

ATTACHMENT 1

APPROVED: March 11, 2019

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION

February 12, 2019

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Aranda called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Members present:

Chairperson Aranda introduced the newly appointed Planning Commissioner Carbajal and invited her to lead everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Chairperson Aranda Commissioner Carbajal Commissioner Ybarra

Staff:

Richard L. Adams, II City Attorney Wayne Morrell, Director of Planning Cuong Nguyen, Senior Planner Laurel Reimer, Planning Consultant Vince Velasco, Planning Consultant Jimmy Wong, Planning Consultant Claudia Jimenez, Planning Intern

Members absent:

Commissioner Arnold Commissioner Jimenez (Excused)

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS None

5. MINUTES To be approved at the Planning Commission Regular Meeting of March 11, 2019

6. PUBLIC HEARING

Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration Tentative Parcel Map Case No. 82566 Development Plan Approval Case No. 963 Modification Permit (MOD) Case No. 1310

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Open the Public Hearing and receive any comments from the public regarding Tentative Parcel Map Case No. 82566, Development Plan Approval Case No. 963, Modification Permit Case No. 1310 and related Environmental Documents, thereafter, close the Public Hearing; and
- Find and determine that the proposed project will not be detrimental to persons or properties in the surrounding area or to the City in general, and will be in conformance with the overall purpose and objective of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and program of the City's General Plan; and
- Find that the Tentative Parcel Map Case No. 82566 meets the standards set forth in Sections 66474 and 66474.6 of the Subdivision Map Act for the granting of a tentative or final map; and
- Find that the applicant's request meets the criteria set forth in §154.07 of the Subdivision Regulations for the granting of a tentative or final map; and
- Find that the applicant's request meets the criteria set forth in §155.695 and §155.696 of the Zoning Regulations, for the granting of a Modification Permit; and
- Find that the applicant's request meets the criteria set forth in §155.739 of the Zoning Regulations for the granting of a Development Plan Approval; and
- Approve and adopt the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration with Traffic Study which, based on the findings of the Initial Study, indicates that although potential significant effects on the environment have been identified, revisions in the project plan or proposal made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects on the environment would occur, and there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- Approve the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project; and
- Approve Tentative Parcel Map Case No. 82566, Development Plan Approval Case No. 963; and Modification Permit Case No. 1310, subject to the conditions of approval as contained with Resolution No. 112-2019; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 112-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

Chair Aranda called upon Planning Consultant Jimmy Wong to present Item No. 6 before the Planning Commission. Present in the audience was the Developer and the Applicant's Environmental Consultant to answer any questions the commissioners and audience may have.

Chair Aranda called upon the Commissioners for questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Ybarra commented that the property is overdue for development and inquired about the 8' high wrought iron fence. He would like to know if the fence will be see through or screened. Jimmy stated at this point, he doesn't know for sure; however, it would need to meet standards. Commissioner Ybarra commented that see through would be nice/preferred.

Jimmy Wong stepped up to the podium to announce that staff received a letter at City Hall on February 12, after the review period was over. The letter had been presented to

all the commissioners and will be made part of the records.

Chair Aranda opened the Public Hearing and asked if the applicant would like to approach the podium to address the Planning Commission. Mr. Hoonie Kang, the developer's representative, approached the podium to answer questions and comments. There were no questions or comments; therefore, Mr. Kang was excused.

Chair Aranda asked if anyone present in the audience wished to speak on this matter. Jordan Sisson from the law firm Lozeau Drury approached the podium. He raised concerns about two warehouse projects being developed simultaneously, catty corner from each other, and in his opinion, without a full vetting of Environmental Impact. The environmental attorney felt that an EIR is necessary to disclose and analyze whether the MND has flaws or red flagged. He urged the commissioners to vote no; furthermore, he requested to be notified via USPS and e-mail of any upcoming environmental public notices.

Another representative, Eric Shaw, who represent four of the seven property owners north of this property, had issues with DPA 963 & MOD 1310. He raised concerns and brought up an example of Goodman Development on Bloomfield. Eric felt that location should have more dense trees coverage, some artwork and walking and additional landscape near walkway and setbacks. Furthermore, he wants to ensure that the cell tower, next to the railroad tracks, when the development is completed, that it doesn't interfere with the cell tower.

Chair Aranda offered the Environmental Consultant to rebuttal first. Environmental Consultant Officer Bryan Hamilton with Blodgett Baylosis stepped up to the podium. Bryan stated that his team fully and thoroughly vetted and confirmed the lead agency, which is the City of Santa Fe Springs, did performed due diligence to a level less than significant, 10,000 metric ton per year threshold project air emission. Both sites 3 & 4 were identified as different project.

Next up is the Developer representative, Hoonie Kang, who stepped up as the second applicant representative to rebuttal. Hoonie stated that the applicant is providing more landscape than is required by code. All active wells will have screen around them, in addition to the wrought iron fence. There will be a joint use area as well as exclusive use area since Maverick continue to need access for their truck. Per Hoonie, the intent at this time is to make the wrought iron fence a see through.

Commissioner Ybarra inquired whether there will be a sidewalk along Telegraph Road, Jimmy Wong showed a rendering in the presentation depicting a sidewalk, heading east on Telegraph.

Commissioner Carbajal inquired about site 1 & 2, whether there are plans for those two sites to be developed. Director of Planning, Mr. Morrell, stated that he's been with the City for 29 years and the subject of site 1 & 2 has never been brought up. Rick with CBRE stated that he's been working on this property for approximately 20 years now and identified site 1 as located on the n/w corner of Shoemaker & Florence. Site 2 is along Bloomfield.

Commissioner Carbajal also inquired about the art fees. Director Morrell said that it is up to the developer on whether they choose to do a public art piece or pay the 1% developer's fees. It's one or the other.

Chairperson Aranda closed the Public Hearing and requested a motion and second for Item No. 6.

It was moved by Commissioner Ybarra with the condition that the fence be see through and to add in the conditional use. Staff requested amendment to remove Condition 16 by attaching the letter that was handed out to the Commissioners earlier. It was seconded by Commissioner Carbajal for the Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration, to approve Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) Case No. 82566, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case No. 963, and Modification Permit (MOD) Case Nos. 1310, and the recommendations regarding these matters, which passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes:Aranda, Carbajal, and YbarraNayes:NoneAbsent:Arnold and Jimenez

City Attorney Richard L. Adams read the City's appeal process to inform the Planning Commission and public.

7. PUBLIC HEARING

Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567 Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962 Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 Pagammendation: That the Planning Commission:

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Open the Public Hearing and receive any comments from the public regarding Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567; Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962; Zone Change Case No. 138; and related Environmental Documents; and thereafter close the Public Hearing. and
- Find and determine that the proposed project will not be detrimental to persons or properties in the surrounding area or to the City in general, and will be in conformance with the overall purpose and objective of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and program of the City's General Plan; and
- Find that the Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 meets the standards set forth in Sections 66474 and 66474.6 of the Subdivision Map Act for the granting of a tentative or final map; and
- Find that the applicant's DOA requests meet the criteria set forth in §155.739 of the City's Zoning Regulations, for the granting of a Development Plan Approval; and
- Find that Zone Change Case No. 138 satisfies the criteria and conditions set forth in Section §155.829 et seq. of the City Code for the granting of a Change of Zone request and thus, recommend that the City Council approve said Change of Zone; and

- Approve and adopt the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration which, based on the findings of the initial study, indicates that although potential significant effects on the environment have been identified, revisions in the project plan or proposal made by, or agreed to by, the applicant, would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects on the environment would occur, and there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- Approve the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project; and
- Approve the Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567; Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962; and Zone Change Case No. 138, subject to the conditions of approval as contained with the Resolution No. 114-2019; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 114-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

Chair Aranda called upon Planning Consultant Vince Velasco to present Item No. 7 before the Planning Commission.

Chair Aranda called upon the Commissioners for questions and/or comments. Commissioner Carbajal inquired if there was a traffic study done on the impact on Telegraph Road. Chair Aranda asked for clarification if it's true that the Telegraph Road driveway is not accessible to truck and it was confirmed to be true.

Chair Aranda opened the Public Hearing and asked if the applicant would like to approach the podium to address the Planning Commission. Hoonie Kang stepped up to the podium to answer question, there being no questions/comments, Mr. Kang stepped down.

Jordan Sisson on behalf of Lozeau Drury stepped up to the podium for a rebuttal. He contends we don't know who the future tenants will be, it could be a fulfillment center such as Amazon. He stated that we need to notify the public more than 20 days in advance and only file MMD upon final appeal. He asserted that we don't have an EIR here, only MND.

Environmental Consultant Marc Blodgett, of Blodgett Baylosis, rebutted with respect to item #1 of Lozeau Drury rebuttal. Marc stated we do not agree with the fulfillment assessment. The floor area is nowhere near the square footage of a fulfillment center; furthermore, it is not designed for a large fulfillment center or warehouse. Amazon is not a true comparison. As for rebuttal #2 from Mr. Sisson, of Lozeau Drury, Marc said that it only has 4 pages dealing with greenhouse gas and those variables can be easily duplicated. As to the reference of fragmenting projects due to geographical locations, they are different. One is a single building and the other is a series of seven (7) buildings. Site 4 is tailored to that and the traffic impact, air quality and noise is well below the threshold that AQMD use of significant impact. Marc also doesn't agree with the assertion to not file a NOD until appeal. He reiterated that the City need to file NOD within the 5-day period. Marc stated that Bryan Hamilton is the principal author for site 4 and Marc is the principal author for site 3. Marc said that should the property remain in its present state, it would be a major concern in the absence of development. Mr. Blodgett also said that an EIR is not done because it is not warranted.

Vince wish to reiterate that every tenant would be required to come before the Planning Department for a business license and will be vetted then for condition of use.

City Attorney, Richard Adams II, suggested making a motion to move staff recommendations. Additionally, he suggested staff mail and/or e-mail the attorney representing Lozeau Drury, the public hearing notices regarding this project from this point on.

There being no one wishing to speak and having no further questions, Chair Aranda closed the Public Hearing and requested a motion and second for Item No. 7.

It was motioned by Commissioner Ybarra to move staff recommendations and he also thanked the developer for bringing this to our City. Commissioner Carbajal seconded, which passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes:Aranda, Carbajal, and YbarraNayes:NoneAbsent:Arnold and Jimenez

City Attorney Richard L. Adams read the City's appeal process to inform the Planning Commission and public.

8. PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Categorically Exempt – CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1</u> <u>Conditional Use Permit Case No. 789</u>

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Open the Public Hearing and receive any comments from the public regarding Conditional Use Permit Case No. 789, and thereafter close the Public Hearing; and
- Find and determine that pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1 (Existing Facilities), of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is categorically Exempt, and
- Find and determine that the proposed project will not be detrimental to persons or properties in the surrounding area or to the City in general, and will be in conformance with the overall purpose and objective of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the City's General Plan; and
- Find that the applicant's CUP request meets the criteria set forth in §155.716 of the Zoning Regulations for the granting of a Conditional Use Permit; and
- Approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 789, subject to the conditions of approval as contained with Resolution No. 115-2018; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 115-2018, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

Chair Aranda called upon Planning Consultant Laurel Reimer to present Item No. 8 before the Planning Commission. The applicant representative, Jeremy Seagal is here on behalf of AT&T to answer any questions or comments.

Chair Aranda called upon the Commissioners for questions and/or comments.

Commissioner Ybarra commented that the palm fronds look real. Ms. Reimer agreed that they are looking better. Chair Aranda commented that he didn't see the support building. Laurel commented it's there but difficult to see unless you know what to look at. She said if you look closely, there's a ramp underneath the equipment room.

Chair Aranda opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to approach the podium to address the Planning Commission. Jeremy said that the tech paints the equipment to match the prongs and that they will add 12 prongs to make it fuller.

There being no one wishing to speak and having no further questions, Chair Aranda closed the Public Hearing and requested a motion and second for Item No. 8.

It was motioned by Commissioner Ybarra and seconded by Commissioner Carbajal, which passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes:Aranda, Carbajal, and YbarraNayes:NoneAbsent:Arnold and Jimenez

City Attorney Richard L. Adams read the City's appeal process to inform the Planning Commission and public.

9. PUBLIC HEARING

Adoption of Negative Declaration

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 792

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Open the Public Hearing and receive any comments from the public regarding Conditional Use Permit Case No. 792 and the related Environmental Document; and
- Find and determine that the proposed project will not be detrimental to persons or properties in the surrounding area or to the City in general, and will be in conformance with the overall purpose and objective of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the City's General Plan; and
- Find that the Negative Declaration, based on the findings of the Initial Study, indicates that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant adverse effect on the environmental; and
- Find that the applicant's CUP request meets the criteria set forth in §155.379(B), §155.384 (C), and §155.716 of the Zoning Regulations, for the granting of a Conditional Use Permit; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 113-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter; and
- Recommend that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 9621, to approve and adopt the proposed Negative Declaration and to approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 792 subject to the conditions of approval as contained within Resolution No. 9621; and
- Recommend that the City Council adopt Ordinance No. 1099, to approve a development agreement by and between the City of Santa Fe Springs and General Outdoor Advertising.

Chair Aranda called upon Planning Consultant Laurel Reimer to present Item No. 9 before the Planning Commission.

Chair Aranda called upon the Commissioners for questions and/or comments. Commissioner Ybarra inquired about lighting. Commissioner Carbajal inquired about the City receiving income from the billboards...

Chair Aranda opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to approach the podium to address the Planning Commission. Rod Lynch of General Outdoor Advertising went up to the podium to answer questions or comments.

There being no one wishing to speak and having no further questions, Chair Aranda closed the Public Hearing and requested a motion and second for Item No. 9.

It was motioned by Commissioner Ybarra and seconded by Commissioner Carbajal, which passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Aranda, Carbajal, and Ybarra Naves: None

Absent: Arnold and Jimenez

City Attorney Richard L. Adams read the City's appeal process to inform the Planning Commission and public.

10. NEW BUSINESS

Modification Permit Case No. 1309

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Find that the proposed project, if conducted in strict compliance with the conditions of approval, will be harmonious with adjoining properties and surrounding uses in the area and will be in conformance with the overall purposes and objectives of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the City's General Plan; and
- Find that the applicant's Modification Permit request meets the criteria set forth in Section 155.695 of the City's Zoning Regulation for the granting of a Modification in nonresidential zones; and
- Find that pursuant to Section 15311, Class 11 (Construction or placement of minor structures accessory to existing facilities), of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is, therefore, considered to be Categorically Exempt; and
- Approve Modification Permit Case No. 1309, subject to the conditions of approval as contained within approval as contained with Resolution No. 111-2019; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 111-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

Chair Aranda called upon Senior Planner Cuong Nguyen to present Item No. 10 before the Planning Commission. The Planning Department is recommended to allow Santa Fe Auto Salvage to maintain the sign, although at 30" it is larger than the 24" allowed. Applicant George Gonzalez is in the audience to answer any questions or comments.

Having no questions or comments, Chair Aranda requested a motion and second for Item

No. 10.

It was moved by Commissioner Carbajal, seconded by Commissioner Ybarra to approve for the sign to stay as is, which passed by the following vote:

Ayes:Aranda, Carbajal and YbarraNayes:NoneAbsent:Arnold & Jimenez

CONSENT ITEMS

11. CONSENT ITEMS

Consent Agenda items are considered routine matters which may be enacted by one motion and roll call vote. Any item may be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately by the Planning Commission.

A. CONSENT ITEM

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 738-2

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Find that the continued operation and maintenance of a non-profit trade school, if conducted in strict compliance with the conditions of approval, will be harmonious with adjoining properties and surrounding uses in the area and will be in conformance with the overall purposes and objectives of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies, and programs of the City's General Plan.
- Require that Conditional Use Permit Case No. 738, be subject to a compliance review in five (5) years, on or before August 10, 2023, to ensure that the use is still operating in strict compliance with the conditions of approval as contained within this staff report.

B. CONSENT ITEM

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 756-3

Recommendation: That the Planning Commission:

- Find that the continued operation and maintenance of a service station and convenience market, if conducted in strict compliance with the conditions of approval, will be harmonious with adjoining properties and surrounding uses in the area and will be in conformance with the overall purposes and objectives of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies, and programs of the City's General Plan; and
- Require that Conditional Use Permit Case No. 756-3 be subject to a compliance review in five (5) years, on or before January 14, 2024, to ensure the use is still operating in strict compliance with the conditions of approval as contained within this staff report.

Chair Aranda requested a motion and second to move both Consent Items 11A & 11B to the March 11, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.

It was moved by Commissioner Ybarra, seconded by Commissioner Carbajal, which passed by the following vote:

Ayes:Aranda, Carbajal and YbarraNayes:NoneAbsent:Arnold and Jimenez

12. PRESENTATION

Planning Highlights of 2018

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioners:

Chair Aranda once again welcomed Commissioner Francis Carbajal on being newly appointed to the Planning Commission.

Staff:

Cuong explained and enunciated the correct pronunciation of his first and last name. The enunciation of his first and last name sounds nothing like the way it should be; however, he stuck with it because it's been mispronounced so many variety of ways. The Commissioners joked that we should stick to referring to Cuong as "Hey You".

Richard Adams introduced Carmen Vasquez, an associate from Jones and Mayer to the Planning Commission and staff. Ms. Vasquez resides in Downey and may assist Richard with the legal process.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Aranda adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

Ralph Aranda Chairperson

ATTEST:

Wayne Morrell Acting Planning Secretary

11-19

Date

City of Santa Fe Springs



Special Planning Commission Meeting

February 12, 2019

PUBLIC HEARING

Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567 Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962 Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138

TPM No. 82567: A request for approval to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979), into a single parcel measuring ±8.68 acres;

DPA Case Nos. 957-962: A request for approval to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue;

ZC Case No. 138: A request for approval to change the zoning designation of an 8.68-acre site, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay).

The project site is located at 10075 – 10095 Romandel Avenue and 12015 – 12085 Telegraph Road, within the M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, Zone. (PPF Industrial, LLC)

*The Building Official has assigned the following addresses: 10075 Romandel Avenue (Building 1), 10085 Romandel Avenue (Building 2), 10095 Romandel Avenue (Building 3), 12015 Telegraph Road (Building 4), 12051 Telegraph Road (Building 5), and 12085 Telegraph Road (Building 6).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- Open the Public Hearing and receive any comments from the public regarding Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567; Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962; Zone Change Case No. 138; and related Environmental Documents, and thereafter, close the Public Hearing; and
- Find and determine that the proposed project will not be detrimental to persons or properties in the surrounding area or to the City in general, and will be in conformance with the overall purpose and objective of the Zoning Regulations and consistent with the goals, policies and program of the City's General Plan; and

RECOMMENDATIONS (Cont.)

- Find that Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 meets the standards set forth in Sections 66474 and 66474.6 of the Subdivision Map Act for the granting of a tentative or final map; and
- Find that the applicant's DPA requests meet the criteria set forth in §155.739 of the City's Zoning Regulations, for the granting of a Development Plan Approval; and
- Find that Zone Change Case No. 138 satisfies the criteria and conditions set forth in Section 155.829 et seq. of the City Code for the granting of a Change of Zone request and thus, recommend that the City Council approve said Change of Zone; and
- Approve and adopt the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration which, based on the findings of the initial study, indicates that although potential significant effects on the environment have been identified, revisions in the project plan or proposal made by, or agreed to by, the applicant, would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects on the environment would occur, and there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- Approve the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project; and
- Approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567; Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962; and Zone Change Case No. 138, subject to the conditions of approval as contained with Resolution No. 114-2019; and
- Adopt Resolution No. 114-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

GENERAL INFORMATION

- Α. Applicant: PPF Industrial, LLC 1875 Century Park East, Suite 380 Los Angeles, CA 90067 310.203.1844 dbroder@Kearny.com Β. Property Owner: PPF Industrial, LLC 1875 Century Park East, Suite 380 Los Angeles, CA 90067 310.203.1844 dbroder@Kearny.com Subject Property: 10075-10095 Romandel Avenue & C.
- Report Submitted By: Vince Velasco Planning and Development Department

		12015-12085 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
D. E.	Existing Zone: General Plan:	M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) Industrial
F.	CEQA Recommendation:	Mitigated Negative Declaration
G.	Hearing Date:	February 12, 2019
H.	Staff Contact:	Vince Velasco, Planning Consultant vincevelasco@santafesprings.org Phone: (562)-868-0511 Ext 7353

LOCATION / BACKGROUND

The subject property, located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue, is comprised of twenty-eight (28) parcels, measuring 378,288 sq. ft. (8.68 acres). The property is currently zoned M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) and is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located throughout the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment. Industrial uses are located to the north and east of the property, while the properties to the north, south, and west are occupied by additional oil production activities.

The applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, is proposing to construct six (6) new concrete tiltup industrial buildings on the subject property. In accordance with the City's Zoning Regulations, a Development Plan Approval is required for the construction of all new buildings. It should be noted that the applicant is concurrently requesting consideration and approval for a Tentative Parcel Map, to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) parcels that make up the subject property into one parcel and a Zone Change, to change the zoning designation of the 8.68-acre site, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project requires approval of the following entitlements:

Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 82567) – A request for approval to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979), into a single parcel measuring ±8.68 acres;

Development Plan Approvals (DPA 957-962) – A request for approval to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue;

Zone Change (ZC 138) – A request for approval to change the zoning designation of an 8.68-acre property, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay).

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map will effectively consolidate the twenty-eight (28) parcels that currently make-up the subject site. As shown in the attached plans, the Tentative Parcel Map will involve the removal of existing common property lines, resulting in a single parcel measuring 8.68 acres.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962

As stated previously, the applicant is requesting approval to allow the construction of six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue.

<u>Site Plan</u>

The applicant is proposing to construct six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue. The proposed industrial buildings will be setback a minimum 30' from the front property line along Romandel Avenue and a minimum 46'-9" from the front property line along Telegraph Road. The proposed development will provide a 30' wide driveway along Telegraph Road and a 98'-3" wide driveway along Romandel Avenue for ingress and egress. Parking for the subject property is distributed evenly throughout the property.

The building sizes are as follows:

Building 1 – 16,980 sq. ft. Building 2 – 13,582 sq. ft. Building 3 – 28,500 sq. ft. Building 4 – 17,770 sq. ft. Building 5 – 22,679 sq. ft. Building 6 – 16,290 sq. ft.

Floor Plan

Each of the floor plans indicate that the proposed industrial buildings will measure 13,582 - 28,500 sq. ft., with 1,100 - 2,500 sq. ft. designated as first floor office area, 1,100 - 2,500 sq. ft. designated as office mezzanine, and the remaining

	Warehouse	1 st Floor Office	Mezzanine	Total
Building 1	13,680 sq. ft.	1,650 sq. ft.	1,650 sq. ft.	16,980 sq. ft.
Building 2	11,382 sq. ft.	1,100 sq. ft.	1,100 sq. ft.	13,582 sq. ft.
Building 3	23,500 sq. ft.	2,500 sq. ft.	2,500 sq. ft.	28,500 sq. ft.
Building 4	14,570 sq. ft.	1,600 sq. ft.	1,600 sq. ft.	17,770 sq. ft.
Building 5	18,679 sq. ft.	2,000 sq. ft.	2,000 sq. ft.	22,679 sq. ft.
Building 6	13,390 sq. ft.	1,450 sq. ft.	1,450 sq. ft.	16,290 sq. ft.

11,382 – 23,500 sq. ft. designated for warehouse/manufacturing use.

Elevations

The elevations indicate that the proposed industrial buildings will have a contemporary design. Each entry to the office areas are provided with extensive glazing, color variation, height variation, recessed walls, and materials used. The remaining elevations have also been provided with a combination of the aforementioned architectural treatments, resulting in an aesthetically pleasing building.

Landscape Requirement

For maximum value, the majority of the landscaping will be provided along the setback areas that adjoins the two street frontages (Telegraph Road & Romandel Avenue). Additionally, as required by the Code, the applicant will landscape at least 6% of the parking area. The minimum landscape requirement for the project, based on the overall street frontage of 617' and 44,733 sq. ft. of parking area is 18,683 sq. ft. According to the conceptual landscape plan, the applicant will be providing an overall total of 75,382 sq. ft. of landscaping throughout the site. The project, therefore, exceeds the minimum requirement set forth in the City's Zoning Regulation.

Parking Requirements

A total of 263 parking stalls will be provided for the six (6) new buildings. As proposed, the project is required to provide a total of 187 parking stalls.

1 stall per 500 sq. ft. for the first 40,000 sq. ft. = 80 stalls, 1 stall per 750 sq. ft. for the next 60,000 sq. ft. = 80 stalls, and 1 stall per 1000 for the remaining 99,999 sq. ft. = 16 stalls. In addition, 1 stall per 300 sq. ft. for the 3,230 sq. ft. of office area above 15% = 11 stalls.

The proposed project, therefore, exceeds the minimum parking requirements set forth by the City's zoning regulations.

Loading/ Roll Up Doors

According to the plan, the proposed buildings will have a total of five (5) loading doors and seventeen (17) dock high doors, throughout the subject property. All loading doors are strategically placed so that they will not be directly visible from Telegraph Road or Romandel Avenue. As mentioned previously, Buildings 1, 2, and 5 are configured with the dock doors facing Romandel Avenue. Staff, however, believes that visibility of said doors will be limited. Building 1 dock doors will only be visible by persons driving westbound on Romandel Avenue and proposed landscaping should reduce most of the visibility. In addition, Buildings 2 and 5 are approximately 200-500 feet away from Romandel Avenue and therefore, the dock doors are not a focal point when traveling in either direction.

