviews with local government officials is incorporated into the appropriate segments of this section.

6.2 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

User provided information is intended to help identify the possibility of RECs in connection with the subject property. According to ASTM E1527-13 and the EPA Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312), certain items should be researched by the prospective landowner or grantee, and the results of such inquiries may be provided to the Environmental Professional. The responsibility for qualifying for LLPs by conducting the inquiries ultimately rests with the User, and providing the information to the Environmental Professional would be prudent if such information is available.

The User did not complete the ASTM User Questionnaire or provide the User information to AEI. AEI assumes that qualification for the LLPs is being established by the User in documentation outside of this assessment.

Question	Response/Comment
Environmental liens that are filed or recorded against the property (40 CFR 312.25) Did a search of recorded land title records (or judicial records where appropriate, see Note 1 below) identify any environmental liens filed or recorded against the property under federal, tribal, state or local law?	Information not provided

Question	Response/ Comment
<p>Activity and use limitations that are in place on the property or that have been filed or recorded against the property (40 CFR 312.26(a)(1)(v) and vi)).</p> <p>Did a search of recorded land title records (or judicial records where appropriate) identify any AULs, such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls that are in place at the property and/or have been filed or recorded against the property under federal, tribal, state or local law?</p>	Information not provided
<p>Specialized knowledge or experience of the person seeking to qualify for the LLP (40 CFR 312.28).</p> <p>As the User of this ESA do you have any specialized knowledge or experience related to the property or nearby properties? For example, are you involved in the same line of business as the current or former occupants of the property or an adjoining property so that you would have specialized knowledge of the chemicals and processes used by this type of business?</p>	Information not provided
<p>Relationship of the purchase price to the fair market value of the property if it were not contaminated (40 CFR 312.29).</p> <p>Does the purchase price being paid for this property reasonably reflect the fair market value of the property?</p>	Information not provided
<p>Commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property (40 CFR 312.30).</p> <p>Are you aware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property that would help the environmental professional to identify conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases? For example:</p> <p>(a.) Do you know the past uses of the property? (b.) Do you know of specific chemicals that are present or once were present at the property? (c.) Do you know of spills or other chemical releases that have taken place at the property? (d.) Do you know of any environmental cleanups that have taken place at the property?</p>	Information not provided
<p>The degree of obviousness of the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property, and the ability to detect the contamination by appropriate investigation (40 CFR 312.31).</p> <p>As the User of this ESA, based on your knowledge and experience related to the property, are there any obvious indicators that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property?</p>	Information not provided

6.3 PREVIOUS REPORTS AND OTHER PROVIDED DOCUMENTATION

Documentation was provided to AEI by Mr. Brian Matteoni, Broker during this assessment. A summary of this information follows:

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (967 Mabury Road), prepared by Property Solutions Inc. (December 22, 2009)

The report text and appendices A through E were provided to AEI for review.

When this assessment was conducted, the subject property was developed as it is currently, and occupied by Quest Diagnostics lab. The uses of the two sheds was not made clear.

No RECs were identified during the assessment.

One HREC was identified for the prior LUST case and UST removals. The report concluded that, "Based on the analytical results, an impact to soil and groundwater is confirmed to be present; however, the SFRWQCB was of the position that the remaining contamination does not pose a significant threat to beneficial uses of groundwater or to human health and the environment. In addition, the no further action indicated in the RACC letter was based on the current land use. Based on the RACC, the above is considered a HREC and no further investigation is warranted at this time."

A city of San Jose representative provided the consultant with two site maps showing the locations of the former USTs and hazardous materials storage areas associated with Control Data Corporation. The appendices in which the map was included was not provided to AEI.

ASTM non-scope concerns included the presence of presumed asbestos containing materials, which an O&M Plan was recommended for. Water stained ceiling tiles were observed and the consultant recommended the the source be repaired and the ceiling tiles replaced. The consultant also recommended that the remaining wells associated with the LUST case be property verified and closed in accordance with SFRWQCB requirements.

During the site reconnaissance, three ASTs were observed on the subject property; one 200-gallon diesel tank used in association with the emergency generator, and two ASTs of unknown capacity containing de-ionized water.