Per the City's Zoning Regulations, all off-street truck loading areas, zones, ramps, doors, wells, or docks shall be designed to provide and maintain a minimum unobstructed area of 120' to allow for proper truck maneuvering on-site. According to the site plan, the proposed design will provide the required unobstructed area in all necessary locations.

Trash Enclosures

According to the site plan, five (5) 6' high (\pm 192 sq. ft.) trash enclosures will be located throughout the subject property. The proposed trash enclosures are strategically placed in areas that will not be visible or accessible to the public.

Planned Development Overlay

As stated previously, the proposed rezoning will result in a Planned Development Overlay. The intent of the Overlay is to allow variety and flexibility, while at the same time, maintaining high standards of design and quality of improvements. The proposed project does involve deviations from the development standards set forth in the underlying M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, Zone. The deviations for this particular project are to allow several truck loading doors to be visible from a public street, to not provide the required landscape setback area along Telegraph Road, and to allow a 3'-5" reduction of the required front yard setback along Romandel Avenue for Building 3.

Truck Loading Doors:

Due to a Joint Use Agreement between the buyer, PPF Industrial, LLC, and the existing oil well operator, Breitburn-Maverick, the potential configuration of building placement and orientation for the subject property are extremely limited. As a result, Buildings 1, 2, and 5 will each have truck loading doors that front onto a public street without the required screening. Again, this is the direct result of the Joint Use Agreement, which limits the placement of buildings. In order to allow this deviation

from the City's Zoning Regulations, staff has considered the street in which the dock doors will be visible, the level of visibility, and the extensive detail of architectural treatments given to the proposed buildings. As proposed, the aforementioned buildings will have limited visibility from Romandel Avenue, which is not a "Major" or "Secondary" arterial. The subject property is located on a 90 degree curve along Romandel Avenue, and therefore, visibility of the buildings is severely limited. In addition, Building 2 is approximately 270' from Romandel Avenue and Building 5 is approximately 450' from Romandel Avenue. At these extended distances, the aesthetic impacts are significantly reduced. Furthermore, the architect has applied an extensive amount of glazing, color variation, height variation, recessed areas, and has uniquely incorporated an Arizona tile known as Aequa Cirrus into the overall design. Specifically, the Aequa Cirrus will be used within, or directly adjacent to, the truck loading areas for the aforementioned buildings, which is not commonly seen for most industrial projects.

Landscape Setback:

As previously mentioned, the proposed project will include a Joint Use Agreement between PPF Industrial, LLC and Breitburn-Maverick to ensure that the existing oil well operations remain unchanged and proper maintenance may occur as needed. In accordance with Section 155.260(E) of the City's Zoning Regulations, the proposed project shall landscape the entire area between Building 5 and the front property line along Telegraph Road. However, as proposed, a 26' wide fire lane and an approximately 195' wide gap within the required landscape setback along Telegraph Road, which will be reserved within the Joint Use Agreement to service and maintain Well #843-E.

To justify allowing this deviation, staff has considered the area in which the landscaping will not be provided. This area will be at a higher grade level than the vehicles traveling along Telegraph Road and, therefore, have restricted visibility. In addition, it has been conditioned that the applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, request for the installation of grasscrete from Brietburn Maveriack within this area, with exception to the 26' wide fire lane. Grasscrete is a pervious concrete that is covered with grass, thus, will serve as an acceptable replacement of traditional landscaping in this specific area.

Also, in accordance with Section 155.260(C), a 20' wide landscape setback along Telegraph Road may be allowed when adjacent to an on-site parking area. It should be noted that the project will be in conformance to this zoning requirement as they have provided a 21'-3" wide landscape setback in front of Building 6.

Front Yard Setback:

Pursuant to Section 155.248 of the City's Zoning Regulations, the front yard setback required for M-2 zoned properties is 20', unless the property fronts onto a major or secondary highway, which then requires a minimum setback of 30'.

Nevertheless, a property containing a building with a height greater than the minimum front yard setback distance shall be provided with a setback at a ratio of one foot for each foot of the building, or portion thereof. As proposed, the minimum setback along Romandel Avenue should be 33.5', based on the proposed building height.

The areas of the building which exceed the front yard setback requirement are simply architectural features and do not increase the overall square footage of the building. Therefore, by requiring that the entire building be setback 33'-6", this discourages the architectural features used to enhance the building's design and curb appeal.

ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138

As part of their request, the applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Change (ZC) to change the zoning designation of the 8.68-acre site, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay).

The proposed Zone Change is to allow variety and flexibility to the City's Zoning Regulations in order to improve the subject 8.68-acre site, which has never been developed due to existing and on-going oil production activities. In exchange for the Planned Development Overlay, the applicant has provided a project of high standards of design and quality of improvements. It should be noted that, as set forth by Section 155.328 of the City's Zoning Regulations, the project will exceed the minimum 5-acre requirement.

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

The subject site is located on the south side of Romandel Avenue and the north side of Telegraph Road. Romandel Avenue is designated as a "Local" arterial and Telegraph Road is designated as a "Major" arterial, within the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan.

ZONING AND LAND USE

The subject property is currently zoned M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, with a general plan land use designation of "Industrial". In conjunction with the subject TPM and DPA request, the applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, to M-2-PD, Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay. The Zoning, General Plan and Land Use of the surrounding properties are shown in "Table 1" on the following page:

Direction	Zoning District	General Plan	Land Use			
North	M-2	Industrial	10207 Freeman Avenue – Electrical contracting (Anthony Electric/RGA Electric) 10140 Romandel Avenue – Ceramics and stone (Forever Tile & Stone)			
South	M-2	Industrial	12720 Telegraph Road – Vacant			
East	M-2	Industrial	12828 Romandel Avenue – Manufacturing cable products (Windy City Wire and Cable) 12803 Telegraph Road – Warehou (Globegistics Inc.)			
West	M-2	Industrial	10051 Romandel Avenue – Vacant			

Table 1
General Plan Consistency Analysis

LEGAL NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

This matter was set for Public Hearing in accordance with the requirements of Sections 65090 and 65091 of the State Planning, Zoning and Development Laws and the requirements of Sections 155.860 through 155.864 of the City's Municipal Code.

Legal notice of the Public Hearing for the proposed project was sent by first class mail to all property owners whose names and addresses appear on the latest County Assessor's Roll within 500 feet of the exterior boundaries of the subject property on February 1, 2019. The legal notice was also posted in Santa Fe Springs City Hall, the City Library and the City's Town Center kiosk on February 1, 2019, and published in a newspaper of general circulation (Whittier Daily News) February 1, 2019, as required by the State Zoning and Development Laws and by the City's Zoning Regulations. As of the date of this report, staff has not received any comments and/or inquiries regarding the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The environmental analysis provided in the Initial Study indicates that the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse immitigable impacts on the environment, therefore, the City caused to be prepared and proposed to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed project. The MND reflects the independent judgment of the City of Santa Fe Springs, and the environmental consultant, Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning.

Phases in the Environmental Review Process:

The implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) entails three separate phases:

- 1. The first phase consists of preliminary review of a project to determine whether it is subject to CEQA
- 2. If the project is subject to CEQA, the second phase involves the preparation of an Initial Study to determine whether the project may have a significant environment effect.
- 3. The third phase involves the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) if the project may have a significant environmental effect of a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Declaration if no significant effects will occur.

<u>Phase 1</u>: The first phase is to determine if the proposed project is subject to CEQA. CEQA applies to an activity that (a) involves the exercise of an agency's discretionary powers, (b) has the potential to result in a direct or reasonable foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and (c) falls within the definition of a "project" as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15378. City Staff and Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning reviewed the proposal and determined that the project is subject to CEQA

Phase 2: The second phase involves the preparation of an Initial Study. An Initial Study is a preliminary analysis to determine whether an EIR or a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration is needed. If the Initial Study concludes that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment that cannot be mitigated, an EIR should be prepared. If no potentially significant impacts are identified, then a Negative Declaration can be prepared. If potentially significant impacts are identified that can be mitigated, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be prepared with mitigated measures conditioned as part of the project's approval to reduce potentially significant impacts to levels of insignificance. To facilitate the Commission's determination whether "effects" are potentially significant, the Commission should focus on scientific and factual data. Unfortunately, CEQA does not provide a definitive definition of what constitutes a "significant effect" as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the physical environment. City Staff and Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning determined, through the preparation of the Initial Study, that there were no potentially significant environmental effect that could not be mitigated to a level of insignificance and, therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared.

<u>Phase 3:</u> A Mitigated Negative Declaration is a written statement, briefly explaining why a proposed project will not have a significant environmental effect and includes a copy of the Initial Study justifying this finding. Included within the Initial Study are mitigation measures to avoid potentially significant effects. City Staff and Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning determined that, although, the proposed

```
Report Submitted By: Vince Velasco
Planning and Development Department
```

project could have a significant effect on the environment, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project applicant or mitigation measures are being implemented to reduce all potentially significant effects to levels of insignificance. As a result, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project.

Draft MND Review:

The Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City of Santa Fe Springs and the environmental consultant, Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning, as to the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project on the environment. The Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for the required 20-day public review and comments from January 15, 2019 to February 4, 2019. The Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted with the Los Angeles County Clerk. A copy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was also mailed to all responsible and trustee agencies as well as surrounding cities for their review and comment.

On January 15, 2019, the City released the Draft IS/MND, along with the accompanying Traffic Study. These materials were made available to the public throughout the 20-day review and comment period. The public comment period for the Draft IS/MND ended February 4, 2019 and, to date, no comments were received. All materials were made available for review at the following locations:

- Planning Department Counter City Hall (11710 Telegraph Road)
- The City of Santa Fe Springs Library
- Los Angeles County Recorder's Office
- On the City's Website:

https://www.santafesprings.org/cityhall/planning/planning/environmental_documents.asp

When reviewing the Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study, the focus of the review should be on the project's potential environmental effects. If persons believe that the project may have a significant effect, they should, (a) Identify the specific effect; (b) Explain why they believe the effect would occur, and; (c) Explain why they believe the effect would be significant.

Individuals who believe there are significant effects as outlined above, should also explain the basis for their comments and submit data or reference offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

AUTHORITY OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Tentative Parcel Map

The Planning Commission, after receiving and hearing the results of investigations and reports on the design and improvements of any proposed division of real property for which a tentative map is filed, shall have the authority to impose requirements and conditions upon such division of land and to approve, conditionally approve or disapprove such map and division of land.

Development Plan Approval

The Planning Commission has the authority, subject to the procedures set forth in the City's Zoning Regulations, to grant a Development Plan Approval when it has been found that said approval is consistent with the requirements, intent and purpose of the City's Zoning Regulations. The Commission may grant, conditionally grant or deny approval of a proposed development plan based on the evidence submitted and upon its own study and knowledge of the circumstances involved, or it may require submission of a revised development plan.

Zone Change

The Planning Commission has the authority, subject to the procedures set forth in the City's Zoning Regulations, to recommend that all or any part of a request for a change of zone be granted or denied by the City Council. The Commission's actions shall be set forth in a resolution and shall be carried by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of the total voting members. Failure to receive said two-thirds affirmative votes shall mean that the request for a change of zone has been denied.

STAFF REMARKS

Based on the findings set forth in the attached Resolution (114-2019), Staff finds that the applicant's request meets the criteria set forth in §155.739 and §155.829 of the City's Zoning Regulations, for the granting of a Development Plan Approval and a Zone Change, respectively. Staff also finds that the applicants request meets the criteria set forth in Section 66412 of the State's Subdivision Map Act, for the granting of Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567.

TPM No. 82567; DPA Case Nos. 957-962; and ZC Case No. 138

Page 13 of 17

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Conditions of approval for TPM 82567, DPA 957-962, and ZC 138 is attached to Resolution 114-2019 as Exhibit A.

Jarme M. Morel Wayne M. Morrell

Director of Planning

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial Photograph
- Public Hearing Notice 2.
- 3. Radius Map for Public Hearing Notice
- Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (previously delivered to PC on 01/22/2019) 4.
- Resolution 114-2019 5.
 - a. Exhibit A DPA Conditions of Approval
 b. Exhibit B TPM Conditions of Approval
- Full Set of Proposed Plans 6.

Aerial Photograph



CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567, DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962, & ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138



TELEGRAPH RD. & ROMANDEL AVE. (Applicant: Kearney Real Estate)

Public Hearing Notice

Report Submitted By: Vince Velasco Planning and Development Department







EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS: PARCEL 1:

LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 29 AND 30 IN BLOCK 46 OF SANTA FE SPRINGS IN THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 26 PAGES 37 TO 40 INCLUSIVE OF MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF THE EAST HALF OF VACATED ALLEY ADJOINING SAID LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 6 ON THE WEST AND THAT PORTION OF THE WEST HALF OF. THE VACATED ALLEY ADJOINING SAID LOTS 29 AND 30 ON THE EAST, TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF THE SOUTH HALF OF FIRST STREET ADJOINING SAID LOTS 1 AND 30 ON THE NORTH.

EXCEPT FROM SAID LOTS 1, 5 AND 6, ALL OIL, GAS, MINERAL AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES IN, ON AND UNDER SAID LAND AS SET OUT IN THAT CERTAIN GRANT DEED, RECORDED MARCH 4, 1980 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 80–216991, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ALSO EXCEPT FROM SAID LOT 29, ALL CRUDE OIL, PETROLEUM, GAS, BREA. ASPHALTUM AND ALL KINDRED SUBSTANCES AND OTHER MINERALS UNDER AND IN SAID LAND. LYING BELOW A DEPTH OF 500 FEET FROM THE SURFACE THEREOF. IN FAVOR OF LEON BEAUMON. BY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 9, 1981 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 81-144399, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, ALL MINERALS WHATSOEVER, PETROLEUM, OIL, ASPHALTUM, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, HELIÚM AND CARBON DIOXIDE, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING THE HERETOFORE DESCRIBED REAL PROPERTY, AT A DEPTH OF MORE THAN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT OF PROSPECTING, DRILLING, REDRILLING, MINING, PRODUCING AND/OR REMOVING THE SAME THEREFROM AND THEREUNDER; PROVIDED THAT EXCEPT AS SET FORTH IN THAT CERTAIN MINERAL RESERVATION AGREEMENT DATED DECEMBER 27, 1989, AND RECORDED

DECEMBER 28, 1989 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 89-2087140, OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE, SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS. OR ASSIGNS, SHALL HAVE NO-RIGHT OF SURFACE ENTRY NOR RIGHT TO DISTURB THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY NOR OTHER RIGHT TO ENTER AT ANY POINT ON SAID REAL PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE THEREOF FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHETHER TO EXPLORE, TO EXTRACT AND/OR. REMOVE SAID OIL, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON OR MINERAL SUBSTANCES OR OTHERWISE.

PARCEL 2:

LOTS 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 AND 25 OF TRACT NO. 17977, IN THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 549 PAGES 21, 22 AND 23 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, TOGETHER WITH THE NORTH HALF OF FIRST STREET, ADJOINING SAID LOTS 22, 24 AND 25 ON THE SOUTH; TOGETHER WITH THE SOUTH HALF OF FIRST STREET, ADJOINING SAID LOT 20 ON THE NORTH; TOGETHER WITH THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOT 22 ON THE EAST; TOGETHER WITH THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOT 25 ON THE. WEST: TOGETHER WITH THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOT 23 ON THE SOUTH; TOGETHER WITH THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING. SAID LOT 19 ON THE NORTH; TOGETHER WITH THE EAST HALF OF THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOTS 19 AND 20 ON THE WEST; TOGETHER WITH THE WEST HALF OF THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOT 21 ON THE EAST: TOGETHER WITH THE WEST HALF OF THE 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOTS 19 AND 20 ON THE EAST AND THE EAST HALF OF A 20.00 FOOT ALLEY, ADJOINING SAID LOT 18 ON THE WEST.

ALSO EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, ALL MINERAL WHATSOEVER, PETROLEUM, OIL, ASPHALTUM, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO. HELIÚM AND CARBON DIOXIDE. WITHIN OR UNDERLYING THE HERETOFORE DESCRIBED REAL PROPERTY, AT A DEPTH OF MORE THAN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT OF PROSPECTING. DRILLING. REDRILLING. MINING. PRODUCING AND/OR REMOVING THE SAME THEREFROM AND THEREUNDER; PROVIDED THAT EXCEPT AS SET FORTH IN THAT CERTAIN MINERAL RESERVATION AGREEMENT DATED DECEMBER 27, 1989, AND RECORDED DECEMBER 28, 1989 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 89-2087140, OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE, SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, SHALL HAVE NO RIGHT OF SURFACE ENTRY NOR RIGHT TO DISTURB THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY NOR OTHER RIGHT TO ENTER AT ANY POINT ON SAID REAL PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE THEREOF FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHETHER TO EXPLORE, TO EXTRACT AND/OR REMOVE SAID OIL,

PARCEL 3:

LOTS 7, 8, 9, 10 AND 11 OF TRACT NO. 5326, IN THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 58 PAGES 56 AND 57 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON OR MINERAL SUBSTANCES OR OTHERWISE.

EXCEPT FROM SAID LOTS 8 AND 11, ALL OIL, GAS, MINERAL AND OTHER HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES IN, ON AND UNDER SAID LAND, AS SET OUT IN THAT CERTAIN GRANT DEED, RECORDED MARCH 4, 1980 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 80-216991, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, ALL MINERALS WHATSOEVER, PETROLEUM, OIL, ASPHALTUM. GAS AN/OR HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO. HELIUM AND CARBON DIOXIDE, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING THE HERETOFORE DESCRIBED REAL PROPERTY, AT A DEPTH OF MORE THAN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT OF PROSPECTING, DRILLING, REDRILLING, MINING, PRODUCING AND/OR REMOVING THE SAME THEREFROM AND THEREUNDER; PROVIDED THAT EXCEPT AS SET FORTH IN THAT CERTAIN MINERAL RESERVATION AGREEMENT DATED DECEMBER 27, 1989, AND RECORDED DECEMBER 28, 1989 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 89-2087140, OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE, SANTA FE

ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, SHALL HAVE NO RIGHT OF SURFACE ENTRY NOR RIGHT TO DISTURB THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY NOR OTHER RIGHT TO ENTER AT ANY POINT ON SAID REAL PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE THEREOF FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHETHER TO EXPLORE, TO EXTRACT AND/OR REMOVE SAID OIL, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON OR MINERAL SUBSTANCES OR OTHERWISE.

PARCEL 4:

THAT PORTION OF ROMANDEL AVENUE. 60 FEET WIDE. IN THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON MAP OF TRACT NO. 17977. AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 549 PAGES 21 TO 23 INCLUSIVE OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, LYING BETWEEN THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY LINE. OF THE LINE. OF THE LAND DESCRIBED AS PARCEL XIII IN EXHIBIT "A" OF THAT CERTAIN RESOLUTION NO. 4243, RECORDED JULY 18. 1979 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 79–788602. OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, AND THE WESTERLY PROLONGATION OF A LINE PARALLEL WITH AND DISTANT NORTHERLY 30 FEET, MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES FROM THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 22 OF SAID TRACT NO. 17977.

EXCEPT FROM A PORTION OF SAID LAND, ALL CRUDE OIL, PETROLEUM, GAS, BREA, ASPHALTUM AND ALL KINDRED SUBSTANCES AND OTHER MINERALS UNDER AND IN SAID. LAND, LYING BELOW A DEPTH OF 500 FEET FROM THE SURFACE THEREOF, IN FAVOR OF LEON BEAUMON, BY DEED RECORDED MARCH 17, 1980 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 80-265102, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY. ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, ALL MINERALS WHATSOEVER, PETROLEUM, OIL, ASPHALTUM, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON SUBSTANCES, INCLUDING, BU NOT LIMITED TO, HELIÚM AND CARBON DIOXIDE, WITHIN OR UNDERLYING THE HERETOFORE DESCRIBED REAL PROPERTY. AT A DEPTH OF MORE THAN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT OF PROSPECTING, DRILLING, REDRILLING, MINING, PRODUCING AND/OR REMOVING THE SAME THEREFROM AND THEREUNDER: PROVIDED THAT EXCEPT AS SET FORTH IN THAT CERTAIN MINERAL RESERVATION AGREEMENT DATED DECEMBER 27. 1989. AND RECORDED DECEMBER 28, 1989 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 89-2087140, OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE, SANTA FE ENERGY COMPANY, ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS, SHALL HAVE NO RIGHT OF SURFACE ENTRY NOR RIGHT TO DISTURB THE SURFACE OF SAID REAL PROPERTY NOR OTHER RIGHT TO ENTER AT ANY POINT ON SAID REAL PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE THEREOF FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHETHER TO EXPLORE, TO EXTRACT AND/OR REMOVE SAID OIL, GAS AND/OR HYDROCARBON OR MINERAL SUBSTANCES OR OTHERWISE.

APN: 8011-003-955 THROUGH 979, AND 8011-002-901, 902, 903



REST AT TH A MUNICIPAL	E DATE HEREOF IS VESTED IN: L CORPORATION
	TELEGRAPH ROAD SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA
	8011—003—955 THROUGH —979 8011—002—901, —902, —903
CELS 1-4) =	= 403,135 S.F. (GROSS) 9.255 ACRES (GROSS)
& 10) =	24,848 S.F. (STREET) 0.571 ACRES (STREET)
	0 S.F. (STREET) 0.000 ACRES (STREET)
7B) =	3,153 S.F. (STREET) 0.072 ACRES (STREET)
LOPE	375,134 S.F. (NET) 8.612 ACRES (NET)



HEAVY MANUFACTURING (M-2)

SITE PLAN KEYNOTES

- $\langle 1 \rangle$ heavy broom finish conc. pavement,
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ concrete (ac) paving
- 3 CONCRETE WALKWAY
- $\langle 4 \rangle$ driveway approns to be constructed per "L" drawings. $\left< 5 \right>$ 5'-6"X5'-6"X4" MIN. THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING
- PAD TYP. AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREAS. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BROOM FINISH.
- SLOPE TO BE 1/4" : 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO PUBLIC WAY OR DRIVE WAY W/ 1:20 MAX. AS REQ. BY CITY INSPECTOR.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ trash enclosure
- (10) PRE-CAST CONC. WHEEL STOP
- (11) CONC. FILLED GUARD POST "6 DIA. U.N.O. 42" H, 12) EXTERIOR CONC. STAIR.
- LANDSCAPE. SEE "L" DWGS. LANDSCAPE AREAS INDICATED
- BY SHADED PATTERN.
- (14) HANDICAPPED ENTRY SIGN
- 15/ HANDICAPPED PARKING STALL SIGN (17) APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF THE TRANSFORMER
- AND GENERATOR $\langle 18 \rangle$ 8'H WROUGHT IRON FENCE
- (19) DOUBLE DETECTOR CHECK VALVE
- $\langle 20 \rangle$ 8'H WROUGHT IRON FENCE WITH SLATS
- $\langle 21 \rangle$ UNOBSTRUCTED LOADING AREA 250 S.F.
- (22) UNOBSTRUCTED LOADING AREA 500 S.F.
- $\langle 23 \rangle$ 3.5' H FENCING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD SETBACK
- (24) GRASSCRETE

SITE LEGEND

LANDSCAPED AREA PAVING - SEE "C" DRWGS. FOR THICKNESS CONCRETE PAVING SEE "C" DRWGS. FOR THICKNESS _____ STALL (9' X 19') HANDICAP PARKING

STALL (9' X 19')

SITE PLAN GENERAL NOTES

- 1. THE SOILS REPORT PREPARED BY _____
- SHOULD BE A PART OF THESE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.
- 2. IF SOILS ARE EXPANSIVE IN NATURE, USE STEEL REINFORCING FOR ALL SITE CONCRETE.
- 3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE WALL, FACE OF CONCRETE CURB OR GRID LINE U.N.O.
- 4. SEE "C" PLANS FOR ALL CONCRETE CURBS, GUTTERS AND SWALES. DETAILS ON SHEET AD.1 ARE MINIMUM STANDARDS.
- 5. THE ENTIRE PROJECT SHALL BE PERMANENTLY MAINTAINED WITH AN AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION SYSTEM, PRIOR TO INSTALLATION & AT LEAST 60 DAYS BEFORE BLDG. COMPLETION.
- SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS. PROVIDE POSITIVE DRAINAGE AWAY FROM BLDG. SEE "C" DRAWINGS.
- 8. CONTRACTOR TO REFER TO "C" DRAWINGS FOR ALL HORIZONTAL CONTROL DIMENSIONS. SITE PLANS ARE FOR GUIDANCE AND STARTING LAYOUT POINTS.
- 9. SEE "C"DRAWINGS FOR FINISH GRADE ELEVATIONS. 10. CONCRETE SIDEWALKS TO BE A MINIMUM OF 4" THICK W/ TOOLED JOINTS AT 6' O.C. EXPANSION/CONSTRUCTION JOINTS SHALL BE A MAXIMUM 12' EA. WAY W/ 1:20 MAX. SLOPE. EXPANSION JOINTS TO HAVE COMPRESSIVE EXPANSION FILLER MATERIAL OF 1/4". SEE "L" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH.
- 11. PAINT CURBS AND PROVIDE SIGNS TO INFORM OF FIRE LANES AS REQUIRED BY FIRE DEPARTMENT.
- 12. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION OF THE ENTIRE PROJECT SITE SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND APPROVED BY PUBLIC FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS.
- 13. PRIOR TO FINAL CITY INSPECTION, THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL SUBMIT A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION TO PUBLIC FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT.
- 14. ALL LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION DESIGNS SHALL MEET CURRENT CITY STANDARDS AS LISTED IN GUIDELINES OR AS OBTAINED FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT.
- 15. LANDSCAPED AREAS SHALL BE DELINEATED WITH A MINIMUM SIX INCHES (6") HIGH CURB
- 16. APPROVED CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN PRIOR TO grading permit
- 17. WELL SCREENING DONE WITH CHAIN LINK FENCE AND SLATS PER BREITBURN REQUIREMENTS

PROJECT	DATA

	BLDG	1 BLDG	2 BLDG. 3	BLDG. 4	BLDG. 5	BLDG. 6	TOTAL
SITE AREA							
in sq.ft.							377,600 s.f.
in ac.							8.67 ac
BUILDING AREA							
Office - 1st floor	1,65	0 1,10	0 2,500	1,600	2,000	1,450	10,300 s.f.
Office - 2nd floor	1,65	0 1,10	0 2,500	1,600	2,000	1,450	10,300 s.f.
Warehouse	13,68	0 11,38	2 23,500	14,570	18,679	13,390	95,201 s.f.
Total	16,98	0 13,58	2 28,500	17,770	22,679	16,290	115,801 s.f.
COVERAGE	4.5	% 3.6	% 7.5%	4.7%	6.0%	4.3%	30.7%
office : 1/200 o f		2	1 2	2	2	2	12 stalls
office : 1/300 s.t.		3	1 3	2	2	2	15 stails
(apply only if more than 15% GFA)					10		
warehouse: 0-20,000 @ 1/500 s.f.		34 3	28 40	36	40	33	211 stalls
20K-100K @ 1/750 s.f.	n	/a n	1/a 12	n/a	4	n/a	16 stalls
100K-200K @ 1/1,000 s.f.	n	/a n	n/a n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a stalls
above 200K @ 1/2,000 s.f.	n	/a n	n/a n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a stalls
TOTAL		37	29 55	38	46	35	240 stalls
PARKING REQUIRED (MULTI-TENANT)							
office : 1/300 s.f.							11 stalls
warehouse: 0-40,000 @ 1/500 s.f.							80 stalls
40K - 100K @ 1/750 s.f.							80 stalls
100K-200K @ 1/1,000 s.f.							16 stalls
above 200K @ 1/2,000 s.f.							0 stalls
TOTAL							187 stalls
AUTO PARKING PROVIDED							
Standard Parking Stall (8.5' x 19')		31	24 52	31	41	29	208 stalls
ADA Parking Stall (9'x 19')		1	1 1	1	1	1	6 stalls
VAN Accesible Stall (12'x19')		1	1 1	1	1	1	6 stalls
Clean Air/ EV (8.5'x19') - 10%		4	3 6	5	5	4	27 stalls
TOTAL		37	29 60	38	48	35	247 stalls
SETBACK							
Building Landscape							
Side - 0 0							
Rear - 0 0							
* 30' min. Setback increases 1' for each 1' of bldg. h	t. above 30'						
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT ALLOWED							
No limit (if less than 100'							
from residential: 50' max.)							
ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY							
Zoning Designation - Heavy industrial (M-2)							
Frontage @ 25 sf / linear foot (877' x 25 sf) =	21,925 s	.f.					
그 그는 것 같은 것이 같은 것 같은 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 같은 것이 같을 것이 같다.	5.085 s	.f.					
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) =							
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) = Total Required =	27,010 s	.f.					1
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) = Total Required = LANDSCAPE PROVIDED	27,010 s	.f.					
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) = Total Required = LANDSCAPE PROVIDED Frontage =	27,010 s 15,272 s	f. f.					
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) = Total Required = LANDSCAPE PROVIDED Frontage = Frontage (w ith grasscrete) =	27,010 s 15,272 s 6,948 s	.f. .f. .f.					
6% of total parkings (84,766 s.f. x 6%) = Total Required = LANDSCAPE PROVIDED Frontage = Frontage (w ith grasscrete) = 6% of total parking =	27,010 s 15,272 s 6,948 s 18,502 s	.f. .f. .f.					





- 5 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 6 \rangle$ Exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"X5'-6"X4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4": 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation.
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ dock door bumper
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- (11) 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "s" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ Approximate location of roof top unit.

- D. NOT USED
- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY, ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER.
- F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION.
- G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR FACE OF STUD U.N.O. H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS. PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION.
- I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS.
- J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS. K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN. hardware. 🔿
- L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING. M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT". THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH
- FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1
- O. ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW, SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.







KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- 1 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED). FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE. WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ panel joint.
- 3 PANEL REVEAL. ALL REVEALS TO HAVE A MAX. OF 3/8" CHAMFER. REVEAL COLOR TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING FIELD COLOR. U.N.O.
- (4) OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE
- AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS. $\left< 7 \right>$ Metal louver, design to resist 90 MPH wind exposure "C". Paint to match building color
- 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR. PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ exterior downspout and overflow scupper
- (10) DOCK BUMPER
- 11 ALUMINUM STOREFRONT FRAMING WITH TEMPERED GLAZING AT ALL DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ exterior lighting fixture
- 13 METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION.
- D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS. ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING REMAINDER OF BUILDING.
- G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH ELASTOMERIC PAINT.
- H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH. J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS.
- K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED-ON AND THE SECOND COAT TO BE SPRAYED-ON

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

	1	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004
	2	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7071
	3	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7072
	4	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7073
	5	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7074
	6	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7602
	7	MULLIONS			PAINT	BRAND_	CLEAR AN	IODIZED		
+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	8	GLAZING			COLOF	RBLUE	E REFLECT	VE		
	9	METAL CAN	IOPY		PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004
	10	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	ARIZONA	TILE AEQU	IA-C	

GLAZING LEGEND

+ * + * + + + * + \$+	SPANDREL GLASS	TEMPERED	VISION	GLASS	
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	VISION GLASS				





KETNOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- $\langle 1 \rangle$ concrete tilt-up panel. See "S" dwgs. For thickness and steel requirements.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ structural steel column. See "s" drawings for size. TYPICAL STOREFRONT SYSTEM WITH GLAZING. SEE OFFICE BLOW-UP AND ELEVATIONS FOR SIZE, COLOR AND LOCATIONS.
- \checkmark Concrete ramp w/ 42"high conc tilt-up guard wall or building wall on both side of ramp, see "s" dwg for detail.
- 5 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 6 \rangle$ Exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"X5'-6"X4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4": 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation.
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ dock door bumper
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- (11) 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "s" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ Approximate location of roof top unit.

GENERAL NOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- A. THIS BUILDING IS DESIGNED FOR HIGH PILE STORAGE WITH FIRE ACCESS MAN
- DOORS AT 100' MAXIMUM O.C. A SEPARATE PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR ANY RACKING/CONVEYER SYSTEMS. B. FIRE HOSE LOCATIONS SHALL BE APPROVED PER FIRE DEPARTMENT. C. THE BUILDING FLOOR SLAB IS SLOPED, SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH
- SURFACE ELEVATIONS. D. NOT USED
- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY. ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE
- 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER. F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION.
- G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR FACE OF STUD U.N.O. H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS.
- PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION. I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS
- PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS. J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS.
- K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN. hardware. 🔿
- L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING. M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT". THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH
- FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1
- O. ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW, SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.







(5)

KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED). FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE. WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS. $\langle 2 \rangle$ panel joint.
- 3 PANEL REVEAL. ALL REVEALS TO HAVE A MAX. OF 3/8" CHAMFER. REVEAL COLOR TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING FIELD COLOR. U.N.O.
- (4) OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS.
- $\overline{7}$ Metal louver, design to resist 90 MPH wind exposure "C". Paint to match building color
- 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR. PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ exterior downspout and overflow scupper
- $\langle 10 \rangle$ dock bumper
- $\langle 11 \rangle$ Aluminum storefront framing with tempered glazing at all DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ Exterior lighting fixture

(13) METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION.
- D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS. ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING REMAINDER OF BUILDING.
- G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH ELASTOMERIC PAINT.
- H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH. J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS.
- K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED-ON AND THE SECOND COAT TO BE SPRAYED-ON

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

	\bigcirc	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004	
	2	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7071	
	3	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7072	
	4	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7073	
	5	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW_	7074	
	6	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7602	
	$\overline{7}$	MULLIONS			PAINT	BRAND_	CLEAR AI	NODIZED			
+ + + + + +	8	GLAZING			COLOF	RBLUE	E REFLECT	IVE			
	9	METAL CAN	IOPY		PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004	
	(10)	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND	ARIZONA	TILE AEQU	JA-C	RCUS	

GLAZING LEGEND

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	SPANDREL GLASS
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	VISION GLASS

EAST ELEVATION scale: 1/8"=1'-0"

TEMPERED VISION GLASS





KETNOTES - FLOOR PLAN

 $\langle 1 \rangle$ concrete tilt-up panel. See "S" dwgs. For thickness and steel requirements. $\langle 2 \rangle$ structural steel column. See "s" drawings for size.

- Typical storefront system with glazing. See office blow-up and elevations for size, color and locations.
- ${4 \choose 4}$ concrete ramp w/ 42"high conc tilt-up guard wall or building wall on both side of ramp, see "S" dwg for detail.
- 5 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\left< \begin{array}{c} 6 \end{array} \right>$ exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"X5'-6"X4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4" : 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation.
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- (11) 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "S" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ Approximate location of roof top unit.

GENERAL NOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- A. THIS BUILDING IS DESIGNED FOR HIGH PILE STORAGE WITH FIRE ACCESS MAN DOORS AT 100' MAXIMUM O.C. A SEPARATE PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED
- FOR ANY RACKING/CONVEYER SYSTEMS. B. FIRE HOSE LOCATIONS SHALL BE APPROVED PER FIRE DEPARTMENT.
- C. THE BUILDING FLOOR SLAB IS SLOPED, SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH SURFACE ELEVATIONS.
- D. NOT USED

SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.

- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY. ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER.
- F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION.
- G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR FACE OF STUD U.N.O. H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS.
- PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION.
- I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS.
- J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS. K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN.
- hardware. 🔿
- L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING. M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT".
- THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR
- SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1 O. ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW,





		A			B	
		/ /	40'			50'
		4'	26'	2' 8'	16'	5'
-	~ ``	T.O.P	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	TYP.
),-6"					
	10					
6"	6,					$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & $
33'-	-					
	Û,					····s···
4	6	F.F.				







2

++++

· * + \$ * + + **||** * + \$ + * + **||** * + * \$ + * + **||** * + * \$ + * + * **||** + * + \$ + * + * + **||** * + \$ + * + *

		50'		50'			
3'	22' 4' 4	21'	4' h ¹	26'	4'		
TYP	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}$	$\begin{array}{c} TYP. \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c c} TYP. \\ \hline \\ $	$\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{TYP.} \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \right)$			
					°0,		
Ī							
	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		
•							

•

•_____′ /





KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED). FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE. WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS.
- 2 PANEL JOINT.
- 3 PANEL REVEAL. ALL REVEALS TO HAVE A MAX. OF 3/8" CHAMFER. REVEAL COLOR TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING FIELD COLOR. U.N.O.
- 4 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS.
- METAL LOUVER, DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
 PAINT TO MATCH BUILDING COLOR
 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE.
- 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR. PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 9 EXTERIOR DOWNSPOUT AND OVERFLOW SCUPPER
- (10) DOCK BUMPER
- ALUMINUM STOREFRONT FRAMING WITH TEMPERED GLAZING AT ALL DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
 EXTERIOR LIGHTING FIXTURE
- (13) METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
 B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
 C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION.
- D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION.

TO BE SPRAYED-ON

- E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS. ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING REMAINDER OF BUILDING.
- G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH ELASTOMERIC PAINT.
- H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH. J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS. K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED—ON AND THE SECOND COAT

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

(1)	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004	
2	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7071	
3	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7072	
4	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7073	
5	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7074	
6	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7602	
7	MULLIONS			PAINT	BRAND_	CLEAR AN	NODIZED			
8	GLAZING			COLOF	ORBLUE_REFLECTIVE					
9	METAL CANOPY			PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004	

10 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND_ARIZONA TILE AEQUA-CIRCUS

GLAZING LEGEND

TEMPERED VISION GLASS

EAST ELEVATION scale: 1/8"=1'-0"





KETNOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- (1) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL. SEE "S" DWGS. FOR THICKNESS AND STEEL REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ structural steel column. See "s" drawings for size.
- TYPICAL STOREFRONT SYSTEM WITH GLAZING. SEE OFFICE BLOW-UP AND ELEVATIONS FOR SIZE, COLOR AND LOCATIONS.
- CONCRETE RAMP W/ 42"HIGH CONC TILT-UP GUARD WALL OR BUILDING WALL ON BOTH SIDE OF RAMP, SEE "S" DWG FOR DETAIL.
 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE.
 DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 6 \rangle$ exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"x5'-6"x4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4" : 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation. $\langle 9 \rangle$ dock door bumper
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\left< 11 \right>$ 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "S" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ Conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ approximate location of roof top unit.

GENERAL NOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- A. THIS BUILDING IS DESIGNED FOR HIGH PILE STORAGE WITH FIRE ACCESS MAN DOORS AT 100' MAXIMUM O.C. A SEPARATE PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR ANY RACKING/CONVEYER SYSTEMS.
- B. FIRE HOSE LOCATIONS SHALL BE APPROVED PER FIRE DEPARTMENT.
- C. THE BUILDING FLOOR SLAB IS SLOPED, SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH SURFACE ELEVATIONS.
- D. NOT USED
- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY. ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER.
- F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION. G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR
- FACE OF STUD U.N.O. H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES.
- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS. PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION.
- I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS.
- J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS. K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN.
- hardware. 🔿 L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING.
- M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT".
- THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1
- O. ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW, SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.










WEST ELEVATION scole: 1/8°=1'-0°

KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED).
 FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE. WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS.
 PANEL JOINT.
- 2 PANEL JOIN
- 3 PANEL REVEAL. ALL REVEALS TO HAVE A MAX. OF 3/8" CHAMFER. REVEAL COLOR TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING FIELD COLOR. U.N.O.
- 4 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS.
- $\fbox{7}$ Metal Louver, design to resist 90 MPH wind exposure "C". Paint to match building color
- 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR. PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 9 EXTERIOR DOWNSPOUT AND OVERFLOW SCUPPER
- (10) DOCK BUMPER
- 11) ALUMINUM STOREFRONT FRAMING WITH TEMPERED GLAZING AT ALL DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- (12) EXTERIOR LIGHTING FIXTURE

(13) METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
 B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
 C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION.
 D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION.
- E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS, ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING
- REMAINDER OF BUILDING. G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH FLASTOMERIC PAINT
- ELASTOMERIC PAINT. H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH. J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS.
- K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED-ON AND THE SECOND COAT TO BE SPRAYED-ON

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

	\bigcirc	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004
	2	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7071
	3	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7072
	4	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7073
	5	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW_	7074
	6	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7602
	7	MULLIONS			PAINT	BRAND_	CLEAR AN	NODIZED		
+ + + + + +	8	GLAZING			COLOF	RBLUE	E REFLECT	IVE		
	9	METAL CAN	IOPY		PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN	WILLIAMS	SW	7004
	10	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	ARIZONA	TILE AEQU	JA-C	IRCUS

GLAZING LEGEND

+ * + * + + * + \$ + + _ + \$ +	SPANDREL GLASS
$^{+}_{+}^{+}$	VISION GLASS

TEMPERED VISION GLASS

EAST ELEVATION scale: 1/8"=1'-0"







KETNOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- (1) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL. SEE "S" DWGS. FOR THICKNESS AND STEEL REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ structural steel column. See "s" drawings for size. TYPICAL STOREFRONT SYSTEM WITH GLAZING. SEE OFFICE BLOW-UP AND ELEVATIONS FOR SIZE, COLOR AND LOCATIONS.
- CONCRETE RAMP W/ 42"HIGH CONC TILT-UP GUARD WALL OR BUILDING WALL ON BOTH SIDE OF RAMP, SEE "S" DWG FOR DETAIL.
 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE.
 DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 6 \rangle$ exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"X5'-6"X4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4": 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation.
- 9) DOCK DOOR BUMPER
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\left< 11 \right>$ 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "s" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ Exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ approximate location of roof top unit.

GENERAL NOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- A. THIS BUILDING IS DESIGNED FOR HIGH PILE STORAGE WITH FIRE ACCESS MAN DOORS AT 100' MAXIMUM O.C. A SEPARATE PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED
- FOR ANY RACKING/CONVEYER SYSTEMS. B. FIRE HOSE LOCATIONS SHALL BE APPROVED PER FIRE DEPARTMENT.
- C. THE BUILDING FLOOR SLAB IS SLOPED, SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH SURFACE ELEVATIONS.
- D. NOT USED
- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY. ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER.
- F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION.
- G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR FACE OF STUD U.N.O.
- H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS.
- PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION. I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS
- PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS. J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT
- TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS. K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN. hardware. 🔿
- L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING. M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT". THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH
- FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1
- ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW, SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.









KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- 1 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED). FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE. WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS.
- $\langle 2 \rangle$ panel joint.
- 4 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS.
- $\left< 7 \right>$ METAL LOUVER, DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C". PAINT TO MATCH BUILDING COLOR
- 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR. PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\left<9\right>$ exterior downspout and overflow scupper
- $\langle 10 \rangle$ dock bumper
- (11) ALUMINUM STOREFRONT FRAMING WITH TEMPERED GLAZING AT ALL DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ Exterior lighting fixture
- (13) METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION. D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION.
- E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS. ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING REMAINDER OF BUILDING.
- G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH ELASTOMERIC PAINT.
- H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH. J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS. K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED-ON AND THE SECOND COAT TO BE SPRAYED-ON

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

ONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND
(2) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND_SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7071
3 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND_SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7072
(4) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND_SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7073
5 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7074
6 CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7602
7 MULLIONS PAINT BRAND_CLEAR ANODIZED
(8) GLAZING COLOR_BLUE_REFLECTIVE
9 METAL CANOPY PAINT BRAND SHERWIN WILLIAMS SW 7004
(10) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL PAINT BRAND_ARIZONA TILE AEQUA-CIRCUS

GLAZING LEGEND

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	SPANDREL GLASS	
${}^{+}_{+}{}^{$	VISION GLASS	

TEMPERED VISION GLASS

EAST ELEVATION scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"





KETNOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- (1) CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL. SEE "S" DWGS. FOR THICKNESS AND STEEL REQUIREMENTS. $\langle 2 \rangle$ structural steel column. See "S" drawings for size.
- TYPICAL STOREFRONT SYSTEM WITH GLAZING. SEE OFFICE BLOW-UP AND ELEVATIONS FOR SIZE, COLOR AND LOCATIONS.
- CONCRETE RAMP W/ 42"HIGH CONC TILT-UP GUARD WALL OR BUILDING WALL ON BOTH SIDE OF RAMP, SEE "S" DWG FOR DETAIL.
- 5 9'-0" X 10' TRUCK DOOR, SECTIONAL O'H., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 6 \rangle$ Exterior concrete stair
- 5'-6"x5'-6"x4" THICK CONCRETE EXTERIOR LANDING PAD TYPICAL AT ALL EXTERIOR MAN DOORS TO LANDSCAPED AREA. FINISH TO BE MEDIUM BLOOM FINISH. SLOPE TO BE 1/4" : 12" MAX. PROVIDE WALK TO HARD SURFACE PER CITY REQUIREMENTS.
- $\langle 8 \rangle$ louvered opening for ventilation.
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ dock door bumper
- 12' X 14' DRIVE THRU. SECTIONAL OH., STANDARD GRADE. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIND 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- (1) 3'X7' HOLLOW METAL EXTERIOR MAN DOOR. DESIGNED TO RESIST WIN 90 MPH., EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ SOFFIT LINE ABOVE
- $\langle 13 \rangle$ brace frame, see "S" dwgs.
- $\langle 14 \rangle$ conc. Filled guard post. 6" dia. U.N.O.. 42"H.
- $\langle 15 \rangle$ exterior downspout with overflow scupper,
- $\langle 16 \rangle$ z guard
- $\langle 17 \rangle$ Approximate location of roof top unit.

GENERAL NOTES - FLOOR PLAN

- A. THIS BUILDING IS DESIGNED FOR HIGH PILE STORAGE WITH FIRE ACCESS MAN DOORS AT 100' MAXIMUM O.C. A SEPARATE PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED
- FOR ANY RACKING/CONVEYER SYSTEMS. B. FIRE HOSE LOCATIONS SHALL BE APPROVED PER FIRE DEPARTMENT.
- C. THE BUILDING FLOOR SLAB IS SLOPED, SEE "C" DRAWINGS FOR FINISH SURFACE ELEVATIONS.
- D. NOT USED
- E. WAREHOUSE INTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS ARE PAINTED WHITE. COLUMNS ARE TO RECEIVE PRIMER ONLY. ALL GYP. BD. WALLS IN WAREHOUSE TO RECEIVE 1 COAT OF WHITE TO COVER.
- F. SLOPE POUR STRIP 1/2" TO EXTERIOR AT ALL MANDOOR EXITS. SEE "S" DRAWINGS FOR POUR STRIP LOCATION. G. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF CONCRETE PANEL WALL, GRIDLINE, OR
- FACE OF STUD U.N.O. H. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR POINT OF CONNECTIONS TO OFF-SITE UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL UTILITY LOCATIONS.
- PLUMBING/ELECTRICAL COORDINATION.
- I. FOR DOOR TYPES AND SIZES, SEE DETAIL SHEET AD.4. NOTE: ALL DOORS PER DOOR SCHEDULE ARE FINISH OPENINGS.
- J. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND KEEP THE FLOOR SLAB CLEAN. ALL EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCKS. K. ALL EXIT MAN DOORS IN WAREHOUSE TO HAVE ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN.
- hardware. 🔿 L. HIGHLY FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL SHALL NOT BE USED OR STORED IN THIS BUILDING.
- M. EACH EXTERIOR EXIT DOOR SHALL BE IDENTIFIED BY A TACTILE EXIT SIGN WITH THE WORDS "EXIT". THE MOUNTING HEIGHT FOR SUCH SIGNAGE SHALL BE 60" FROM FINISH
- FLOOR LEVEL TO THE CENTER OF THE SIGN. N. NON-ACCESSIBLE DOOR. PROVIDE WARNING SIGN LOCATED IN THE INTERIOR SIDE PER CBC 1133B.1.1.1
- 0. ALL ROOF MOUNTED MATERIALS SHALL BE FULLY SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW, SEE A/A4.1 OFFICE SECTION.









KEYNOTES - ELEVATIONS

- CONCRETE TILT-UP PANEL(PAINTED).
 FINISH GRADE VARIES. SEE "C" DRAWINGS. WATERPROOF ALL WALLS
 WHERE GRADE IS HIGHER AND EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER ONE SIDE.
 WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND WATERPROOFING TO BE PROTECTED WITH PROTECTION BOARD AND A MIN. OF 6" OF GRAVEL. PROVIDE TRENCH DRAIN AT BOTTOM AND DAYLIGHT TO CURB OR TAKE TO STORM DRAIN. NOT REQUIRED AT DOCK HIGH CONDITION OR AT RAMP WALLS. $\langle 2 \rangle$ panel joint.
- $\boxed{3}$ PANEL REVEAL. ALL REVEALS TO HAVE A MAX. OF 3/8" CHAMFER. REVEAL COLOR TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING FIELD COLOR. U.N.O.
- 4 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DRIVE THRU. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 5 OVERHEAD DOOR @ DOCK HIGH. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER-STRIPPING PROTECTION ALL AROUND. DESIGN TO RESIST 110 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- 6 CONCRETE STAIR, LANDING AND GUARDRAIL W/ METAL PIPE HANDRAIL. PROVIDE NON SKID NOSING TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. PROVIDE CONTRASTING COLORED 3" WIDE WARNING STRIPE INTEGRAL TO CONCRETE AT TOP LANDING AND BOTTOM TREAD PER ADA REQUIREMENTS.
- $\left< 7 \right>$ METAL LOUVER, DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C". PAINT TO MATCH BUILDING COLOR 8 HOLLOW METAL DOORS. SEE DOOR SCHEDULE. PROVIDE COMPLETE WEATHER STRIPING ALL AROUND DOOR.
- PROVIDE FOR RAIN DIVERTER ABOVE DOOR. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 9 \rangle$ exterior downspout and overflow scupper
- (10) DOCK BUMPER
- ALUMINUM STOREFRONT FRAMING WITH TEMPERED GLAZING AT ALL DOORS, SIDELITES ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING WITH BOTTOMS LESS THAN 18" ABOVE FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION. DESIGN TO RESIST 90 MPH WIND EXPOSURE "C".
- $\langle 12 \rangle$ Exterior lighting fixture (13) METAL CANOPY

GENERAL NOTES - ELEVATIONS

- A. ALL PAINT COLOR CHANGES TO OCCUR AT INSIDE CORNERS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- B. ALL PAINT FINISHES ARE TO BE FLAT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. C. T.O.P. EL.= TOP OF PARAPET ELEVATION. D. F.F. = FINISH FLOOR ELEVATION.
- E. STOREFRONT CONSTRUCTION: GLASS, METAL ATTACHMENTS AND LINTELS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST 90 MPH. EXPOSURE "C" WINDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- F. CONTRACTOR SHALL FULLY PAINT ONE CONCRETE PANEL W/ SELECTED COLORS. ARCHITECT AND OWNER SHALL APPROVE PRIOR TO PAINTING
- REMAINDER OF BUILDING. G. BACK SIDE OF PARAPETS TO HAVE SMOOTH FINISH AND BE PAINTED WITH
- ELASTOMERIC PAINT. H. FOR SPANDREL GLAZING, ALLOW SPACE BEHIND SPANDREL TO BREATH.
- J. USE ADHESIVE BACK WOOD STRIPS FOR ALL REVEAL FORMS. K. THE FIRST COAT OF PAINT TO BE ROLLED-ON AND THE SECOND COAT TO BE SPRAYED-ON

COLOR SCHED. - ELEVATIONS

	\bigcirc	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN W	ILLIAMS S'	N 7004	
	2	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN W	ILLIAMS S	<i>N</i> 7071	
	3	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN WI	ILLIAMS SI	N 7072	
	4	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN WI	ILLIAMS SI	W 7073	
	5	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN WI	LLIAMS SW	/ 7074	
	6	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN WI	ILLIAMS SI	V 7602	
	7	MULLIONS			PAINT	BRAND_	CLEAR ANO	DIZED		
+ + + + + +	8	GLAZING			COLOF	RBLUE	REFLECTIVE	<u> </u>		
	9	METAL CAN	IOPY		PAINT	BRAND_	SHERWIN WI	ILLIAMS SI	W 7004	
	(10)	CONCRETE	TILT-UP	PANEL	PAINT	BRAND_	ARIZONA TIL	<u>e aequa-</u>	-CIRCUS	

GLAZING LEGEND

+ * + * + + * + \$	SPANDREL GLASS	
$\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}{\overset{+}$	VISION GLASS	

TEMPERED VISION GLASS







West Elevation













Santa Fe Springs, California

BUILDING 1 (24' CLEAR/ 30' T.O.P.) Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.