Observed hazardous materials on the subject property included typical cleaning chemicals and laboratory chemicals. No staining or evidence of mishandling was observed.

The User Questionnaire referenced a prior report, however this report was not appended. It appears this was a 1999 ESA performed by the same consultant.

Site Document Review (967 Mabury Road), prepared by GeoRestoration Inc. (May 19, 2014)

The text only was provided to AEI for review.

GeoRestoration Inc reviewed the 2009 Phase I and a 2010 Site Walk, where four of the five wells were located. It was presumed that MW-3 could not be located because it was beneath asphalt.

The report concluded that, "Based on the closure letter for soil and groundwater, the only remaining issues appear to be the abandoned well and the possibility of asbestos containing materials. The Phase I indicated that presumed or suspect asbestos containing materials should be managed and tested completely if any disturbance occurs. If pavement is removed in the area of MW-3 or the well is found, it should be properly destroyed."

Draft Purchase Agreement, (September 26, 2017)

The following items are noted:

- Vandalization of the building, including removal of copping wiring
- Lack of power to HVAC equipment
- Ponding of water in parking lot
- Exterior glazing leaks
- Noted history of storage tanks and monitoring wells
- ADA remediation work completed by previous tenant
- Vacant lab, previous tenant Quest Diagnostics failed to provide bleach cleaning of building. Contractor quote has been provided to buyer.

Note: If the above documents were not prepared by AEI, the information obtained was not verified for accuracy and a critique of the documents is beyond the scope of this assessment.

6.4 ENVIRONMENTAL LIEN SEARCH

In accordance with our approved scope of services, an environmental lien search was not performed as part of this assessment.

7.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

Site Reconnaissance Date	October 18, 2017
AEI Site Assessor	Natalie Vaughan
Property Escort(s)/ Relationship(s) to Property	Mr. John Smrdeli/Buyer
Units/Areas Observed	Interior and exterior areas of the commercial lab/office building and common areas
Area(s) not accessed and reason(s)	Sheds, due to lack of access. Refer to Section 1.5.

Feature	Observed on Subject Property (see Section 7.1)	Observed on Adjacent Property (see Section 7.2)
Regulated Hazardous Substances/Wastes and/or Petroleum Products in Connection with Property Use		
Aboveground/Underground Hazardous Substance or Petroleum Product Storage Tanks (ASTs/USTs)	✓	
Hazardous Substance and Petroleum Product Containers Not in Connection with Property Use		
Unidentified Substance Containers		
Electrical or Mechanical Equipment Likely to Contain Fluids	✓	
Interior Stains or Corrosion		
Strong, Pungent, or Noxious Odors		
Pools of Liquid		
Drains, Sumps, and Clarifiers	✓	
Pits, Ponds, and Lagoons		
Stained Soil or Pavement		
Stressed Vegetation		
Solid Waste Disposal or Evidence of Fill Materials		
Waste Water Discharges		
Wells		
Septic Systems		
Biomedical Wastes		
Other	✓	

7.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY RECONNAISSANCE FINDINGS

The subject property is currently a vacant lab/office building.

7.1.1 ABOVEGROUND/UNDERGROUND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE OR PETROLEUM PRODUCT STORAGE TANKS (ASTs/USTs)

AST(s)

Size (gallons)/ Contents	Location	Construction/ Secondary Containment	Product Piping (Aboveground/ Underground)
Two 1,000/Empty	Northeast corner of SP building	None	Unknown

According to the prior report, these ASTs were formerly used to store de-ionized water. Based on the former contents, the presence of the ASTs is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

7.1.2 ELECTRICAL OR MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT LIKELY TO CONTAIN FLUIDS

Toxic PCBs were commonly used historically in electrical equipment such as transformers, fluorescent lamp ballasts, and capacitors. According to United States EPA regulation 40 CFR Part 761, there are three categories for classifying such equipment: <50 ppm of PCBs is considered "Non-PCB"; between 50 and 500 ppm is considered "PCB-Contaminated"; and >500 ppm is considered "PCB-Containing". Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2605(e)(2)(A), the manufacture, process, or distribution in commerce or use of any polychlorinated biphenyl in any manner other than in a totally enclosed manner was prohibited after January 1, 1977.