1	
2	
North Elevation	





Martin State		
South Elevation	harrowed do Manual control of the second	acceled 19 accessed a bandled











Santa Fe Springs, California

Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.

BUILDING 2 (24' CLEAR/ 30' T.O.P.)

Marine Marine	
	SIGNAGE
North Elevation	

M		-		
	- Change			T
1				
2			R	

West Elevation

1	and and	where the second	
South Elevation	and the second		and the second se

E			



Enlarged View of North Elevation







Santa Fe Springs, California

BUILDING 3 (24' CLEAR/ 30' T.O.P.) Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.



West Elevation







Enlarged View of East Elevation - Romandel Avenue







Santa Fe Springs, California

BUILDING 4 (24' CLEAR/ 30' T.O.P.) Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.



HPA architecture 01.21.2019

Santa Fe Springs, California

Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.









Telegraph Rd. & Bloomfield Ave.









CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS RESOLUTION NO. 114-2019

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS REGARDING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567; DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962; AND ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138

WHEREAS, a request was filed for Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979), into a single parcel measuring ±8.68 acres; and

WHEREAS, a request was concurrently filed for Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962 to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue; and

WHEREAS, a request was concurrently filed for Zone Change Case No. 138 to change the zoning designation of an 8.68-acre property, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay); and

WHEREAS, the subject property is located at 10075 – 10095 Romandel Avenue and 12015 – 12085 Telegraph Road, with Accessor's Parcel Numbers of 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979, as shown in the latest rolls of the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor; and

WHEREAS, the property owner is PPF Industrial, LLC, 1875 Century Park East, Suite 380, Los Angeles, CA 90067; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development which includes Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567, Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962 and Zone Change Case No. 138 is considered a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Article 20, Section 15378(a); and

WHEREAS, based on the information received from the applicant and staff's assessment, it was found and determined that the proposed project will not have a

significant adverse effect on the environmental following mitigation, therefore, the City caused to be prepared and proposed to adopt an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, On February 1, 2019, the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning and Development Department published a legal notice in the *Whitter Daily News*, a local paper of general circulation, indicating the date and time of the public hearing, and also mailed said public hearing notice on February 1, 2019 to each property owner within a 500 foot radius of the project site in accordance with state law; and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission has considered the application, the written and oral staff report, the General Plan and zoning of the subject property, the testimony, written comments, or other materials presented at the Special Planning Commission Meeting on February 12, 2019 concerning Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567, Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962 and Zone Change Case No. 138.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it RESOLVED that the PLANNING COMMISSION of the CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS does hereby RESOLVE, DETERMINE and ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I. ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

The proposed development is considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and as a result, the project is subject to the City's environmental review process. The environmental analysis provided in the Initial Study indicated that the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse immitigable impacts to the environment, therefore, the City required the preparation and adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Project. The MND reflects the independent judgment of the City of Santa Fe Springs, and the City's environmental consultant, Blodgett/Baylosis Environmental Planning.

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have any significant adverse environmental impacts. The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this Initial Study:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, when considering planned or proposed development in the immediate vicinity.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects that will adversely affect humans, either directly or indirectly.

In addition, pursuant to Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, findings must be adopted by the decision-maker coincidental to the approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, which relates to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. These findings shall be incorporated as part of the decision-maker's findings of fact, in response to AB-3180 and in compliance with the requirements of the Public Resources Code. In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081(a) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the City of Santa Fe Springs can make the following additional findings:

- A mitigation reporting or monitoring program will be required; and,
- An accountable enforcement agency or monitoring agency shall be identified for the mitigation measures adopted as part of the decision-maker's final determination.

A number of mitigation measures have been recommended as a means to reduce or eliminate potential adverse environmental impacts to insignificant levels. AB-3180 requires that a monitoring and reporting program be adopted for the recommended mitigation measures.

SECTION II. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP DETERMINATION

Pursuant to Section 154.07 of the Municipal Code, a tentative map shall not be approved unless the Planning Commission finds that the proposed subdivision, together with the provisions for its design and improvements, is consistent with the general plan as required by Section 66473.5 of the Subdivision Map Act. Additionally, the Planning Commission shall deny a tentative map if it makes any of the findings set forth in Sections 66474 and 66474.6 of the Subdivision Map Act.

(A) <u>Section 66473.5 and Sections 66474(a) and (b) of the Subdivision Map Act require</u> tentative maps to be consistent with the general plan and specific plans.

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map, subject to the attached conditions, is in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act in that:

Approval of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map would promote a number of Specific General Plan Goal and Policies as described in "Table 1" on the following page:

Table 1

General Plan Consistency Analysis

General Plan Element	Policy	Project Consistency
	Goal 9: Provide for growth and diversification of industry and industrial related activities within the Santa Fe Springs industrial area.	The consolidation of the individual parcels will produce one lot that will provide industrial uses that provide a more viable development opportunity of the subject site.
Land Use	Policy 9.4: Encourage the grouping of adjoining small or odd shaped parcels in order to create more viable development.	The project involves the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels measuring approximately +/- 8.68 ac. into one (1) parcel located between Telegraph Rd. & Romandel Ave.
	Goal 11: Support and encourage the viability of the industrial and commercial areas of Santa Fe Springs.	The consolidation of the existing parcels will support and facilitate the development of a new six (6) building industrial center within city limits.

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map, subject to the attached conditions, is compatible with the goals and objectives of various elements of the City of Santa Fe Springs General Plan, and therefore, is in compliance with Government Code Sections 66473.5, and 66474(a) and (b).

(B) <u>Sections 66474(c) and (d) of the Subdivision Map Act require the site to be</u> physically suitable for the type of development and proposed density of <u>development</u>.

In addition to the proposed parcel map, the applicant is concurrently seeking approval to allow the existing zoning designation of M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, to be changed to M-2-PD, Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development, and to allow for the construction of six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue. Therefore, the subject site is physically suitable for the proposed development.

(C) <u>Sections 66474(e) and (f) of the Subdivision Map Act require that the design of the</u> <u>subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial</u> <u>environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their</u> <u>habitat or is likely to cause serious public health concerns.</u> The proposed consolidation is located in an urbanized area that does not contain habitats or would otherwise injure fish and wildlife. Additionally, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study (IS)/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for the proposed industrial project. According to the IS/MND, the project is not expected to have any impacts on biological resources or cause serious public health problems.

(D) <u>Section 66474(g) of the Subdivision Map Act requires that the design of the</u> <u>subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired</u> <u>by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed</u> <u>subdivision.</u>

New easements for utility or roadways, if necessary, will be provided prior to final map approval. Moreover, no public easements are anticipated as a result of the proposed consolidation.

(E) In accordance with Government Code Section 66474.6, it has been determined that the discharge of waste from the proposed subdivision, subject to the attached conditions, into the existing sewer system will not result in a violation of the requirements prescribed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board in that the developer is required to comply with the IS/MND Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, submit an erosion control plan and comply with the NPDES Best Management Practices during the grading and construction phases of the project.

The project is conditioned to meet all federal, state, and local ordinances and requirements including, but not limited to, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

(F) <u>That the proposed subdivision shall be in accordance with Government Code</u> <u>Section 66473.1, entitled "Design of Subdivisions to provide for Future Passive or</u> <u>Natural Heating and Cooling Opportunities."</u>

Future Passive or Natural Heating and Cooling Opportunities will be incorporated with the proposed developments. To the extent feasible, staff will review the proposed developments to ensure that energy-saving devices or materials, including, but not limited to, insulation, double-pane windows, and high efficiency central heating and cooling systems will be incorporated.

SECTION III. DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL FINDINGS

Pursuant to Section 155.739 of the City of Santa Fe Springs Zoning Regulations, the Planning Commission shall consider the following findings in their review and

determination of the subject Development Plan Approval. Based on the available information, the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission hereby make the following findings:

(A) <u>That the proposed development is in conformance with the overall objectives of this chapter</u>.

The proposed project is located within the M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, Zone. Pursuant to Section 155.240 of the Zoning Regulations, "The purpose of the M-2 Zone is to preserve the lands of the city appropriate for heavy industrial uses, to protect these lands from intrusion by dwellings and inharmonious commercial uses, to promote uniform and orderly industrial development, to create and protect property values, to foster an efficient, wholesome and aesthetically pleasant industrial district, to attract and encourage the location of desirable industrial plants, to provide an industrial environment which will be conducive to good employee relations and pride on the part of all citizens of the community and to provide proper safeguards and appropriate transition for surrounding land uses."

The proposed project is consistent with the purpose of the M-2 Zone in the following manner:

- 1. The land is appropriate for industrial uses based on its zoning, M-2, Heavy Manufacturing and its General Plan Land Use designation of Industrial.
- 2. The proposed project will result in six (6) new concrete tilt-up speculative industrial buildings, therefore the land is being maintained for industrial uses.
- 3. The project involves the construction of six (6) new attractive industrial buildings on a site that is currently underutilized. The assessed value of the property will significantly improve after the project, thus leading to an increase in property values for both the subject property and neighboring properties.
- 4. The new buildings offers new construction with modern amenities (i.e. greater ceiling height, energy efficient, etc.) that will help to attract local industrial businesses to either locate or remain in Santa Fe Springs.

It should be noted that a Zone Change is being requested to allow a Planned Development Overlay. The proposed Zone Change is to allow variety and flexibility to the City's Zoning Regulations in order to improve the subject 8.68-acre site, which has never been developed due to existing and on-going oil production activities. In exchange for the Planned Development Overlay, the applicant has provided a project of high standards of design and quality of improvements. It should be noted that, as set forth by Section 155.328 of the City's Zoning Regulations, the project will exceed the minimum 5-acre requirement.

(B) <u>That the architectural design of the proposed structures is such that it will enhance</u> <u>the general appearance of the area and be in harmony with the intent of this</u> <u>chapter</u>. As mentioned previously, the subject site is currently underutilized. The applicant is proposing to construct six (6) new concrete-tilt up industrial buildings on the subject site. The proposed buildings have been designed with variation in the provided setback, height, color, and materials used. The result is an attractive project with contemporary buildings that are comparable to other high quality office/industrial projects here in Santa Fe Springs.

(C) <u>That the proposed structures be considered on the basis of their suitability for their</u> intended purpose and on the appropriate use of materials and on the principles of proportion and harmony of the various elements of the buildings or structures.

The proposed building is well-designed and should be highly suitable for a variety of office, manufacturing and/or warehouse-type users. The design of the proposed buildings provide quality architectural design, as demonstrated by glazing, popouts, and variations in height, materials, and color. These architectural design elements break up the mass of the buildings, and present an attractive, distinctive façade to visitors. As designed, the new buildings represents the architectural design users, and the distinctive design of the buildings represents the architectural principles of proportion and harmony.

(D) <u>That consideration be given to landscaping, fencing and other elements of the</u> proposed development to ensure that the entire development is in harmony with the objectives of this chapter.

Extensive consideration has been given to numerous elements associated with the proposed project to achieve harmony with the City's Zoning Regulations. The majority of the landscaping will be provided along Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue for maximum aesthetic value. Additionally, the majority of truck wells and dock doors have been strategically placed so that they will not be directly visible from the public right-of-way, with exception of Buildings 1, 2, and 5. Considerations have been taken to ensure that the truck wells and dock doors which are visible have been placed in a manner to reduce its visibility from the public street, or otherwise, setback far enough that aesthetic impacts are reduced. And lastly, the proposed trash enclosures have been strategically placed where they are not visible or easily accessible by the public, and where they have least impact on adjacent properties.

(E) <u>That it is not the intent of this subchapter to require any particular style or type of</u> <u>architecture other than that necessary to harmonize with the general area.</u>

As stated previously, the proposed buildings are contemporary in design. The architect used variations in the provide setback, materials and color. The style and architecture of the proposed buildings are consistent with other high quality buildings in the general area. The architect has applied an extensive amount of glazing, color variation, height variation, recessed areas, and has uniquely

incorporated an Arizona tile known as Aequa Cirrus into the overall design. Specifically, the Aequa Cirrus will be used within, or directly adjacent to, the truck loading areas for the aforementioned buildings, which is not commonly seen for most industrial projects.

(F) <u>That it is not the intent of this subchapter to interfere with architectural design</u> <u>except to the extent necessary to achieve the overall objectives of this chapter.</u>

Pursuant to Section 155.736 of the Zoning Regulations "The purpose of the development plan approval is to assure compliance with the provisions of this chapter and to give proper attention to the siting of new structures or additions or alterations to existing structures, particularly in regard to unsightly and undesirable appearance, which would have an adverse effect on surrounding properties and the community in general." The Planning Commission believes that proper attention has been given to the location, size, and design of the proposed building. The Planning Commission, therefore, finds that the new contemporary industrial buildings are well-designed and thus will be an enhancement to the overall area.

SECTION IV. ZONE CHANGE FINDINGS

Section 155.829 of the Zoning Regulations stipulates that, in considering any request for a change of zone, the Commission shall satisfy itself that the following conditions prevail before recommending that the change be granted:

(A) <u>That there is a real need in the community for more of the types of uses permitted</u> by the zone requested than can be accommodated in the areas already zoned for such use.

As proposed, the underlying zone of M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, will remain unchanged. The intent of the Zone Change is to include a PD, Planned Development Overlay to the existing zoning, which will allow variety and flexibility, while at the same time, maintain high standards of design and quality of improvements. The subject site has never been developed due to the existing oil well operations, and therefore, the flexibility of the Planned Development Overlay is needed to cooperate with the Joint Use Agreement imposed by Breitburn-Maverick.

(B) <u>That the property involved in the proposed change of zone is more suitable for the</u> <u>uses permitted in the proposed zone than for the uses permitted in the present</u> <u>zone classification.</u>

As previously mentioned, the Joint Use Agreement imposed by the oil well operator, Bretiburn-Maverick, restricts the overall design configuration for the subject property. The proposed Zone Change will allow the applicant to develop the desired speculative buildings, including truck wells and dock doors for the intended users, while allowing flexibility from the City's Zoning Regulations in exchange for a high quality project. Without the Zone Change, and specifically the Planned Development Overlay, it would be very challenging for anyone to achieve an economically viable project that also conforms to the Joint Use Agreement with Breitburn-Maverick.

(C) <u>That the proposed change of zone would not be detrimental in any way to persons</u> or property in the surrounding area, nor to the community in general.

The proposed Zone Change will have the following positive impacts: (1) promote jobs and increase employment opportunities; (2) raise the property value of the subject property, as well as, other properties in the surrounding area; and (3) provide a project that incorporates high-quality landscaping and aesthetics, creating a more beautiful environment.

(D) <u>That the proposed change of zone will not adversely affect the master plan of the city.</u>

The General Plan is the master plan of the city. The General Plan provides the overall direction for the future development of the City. It is a comprehensive planning document that addresses the many aspects of community life in the City of Santa Fe Springs. It is a long range plan in that it seeks to provide for the needs of the community into the future. The General Plan is also flexible enough to respond to the changing needs and concerns of those who live, work and frequent Santa Fe Springs.

The General Plan consists of six mandatory elements, including: 1) Land Use; 2) Housing; 3) Open Space/Conservation; 4) Safety; 5) Circulation; and 6) Noise. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed Zone Change will adversely affect the master plan of the city. In fact, the Zone Change, if approved, will help facilitate a development project that may not be possible without the flexibility provided by the Planned Development Overlay Zone.

Additionally, the following table (Table 2) illustrates how the proposed Zone Change will be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

Element	Policy	Project Consistency/Comment
Land Use	Goal 9: Provide for growth and diversification of industry and industrial related activities within the Santa Fe Springs Industrial area.	Consistent: The proposed development will allow an area of land currently dedicated for the sole purpose of oil extraction to incorporate other industrial and office uses, while constructing six (6) new attractive buildings.
	Policy 9.4: Encourage the grouping of	Consistent: The proposed Tentative Parcel
	adjoining small or odd shaped parcels in	Map will consolidate twenty-eight (28)

Table 2 General Plan Consistency Analysis

	order to create more viable	existing parcels into one (1) 8.86 AC lot in
	development.	order to allow an attractive new development
		consisting of six (6) industrial buildings.
	Policy 9.5: Encourage the release of	Consistent: The proposed Zone Change will
	land surface no longer needed for	allow flexibility so that the existing oil
	petroleum production so the oil field area	operations may remain, but to also allow for
	can be developed in accordance with the	the land surrounding the wells to be
	goals of the General Plan.	developed.
Circulation	Policy 1.6: Limit driveway access on	Consistent: It has been conditioned that the
	arterial streets to maintain a desired	driveway along Telegraph Road shall only
	quality of flow.	allow the ingress and egress of passenger
		vehicles. All truck traffic shall occur on
		Romandel Avenue.

SECTION V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

The Planning Commission hereby adopts Resolution No. 114-2019 to approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979), into a single parcel measuring ±8.68 acres; Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962 to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road with additional frontage on Romandel Avenue; Zone Change Case No. 138 to change the zoning designation of the 8.68-acre property, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing - Planned Development Overlay); and also to approve and adopt the proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (IS/MND/MMRP) for the subject property located at 10075 – 10095 Romandel Avenue and 12015 - 12085 Telegraph Road, subject to conditions attached hereto as Exhibit A & Exhibit B.

ADOPTED and APPROVED this 12th day of February, 2019 BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS.

Chairperson

ATTEST:

Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval

Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962

Telegraph Road & Romandel Avenue (APNs: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

GENERAL

1. The attached list of conditions of approval shall apply to the applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, and specifically the proposed development project on the subject 8.68-acre site. These conditions do not affect the existing ongoing operations of Breitburn-Maverick.

ENGINEERING / PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:

(Contact: Robert Garcia 562.868-0511 x7545)

STREETS

- 2. That the applicant shall pay a flat fee of \$83,892.10 to reconstruct/resurface the existing street frontage to centerline for Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue.
- 3. That applicant shall remove and replace (2) driveway approaches, curb, & gutter per city standard plan R-6.4 along Telegraph Road and along Romandel Avenue.
- 4. That the applicant shall design and construct a 5-foot wide meandering sidewalk per City standards and dedicate an easement along the entire Romandel Avenue frontage and Telegraph Road frontage from the east property line to the driveway (approximately 120 Feet). If applicable, the dedicated easement shall be shown on the Parcel/Tract Map. Furthermore, said meandering sidewalk shall be shown on both the civil and landscape plans.
- 5. All above ground oil wells, pipelines, tanks, and related lines within the public right-ofway shall be placed underground unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
- 6. That the applicant shall pay to the City the entire cost (\$30,000) of design, engineering, installation and inspection to relocate (1) street light on Romandel Avenue in conflict with proposed driveway entrance and (1) new street light on Telegraph Road east of the driveway.
- 7. That adequate "on-site" parking shall be provided per City requirements, and all streets abutting the development shall be posted "No Stopping Any Time." The City will install the offsite signs and the applicant shall pay \$1,600.00 to install (8) new signs.

- 8. The applicant will be responsible for the installation, replacement or modification of street name signs, traffic control signs, striping and pavement markings required in conjunction with the development.
- 9. Proposed driveways shall be located to be free and clear of existing fire hydrants, street lights, water meters, etc.

CITY UTILITIES

- 10. Storm drains, catch basins, connector pipes, retention basin and appurtenances built for this project shall be constructed in accordance with City specifications in Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue). Storm drain plans shall be approved by the City Engineer.
- 11. Fire hydrants shall be installed as required by the Fire Department. Existing public fire hydrants adjacent to the site, if any, shall be upgraded if required by the City Engineer. That the applicant shall pay to the City the entire cost of design, engineering, installation and inspection of Fire hydrants.
- 12. That sanitary sewers shall be constructed in accordance with City specifications to serve the subject development. The plans for the sanitary sewers shall be approved by the City Engineer. A sewer study (including a sewer flow test) shall be submitted along with the sanitary sewer plans.
- 13. All buildings shall be connected to the sanitary sewers.
- 14. That the fire sprinkler plans, which show the proposed double-check valve detector assembly location, shall have a stamp approval from the Planning Department and Public Works Department prior to the Fire Department's review for approval. Disinfection, pressure and bacteriological testing on the line between the street and detector assembly shall be performed in the presence of personnel from the City Water Department. The valve on the water main line shall be operated only by the City and only upon the City's approval of the test results.
- 15. That the applicant shall obtain a Storm Drain Connection Permit for any connection to the storm drain system.
- 16. The applicant shall have an overall site utility master plan prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer showing proposed location of all public water mains, reclaimed water mains, sanitary sewers and storm drains. This plan shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to the preparation of any construction plans for the aforementioned improvements.

TRAFFIC

17. All trucks will only be allowed to enter/exit development from Romandel Avenue. Non truck traffic exiting the development via the Telegraph Road driveway will be restricted

to right turn out. The applicant will modify the existing Telegraph Road median to prohibit left turns out of the Telegraph driveway.

PARCEL MAPS

- 18. Final parcel map checking of \$4,970 plus \$295 per parcel shall be paid to the City. Developer shall comply with Los Angeles County's Digital Subdivision Ordinance (DSO) and submit final maps to the City and County in digital format.
- 19. The applicant shall provide at no cost to the City, one mylar print of the recorded parcel map from the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, P.O. Box 1460, Alhambra, CA 91802-1460, Attention: Bill Slenniken (626) 458-5131.

FEES

- 20. That the applicant shall comply with Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements and provide mitigation of trips generated by the development. The applicant and/or developer will receive credit for the demolition of any buildings that formerly occupied the site. For new developments, the applicant and/or developer cannot meet the mitigation requirements, the applicant and/or developer shall pay a mitigation fee to be determined by the City Engineer for off-site transportation improvements.
- 21. That the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the County Sanitation District, make application for and pay the sewer maintenance fee.
- 22. That the applicant shall pay the water trunkline connection fee of \$3,700 per acre upon application for water service connection or if utilizing any existing water service.

MISCELLANEOUS

- 23. That a grading plan shall be submitted for drainage approval to the City Engineer. The applicant shall pay drainage review fees in conjunction with this submittal. A professional civil engineer registered in the State of California shall prepare the grading plan.
- 24. That a hydrology study shall be submitted to the City if requested by the City Engineer. The study shall be prepared by a Professional Civil Engineer.
- 25. That upon completion of public improvements constructed by developers, the developer's civil engineer shall submit mylar record drawings and an electronic file (AutoCAD Version 2004 or higher) to the office of the City Engineer.
- 26. That the applicant shall comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and shall require the general contractor to implement storm water/urban runoff pollution prevention controls and Best Management Practices (BMPs) on all construction sites in accordance with the current MS4 Permit. The applicant will also be required to submit a Certification for the project and will be

required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Low Impact Development Plan (LID).