Transformers

Type	Quantity	Owner	Presumed Date of Installation	Spills or Stains Observed (Yes/No)	Non-PCB Label (Yes/ No)
Pad-Mounted	1	Unknown	1968	No	No
Dry-Type	2	Unknown	1968	No	NO

The management of potential PCB-containing transformers is the responsibility of the local utility or the transformer owner. Actual material samples need to be collected to determine if transformers are PCB-containing.

Transformers installed prior to 1977 may be PCB containing while transformers installed after 1977 are unlikely to be PCB containing. Federal Regulations (40 CFR 761 Subpart G) require any release of material containing >50 ppm PCB and occurring after May 4, 1987, be cleaned up by the transformer owner following the United States EPA's PCB spill cleanup policy.

AEI did not observe evidence of spills, staining, or leaks on or around the pad-mounted transformer. Based on the good condition of the equipment, the pad-mounted transformer is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

AEI observed two dry-type transformers within the subject property building. Dry-type transformers do not utilize oils for dielectric fluid. Based on the absence of any oils, the presence of the dry-type transformers is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

7.1.3 DRAINS, SUMPS, AND CLARIFIERS

AEI observed several drains inside the subject property building. No significant stains were observed in the area of the drains, and no evidence of the improper discharge of hazardous materials or petroleum products was apparent. No storage of hazardous materials or petroleum

products appeared present near the drains. Based on these observations, the presence of the drains is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

7.1.4 OTHER

The subject property is equipped with an emergency generator. Approximately 200-gallons of diesel fuel is contained within the generator equipment (aboveground). No evidence of leaks or spills was observed at the base of the generator. Based on the good condition of the equipment, the presence of the emergency generator and associated diesel fuel is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

7.2 ADJACENT PROPERTY RECONNAISSANCE FINDINGS

No features of concern were observed on the adjacent properties.

8.0 NON-ASTM SERVICES

8.1 ASBESTOS-CONTAINING BUILDING MATERIALS

Asbestos is the name for a group of naturally occurring silicate minerals that can be separated into fibers. The fibers are strong, durable, and resistant to heat and fire. They are also long, thin and flexible, so they can even be woven into cloth. Because of these qualities, asbestos has been used in thousands of consumer, industrial, maritime, automotive, scientific and building products. During the 20th century, some 30 million tons of asbestos have been used in industrial sites, homes, schools, shipyards and commercial buildings in the United States. Commercial use of ACM began in the early 1900's and peaked in the period between 1940 and into the 1970's. Common ACMs include pipe-covering, insulating cement, insulating block, refractory and boiler insulation materials, transite board, fireproofing spray, joint compound, vinyl floor tile, ceiling tile, mastics, roofing products, and duct insulation for HVAC applications. Inhalation of asbestos fibers can result in deleterious health effects.

The potential for ACM was evaluated based the USEPA Guidance Document: Managing Asbestos in Place - A Building Owner's Guide to Operations and Maintenance Programs for Asbestos-Containing Materials (the Green Book). In 1973 the NESHAPS banned the use of most spray-applied surfacing ACM, specifically asbestos containing spray-on fireproofing and insulation. Subsequent revisions to this regulation in 1975 and 1978 effectively eliminated the use of friable pre-molded pipe, boiler, turbine, and duct insulation; and the spray application of friable asbestos-containing materials for all uses in buildings. In 1989 the EPA issued regulations to ban some asbestos-containing products and phase out most others over a multi-year period. The "Ban and Phase-Down" rule was challenged in court and the regulation remanded to the agency. As a result, any asbestos-containing products then "in commerce" would not be banned. Those not in commerce would be banned. Those materials "banned" could not be sold. It did not affect such materials already installed, or in use. Most US firms voluntarily ceased production of asbestos containing building materials not covered by the aforementioned Federal bans by the mid-1980's. In 1994, the OSHA determined that employers and building owners are required to treat installed thermal system installation and sprayed on and troweled-on surfacing materials, as well as vinyl or asphalt flooring material, as ACM in buildings constructed no later than 1980 until tested by laboratory analysis to prove otherwise.

The information below is for general informational purposes only and does not constitute an asbestos survey. In addition, the information is not intended to comply with federal, state or local regulations in regards to ACM.

Due to the age of the subject property building, there is a potential that ACMs are present. A limited list of typical suspect ACMs is included in the following table:

Material Type	Location
Plaster (acoustical and smooth)	Walls and ceilings
Ceiling tile	Ceiling systems
Thermal systems insulations, packings, and gaskets	Heating systems, cooling systems, domestic and heating and cooling piping, ductwork, and other equipment
Floor tile and associate mastics, flooring felts, and papers (under hardwood/other)	Floors
Vinyl sheet flooring and adhesives	Floors
Cove base and associated mastics	Walls
Ceramic tile adhesives and grouts	Walls, floors, and ceilings
All adhesives	Mirrors, wall coverings, construction, etc.
Grout and caulking	Windows and doors
Gypsum board, tape, and joint compound	Wall and ceiling systems
Insulation materials	Walls, ceilings, and attic spaces
Roofing materials (felts, rolled, shingle, flashings, adhesives, tar, and insulations)	Roof and parapet wall systems
Brick and block, mortars	Walls

All observed suspect ACMs at the subject property were in good condition at the time of the site reconnaissance and are not expected to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. In the event that building renovation or demolition activities are planned, a thorough asbestos survey is required in accordance with the EPA NESHAP 40 CFR Part 61 prior to demolition or renovation activities that may disturb suspect ACMs.

8.2 LEAD-BASED PAINT

Lead-based Paint (LBP) is defined as any paint, varnish, stain, or other applied coating that has ≥ 1 mg/cm² (5,000 µg/g or 5,000 ppm) or more of lead by federal guidelines; state and local definitions may differ from the federal definitions in amounts ranging from 0.5 mg/cm² to 2.0 mg/cm². Section 1017 of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Guidelines, Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, otherwise known as "Title X", defines a LBP hazard as "any condition that causes exposure to lead that would result in adverse human health effects" resulting from lead-contaminated dust, bare, lead-contaminated soil, and/or lead-contaminated paint that is deteriorated or present on accessible, friction, or impact surfaces. Therefore, under Title X, intact LBP on most walls and ceilings would not be considered a "hazard", although the paint should be maintained and its condition monitored to ensure that it does not deteriorate and become a hazard. Additionally, Section 1018 of this law directed HUD and EPA to require the disclosure of known information on LBP and LBP hazards before the sale or lease of most housing built before 1978. Most private housing, public housing, or federally owned or subsidized housing is affected by this rule.

LBP is defined as any paint with any detectable amount of lead present in it. It is important to note that LBP may create a lead hazard when being removed. The condition of these materials must be monitored when they are being disturbed. In the event LBP is subject to abrading, sanding, torching, and/or cutting during demolition or renovation activities, there may be regulatory issues that must be addressed.

The information below is for general informational purposes only and does not constitute a lead hazard evaluation. In addition, the information is not intended to comply with federal, state, or local regulations in regards to LBP.

In buildings constructed after 1978, it is unlikely that LBP is present. Structures built prior to 1978 and especially prior to the 1960s should be expected to contain LBP.

Due to the age of the subject property building, there is a potential that LBP is present. All observed painted surfaces were in good condition and are not expected to pose a health and safety concern to the occupants of the subject property at this time. Local regulations may apply to LBP in association with building demolition/renovations and worker/occupant protection. Actual material samples would need to be collected or an XRF survey performed in order to determine if LBP is present. It should be noted that construction activities that disturb materials or paints containing any amount of lead may be subject to certain requirements of the OSHA lead standard contained in 29 CFR 1910.1025 and 1926.62.

8.3 RADON

Radon is a naturally-occurring, odorless, and invisible gas. Natural radon levels vary and are closely related to geologic formations. Radon may enter buildings through basement sumps or other openings.

The United States EPA has prepared a map to assist National, State, and local organizations to target their resources and to implement radon-resistant building codes. The map divides the country into three radon zones, with Zone 1 being those areas with the average predicted indoor radon concentration in residential dwellings exceeding the EPA Action Limit of 4.0 pCi/L. It is important to note that the EPA has found homes with elevated levels of radon in all three zones, and the EPA recommends site specific testing in order to determine radon levels at a specific location. However, the map does give a valuable indication of the propensity of radon gas accumulation in structures.