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE - RESCUE (FIRE PREVENTION DIVISION) (Contact: Raul Diaz 562.868-0511 x3813)

- 27. When applicable, abandoned oil wells must be exposed and inspected under the oversight of a registered engineer, registered geologist or other Fire-Rescue approved technical expert. The wells must be monitored for methane leaks and the precise location of each abandoned well shall be surveyed. A report of findings, along with a description of any recommended remedial actions (if necessary), signed by a registered engineer, registered geologist or Fire-Rescue approved technical expert, must be provided to the Department of Fire-Rescue.
- 28. That a methane gas protection system designed in accordance with the standards established by the County of Los Angeles shall be required for all habitable structures. Plans for the proposed methane gas protection system shall be submitted to the Department of Fire-Rescue prior to construction. An alternative to the County of Los Angeles standards may be acceptable if approved by the Department of Fire-Rescue.
- 29. That all abandoned oil wells located beneath or within 10 feet of the proposed building footprint are abandoned to current Department of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) standards.
- 30. That all abandoned oil wells located beneath or within 10 feet of the proposed building footprint shall be equipped with a concrete vent cone. The installation of the vent cone and associated vent piping shall be approved by the Department of Fire-Rescue prior to installation.
- 31. That interior gates or fences are not permitted across required Department of Fire-Rescue access roadways unless otherwise granted prior approval by the City Department of Fire-Rescue.
- 32. That if on-site fire hydrants are required by the Department of Fire-Rescue, a minimum flow must be in accordance with Appendix B from the current Fire Code flowing from the most remote hydrant. In addition, on-site hydrants must have current testing, inspection and maintenance per California Title 19 and NFPA 25.
- 33. That the standard aisle width for onsite emergency vehicle maneuvering shall be 26 feet with a minimum clear height of 13 feet 6 inches. Internal driveways shall have a turning radius of not less than 52 feet. The final location and design of this 26 feet shall be subject to the approval of the City's Fire Chief as established by the California Fire Code. A request to provide emergency vehicle aisle width less than 26 feet shall be considered upon the installation/provision of mitigation improvements approved by the City's Fire Chief.

- 34. That prior to submitting plans to the Building Department, a preliminary site plan shall be approved by the Department of Fire-Rescue for required access roadways and onsite fire hydrant locations. The site plan shall be drawn at a scale between 20 to 40 feet per inch. Include on plan all entrance gates that will be installed.
- 35. That Knox boxes are required on all new construction. All entry gates shall also be equipped with Knox boxes or Knox key switches for power-activated gates.
- 36. That signs and markings required by the Department of Fire-Rescue shall be installed along the required Department of Fire-Rescue access roadways.

DEPARTMENT OF FIRE - RESCUE (ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION) (Contact: Tom Hall 562.868-0511 x3815)

- 37. That prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall comply with the applicable conditions below and **obtain notification in writing** from the Santa Fe Springs Department of Fire-Rescue Environmental Protection Division (EPD) that all applicable conditions have been met:
 - a. At a minimum, the applicant must conduct an All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) Investigation (formerly called a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment) in accordance with ASTM Standard E1527-05. The applicant shall provide the EPD with a copy of the AAI investigation report for review and approval. If the AAI investigation identifies a release, or potential release at the site, the applicant must comply with part b.
 - b. An environmental site assessment may be required based on the information presented in the AAI investigation report. The environmental site assessment report must be reviewed and approved by the EPD in writing. Should the report indicate that contaminate levels exceed recognized regulatory screening levels, remedial action will be required. A remedial action work plan must be approved by the authorized oversight agency before implementation. Once remedial action is complete, a final remedial action report must be submitted and approved by the oversight agency.
 - c. Soil Management Plan & Report. A Soils Management Plan (SMP) which addresses site monitoring and a contingency plan for addressing previously unidentified contamination discovered during site development activities may be required. If required, the SMP shall be submitted to the EPD for review and approval before grading activities begin. Once grading is complete, a SMP report must be submitted to the EPD for final written approval. Building plans will not be approved until the SMP report has been approved by the EPD in writing.
- 38. <u>Permits and approvals</u>. That the applicant shall, at its own expense, secure or cause to be secured any and all permits or other approvals which may be required by the City and any other governmental agency prior to conducting environmental assessment or

remediation on the property. Permits shall be secured prior to beginning work related to the permitted activity.

- 39. That all abandoned pipelines, tanks and related facilities shall be removed unless approved by the City Engineer and Fire Chief. Appropriate permits for such work shall be secured before abandonment work begins.
- 40. That the applicant shall comply with all Federal, State and local requirements and regulations included, but not limited to, the Santa Fe Springs City Municipal Code, California Fire Code, Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) programs, the Air Quality Management District's Rules and Regulations and all other applicable codes and regulations.
- 41. That the applicant shall submit plumbing plans to the Santa Fe Springs Department of Fire-Rescue Environmental Protection Division (EPD) and, if necessary, obtain an Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit Application for generating, storing, treating or discharging any industrial wastewater to the sanitary sewer.

POLICE SERVICES DEPARTMENT:

(Contact: Luis Collazo 562.409.1850 x3320)

- 42. That the applicant shall submit and obtain approval of a proposed lighting (photometric) and security plan for the property from the City's Department of Police Services. The photometric plan shall be designed to provide adequate lighting (minimum of 1 foot candle power) throughout the subject property. Further, all exterior lighting shall be designed/installed in such a manner that light and glare are not transmitted onto adjoining properties in such concentration/quantity as to create a hardship to adjoining property owners or a public nuisance. The photometric and security plans shall be submitted to the Director of Police Services no later than sixty (60) day from the date of approval by the Planning Commission.
- 43. That for emergency purposes, the applicant shall provide the name of the construction manager/superintendent, and his contact information to the Department of Police Services. The name, telephone number, fax number and e-mail address of that person shall be provided to the Director of Police Services no later than 60 days from the date of approval by the Planning Commission. Emergency information shall allow emergency service to reach the applicant or their representative any time, 24 hours a day.
- 44. That in order to facilitate the removal of unauthorized vehicles parked on the property, the applicant shall post, in plain view and at each entry to the property, a sign not less than 17" wide by 22" long. The sign shall prohibit the public parking of unauthorized vehicles and indicate that unauthorized vehicles will be removed at the owner's expense and also contain the California Vehicle Code that permits this action. The sign shall also contain the telephone number of the local law enforcement agency (Police Services Center (562) 409-1850). The lettering within the sign shall not be less than one inch in height. The applicant shall contact the Police Services Center for an inspection no later

than 30 days after the project has been completed and prior to the occupancy permit being issued.

- 45. That the proposed buildings, including any lighting, fences, walls, cabinets, and poles shall be maintained in good repair, free from trash, debris, litter and graffiti and other forms of vandalism. Any damage from any cause shall be repaired within 72 hours of occurrence, weather permitting, to minimize occurrences of dangerous conditions or visual blight. Paint utilized in covering graffiti shall be a color that matches, as closely possible, the color of the existing and/or adjacent surfaces.
- 46. That during the construction phase of the proposed project, the contractor shall provide an identification number (i.e. address number) at each building and/or entry gate to direct emergency vehicles in case of an emergency. The identification numbers may be painted on wood boards and fastened to the temporary construction fence. The boards may be removed after each building has been identified with their individual permanent number address.
- 47. That during the construction phase, the developer and/or contractor shall maintain the construction site free of trash and debris where it is not visible from public view. Moreover, all bathroom facilities (outhouses, etc.) shall be placed where they are not visible from the public street.
- 48. That during the construction phase, the developer and/or contractor shall monitor the site and maintain it clean of any graffiti. Graffiti shall be removed within 72-hours from when it was noticed.
- 49. That the property owner and/or lease agent shall notify any potential tenant that a city business license is required prior to occupying any portion of the property.
- 50. That the property owner and/or lease agent shall notify any potential tenants that the parking areas and their respective aisle shall not be reduced or encroached upon with outdoor storage. Moreover, outdoor storage is prohibited at all times. This condition does not apply to Breitburn Operating LP and/or its contractors when servicing wells or their related well equipment
- 51. That the property manager shall not allow any gardeners or landscaping maintenance crews, or parking sweeping crews to begin their work until after 7:00 a.m. and no later than 7:00 p.m. seven-days per week. This condition does not apply to Breitburn Operating LP and/or its contractors when servicing wells or their related well equipment.
- 52. That all parking stalls and/or designated on-site parking areas shall be constantly available to all employees during their respective business hours. Parking stalls shall not be sectioned off for reserved or preferred parking. This condition does not apply to Breitburn Operating LP and/or its contractors when servicing wells or their related well equipment.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: (Contact: Wayne Morrell 562.868.0511 x7362)

- 53. The applicant shall comply with Section 50.51 of the Municipal Code which prohibits any business or residents from contracting any solid waste disposal company that does not hold a current permit from the City.
- 54. All projects over \$50,000 are subject to the requirements of Ordinance No. 914 to reuse or recycle 75% of the project waste. Contact the Environmental Consultant, Morgan McCarthy at (562) 432-3700 or (805) 815-2492.
- 55. The applicant shall comply with Public Resource Code, Section 42900 et seq. (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991) as amended, which requires each development project to provide adequate storage area for the collection/storage and removal of recyclable and green waste materials.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT: (Contact: Vince Velasco 562.868-0511 x7353)

- 56. Approval of the subject Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962 is still contingent upon approval of Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567, to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979) into a single parcel measuring ±8.68 acres, and Zone Change Case No. 138, to change the zoning designation of the subject ±8.68 acre site, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing Planned Development).
- 57. To prevent the travel of combustible methane gas into any structure, all slab or foundation penetrations, including plumbing, communication and electrical penetrations, must be sealed with an appropriate material. In addition, underground electrical conduits penetrating the slab or foundation of the structure, shall comply with the National Electrical Code (NEC), replete with a seal-off device normally required for classified electrical installations, so as to prevent the travel of combustible methane gas into the structure through conduit runs. <u>Refer to California Electrical Code, Chapter 5, Sections 500 and 501.</u>
- 58. If the subject property is deemed to be located within the "Methane Zone" by the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Department, the owner/developer shall indicated the subject property is located within the Methane Zone on the first page of the building construction plans. Said indication shall be clearly painted with a minimum front size of 20 point.

- 59. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which was prepared for the proposed project and adopted by the Planning Commission upon completion of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, shall be made part of the conditions of approval for the subject development. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is listed as an attachment to the staff report.
- 60. Applicant shall be responsible for implementing mitigation measures pursuant to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and provide all necessary documentation. Planning Department staff will verify compliance prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. *On-going monitoring shall be reported to the City every six (6) months.*
- 61. During construction, the following information shall be made available on a sign posted at the main entrance(s) to the site:
 - a) Name of the development/project.
 - b) Name of the development company.
 - c) Address or Address range for the subject site.
 - d) 24-hour telephone number where someone can leave a message on a particular complaint (dust, noise, odor, etc.)
- 62. The applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, shall implement a dust control program for air quality control. The program shall ensure that a water vehicle for dust control operations is kept readily available at all times during construction. The developer shall provide the City Engineer and Building Official with the name, telephone number and e-mail address of the person directly responsible for dust control and operation of the vehicle.
- 63. Secure fencing around the construction site with locking gates and appropriate lighting shall be installed during construction to prevent trespassing and theft.
- 64. It shall be unlawful for any person to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on buildings, structures, or projects, other than emergency work, between 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, if such maintenance activity produces noise above the ambient levels as identified in the City's Zoning Regulations.
- 65. Prior to the issuance of Building Permits, the applicant shall obtain an Office Trailer Permit for the use of mobile office trailers during the construction process.
- 66. Except as described in Section 155.462 of the City's Zoning Regulations, the applicant agrees and understands that all electrical distribution lines of 16,000 volts or less, telephone, cable antenna television and similar service wires or cables, which provide direct service to the property being developed shall be placed underground.
- 67. Applicant shall provide for appropriate cable television systems and for communication systems, including but not limited to, telephone and internet services to each building in

the subdivision. The applicant is responsible for complying with this requirements and shall make necessary arrangements with each of the serving utilities, including licensed cable television operators and other video service providers for the installation of these facilities.

- 68. The Department of Planning and Development requires that the double-check detector assembly be placed as far back as practical, screened by shrubs or other materials, and painted forest green. All shrubs shall be planted a minimum distance of two (2) feet surrounding the detector assembly; <u>however, the area in front of the OS and Y valves shall not be screened.</u> The screening shall also only be applicable to the double-check detector assembly and <u>shall not</u> include the fire department connector (FDC). Notwithstanding, the Fire Marshall shall have discretionary authority to require the FDC to be located a minimum distance of two (2) feet between the lowest part of the ground and the bottom of the valve shut off wheel.
- 69. Applicant shall comply with the City's "Heritage Artwork in Public Places Program" in conformance with City Ordinance No. 1054.
- 70. Applicant understands and agrees that all exterior mechanical equipment shall be screened from view on all sides. Additionally, all roof-mounted mechanical equipment and/or duct work which projects above the roof or roof parapet of the proposed development and is visible from adjacent property or a public street shall be screened by an enclosure which is consistent with the architecture of the building in terms of materials and color and also approved by the Director of Planning or designee. In addition, rooftop mechanical equipment shall be setback a minimum 15 feet from the exterior edges of the building. If full screening of roof mounted equipment is not designed specifically into the building, the applicant shall submit mechanical plans that includes a roof plan showing the location of all roof mounted equipment and any proposed screening prior to submitting plans to the Building Division for plan check.
 - a. To illustrate the visibility of equipment and/or duct work, the following shall be submitted along with the Mechanical Plans:
 - i. A roof plan showing the location of all roof-mounted equipment;
 - ii. Elevations of all existing and proposed mechanical equipment; and
 - iii. A building cross-section drawing which shows the roof-mounted equipment and its relation to the roof and parapet lines.
- 71. Applicant shall design and construct meandering sidewalks along the front setback area of Romandel Avenue. Said meandering sidewalks must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department and Public Works Department prior to construction.
- 72. Applicant shall submit for approval a detailed landscape and automatic irrigation plan pursuant to the Landscaping Guidelines of the City. Said landscape plan shall indicate the location and type of all plant materials, existing and proposed, to be used, shrubs designed to fully screen the interior yard and parking areas from public view, and 24"

box trees along the street frontage. Said plans shall be consistent with AB 1881 (Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance).

- 73. The landscaped areas shall be provided with a suitable, fixed, permanent and automatically controlled method for watering and sprinkling of plants. This operating sprinkler system shall consist of an electrical time clock, control valves, and piped water lines terminating in an appropriate number of sprinklers to insure proper watering periods and to provide water for all plants within the landscaped area. Sprinklers used to satisfy the requirements of this section shall be spaced to assure complete coverage of all landscaped areas. Said plan shall be consistent with AB 1881 (Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance).
- 74. The applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, shall submit a lighting program that is integrated into the overall site, landscape design and building design. Lighting shall be used to highlight prominent building features such as entries and other focal points. Up-lighting can also be used as a way to enhance the texture of plants and structures, to create a sense of height in a landscape design.
- 75. Landscaping shall be provided between Buildings 3 & 6 in a manner that will screen all dock doors and loading activities from both Telegraph Road & Romandel Avenue. Any proposed landscaping shall first be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning or designee.
- 76. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant (PPF Industrial, LLC) shall provide proof of request from Breitburn Operating LP for the installation and use of grasscrete where deemed appropriate on the subject property. The final location and overall quantity of grasscrete shall be determined by a mutual agreement between the City of Santa Fe Springs, PPF Industrial, LLC, and Breitburn Operating LP.
- 77. Upon completion of the new landscaping, the required landscaped areas shall be maintained in a neat, clean, orderly and healthful condition. This is meant to include proper pruning, mowing of lawns, weeding, removal of litter, fertilizing, and replacement of plants when necessary and the regular watering of all plantings.
- 78. Prior to plan check submittal, the applicant shall submit plans to the Planning Department for review and approval of all private open space areas for the development. At minimum, the proposal (plan) shall include the size and location of the dedicated spaces, as well as, identify the proposed features and/or amenities. Such features shall include, but are not limited to, conceptual landscaping, seating areas, etc.
- 79. The electrical plans, which show the location of electrical transformer(s), shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Department. Transformers shall not be located within the front yard setback area. The location of the transformer(s) shall be subject to the <u>prior approval</u> of the Director of Planning and Development or designee. The electrical transformer shall be screened with shrubs consistent with Southern California Edison's Guidelines which requires three (3) foot clearance on sides and back of the

equipment, and eight (8) foot clearance in front of the equipment. Additionally, the landscaping irrigation system shall be installed so that they do not spray on equipment. A copy of the Guideline is available at the Planning Department.

- 80. All activities shall occur inside the building(s). No portion of the required off-street parking and driveway areas shall be used for outdoor storage of any type or for specialevent activities, unless prior written approval is obtained from the Director of Planning, Director of Police Services and the Fire Marshall.
- 81. The proposed grade level roll-up doors located at the rear of Buildings 3 & 6 shall only be used for forklift access and shall not be utilized for truck loading and unloading at any time.
- 82. All vehicles associated with the businesses on the subject property shall be parked on the subject site at all times. Off-site parking is not permitted and would result in the restriction or revocation of privileges granted under this Permit. In addition, any vehicles associated with the property shall not obstruct or impede any traffic.
- 83. All fences, walls, gates and similar improvements for the proposed development shall be subject to the *prior* approval of the Department of Fire-Rescue and the Department of Planning and Development.
- 84. There shall be no roof-mounted mechanical equipment and/or duct work which projects above the roof or roof parapet of any of the proposed buildings and visible from a public street.
- 85. The Department of Planning and Development shall first review and approve all sign proposals for the development. The sign proposal (plan) shall include a site plan, building elevation on which the sign will be located, size, style and color of the proposed sign. All drawings shall be properly dimensioned and drawn to scale on 11" x 17" maximum-size paper. All signs shall be installed in accordance with the sign standards of the Zoning Ordinance and the Sign Guidelines of the City.
- 86. Pursuant to the sign standards of the Zoning Regulations and related Sign Guidelines of the City of Santa Fe Springs, a comprehensive Sign Program for the development shall be prepared and submitted to the Director of Planning (or designee) for approval prior to obtaining a building permit for any signs related to the subject development. All signs throughout the subject site shall be installed in accordance with the approved comprehensive Sign Program for the subject development.
- 87. Sufficient number of approved outdoor trash enclosures shall be provided for the development subject to the approval of the Director of Planning or designee. The calculation to determine the required storage area is: 1% of the first 20,000 sq ft of floor area + ½% of floor area exceeding 20,000 sq ft, but not less that 4 ½ feet in width nor than 6 feet in height. *(Calculations are subject to change).* Further, all trash enclosures shall be designed to architecturally integrate with the overall design theme of the
development. Trash enclosures should be provided with a trellis (or other covered structure) and also provided with vines (if located adjacent to or within a landscaped area) to help minimize the visual impact of said enclosures. Additionally, said enclosure shall be consistent with the County of Los Angeles Building Code requirements, and specifically Title A, Division 7, Section 7313.

- 88. Applicant shall not allow commercial vehicles, trucks and/or truck tractors to queue on Romandel Avenue or Telegraph Road, use street(s) as a staging area, or to backup onto the street from the subject property.
- 89. The proposed building shall be constructed of quality material and any material shall be replaced when and if the material becomes deteriorated, warped, discolored or rusted.
- 90. Approved suite numbers/letters or address numbers shall be placed on the proposed building in such a position as to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property. Said numbers shall contrast with their background. The size recommendation shall be 12" minimum.
- 91. The applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, shall provide a bulletin board, display case, or kiosk to display transportation information where the greatest number of employees are likely to see it. In formation shall include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a) Current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site; and
 - b) Telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators; and
 - c) Ridesharing promotional material supplied by commuter-oriented organizations; and
 - d) Bicycle route and facility information, including regional/local bicycle maps and bicycle safety information; and
 - e) A listing of facilities available for carpoolers, vanpoolers, bicyclists, transit riders and pedestrians at the site.
- 92. A minimum of 187 parking stalls shall be provided and continually maintained on-site at all times. Said parking stalls shall be legibly marked off on the pavement, showing the required parking spaces. Additionally, all compact spaces shall be further identified by having the words "compact" or comparable wording legibly written on the pavement, wheel stop or on a clearly visible sign.
- 93. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall comply with the following conditions to the satisfaction of the City of Santa Fe Springs:
 - a. Covenants.
 - 1. Applicant shall provide a written covenant to the Planning Department that, except as owner/developer may have otherwise disclosed to the City, Commission, Planning Commission or their employees, in writing, owner/developer has investigated the

environmental condition of the property and does not know, or have reasonable cause to believe, that (a) any crude oil, hazardous substances or hazardous wastes, as defined in state and federal law, have been released, as that term is defined in 42 U.S.C. Section 9601 (22), on, under or about the Property, or that (b) any material has been discharged on, under or about the Property that could affect the quality of ground or surface water on the Property within the meaning of the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, as amended, Water Code Section 13000, et seq

- 2. Applicant shall provide a written covenant to the City that, based on reasonable investigation and inquiry, to the best of applicant's knowledge, it does not know or have reasonable cause to believe that it is in violation of any notification, remediation or other requirements of any federal, state or local agency having jurisdiction concerning the environmental conditions of the Property.
- b. Applicant understands and agrees that it is the responsibility of the applicant to investigate and remedy, pursuant to applicable federal, state and local law, any and all contamination on or under any land or structure affected by this approval and issuance of related building permits. The City, Commission, Planning Commission or their employees, by this approval and by issuing related building permits, in no way warrants that said land or structures are free from contamination or health hazards.
- c. Applicant understands and agrees that any representations, actions or approvals by the City, Commission, Planning Commission or their employees do not indicate any representation that regulatory permits, approvals or requirements of any other federal, state or local agency have been obtained or satisfied by the applicant and, therefore, the City, Commission, Planning Commission or their employees do not release or waive any obligations the applicant may have to obtain all necessary regulatory permits and comply with all other federal, state or other local agency regulatory requirements. Applicant, not the City, Commission, Planning Commission or their employees will be responsible for any and all penalties, liabilities, response costs and expenses arising from any failure of the applicant to comply with such regulatory requirements.
- 94. Applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that information contained in construction drawings and/or landscape & irrigation plans are consistent among architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, fire, utility and public improvement plans as well as other civil drawings. This responsibility may be transferred by the applicant to the project architect. While the City aims to correct inconsistencies, it is the ultimate responsibility of the applicant/project architect to remedy, up to and including completion of construction revisions prior to receiving final occupancy approvals.

- 95. Applicant shall clarify on the construction drawings that all roof drains (facing the street), shall be provided along the interior walls and not along the exterior of the building.
- 96. Applicant shall be responsible for reviewing and/or providing copies of the required conditions of approval to his/her architect, engineer, contractor, tenants, etc. Additionally, the conditions of approval contained herein, shall be made part of the construction drawings for the proposed development. *Construction drawings shall not be accepted for Plan Check without the conditions of approval incorporated into the construction drawings*.
- 97. Prior to occupancy of the property/building, the applicant, and/or his tenant(s), shall obtain a valid business license (AKA Business Operation Tax Certificate), and submit a Statement of Intended Use. Both forms, and other required accompanying forms, may be obtained at City Hall by contacting the Finance Department at (562) 868-0511, extension 7520, or through the City's web site (www.santafesprings.org).
- 98. Applicant shall require and verify that all contractors and sub-contractors have successfully obtained a Business License with the City of Santa Fe Springs prior to beginning any work associated with the subject project. A late fee and penalty will be accessed to any contractor or sub-contractor that fails to obtain a Business License and a Building Permit final or Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued until all fees and penalties are paid in full. Please contact the Finance Department, at (562) 868-0511, extension 7520 for additional information. A business license application can also be downloaded at www.santafesprings.org.
- 99. The development shall otherwise be substantially in accordance with the plot plan, floor plan, and elevations submitted by the owner and on file with the case.
- 100. The final plot plan, floor plan and elevations of the proposed development and all other appurtenant improvements, textures and color schemes shall be subject to the final approval of the Director of Planning.
- 101. Applicant understands if changes to the original plans (submitted and on file with the subject case) are required during construction, revised plans must be provided to the planning department for review and approval prior to the implementation of such changes. *It should be noted that certain changes may also require approvals from other departments.*
- 102. The applicant, PPF Industrial, LLC, agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Santa Fe Springs, its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the City or any of its councils, commissions, committees or boards arising from or in any way related to all entitlements and approvals issued by the City in connection with the Project and from any CEQA challenges relating to the environmental review and determination for the Project, or any actions or operations conducted pursuant thereto. Should the City, its agents, officers or employees receive

notice of any such claim, action or proceeding, the City shall promptly notify the applicant of such claim, action or proceeding, and shall cooperate fully in the defense thereof.

- 103. All other requirements of the City's Zoning Regulations, Building Code, Property Maintenance Ordinance, State and City Fire Code and all other applicable County, State and Federal regulations and codes shall be complied with.
- 104. It is hereby declare to be the intent that if any provision of this Approval is violated or held to be invalid, or if any law, statute or ordinance is violated, this Approval shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
- 105. All otherwise specified in the action granting Development Plan Approval, said approval which has not been utilized within a period of 12 consecutive months from the effective date shall become null and void. Also, the abandonment or nonuse of a Development Plan Approval for a period of 12 consecutive months shall terminate said Development Plan Approval and any privileges granted thereunder shall become null and void. However, an extension of time may be granted by Commission or Council action.

Exhibit B – Conditions of Approval

Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567

Telegraph Road & Romandel Avenue (APNs: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

ENGINEERING / PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Contact: Robert Garcia 562.868-0511 x7545)

- 1. Final parcel map checking of \$4,970 plus \$295 per parcel shall be paid to the City. Developer shall comply with Los Angeles County's Digital Subdivision Ordinance (DSO) and submit final maps to the City and County in digital format.
- 2. The applicant shall provide at no cost to the City, one mylar print of the recorded parcel map from the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, P.O. Box 1460, Alhambra, CA 91802-1460, Attention: Bill Slenniken (626) 458-5131.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT: (Contact: Vince Velasco 562.868-0511 x7353)

- 3. Approval of Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 is subject to compliance with the provisions of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) which was prepared for the proposed project and adopted by the Planning Commission upon completion of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. The MMRP has been made part of the conditions of approval and is also listed as an attachment to the staff report.
- 4. Applicant shall provide for appropriate cable television systems and for communication systems, including but not limited to, telephone and internet services to each building in the subdivision. The applicant is responsible for complying with this requirements and shall make necessary arrangements with each of the serving utilities, including licensed cable television operators and other video service providers for the installation of these facilities.