Radon sampling was not requested as part of this assessment. According to the California Department of Health Services Radon Database, three tests were conducted for radon levels in the subject property zip code (95133) in 2010. All of these tests indicated that radon levels were below the action level of 4.0 pCi/L set forth by the US EPA. Therefore, radon is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern.

8.4 MOLD/INDOOR AIR QUALITY ISSUES

Molds are simple microscopic organisms which can often be seen in the form of discoloration, frequently green, gray, white, brown, or black. When excessive moisture or water accumulates indoors, mold growth may occur, particularly if the moisture problem remains undiscovered or unaddressed. As such, interior areas of buildings characterized by poor ventilation and high humidity are the most common locations of mold growth. Building materials, including drywall, wallpaper, baseboards, wood framing, insulation, and carpeting, often play host to such growth. Mold spores primarily cause health problems through the inhalation of spores or the toxins they emit when they are present in large numbers. This can occur when there is active mold growth within places where people live or work.

Mold, if present, may or may not visually manifest itself. Neither the individual completing this inspection, nor AEI has any liability for the identification of mold-related concerns except as defined in applicable industry standards. In short, this Phase I ESA should not be construed as a mold survey or inspection.

AEI observed interior areas of the subject property building in order to identify the presence of mold. During the on-site reconnaissance, the following obvious visible signs of mold growth or conditions conducive for suspect mold growth were observed:

Location	Material Affected
Prior lab area	Stained floor tiles
Prior office area	Ceiling tiles
Surrounding outdoor patio	Carpet

Please refer to the appendices for related photographs.

Although typically not included in the scope of work for a Phase I ESA, the presence of the suspect mold identified may pose a health and safety concern to any subsequent occupants and/or construction workers during future renovation activities. Based upon our observations, AEI recommends a mold and water intrusion assessment for the subject property.

In order to assist on-site staff with proper methods of mold growth evaluation and remediation, as well as proper training for on-site maintenance personnel, it would be prudent for the property owner to implement a Mold/Moisture Plan (MMP).

This activity was not designed to discover all areas which may be affected by mold growth on the subject property. Rather, it is intended to give the client an indication if significant (based on observed areas) mold growth is present at the subject property. Potential areas of mold growth, such as in pipe chases, HVAC systems, and behind enclosed walls and ceilings, were not observed as part of this limited assessment.

9.0 SIGNATURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONALS

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in §312.10 of 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 have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Prepared By:



Natalie Vaughan
Project Manager

Reviewed By:



Katie Hindt, REPA
Senior Author

10.0 REFERENCES

Item	Date(s)	Source
Soils Information	Accessed October 2017	USDA Web Soil Survey http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx
Topographic Map	2015	USGS, San Jose West
Depth to Groundwater Information	January 22, 1997	Case Closure Letter for subject property
Aerial Photographs	1939-2008 (non-inclusive)	Environmental First Search and www.HistoricAerials.com
Sanborn Map Report/Search	October 11, 2017	EDR
City Directories	1922-2014 (non-inclusive)	EDR and prior report
Environmental Health Department/ State Environmental Agency	October 11, 2017	Santa Clara County Environmental Health Department
Fire Department	October 12, 2017	San Jose Fire Department
Building Department	October 12, 2017	San Jose Building Department
Planning Department	October 12, 2017	San Jose Planning Department
Assessor's Information and Parcel Map	October 11, 2017	Santa Clara County Assessor's Office
Other Agencies Searched	October 11-20, 2017	SWRCB Geotracker, DTSC HWTS, and DTSC Envirostor databases, DTSC Berkeley Office FOIA
Oil and Gas Wells	October 11, 2017	California Department of Conservation's Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources
Oil and Gas Pipelines	October 11, 2017	NPMS Public Map Viewer https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/PublicViewer/composite.jsf
Regulatory Database Report	October 11, 2017	EDR
Previous Reports	December 22, 2009 May 19, 2014	<i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (967 Mabury Road)</i> , prepared by Property Solutions <i>Site Document Review (967 Mabury Road)</i> , prepared by GeoRestoration Inc.
PSA	2017	Client-provided
Radon Zone Information	2010	DHS Radon Database

APPENDIX A

FIGURES