- 5. The Final Map to be recorded with the Los Angeles County Recorder shall substantially conform to the Tentative Parcel Map submitted by the applicant and on file with the case.
- 6. Currently, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works is utilizing a computerized system to update and digitize the countywide land use base. If the parcel map is prepared using a computerized drafting system, the applicant or their civil engineer shall submit a map in digital graphic format with the final Mylar map to the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works for recordation and to the City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Public Works for incorporation into its GIS land use map. The City of Santa Fe Springs GIS Coordinate System shall be used for the digital file.
- 7. Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 shall expire 24 months after Planning Commission approval, on February 12, 2021, except as provided under the provisions of California Government Code Section 66452.6. During this time period the final map shall be presented to the City of Santa Fe Springs for approval. The consolidation proposed by Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567 shall not be effective until such time that a final map is recorded.
- 8. As a condition for approval for Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567, the "Consolidator," PPF Industrial, LLC, agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Santa Fe Springs, its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the City or any of its councils, commissions, committees or boards concerning the subdivision when action is brought within the time period provided for in Government Code, Section 66499.37. Should the City, its agents, officers or employees receive notice of any such claim, action or proceeding, the City shall promptly notify subdivider of such claim, action or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense thereof.
- 9. Applicant shall comply with Government Code Section 66436 (a)(3) before approval of the final map, and shall provide "no objection" letters from the public entity or utility to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 10. All other requirements of the City's Zoning Regulations, Building Code, Property Maintenance Ordinance, State and City Fire Code and all other applicable County, State and Federal regulations and codes shall be complied with.

11. It is hereby declare to be the intent that if any provision of this Approval is violated or held to be invalid, or if any law, statute or ordinance is violated, this Approval shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

ATTACHMENT 3

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL (DPA NO. 957 - 962) ZONE CHANGE (ZC NO. 138) TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM NO. 082567) CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT 11710 TELEGRAPH ROAD SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA 90670

REPORT PREPARED BY: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 2211 SOUTH HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107 HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745

JANUARY 15, 2019

SFSP 061

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NAME: MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV.

APPLICANT: The project Applicant is Dan Broder, Kearny Real Estate Company, 1875 Century Park East, Suite 380, Los Angeles, California 90067.

ADDRESS: MC&C Commerce Center Site IV is located along the north side of Telegraph Avenue and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue. The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) applicable to the site include 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979.

CITY/COUNTY: Santa Fe Springs, Los Angeles County.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an industrial park (referred to herein as MC&C Commerce Center Site IV) located within the City of Santa Fe Springs. The MC&C Commerce Center Site IV project site has a total land area of 378,288 square feet (8.68 acres) and consists of 28 parcels. The project will include six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area. Parking will consist of 263 parking stalls and 17 dock high doors. In addition, approximately 75,382 square feet (19%) of the site will be covered over in landscaping. The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment.

FINDINGS: The environmental analysis provided in the attached Initial Study indicates that the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse unmitigable environmental impacts. For this reason, the City of Santa Fe Springs determined that a *Mitigated Negative Declaration* is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project. The following findings may also be made based on the analysis contained in the attached Initial Study:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The environmental analysis is provided in the attached Initial Study prepared for the proposed project. The project is also described in greater detail in the attached Initial Study.

Name and Title:

Date:

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Sectio</u>	<u>n</u>	Page
1.0	Intr	oduction7
	1.1	Purpose of the Initial Study7
	1.2	Initial Study's Organization8
	1.3	Initial Study Checklist8
2.0	Proj	ect Description17
	2.1	Project Overview17
	2.2	Project Location 17
	2.3	Environmental Setting21
	2.4	Project Description23
	2.5	Local Discretionary Actions
3.0	Envi	ronmental Analysis
	3.1	Aesthetics
	3.2	Agriculture & Forestry Resources 40
	3.3	Air Quality42
	3.4	Biological Resources
	3.5	Cultural Resources
	3.6	Energy
	3.7	Geology & Soils57
	3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions63
	3.9	Hazards & Hazardous Materials65
	3.10	Hydrology & Water Quality70
	3.11	Land Use & Planning73
	3.12	Mineral Resources76
	3.13	Noise78
	3.14	Population & Housing
	3.15	Public Services
	3.16	Recreation
	3.17	Transportation & Circulation
	3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources
	3.19	Utilities and Service Systems 101
	3.20	Wildfire106
	3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance107
4.0	Con	clusions
	4.1	Findings109
	4.2	Mitigation Monitoring109
5.0	Refe	rences
	5.1	Preparers111

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Provided under a separate cover)

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1-1	Initial Study Checklist9
2-1	Project Summary Table25
3-1	Estimated Daily Construction Emissions
3-2	Estimated Operational Emissions in lbs/day47
3-3	Local Significance Thresholds Exceedance SRA 5 48
3-4	Historic Resources in Santa Fe Springs54
3-5	Estimated Annual Energy Consumption56
3-6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory
3-7	The Project Conformity with the City's Zoning Standard74
3-8	Noise Measurement Results
3-9	Level of Service Definitions
3-10	Level of Service Criteria
3-11	Intersection Levels of Service – Existing Year 201892
3-12	Project Trip Generation
3-13	2019 Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary97
3-14	Water Consumption103
3-15	Waste Water Generation103
3-16	Solid Waste Generation105

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit

Page

2-1	Regional Map18	8
2-2	Citywide Map19	9
2-3	Local Map 20	0
2-4	Aerial Photograph22	2
2-5	Site Plan	8
2-6	Conceptual Elevations – Building 124	9
2-7	Conceptual Elevations – Building 2	0
2-8	Conceptual Elevations – Building 3	1
2-9	Conceptual Elevations – Building 4	2
2-10	Conceptual Elevations – Building 5	3
2-11	Conceptual Elevations – Building 6	4
3-1	Nearby Sensitive Receptors	9
3-2	Seismic Hazards Map	9
3-3	Zoning Map & General Plan Map7	5
3-4	Oil Well Map7	7
3-5	Typical Noise Sources and Loudness Scale	0
3-6	Typical Construction Noise Levels	1
3-7	Existing Lane Configurations at Key Intersections	3
3-8	Existing 2018 Traffic Volumes at Key Intersections	4
3-9	Percentage of Project Related Trip Distribution9	6

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an industrial park (referred to herein as MC&C Commerce Center Site IV) located within the City of Santa Fe Springs. The MC&C Commerce Center Site IV project site has a total land area of 378,288 square feet (8.68 acres) and consists of 28 parcels. The project will include six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area. Parking will consist of 263 parking stalls and 17 dock high doors. In addition, approximately 75,382 square feet (19%) of the site will be covered over in landscaping.¹ The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment.² The project Applicant is Dan Broder, Kearny Real Estate Company, 1875 Century Park East, Suite 380, Los Angeles, California 90067.

As part of the proposed project's environmental review, the City of Santa Fe Springs authorized the preparation of this Initial Study.³ Although this Initial Study was prepared with consultant support, the analysis, conclusions, and findings made as part of its preparation fully represent the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Santa Fe Springs, in its capacity as the Lead Agency. The primary purpose of CEQA is to ensure that decision-makers and the public understand the environmental impacts of the proposed project and that decision-makers have considered such impacts before considering approval of the project. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, purposes of this Initial Study include the following:

- To provide the City information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR), mitigated negative declaration, or negative declaration;
- To facilitate the project's environmental assessment early in the design and development of the project;
- To eliminate unnecessary EIRs;
- To determine the nature and extent of any impacts associated with the proposed project; and,
- To enable modification of the project to mitigate adverse impacts of the project.

The City also determined, as part of this Initial Study's preparation, that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for the project's environmental review pursuant to CEQA. This Initial Study and the *Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration* will be forwarded to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the public for review and comment. A 20-day public review period will be provided to allow these agencies and other interested parties to comment on the proposed

¹ HPA Architecture. *Conceptual Site Plan.* August 29, 2018.

² Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. Site survey. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

³ California, State of. *Title 14. California Code of Regulations. Chapter 3. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.* As Amended 1998 (CEQA Guidelines). §15050.

project and the findings of this Initial Study.⁴ Questions and/or comments should be submitted to the following individual:

Vince Velasco, Planning Consultant City of Santa Fe Springs 11710 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, California 90670 vincevelasco@santafesprings.org 562-868-0511

1.2 INITIAL STUDY'S ORGANIZATION

The following annotated outline summarizes the contents of this Initial Study:

- *Section 1 Introduction,* provides the procedural context surrounding this Initial Study's preparation and insight into its composition. This section also includes a checklist that summarizes the findings of this Initial Study.
- *Section 2 Project Description*, provides an overview of the existing environment as it relates to the project site and describes the proposed project's physical and operational characteristics.
- *Section 3 Environmental Analysis,* includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed project's construction and the subsequent operation.
- *Section 4 Conclusions* indicates the conclusions of the environmental analysis and the Mandatory Findings of Significance.
- Section 5 References, identifies the sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study.

1.3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The environmental analysis provided in Section 3 of this Initial Study indicates that the proposed project will not result in any unmitigable, significant impacts on the environment. For this reason, the City of Santa Fe Springs determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed project. The findings of this Initial Study are summarized in Table 1-1 provided on the following pages.

⁴ California, State of. *Title 14. California Code of Regulations. Chapter 3. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.* As Amended 1998 (CEQA Guidelines). §15060 (b).

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
SECTION 3.1 AESTHETICS	-	-	-	-
3.1.A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
3.1.B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
3.1.C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				x
3.1.D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day- or night-time views in the area?			x	
SECTION 3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES				
3.2.A. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
3.2.B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				X
3.2.C. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section §51104(g))?				x
3.2.D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?				X
3.2.E. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?				x
SECTION 3.3 AIR QUALITY				
3.3.A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
3.3.B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3.3.C. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
3.3.D. Would the project result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
SECTION 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	-	-	-	-
3.4.A. Would the project, either directly or through habitat modifications, have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				x
3.4.B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				x
3.4.C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or Federally protected wetlands as defined (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				x
3.4.D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				x
3.4.E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				x
3.4.F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans?				x
SECTION 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
3.5.A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?				x
3.5.B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?			X	
3.5.C. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			x	
SECTION 3.6 ENERGY				
3.6.A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy, resources, during project construction or operation?			x	
3.6.B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
SECTION 3.7 GEOLOGY & SOILS		-	-	-
3.7.A. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides?			x	
3.7.B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3.7.C Would the project be located on a soil or geologic unit that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				x
3.7.D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			x	
3.7.E. Would the project be located on soils that are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				x
3.7.F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?		X		
SECTION 3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		·	·	
3.8.A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
3.8.B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases?			x	
SECTION 3.9 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
3.9.A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			x	
3.9.B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			x	
3.9.C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
3.9.D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			x	

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.9.E. For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				x
3.9.F. Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x
3.9.G. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?				X
SECTION 3.10 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY				
3.10.A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
3.10.B. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
3.10.C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
3.10.D. Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
3.10.E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				x
SECTION 3.11 LAND USE & PLANNING				
3.11.A. Would the project physically divide an established community?				X
3.11.B. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
SECTION 3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES				
3.12.A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				X

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.12.B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				x
SECTION 3.13 NOISE				
3.13.A. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			x	
3.13.B. Would the project result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
SECTION 3.14 POPULATION & HOUSING				
3.14.A. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?				X
3.14.B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
SECTION 3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES				
3.15.A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives in <i>fire protection services</i> ?			x	
3.15.B. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives in <i>police protection services?</i>			x	
3.15.C. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives in <i>school services?</i>			x	
3.15.D. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives in other public facilities?				x
SECTION 3.16 RECREATION				
3.16.A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would				x

occur or be accelerated?

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.16.B. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				x
SECTION 3.17 TRANSPORTATION				
3.17.A. Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths?			x	
3.17.B. For a land use project, would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(1)?			X	
3.17.C. For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(2)?				X
3.17.D. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
3.17.E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?				X
SECTION 3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
3.18.A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?		X		
3.18.B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.?			X	
SECTION 3.19 UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS				
3.19.A. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			X	
3.19.B. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			X	

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.19.C. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				x
3.19.D. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?			Х	
3.19.E. Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
3.19.F. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
SECTION 3.20 WILDFIRE				
3.20.A. If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x
3.20.B. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			х	
3.20.C. Would the project require the installation of maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				x
3.20.D. Would the project expose people or structure to significant risks, including down slope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				x
SECTION 3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICAN	CE			
3.21.A. The proposed project <i>will not</i> have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				x

Table 1-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.21.B. The proposed project <i>will not</i> have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and other effects or probable future projects)?				x
3.21.C. The proposed project <i>will not</i> have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.				X



SECTION 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an industrial park (referred to herein as MC&C Commerce Center Site IV) located within the City of Santa Fe Springs. The MC&C Commerce Center Site IV project site has a total land area of 378,288 square feet (8.68 acres) and consists of 28 parcels. The project will include six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area. Parking will consist of 263 parking stalls and 17 dock high doors. In addition, approximately 75,382 square feet (19%) of the site will be covered over in landscaping.⁵ The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment.⁶ The project is described in greater detail in Section 2.4.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located within the central portion of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The City of Santa Fe Springs is located approximately 13 miles southeast of Downtown Los Angeles and 18 miles northwest of Downtown Santa Ana. Santa Fe Springs is bounded on the north by Whittier and an unincorporated County area (West Whittier); on the east by Whittier, La Mirada, and an unincorporated County area (East Whittier); on the south by Cerritos and Norwalk; and on the west by Pico Rivera and Downey. Major physiographic features located in the vicinity of the City include the San Gabriel River (located approximately 2.12 miles west of the project site), the Puente Hills (located approximately three miles northeast of the site), and the Coyote Creek Channel (located approximately one mile east of the site).

Regional access to Santa Fe Springs is possible from two area freeways: the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) and the San Gabriel River Freeway (I-605). The I-5 Freeway extends along the City's western and southern portions in a northwest-southeast orientation and the I-605 Freeway extends along the City's westerly side in a northeast-southwest orientation. The location of Santa Fe Springs in a regional context is shown in Exhibit 2-1. A citywide map is provided in Exhibit 2-2.

The project site is located along the north side of Telegraph Road and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue. No legal address has been assigned to the property which consists of 28 parcels. The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the site include: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-977. A local map is provided in Exhibit 2-3.

⁵ HPA Architecture. *Conceptual Site Plan.* August 29, 2018.

⁶ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

⁷ Los Angeles County. *Tax Assessor, Parcel Viewer*. Website accessed on December 11, 2018.

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-1 REGIONAL MAP Source: Quantum GIS



EXHIBIT 2-2 CITYWIDE MAP Source: Quantum GIS



EXHIBIT 2-3 LOCAL MAP SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

2.3 Environmental Setting

The project site is located within an industrial area of the City. The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. The entire site has been disturbed due to these oil extraction activities. The project site is enclosed with chain-link fencing on all sides. Existing uses found in the vicinity of the project site are summarized below:⁸

- *North of the project site.* Romandel Avenue extends along the site's northeast boundary. Meanwhile, undeveloped parcels abut the project site to the north and northwest.⁹
- *South of the project site*. Telegraph Road extends along the project site's southern boundary. Oil extraction operations were observed within the parcels located along the south side of Telegraph Road.¹⁰
- *East of the project site.* Two warehouse buildings abut the project site to the east. These warehouses possess frontage along the west side of Freeman Avenue.¹¹
- *West of the project site*. An undeveloped property abuts the project site to the west. This property is likely used by Atchison and Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad as an easement for railroad access. An Atchison and Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way (ROW) is located further west.

The project site is currently occupied by oil pumpjacks, pipes, transformers, and electrical equipment. Power lines traverse the project site central part of the project site in a north-south orientation and access is presently controlled by a chain link fence gate. The site is predominantly covered over in dirt, though the existing drive aisles consist of gravel. Sparse weedy vegetation is located in patches throughout the site. The project site is fenced off on the north, east, west, and parts of the south side by a chain link fence.

Notable uses in the vicinity of the project site include: Richard L. Graves Middle School, located 0.45 miles to the east; Saint Paul High School, located 0.50 miles to the northeast; Lake Marie Elementary School, located 0.62 miles to the southeast; Heritage Park, located 0.70 miles to the west; and the Civic Center including City Hall, the City Library, and the Santa Fe Springs Fire Department Station 4, located 1.30 miles to the northwest of the project site. Lastly, the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink station is located 1.72 miles to the south of the project site.¹² An aerial photograph depicting the project site and the surrounding area is provided in Exhibit 2-4.

- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.

⁸ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

 $^{^{\}rm 12}$ Google Earth. Website accessed December 12, 2018.



EXHIBIT 2-4 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH Source: Google Earth

2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.4.1 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project involves the construction of a new industrial park along the north side of Telegraph Road and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue. The proposed project will consist of the following elements:¹³

- *Project Site*. The MC&C Commerce Center Site IV project site has a total land area of 378,288 square feet (8.68 acres) and consists of 28 parcels. The site has a lot depth (north to south) of 680 feet and a lot width (east to west) of 620 feet.¹⁴ In addition, approximately 75,382 square feet (19%) of the site will be covered over in landscaping. The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment. The site will be occupied by six new warehouse buildings (referred to herein as Buildings 1 through 6) totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area. These six new warehouse buildings will be located along the site's property lines.
- *Building 1*. Building 1 will have a total floor area of 16,980 square feet, of which 3,300 square feet will consist of office space and 13,680 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 1,650 square feet of office. A total of 44 shared parking spaces, three dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Parking between the six buildings will be shared. Building 1 will be located within the northwest corner of the project site: 66 feet and 8 inches east of the site's western property line, 12 feet south of the site's northern property line, and 49 feet and 11 inches west of the corner of Romandel Avenue. Two existing wells, Well #831 and #860, are located south of Building 1. The area surrounding Building 1 roughly corresponds to parcels 8011-003-979, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, and 8011-003-977.
- *Building 2*. Building 2 will have a total floor area of 13,582 square feet, of which 2,200 square feet will consist of office space and 11,382 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 1,100 square feet of office. A total of 38 shared parking spaces, two dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Building 2 will be located within the western portion of the project site: 57 feet north of Building 4; 148 feet and 7 inches south of Building 1; and, 230 feet slightly southwest of Building 3. The area surrounding Building 2 roughly corresponds to parcels 8011-003-961, 8011-003-962, and portions of 8011-003-973.
- *Building 3*. Building 3 will have a total floor area of 28,500 square feet, of which 5,000 square feet will consist of office space and 23,500 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 2,500 square feet of office. A total of 56

¹³ HPA Architecture. *Conceptual Site Plan.* August 29, 2018.

¹⁴ Los Angeles County. *Tax Assessor, Parcel Viewer*. Website accessed on December 11, 2018.

shared parking spaces, four dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Building 3 will be located within the northeast corner of the project site: 180 feet north of Building 6; 230 feet slightly northeast of Building 3; and roughly 230 feet southeast of Building 1. Building 3 will be abutting an existing well, Well #828J, to the west. The area surrounding Building 3 roughly corresponds to parcels 8011-003-966 and 8011-003-978.

- *Building 4.* Building 4 will have a total floor area of 17,770 square feet, of which 3,200 square feet will consist of office space and 14,570 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 1,600 square feet of office. A total of 39 shared parking spaces, three dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Building 4 will be located within the southwest corner of the project site: 106 feet and 8 inches north of the site's southern property line; abutting Building 5 to the west; and, 157 feet and 10 inches east of the site's western property line. Two existing wells, Well #834-N and #841-E, are located west of Building 4. Two additional wells, Well #835-C and #837-B, are located west of Building 4. Lastly, Well #843-E is located south of the site. The area surrounding Building 4 roughly corresponds to parcel 8011-003-974.
- *Building 5*. Building 5 will have a total floor area of 22,679 square feet, of which 4,000 square feet will consist of office space and 18,679 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 2,000 square feet of office. A total of 48 shared parking spaces, three dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Two existing wells, Well #835-C and #837-B, are located north of Building 5 while Well 838-N is located northeast of Building 5. In addition, Well 843-E is located west of Building 5. Building 5 will be located within the southern portion of the project site: abutting Building 4 to the west; 69 feet and 6 inches west of Building 6; and, 47 feet and 6 inches north of Telegraph Road. The area surrounding Building 5 roughly corresponds to parcel 8011-003-972, abandoned street dedications, and portion of parcel 8011-003-973.
- *Building 6*. Building 6 will have a total floor area of 16,290 square feet, of which 2,900 square feet will consist of office space and 14,570 square feet will be warehouse space. The office space will be distributed through two floors, with each floor containing 1,450 square feet of office. A total of 38 shared parking spaces, two dock high doors, and one trailer parking space will be provided. Building 6 will be located within the southeast corner of the project site: 75 feet and 4 inches north of the site's southern property line; 69 feet and 6 inches east of Building 5; 180 feet south of Building 3, and 5 feet west of the site's eastern property line. The area surrounding Building 6 roughly corresponds to parcel 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, and abandoned street dedications.
- *Parking and Access*. A total of 263 shared parking spaces, six truck parking spaces, and 17 dock high doors will be provided. Primary passenger vehicle access to the site will be from a 30-foot wide driveway located along the north side of Telegraph Road. Trucks will be prohibited from entering the site from this driveway. In addition, this driveway/drive aisle provides a buffer between Building 5 and Building 6. Vehicle ingress is only possible travelling westbound on

Telegraph Road and executing a right-turn into the industrial park. Vehicle egress from this driveway will be restricted to right-turn exits only due to the presence of the landscape median precluding the execution of left turns. Secondary access will be possible from a 98-foot three inch wide driveway located in the southern portion of the Romandel Avenue. A 26 foot-wide internal drive aisle will meander throughout the site. This internal drive aisle will also function as a fire access lane.

• *Landscaping*. Approximately 75,382 square feet, representing 19% of the site, of landscaping will be planted. The City requires a minimum of 18,683 square feet, or six percent of the site, of landscaping.

The proposed project is summarized in Table 2-1, which is on the following pages. The site plan for the MC&C Commerce Center IV is shown in Exhibit 2-5. Elevations for the project are shown in Exhibits 2-6 and 2-7.

Project Element	Description
Total Site Area	378,288 sq. ft. (8.68 acres)
Total Building Floor Area	115,801 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	263 parking spaces.
Total No. Trailer Parking	6 spaces
Total No. Dock High Doors	17 dock high doors
Landscaping	75,382 sq. ft.
Building 1 Total Floor Area	16,980 sq. ft.
Warehouse Area	13,680 sq. ft.
Office Area	3,300 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	44 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 spaces
Total No. Dock High Doors	3 doors
Building 2 Total Floor Area	13,582 sq. ft
Warehouse Area	11,382 sq. ft.
Office Area	2,200 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	38 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 space
Total No. Dock High Doors	2 doors
Building 3 Total Floor Area	28,500 sq. ft.
Warehouse Area	23,500 sq. ft.
Office Area	5,000 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	56 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 space
Total No. Dock High Doors	4 dock high doors

Table 2-1Project Summary Table

Project Element	Description
Building 4 Total Floor Area	17,770 sq. ft.
Warehouse Area	14,570 sq. ft
Office Area	3,200 sq. ft
Total No. of Shared Parking	39 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 spaces
Total No. Dock High Doors	3 dock high doors
Building 5 Total Floor Area	22,679 sq. ft.
Warehouse Area	18,679 sq. ft.
Office Area	4,000 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	48 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 space
Total No. Dock High Doors	4 dock high doors
Building 6 Total Floor Area	16,290 sq. ft.
Warehouse Area	13,390 sq. ft.
Office Area	2,900 sq. ft.
Total No. of Shared Parking	38 spaces
Total No. Trailer Parking	1 spaces
Total No. Dock High Doors	2 spaces

Table 2-1Project Summary Table (continued)

Source: HPA Architecture.

2.4.2 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS

Prior to the construction of the new building on Site IV, extensive oilfield work including, but not limited to, well abandonment, well re-abandonment, oilfield infrastructure removal, and oil well relocation will be performed. The following types of oilfield work may include, but not be limited to:

- *Well abandonment and re-abandonment*. Of the 15 wells located on the project site, 12 wells are in active production, and 3 wells are abandoned. Following development, the remaining wells will be abandoned or handled in compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements.
- *Oilfield Infrastructure Removal and Relocation*. New infrastructure associated with the 12 active wells will be installed. As much as practical, this new equipment will be relocated and placed underground into common trenches so as to consolidate these substructures throughout the project site. The limited area where the infrastructure will be above ground will be screened and protected from pedestrian and vehicular traffic and located at appropriate distances from the proposed new buildings. Once the new infrastructure is installed and is fully operational, the old infrastructure will be removed.

• *Soil Remediation and Site Closure.* The site's condition will be reviewed by the pertinent governmental oversight agency and will be "environmentally closed." An agency-approved Soils Management Plan will be in place during grading and earthwork.

As stated above, the proposed project will include the retention of 12 oil and gas wells and the supporting infrastructure associated with these wells and the Santa Fe Springs Oilfield. The building locations will be appropriately set back from the well locations based upon applicable regulations. The construction for the proposed project would take approximately ten months to complete. The key construction phases are outlined below:

- *Site Preparation.* The project site will be readied for the construction of the proposed project. Equipment used during this phase will include graders, scrapers, tractors, loaders, and backhoes. This phase will take approximately one month to complete.
- *Grading*. This phase will involve the grading of the site. The building's footings, utility lines, and other underground infrastructure will be placed during this phase. Equipment used during this phase will include graders, rubber tired dozers, tractors, loaders, and backhoes. This phase will take approximately two months to complete.
- *Construction*. The new warehouses will be constructed during this phase. Equipment used during this phase will include cranes, forklifts, generator sets, tractors, loaders, backhoes, and welders. This phase will take approximately four months to complete.
- *Paving*. The project site will be paved during this phase. Equipment used during this phase will include cement and motor mixers, pavers, rollers, other paving equipment. This phase will take approximately one month to complete.
- *Landscaping and Finishing*. This phase will involve the planting of landscaping, painting of the industrial building, and the completion of other on-site improvements. Equipment used during this phase will include air compressors. This phase will last approximately two months.

2.4.3 OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The specific business and/or tenant(s) that would ultimately occupy the proposed buildings are not known at this time. Any prospective use must be either permitted by right or conditionally permitted under the City of Santa Fe Springs Zoning Ordinance. The operating hours of the potential business or businesses that may ultimately occupy the building are also unknown at this time. The proposed project is anticipated to add up to 76 new jobs based on a ratio of one employee per 1,518 square feet of floor area.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the project will have an adequate supply of parking to accommodate demand from new employees.

¹⁵ The Natelson Company, Inc. *Employment Density Study Summary Report*. October 31, 2001.



SOURCE: HPA Architecture



EXHIBIT 2-6 CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS – BUILDING 1 SOURCE: HPA Architecture
Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 2-7 CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS – BUILDING 2

SOURCE: HPA Architecture

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 2-8 CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS – BUILDING 3 SOURCE: HPA Architecture

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 2-9 CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS – BUILDING 4 SOURCE: HPA Architecture

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



EXHIBIT 2-10 CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS – BUILDING 5 SOURCE: HPA Architecture

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



Exhibit 2-11 Conceptual Elevations – Building 6

SOURCE: HPA Architecture

2.5 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

A Discretionary Action is an action taken by a government agency (for this project, the government agency is the City of Santa Fe Springs) that calls for an exercise of judgment in deciding whether to approve a project. The proposed project will require the approval of the following discretionary actions:

- *Development Plan Approval Case No. 957 through 962* to allow the construction of six new concrete tilt-up warehouses;
- *Tentative Parcel Map Case No.* 082567 to allow the consolidation of 28 existing parcels that make up the project site, into a single parcel;
- Zoning Change Case No. 138 to allow for a Planned Development Overlay; and,
- Approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SECTION 3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project analyzes the potential environmental impacts that may result from the proposed project's implementation. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include the following:

- Aesthetics (Section 3.1);
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources (Section 3.2);
- Air Quality (Section 3.3);
- Biological Resources (Section 3.4);
- Cultural Resources (Section 3.5);
- Energy (Section 3.6);
- Geology and Soils (Section 3.7);
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Section 3.8);
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 3.9);
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 3.10);

- Land Use and Planning (Section 3.11);
- Mineral Resources (Section 3.12);
- Noise (Section 3.13);
- Population and Housing (Section 3.14);
- Public Services (Section 3.15);
- Recreation (Section 3.16);
- Transportation (Section 3.17);
- Tribal Cultural Resources (Section 3.18);
- Utilities and Service Systems (Section 3.19);
- Wildfire (Section 3.20); and,
- Mandatory Findings of Significance (Section 3.21).

Under each issue area, a description of the thresholds of significance is provided. These thresholds will assist in making a determination as to whether there is a potential for significant impacts on the environment. The analysis considers both the short-term (construction-related) and long-term (operational) impacts associated with the proposed project's implementation, and where appropriate, the cumulative impacts. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- No Impact. The proposed project will not result in any adverse environmental impacts.
- *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project may have the potential for affecting the environment, although these impacts will be below levels or thresholds that the City of Santa Fe Springs or other responsible agencies consider to be significant.
- *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation*. The proposed project may have the potential to generate a significant impact on the environment. However, the level of impact may be reduced to levels that are less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.
- *Potentially Significant Impact*. The proposed project may result in environmental impacts that are significant. This finding will require the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).

3.1 AESTHETICS

3.1.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse aesthetic impact if it results in any of the following:

- A substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- Substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway;
- Substantial degrading of the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings; if the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality; or,
- A new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect day-time or night-time views in the area.

3.1.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? • Less than Significant Impact.

The only scenic views that are presently available include views of the San Gabriel Mountains, which is located 16 miles north of the project site. Views of these mountains are partially available from a 260 foot long stretch of Telegraph Road beginning at the site's eastern property line. Views of these mountains become completely obstructed as one travels westbound on Telegraph Road past the initial 260 feet since this portion of the street descends below grade. Likewise, views of the San Gabriel Mountains are unavailable travelling eastbound on Telegraph Road since portions of this street are located below grade. The lack of views from these portions of Telegraph Road was confirmed in the site survey that was undertaken for the site.

The uses that occupy frontage along the south side of Telegraph Road are not uses that would be sensitive to a loss of views. Nevertheless, the buildings that will be constructed will have a maximum height of 33 feet and 6 inches. The size and massing of these structures will not be great enough to obstruct any scenic views. In addition, many of the aforementioned mountains extend more than 3,000 feet above sea level. Therefore, views of these mountains will continue to be available from the properties located south of Telegraph Road since the project cannot physically obstruct views of these mountains. Lastly, no scenic views are available from Romandel Avenue. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway? • No Impact.

According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), neither Telegraph Road nor Romandel Avenue are designated scenic highways.¹⁶ The site has been disturbed to accommodate the existing on-site improvements and there are no historic rock outcroppings located within the project site.¹⁷ The vegetation that is present consists of species most commonly found in an urban environment. Lastly, the project site does not contain any buildings listed in the State or National registrar (refer to Section 3.5). As a result, no impacts will occur.

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? • No Impact.

The project site is currently occupied by oil pumpjacks, pipes, transformers, and electrical equipment. Power lines traverse the project site central part of the project site in a north-south orientation and access is presently controlled by a chain link fence gate. The site is predominantly covered over in dirt, though the existing drive aisles consist of gravel. Sparse weedy vegetation is located in patches throughout the site. The project site is fenced off on the north, east, west, and parts of the south side by a chain link fence. Once constructed, the proposed project will improve the quality of the site and the surrounding areas because the new buildings will feature modern architecture and extensive landscaping. As a result, no impacts are expected to result.

D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day- or night-time views in the area? • Less than Significant Impact.

Exterior lighting can be a nuisance to adjacent land uses that are sensitive to this lighting. This nuisance lighting is referred to as *light trespass* which is typically defined as the presence of unwanted light on properties located adjacent to the source of lighting. Glare is related to light trespass and is defined as visual discomfort resulting from high contrast in brightness levels. Glare-related impacts can adversely affect day or nighttime views. As with lighting trespass, glare is of most concern if it would adversely affect sensitive land use or driver's vision. The exterior façade would consist of non-reflective materials, such as concrete. In addition, the windows would be comprised of blue reflective glazing, which reduces glare over other transparent surfaces. As a result, no daytime light or glare-related impacts are anticipated.

Nighttime glare and illumination has the potential to result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors. Many sources of light contribute to the ambient nighttime lighting conditions. These sources of nighttime light include street lights, security lighting, wall packs, and vehicular headlights. The proposed project would not introduce nighttime lighting that could potentially impact nearby sensitive receptors. The project site is located within a predominantly industrial area. The closest sensitive receptor is the Village at Heritage Springs Development, located 1,200 feet to the west

¹⁶ California Department of Transportation. *Official Designated Scenic Highways*. <u>www.dot.ca.gov</u>

¹⁷ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

of the project site. This residential development will not be exposed to spillover lighting during the evening hours because there is no line-of-sight between the project site and the aforementioned sensitive receptor. Furthermore, as a standard practice for new developments, the Police Services Department will require approval of a photometric plan as a condition of approval. As a result, less than significant impacts will result upon the implementation of the proposed project.

3.1.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that less than significant impacts related to aesthetics and views are anticipated upon the implementation of the proposed project, therefore no mitigation measures are required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

3.2.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources if it results in any of the following:

- The conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance;
- A conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract;
- A conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in *Public Resources Code section §12220(g))*, timberland (as defined by *Public Resources Code section §4526)*, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by *Government Code section §51104(g))*;
- The loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use; or,
- Changes to the existing environment that due to their location or nature may result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forestland to a non-forest use.

3.2.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

 A. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? • No Impact.

According to the California Department of Conservation, the City of Santa Fe Springs does not contain any areas of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.¹⁸ The entire

¹⁸ California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program. Important Farmland in California 2010. <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/p df/statewide/2010/fmmp2010</u> <u>08</u> 11.pdf.

City is urban and there are no areas within the City that are classified as "Prime Farmland." Since the implementation of the proposed project will not involve the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to urban uses, no impacts will occur.

B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?
No Impact.

The project site is currently zoned as M-2 (*Heavy Manufacturing*), which permits any principal permitted use within the M-1, M-2, and M-L zone. According to the City's zoning code, agricultural uses (excluding dairies, stockyards, slaughter of animals and manufacturers of fertilizer) are listed as a *permitted use* within the M-1 zone.¹⁹ The proposed project will require a zone change, though no loss in land zoned for/or permitting agricultural uses will occur. The project site is being used for oil extraction activities and there are no agricultural uses located within the site that would be affected by the project's implementation. In addition, according to the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.²⁰ As a result, no impacts on existing Williamson Act Contracts will result from the proposed project's implementation.

C. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section §51104(g))? ● No Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs and the project site are located in the midst of a larger urban area and no forest lands are located within the City. The City of Santa Fe Springs General Plan and Municipal Code do not provide for any forest land preservation. As a result, no impacts on forest land or timber resources will result from the proposed project's implementation.

D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use? ● No Impact.

No forest lands are located within or in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, no loss or conversion of forest lands to urban uses will result from the proposed project's implementation and no impacts will occur.

E. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, may result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use? • No Impact.

The project would not involve the disruption or damage of the existing environment that would result in a loss of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the

¹⁹ City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 155, Code 155.211 Principal Permitted Uses.

²⁰ California Department of Conservation. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/WA/2012%20Statewide%20Map/WA_2012_8x11.pdf</u>

project site is not located in close proximity to farm land or forest land. As a result, no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project.

3.2.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of agricultural and forestry resources indicated that no impacts on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

3.3.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse environmental impact on air quality, if it results in any of the following:

- A conflict with the obstruction of the implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- A violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation;
- The exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or,
- The result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Air quality impacts may occur during the construction or operation phase of a project, and may come from stationary (e.g., industrial processes, generators), mobile (e.g., automobiles, trucks), or area (e.g., residential water heaters) sources. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the main regulatory authority in the region (the South Coast Air Basin, which includes the City of Santa Fe Springs) with regard to air quality issues. In April 1993, the SCAQMD adopted a CEQA Air Quality Handbook that provides guidance for the CEQA analysis of potential air quality impacts of new projects.

The topic of air quality can be divided into three categories: construction emissions, operational emissions, and toxic air contaminants. Construction of new projects has the potential to create air quality impacts through excavation and grading activities and through the use of heavy-duty equipment. Fugitive dust emissions result from land clearing, demolition, excavation, and equipment traffic over unpaved roads at construction sites. Mobile source emissions, primarily nitrogen oxides (NO_x), result from the use of construction equipment such as bulldozers and trucks. Mobile source emissions also result from vehicle trips by construction workers to and from the project site. A great percentage of fugitive dust emissions can be mitigated through the implementation of measures within Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, by SCAQMD.²¹

²¹ South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Rule 403, Fugitive Dust.* As amended June 3, 2005.

Operational emissions are produced by the occupants of a facility or development and by both mobile and stationary sources connected to the facility or development. Depending on the characteristics of the individual project, operational activities have the potential to generate emissions of criteria and/or toxic air contaminants. Stationary source emissions include point source emissions that have an identifiable location, such as a smokestack, as well as area source emissions, such as fumes or minor sources of exhaust, which are emitted by multiple, small sources. Mobile source emissions occur as a result of motor vehicle travel.

The California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 39655 defines a toxic air contaminant as "an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health."²² Impacts from toxic air contaminants can occur during either the construction or operational phases of a project. During certain construction activities, potential releases of toxic air contaminants could occur during site remediation activities, or during building demolition. Toxic air contaminants may also be released during industrial or manufacturing processes, or other activities that involve the use, storage, processing, or disposal of toxic materials.²³ The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established quantitative thresholds for short-term (construction) emissions and long-term (operational) emissions for the following criteria pollutants:

- *Ozone* (O₃) is a nearly colorless gas that irritates the lungs, damages materials, and vegetation. Ozone is formed by photochemical reaction (when nitrogen dioxide is broken down by sunlight).
- *Carbon monoxide* (CO) is a colorless, odorless toxic gas that interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain and is produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels emitted as vehicle exhaust.
- *Nitrogen dioxide* (NO₂) is a yellowish-brown gas, which at high levels can cause breathing difficulties. NO₂ is formed when nitric oxide (a pollutant from burning processes) combines with oxygen.
- *Sulfur dioxide* (SO₂) is a colorless, pungent gas formed primarily by the combustion of sulfurcontaining fossil fuels. Health effects include acute respiratory symptoms and difficulty in breathing for children.
- *PM*₁₀ and *PM*_{2.5} refers to particulate matter less than ten microns and two and one-half microns in diameter, respectively. Particulates of this size cause a greater health risk than larger-sized particles since fine particles can more easily cause irritation.

Projects in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) generating construction-related emissions that exceed any of the following emissions thresholds are considered to be significant under CEQA:

²² California, State of. *Health and Safety Code*. Division 26 Air Resources, Part 2 State Air Resources Board, Chapter 3.5 Toxic Air Contaminants, Article 2 Definitions, Section 39655 (a).

²³ Los Angeles, City of. Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. 2006.

- 75 pounds per day or 2.50 tons per quarter of reactive organic compounds;
- 100 pounds per day or 2.50 tons per quarter of nitrogen dioxide;
- 550 pounds per day or 24.75 tons per quarter of carbon monoxide;
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of PM_{10} ;
- 55 pounds per day or 2.43 tons per quarter of PM_{2.5}; or,
- 150 pounds per day or 6.75 tons per quarter of sulfur oxides.

A project would have a significant effect on air quality if any of the following operational emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants are exceeded:

- 55 pounds per day of reactive organic compounds;
- 55 pounds per day of nitrogen dioxide;
- 550 pounds per day of carbon monoxide;
- 150 pounds per day of PM₁₀;
- 55 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$; or,
- 150 pounds per day of sulfur oxides.

3.3.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan?Less than Significant Impact.

The project area is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which covers a 6,600 square-mile area within all of Orange County, the non-desert portions of Los Angeles County, Riverside County, and San Bernardino County. Measures to improve regional air quality are outlined in the SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The most recent 2016 AQMP was adopted in March 2017 and was jointly prepared with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).²⁴

The AQMP will help the SCAQMD maintain focus on the air quality impacts of major projects associated with goods movement, land use, energy efficiency, and other key areas of growth. Key elements of the 2016 AQMP include enhancements to existing programs to meet the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ Federal health standard and a proposed plan of action to reduce ground-level ozone. The primary criteria pollutants that remain non-attainment in the local area include $PM_{2.5}$ and ozone. Specific criteria for determining a project's conformity with the AQMP is defined in Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Air Quality Handbook refers to the following criteria as a means to determine a project's conformity with the AQMP:²⁵

• *Consistency Criteria 1* refers to a proposed project's potential for resulting in an increase in the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or its potential for contributing to the continuation of an existing air quality violation.

²⁴ South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Final 2016 Air Quality Plan*. Adopted March 2017.

²⁵ South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook. April 1993.

• *Consistency Criteria 2* refers to a proposed project's potential for exceeding the assumptions included in the AQMP or other regional growth projections relevant to the AQMP's implementation.

In terms of Criteria 1, the proposed project's long-term (operational) airborne emissions will be below levels that the SCAQMD considers to be a significant impact (refer to the analysis included in the next section where the long-term stationary and mobile emissions for the proposed project are summarized in Table 3-2). In addition, the project's operational emissions will be well within the emissions projections identified in the most recent AQMP. As shown in Table 3-5 of the Final 2016 AQMP, the future 2031 daily operational emissions *with* the estimated population, employment, and VMT growth projections are estimated to be: 345 tons per day of VOCs; 214 tons per day of NOx; 1,188 tons per day of CO; 18 tons per day of SOx; and 65 tons per day of PM_{2.5}. The project's operational emissions will be well within the emissions will be to be addition.

The proposed project will also conform to Consistency Criteria 2 since it will not significantly affect any regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared for the City of Santa Fe Springs. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the RTP/SCS forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the City of Santa Fe Springs is projected to add a total of 7,400 new jobs through the year 2040.²⁶ According to the State of California Employment Development Department, the City's current unemployment rate is 5.8%, which means there are up to 500 residents actively seeking work.²⁷ The project is projected to result in a total of 76 new jobs.²⁸ The projected number of new jobs is well within SCAG's employment projections for the City of Santa Fe Springs and the proposed project will not violate Consistency Criteria 2. Since the proposed project will not be in violation of either Consistency Criteria, the project's potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation? • Less than Significant Impact.

As indicated previously, the project area is located in a non-attainment area for ozone and particulates, therefore, the proposed project will be required to comply with the requirements of SCAQMD *Rule 403, Fugitive Dust*, which requires the implementation of Best Available Control Measures (BACM) for all fugitive dust sources, and the *2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)*, which identifies BACMs and Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) for area sources and point sources, respectively. According to SCAQMD *Rule 403, Fugitive Dust*, all unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be regularly watered up to three times per day during excavation, grading, and construction as required

²⁶ Southern California Association of Governments. Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2016-2040. Demographics & Growth Forecast. April 2016.

²⁷ State of California Employment Development Department. *Current Month Unemployment Rate and Labor Force Summary*. <u>http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/unemployment-and-labor-force.html.</u> Website accessed May 10, 2018.

²⁸ The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment Density Study Summary Report. October 31, 2001.

(depending on temperature, soil moisture, wind, etc.). Watering could reduce fugitive dust by as much as 55%. Rule 403 also requires that temporary dust covers be used on any piles of excavated or imported earth to reduce wind-blown dust. In addition, all clearing, earthmoving, or excavation activities must be discontinued during periods of high winds (i.e. greater than 15 mph), so as to prevent excessive amounts of fugitive dust. Finally, the contractors must comply with other SCAQMD regulations governing equipment idling and emissions controls. The aforementioned SCAQMD regulations are standard conditions required for every construction project undertaken in the City as well as in the cities and counties governed by the SCAQMD.

The analysis of daily construction and operational emissions was prepared utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod V.2016.3.2). The assumptions regarding the construction phases and the length of construction followed those identified herein in Section 2.4.2. As shown in Table 3-1, daily construction emissions are not anticipated to exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds.

Construction Phase	ROG	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Site Preparation (on-site)	4.33	45.57	22.06	0.03	20.45	12.12
Site Preparation (off-site)	0.08	0.06	0.80		0.20	0.05
Total Site Preparation	4.41	45.63	22.86	0.03	20.65	12.17
Grading (on-site)	2.58	28.34	16.29	0.02	7.90	4.64
Grading (off-site)	0.07	0.05	0.67		0.16	0.04
Total Grading	2.65	28.39	16.96	0.02	8.06	4.68
Building Construction (on-site)	2.36	21.07	17.16	0.02	1.28	1.21
Building Construction (off-site)	0.59	4.43	5.17	0.02	1.30	0.37
Total Building Construction	2.95	25.50	22.33	0.04	2.58	1.58
Paving	1.75	15.24	14.66	0.02	0.82	0.75
Paving	0.07	0.05	0.67		0.16	0.04
Total Paving	1.82	15.29	15.33	0.02	0.98	0.79
Architectural Coatings (on-site)	25.32	1.83	1.84		0.12	0.12
Architectural Coatings (off-site)	0.09	0.06	0.85		0.21	0.05
Total Architectural Coatings	25.41	1.89	2.69		0.33	0.17
Maximum Daily Emissions	25.42	45.63	22.87	0.04	20.65	12.18
Daily Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 3-1Estimated Daily Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod V.2016.3.2.

As shown in Table 3-1, maximum daily construction emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, the construction-related impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

Long-term emissions refer to those air quality impacts that will occur once the proposed project has been constructed and is operational. These impacts will continue over the operational life of the project. The two main sources of operational emissions include mobile emissions and off-site emissions related to the production and consumption of energy. Table 3-2 (shown below) depicts the estimated project operational emissions related to the project's operation.

Emission Source	ROG	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM2.5
Area-wide (lbs/day)	2.63		0.03			
Energy (lbs/day)		0.02	0.02			
Mobile (lbs/day)	0.40	2.10	5.95	0.02	1.78	0.49
Total (lbs/day)	3.04	2.13	6.01	0.02	1.79	0.49
Daily Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 3-2Estimated Operational Emissions in lbs/day

Source: CalEEMod V.2016.3.2.

As indicated in Table 3-2, the projected maximum long-term emissions are below thresholds considered to represent a significant impact. Since the project area is located in a non-attainment area for ozone and particulates, the Applicant will be required to ensure that the contractors adhere to all pertinent provisions of SCAQMD Rule 403 pertaining to the generation of fugitive dust during grading and/or the use of equipment on unpaved surfaces.²⁹ The contractors will be responsible for being familiar with, and implementing any pertinent best available control measures. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

C. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? • Less than Significant Impact.

Sensitive receptors refer to land uses and/or activities that are especially sensitive to poor air quality and typically include residences, board and care facilities, schools, playgrounds, hospitals, parks, childcare centers, and outdoor athletic facilities, and other facilities where children or the elderly may congregate.³⁰ These population groups are generally more sensitive to poor air quality. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site include the Villages at Heritage Springs Development, located 1,200 feet to the west of the project site. These nearby sensitive receptors are shown in Exhibit 3-1.

The SCAQMD requires that CEQA air quality analyses indicate whether a proposed project will result in an exceedance of *localized emissions thresholds* or LSTs. LSTs only apply to short-term (construction) emissions at a fixed location and do not include off-site or area-wide emissions. The pollutants that are the focus of the LST analysis include the conversion of NO_x to NO_2 ; carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from construction; PM_{10} emissions from construction; and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions

²⁹ South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Rule 403, Fugitive Dust.* As Amended June 3, 2005.

³⁰ South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Appendix 9. As amended 2017.

from construction. The use of the "look-up tables" is permitted since each of the construction phases that include grading, site preparation, and building erection will involve the disturbance of less than five acres of land area on any given day. For purposes of the LST analysis, the receptor distance used was 500 meters since the nearest sensitive receptor is located 1,200 feet (350 meters west of the project site).

Emissions	Project Emissions	Туре	Allowable Emissions Threshold (lbs/day) and Specified Distance from Receptor (in meters				
	(lbs/day)		25	50	100	200	500
NO _x	45.63	Construction	172	165	176	194	244
СО	22.87	Construction	1,480	1,855	2,43 7	3,867	9,312
PM ₁₀	20.65	Construction	14	42	60	95	203
PM _{2.5}	12.18	Construction	7	10	15	30	103

Table 3-3
Local Significance Thresholds Exceedance SRA 5

Source: CalEEMod V.2016.3.2.

As indicated in Table 3-3, the proposed project will not exceed any LSTs based on the information included in the Mass Rate LST Look-up Tables provided by the SCAQMD.

Most vehicles generate carbon monoxide (CO) as part of the tail-pipe emissions, therefore, high concentrations of CO along busy roadways and congested intersections are a concern. The areas surrounding the most congested intersections are often found to contain high levels of CO that exceed applicable standards. These areas of high CO concentration are referred to as *hot-spots*. Two variables influence the creation of a hot-spot and these variables include traffic volumes and traffic congestion. Typically, a hot-spot may occur near an intersection that is experiencing severe congestion (a LOS E or LOS F).³¹ The SCAQMD stated in its CEQA Handbook that a CO hot-spot would not likely develop at an intersection operating at LOS C or better. Since the Handbook was written, there have been new CO emissions controls added to vehicles and reformulated fuels are now sold in the Basin. These new automobile emissions controls, along with the reformulated fuels, have resulted in a lowering of both ambient CO concentrations and vehicle emissions. The projected peak hour traffic will not significantly degrade any local intersection's level of service (LOS E or F). In addition, project-generated traffic will not result in the creation of a carbon monoxide *hot-spot*. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

³¹ "LOS" refers to "Level of Service." Refer to Section 3.2.17.A.

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



Ехнівіт 3-1 NEARBY SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

D. Would the project result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? • Less than Significant Impact.

The SCAQMD has identified those land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. These uses include activities involving livestock, rendering facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, and businesses involved in fiberglass molding.³² The building tenants are not yet known. However, if the proposed uses will emit odors, the tenant will be required to comply with Section 155.420 (Odors) of the Santa Fe Spring Municipal Code, which states:

"Any process which involves the creation or emission of any odors, gases or other odorous matter shall at all times comply with the standards set by the Air Pollution Control District of Los Angeles County. In no event shall odors, gases or other odorous matter be emitted in such quantities as to be readily detectable when diluted in a ratio of one volume of odorous air to four volumes of clean air."³³

Furthermore, truck drivers must adhere to Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations, which limits the idling of diesel powered vehicles to less than five minutes.³⁴ Adherence to the aforementioned regulation will minimize odor impacts from diesel trucks. In addition, the project's contractors must adhere to SCAQMD Rule 403 regulations, which significantly reduce the generation of fugitive dust. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

3.3.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of air quality impacts indicated that no impacts on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.4.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on biological resources if it results in any of the following:

- A substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- A substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

³² South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Appendix 9. As amended 2017.

³³ Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code, Title XV Land Usage, Chapter 155 Zoning, Section 155.420 Odors.*

³⁴ California, State of. California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Section 2485 Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling.

- A substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands as defined (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal, pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;
- A substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;
- A conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or,
- A conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans.

3.4.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project either directly or through habitat modifications, have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • No Impact.

The project site is currently occupied by oil extraction activities. A review of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Biodiversity Database (CNDDB) Bios Viewer for the Whittier Quadrangle indicated that there are six threatened or endangered species located within the Whittier Quadrangle (the City of Santa Fe Springs is listed under the Whittier Quadrangle).³⁵ These species include the coastal California Gnatcatcher, the Least Bell's Vireo, the Bank Swallow, the Santa Ana Sucker, the Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo, and California Orcutt Grass.³⁶ The proposed project will not have an impact on the aforementioned species since there is no suitable riparian or native habitat located within, or in the vicinity of, the project site. These species typically require wetland or riparian habitat with native vegetation and access to bodies of water.³⁷

An additional search was conducted using the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants to ascertain any rare or endangered plant species which may occur in the Whittier Quadrangle. The search yielded six results. The following four plants have been identified in the Whittier Quadrangle: intermediate mariposa lily; lucky morning-glory; many stemmed dudleya; Coulter's goldfields; prostrate vernal pool navarretia; and Parish's gooseberry.³⁸ None of these plants

³⁵ California Department of Fish and Wildlife. *Bios Viewer*. <u>https://map.dfg.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick</u>

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Audubon. California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica). <u>https://www.audubon.org/field-guide/bird/california-gnatcatcher;</u> California Partners in Flight Riparian Bird Conservation Plan. Least Bell's Vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus). <u>http://www.prbo.org/calpif/htmldocs/species/riparian/least_bell_vireo.htm;</u> Audubon. Bank Swallow (Riparia riparia). <u>https://www.audubon.org/guia-de-aves/ave/bank-swallow;</u> US Fish and Wildlife Service. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Public Advisory. <u>http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/outreach/Public-Advisories/WesternYellow-BilledCuckoo/outreach_PA_Western-Yellow-Billed-Cuckoo.htm;</u> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Listed Species in the County of Los Angeles. <u>http://dpw.lacounty.gov/pdd/bikepath/bikeplan/docs/App_C_Bio.pdf</u>.

³⁸ California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2018. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39)*. Website http://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 11 May 2018]

were encountered during the site survey. As indicated previously, the only vegetation that is present on-site consists of non-native introduced species typically used as ornamental landscaping. As a result, no impacts on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species will result.

B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • No Impact.

The field survey that was conducted for this project indicated that there are no wetlands or riparian habitat present on-site or in the surrounding areas. This conclusion is also supported by a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper.³⁹ In addition, there are no designated "blue line streams" located within the project site. As a result, no impacts on natural or riparian habitats will result from the proposed project's implementation.

C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands as defined (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ● No Impact.

As indicated in the previous subsection, the project site and adjacent developed properties do not contain any natural wetland and/or riparian habitat.⁴⁰ As a result, the proposed project will not impact any protected wetland area or designated blue-line stream and no impacts will occur.

D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ● No Impact.

The site is surrounded by development and lacks suitable habitat for wildlife habitat. Furthermore, the site contains no natural hydrological features. Constant disturbance (noise and vibration) from vehicles traveling on the adjacent roadways limit the site's utility as a migration corridor. Since the site is surrounded by development on all sides and lacks suitable habitat, the site's utility as a migration corridor is restricted. Therefore, no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project.

E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? • No Impact.

Title IX (General Regulations) Chapter 96 Codes 130-140 of the City of Santa Fe Springs municipal code serves as the City's "Tree Ordinance."⁴¹ The tree ordinance establishes strict guidelines regarding the removal or tampering of trees located within any public right-of-way (such as streets and alleys). According to Section 96.133 of the aforementioned code:

³⁹ United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *National Wetlands Inventory*. <u>https://www.fws.gov/Wetlands/data/Mapper.html</u> ⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Santa Fe Springs, City of, Municipal Code. *Title IX General Regulations, Chapter 96 Streets and Sidewalks, Street Trees.*

"No person shall cut, trim, prune, plant, remove, injure or interfere with any tree, shrub or plant upon any street, alley or public right-of-way within the city without a permit from the Director. The Director is hereby authorized to grant such permit in his discretion and, where necessary, subject to the condition that the removed tree be replaced by an official tree as designated by the master street tree plan. No such permit shall be valid for a longer period than 30 days after its date of issuance."

There are no trees located along the Telegraph Road or Romandel Avenue right-of-way. However, the site contains sparse ruderal vegetation that will be removed during the construction process. This existing vegetation will be replaced with 75,382 square feet of landscaping. Since the project's implementation will not require the removal of street trees, no impacts will result.

 F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans? ● No Impact.

The proposed project will not impact an adopted or approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan because the proposed project is located in the midst of an urban area. In addition, the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA #15) is the closest protected SEA and is located approximately two miles northeast of the project site.⁴² The construction and operation of the proposed project will not affect the Puente Hills SEA because the proposed development will be restricted to the project site. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

3.4.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of biological resources impacts indicated that no impacts on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.5.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines;
- A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to \$15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines;
- The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

⁴² County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning. *Significant Ecological Areas and Coastal Resource Areas Policy Map.* February 2015.

3.5.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to \$15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines? • No Impact.

Two locations in the City are recorded on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of California Historical Resources: the Clarke Estate and the Hawkins-Nimocks Estate.⁴³ The Clarke Estate is located at 10211 Pioneer Boulevard and the Hawkins-Nimocks Estate is located at 12100 Telegraph Road. Other structures and sites of historic significance within the City are outlined in Table 3-4.

instone Resources in Santa re Springs				
Resource Name Location		Description		
Clarke Estate	10211 Pioneer Boulevard	Site is on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of California Historical Resources.		
Hawkins-Nimocks Estate (Ontiveros Adobe)	12100 Telegraph Road	Site is on the National Register of Historic Places and the list of California Historical Resources.		
Hathaway Home	11901 E. Florence Avenue	The Hathaway Ranch Museum is a registered 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation dedicated to preserving and presenting the eras of farming, ranching, and oil development in early Fulton Wells/Santa Fe Springs.		
German Baptist Church Cemetery	Corner of Los Nietos Road and Painter Avenue	Just before the turn of the century, a colony of German Baptists known as Dunkers settled in the area to farm. In 1972, the Dunkers moved to Modesto, leaving behind their church and the neighboring graveyard.		
Santa Fe Springs Hotel	2 blocks north of Telegraph Rd. and 2 blocks east Norwalk Blvd.	Site of 1880's hotel.		
Four Corners (Fulton Wells)	Norwalk Blvd. and Telegraph Rd.	A Banning Stage Coach stop was located here.		

Table 3-4Historic Resources in Santa Fe Springs

Source: Los Angeles County Historical Directory.

The sites and structures listed in Table 3-4 are not located within or adjacent to the project site. Currently, the project site does not meet, or contain any structures that meet, any of the aforementioned criteria. In addition, the project site is not listed on the National or State Historic Register.⁴⁴ The proposed project will be limited to the project site and will not affect any existing resources listed on the National or State Register or those identified as being eligible for listing on the National or State Register. As a result, no impacts are associated with the proposed project's implementation.

⁴³ U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *National Register of Historic Places*. <u>http://focus.nps.gov/nrhp</u>. Secondary Source: California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation. *Listed California Historical Resources*. Website accessed December 13, 2018.

B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to \$15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines? • Less Than Significant Impact.

The greater Los Angeles Basin was previously inhabited by the Gabrieleño-people, named after the San Gabriel Mission. The Gabrieleño tribe has lived in this region for around 7,000 years.⁴⁵ Prior to Spanish contact, approximately 5,000 Gabrieleño people lived in villages throughout the Los Angeles Basin.⁴⁶ The project site is currently occupied by oil extraction activities.⁴⁷ Although the project site has been subject to disturbance to accommodate the existing on-site operations and the surrounding development, the project site is situated in an area of high archaeological significance. In addition, the project will require grading. As a result, a mitigation measure is provided in Section 3.18 (Tribal Cultural Resources) to ensure that a tribal representative is present during construction-related ground-disturbing activities. Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.

C. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? • Less Than Significant Impact.

There are no dedicated cemeteries located within the vicinity of the project site.⁴⁸ The proposed project will be restricted to the designated project site and will not affect any dedicated cemeteries. In addition, the proposed construction is not likely to neither discover nor disturb any on-site burials due to the level of urbanization present and the amount of disturbance sustained to accommodate the surrounding development. Notwithstanding, in the unlikely event that remains are uncovered by construction crews, all excavation and grading activities shall be halted and the City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). In addition, a mitigation measure is provided in Section 3.18 (Tribal Cultural Resources) to ensure that a tribal representative is present during construction-related ground-disturbing activities. As a result, the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact any interred human remains and the impacts are considered to be less than significant.

3.5.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential cultural resources impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

⁴⁵ Tongva People of Sunland-Tujunga. Introduction. <u>http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us/Verdugo_HS/classes/multimedia/intro.html</u>.

⁴⁶ Rancho Santa Ana Botanical Garden. *Tongva Village Site*. <u>http://www.rsabg.org/tongva-village-site-1</u>.

⁴⁷ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site Survey*. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

⁴⁸ Google Earth. Website accessed December 13, 2018.

3.6 ENERGY

3.6.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on the environment if it results in the following:

- A potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation; and,
- A conflict with or obstruction of a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. •

3.6.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation? • Less than Significant Impact.

Table 3-5 below provides an estimate of electrical and natural gas consumption for the proposed project. As indicated in the table, the project is estimated to consume approximately 515,314 kilowatts (kWh) of electricity and 3,474 therms of natural gas on an annual basis.

Estimated Annual Energy Consumption				
Project	Consumption Rate	Total Project Consumption		
Proposed Project (assumes 115,801 sq. ft.)				
Electrical Consumption	4.45 kWh/sq. ft./year	789,608 kWh/year total		
Natural Gas Consumption	0.03 themes/sq. ft./year	3,474 therms/year total		

Table 3-5

Source: CEC End-Use Survey.

According to the California Commercial End-Use Survey that was prepared for the California Energy Commission, the biggest single end use with warehouse uses is interior lighting, followed by cooling and ventilation.⁴⁹ The report also indicates that heating accounts for most of the gas consumption. It is important to note that the project will include energy efficient fixtures. In addition, the energy consumption rates do not reflect the more stringent 2016 California Building and Green Building Code requirements. The proposed project will be in accordance with the City's Building Code requirements and with Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The project will include new light standards and fixtures that will be used as operational and security lighting. This lighting will conform to all state and local building code and lighting regulations. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

⁴⁹ Intron. California Commercial End-Use Survey. Report dated March 2006.

B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? • Less than Significant Impact.

The California Public Utilities Commission prepared an updated Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan in 2011 with the goal of promoting energy efficiency and a reduction in Greenhouse Gases (GHG). Assembly Bill 1109, which was adopted in 2007, also serves as a framework for lighting efficiency. This bill would require the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to adopt minimum energy efficiency standards structured to reduce average statewide electrical energy consumption by not less than 50% from the 2007 levels for indoor residential lighting and not less than 25% from the 2007 levels for indoor commercial and outdoor lighting by 2018. According to the Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, lighting comprises approximately one-fourth of California's electricity use while nonresidential sector exterior lighting (parking lot, area, walkway, and security lighting) usage comprises 1.4% of California's total electricity use, much of which occurs during limited occupancy periods.⁵⁰ As indicated previously, the project will be involved in industrial uses. A majority of the energy that will be consumed by daily operations will be related to lighting and limited industrial equipment. Therefore, mitigation was proposed in the previous subsection that would be effective in reducing wasteful energy consumption. Adherence to the aforementioned mitigation measures will ensure conformance with the State's goal of promoting energy and lighting efficiency. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

3.6.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis concluded that the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts that would warrant mitigation.

3.7 GEOLOGY & SOILS

3.7.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on the environment if it results in the following:

- Direct or indirect cause of potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault (as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault), strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides;
- Substantial soil erosion resulting in the loss of topsoil;
- The exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including location on a geologic unit or a soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;

⁵⁰ California Public Utilities Commission. *Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan*. Plan updated January 2011.

- Locating a project on an expansive soil, as defined in the California Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property;
- Locating a project in, or exposing people to potential impacts, including soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or,
- Direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

3.7.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault (as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault), strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs is located in a seismically active region (refer to Exhibit 3-2). Many major and minor local faults traverse the entire Southern California region, posing a threat to millions of residents, including those who reside in the City. In 1972, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act was passed in response to the damage sustained in the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults.⁵¹ A list of cities and counties subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones is available on the State's Department of Conservation website. The City of Santa Fe Springs is not on the list.⁵²

The Whittier Fault is the closest known fault to the project site. This fault is located approximately 3.25 miles east of the project site.⁵³ The project site is not located within the fault zone of the Whittier Fault (refer to Exhibit 3-2). The potential impacts in regards to ground shaking and fault rupture are less than significant since the risk is no greater in and around the project site than for the rest of the area. Compliance with the most recent State and local building codes will minimize potential impacts related to earthquakes. Construction is regulated by the California Building Standards Code and the Building Regulations within Chapter 150 of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code.⁵⁴ These building codes provide requirements for construction, grading, excavations, use of fill, and foundation work including type of materials, design, procedures, etc., which are intended to limit the probability of occurrence and the severity of consequences from geological hazards.

⁵¹ California Department of Conservation. *What is the Alquist-Priolo Act.* <u>http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/main.aspx</u>.

⁵² California Department of Conservation. Table 4, Cities and Counties Affected by Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones as of January 2010. <u>http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/affected.aspx</u>.

⁵³ Google Earth. Website accessed August 24, 2018.

⁵⁴ Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code*. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 150, Building Regulations.

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER - SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



Ехнівіт 3-2 SEISMIC HAZARDS MAP

SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

Other potential seismic issues include ground failure, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. Ground failure is the loss in stability of the ground and includes landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. The project site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction. According to the United States Geological Survey, liquefaction is the process by which water-saturated sediment temporarily loses strength and acts as a fluid. Essentially, liquefaction is the process by which the ground soil loses strength due to an increase in water pressure following seismic activity. Lastly, the project site is not subject to the risk of landslides because there are no hills or mountains within the vicinity of the project site.

Lateral spreading is a phenomenon that is characterized by the horizontal, or lateral, movement of the ground. Lateral spreading could be liquefaction induced or can be the result of excess moisture within the underlying soils. Liquefaction induced lateral spreading would not affect the proposed development because the site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction. Therefore, lateral spreading caused by liquefaction would not affect the project. The underlying soils may be prone to shrinking and swelling (refer to Section 3.6.2.D); however, the soils that are susceptible shrinking and swelling characteristics will be removed and replaced. Therefore, the project Applicant will be required to adhere to Chapter 150 of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code.⁵⁵ These building codes provide requirements for construction, grading, excavations, use of fill, and foundation work including type of materials, design, procedures, etc., which are intended to limit the probability of occurrence and the severity of consequences from geological hazards. As a result, the potential impacts in regards to liquefaction and landslides are less than significant.

B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? • Less than Significant Impact.

The United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Web Soil Survey was consulted to determine the nature of the soils that underlie the project site. According to the USDA Web Soil Survey, the site is underlain by Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex soils.⁵⁶ Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex soils have a slight risk for erosion; however, construction activities and the placement of "permanent vegetative cover" will reduce the soil's erosion risk.⁵⁷ In addition, Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex soils are described as being used almost exclusively for residential and industrial development, as evident by the current level of urbanization present within the project site and surrounding areas.⁵⁸

The site is, and will continue to be level and no slope failure or landslide impacts are anticipated to occur. Once operational, the project site would be paved over and landscaped, which would minimize soil erosion. The project's construction will not result in soil erosion. The project Applicant will be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) pursuant to Federal NPDES regulations since the project would connect to the City's MS4. Adherence to these regulations is

⁵⁵ Santa Fe Springs, City of. Municipal Code. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 150, Building Regulations.

⁵⁶ United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx

⁵⁷ United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Report and General Soil Map, Los Angeles County, California*. Revised 1969. *And* United States Department of Agriculture. *Web Soil Survey*. <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</u>

mandated in Section 154.17 (Grading and Erosion Control) of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code, which ensures compliance with grading and erosion control regulations.⁵⁹ As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.

C. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including location on a geologic unit or a soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? • No Impact.

The project site is underlain by Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex soils. Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex soils are well-drained, have a slight erosion risk, and are primarily used for urban development.⁶⁰ The surrounding area is relatively level and is at no risk for landslides (refer to Exhibit 3-2). Lateral spreading is a phenomenon that is characterized by the horizontal, or lateral, movement of the ground. Lateral spreading could be liquefaction induced or can be the result of excess moisture within the underlying soils. Liquefaction induced lateral spreading will not affect the proposed project because the site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction (refer to Exhibit 3-2). Therefore, lateral spreading caused by liquefaction will not affect the project.

The soils that underlie the project site may be prone to subsidence due to their shrink swell characteristics. Subsidence occurs via soil shrinkage and is triggered by a significant reduction in an underlying groundwater table, thus causing the earth on top to sink.⁶¹ The local and State regulations mentioned throughout this section (Section 3.7) will minimize potential geologic impacts.

In addition, the project site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction. Lastly, the project will not expose future employees and patrons to collapsible soils since the Applicant is proposing to remove and re-compact unsuitable soils. Collapsible soils consist of loose, dry, low-density materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading.⁶² Since the project site is not located within a liquefaction zone and all underlying soils that are not suitable for development will be removed and re-compacted, no impacts will result.

 D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? • Less than Significant Impact.

The underlying soils consist of Urban Land-Thums-Pierview soils, which exhibit certain shrink swell characteristics. The shrinking and swelling of soils is influenced by the amount of clay present in the underlying soils.⁶³ Up to 45% of Thums soils consist of clay and clay loam, while clay and clay loam

⁵⁹ Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code*. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 154, Subdivisions, Section 154.17 Grading and Erosion Control.

⁶⁰ United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</u>

⁶¹ Subsidence Support. What Causes House Subsidence? <u>http://www.subsidencesupport.co.uk/what-causes-subsidence.html</u>

⁶² Association of Environmental & Engineering Geologists. *Expansive and Collapsible Soils*. <u>http://www.aegweb.org/?page=ExpansiveSoil</u>. Website accessed December 11, 2018.

⁶³ Natural Resources Conservation Service Arizona. Soil Properties Shrink/Swell Potential. <u>http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detailfull/az/soils/?cid=nrcs144p2_065083</u>

comprises up to 35% of Pierview soils.⁶⁴ If soils consist of expansive clay, damage to foundations and structures may occur. The local and State regulations mentioned throughout this section (Section 3.7) will minimize potential geologic impacts. Therefore, the potential impacts are expected to be less than significant.

 E. Would the project be located on soils that are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? • No Impact.

No septic tanks will be used as part of proposed project. The project will connect to the existing sanitary sewer system. As a result, no impacts associated with the use of septic tanks will occur as part of the proposed project's implementation.

F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? • Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

No paleontological resources or geologic features are anticipated to be encountered during the project's construction phase due to the amount of disturbance that has occurred to accommodate the existing development. The soils that underlie the project site are alluvial in nature. Alluvial deposits are typically quaternary in age (from two million years ago to the present day) and span the two most recent geologic epochs, the Pleistocene and the Holocene.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, in the event that previously unidentified paleontological resources are encountered, the following mitigation will be required:

• If previously unidentified paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, work shall cease within 50 feet of the find and the project Applicant must retain a qualified paleontologist, approved by the City, to assess the significance of the find. If a find is determined to be significant, the Lead Agency and the paleontologist will determine appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant fossil materials recovered will be, as necessary and at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.

Adherence to the aforementioned mitigation will ensure that potential impacts remain at levels that are considered to be less than significant.

3.7.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

In the event that previously unidentified paleontological resources are encountered, the following mitigation will be required:

⁶⁴ UC Davis. SoilWeb: Soil Survey Browser. https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/. And UC Davis. SoilWeb: Soil Survey Browser. https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/

⁶⁵ United States Geological Survey. What is the Quaternary? <u>http://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/what_is.html</u>

Mitigation Measure No. 1 (Geology & Soils). If previously unidentified paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, work shall cease within 50 feet of the find and the project Applicant must retain a qualified paleontologist, approved by the City, to assess the significance of the find. If a find is determined to be significant, the Lead Agency and the paleontologist will determine appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant fossil materials recovered will be, as necessary and at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

3.8.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

A project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on greenhouse gas emissions if it results in any of the following:

- The generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; and,
- The potential for conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

3.8.2 Environmental Analysis

A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

The State of California requires CEQA documents to include an evaluation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. GHG are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Examples of GHG that are produced both by natural and industrial processes include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). The SCAQMD has established multiple draft thresholds of significance. These thresholds include 1,400 metric tons of CO₂E (MTCO₂E) per year for commercial projects, 3,500 MTCO₂E per year for residential projects, 3,000 MTCO₂E per year for industrial projects.

Table 3-6 summarizes annual greenhouse gas (CO₂E) emissions from the proposed project. Carbon dioxide equivalent, or CO₂E, is a term that is used for describing different greenhouses gases in a common and collective unit. The CalEEMod V.2016.3.2 was used to calculate the project's construction and operational GHG emissions. These CalEEMod worksheets are provided in Appendix A. The GHG emissions estimates reflect what warehouses of the same location and description would generate once fully operational. The type of activities that may be undertaken once the project is operational have been predicted and accounted for in the model for the selected land use type. As indicated in Table 3-6, the CO₂E total for the project is 2,266.80 pounds per day or 1.02 MTCO₂E per day. This translates into an annual emission of 372 MTCO₂E, which is below the aforementioned thresholds.

-	GHG Emissions (Lbs/Day)					
Source	CO ₂	CH4	N ₂ O	CO ₂ E		
Long-term Area Emissions	0.08			0.08		
Long-term Energy Emissions	32.47			32.66		
Long-term Mobile Emissions	2,231.46	0.10		2,234.05		
Total Long-term Emissions	2,264.02	0.10		2,266.80		
Total Long-term Emissions (MTCO2e)				372 MTCO2E per year		
Thresholds of Significance				7,000 MTCO₂E per year		

Table 3-6Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Source: CalEEMod V.2016.3.2

It is important to note that the project is an "infill" development, which is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. Infill development provides a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) since the project is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC).⁶⁶ Infill development reduces VMT by recycling existing undeveloped or underutilized properties located in established urban areas. When development is located in a more rural setting, such as further east in the desert areas, employees, patrons, visitors, and residents may have to travel farther since rural development is often located a significant distance from employment, entertainment, and population centers. Consequently, this distance is reduced when development is located in urban areas since employment, entertainment, and population centers tend to be set in more established communities. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs does not presently have an adopted Climate Action Plan. However, the City's General Plan includes a Conservation Element that has an air quality focus. In this section, the following policies related to air quality are identified:

- *Policy 2.1:* Continue to research alternatives and pollution control measures that influence air quality, including trip reductions, carpooling, and local transit services.
- *Policy 2.2:* Encourage urban infill and land uses and densities that result in reduced trips and reduced trip lengths, and that support non-motorized modes of travel.
- *Policy 2.3:* Initiate capital improvement programs that allow for bus turnouts, traffic synchronization, and intersection channelization.

⁶⁶ California Strategic Growth Council. <u>http://www.sgc.ca.gov/Initiatives/infill-development.html</u>. Promoting and enabling sustainable infill development is a principal objective of the SGC because of its consistency with the State Planning Priorities and because infill furthers many of the goals of all of the Council's member agencies.

• *Policy 2.4:* Continue to participate and support cooperative programs between cities which will reduce trips and vehicle miles traveled.

The proposed project will not involve or require any variance from the aforementioned policies. As indicated previously, the project will include energy efficient lighting and bicycle parking. There will also be a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) because it is an infill project that is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC). As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

3.8.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to GHG emissions indicated that the proposed project would not result in any adverse impacts. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.9 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3.9.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact regarding hazards or hazardous materials if it results in any of the following:

- The creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- The creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- The generation of hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- Locating the project on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section §65962.5 resulting in a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- Locating the project within an area governed by an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport that would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area;
- The impairment of the implementation of, or physical interference with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or,
- The exposure of people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fire.
3.9.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project's construction would involve the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that would be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, gasoline, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants.

The project site is currently occupied by oil pumpjacks, pipes, transformers, and electrical equipment. Power lines traverse the project site central part of the project site in a north-south orientation and access is presently controlled by a chain link fence gate. The site is predominantly covered over in dirt, though the existing drive aisles consist of gravel. Sparse weedy vegetation is located in patches throughout the site. Oil extraction activities are presently ongoing. Therefore, it is likely that trace concentrations of pollutants such as Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are present in the underlying soils. As a result, the project's contractors must be familiar with SCAQMD Rule 1166-Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil.

The project site is not located on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List).⁶⁷ In addition, the project site is not identified on any Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST).⁶⁸ The property located at 10051 Romandel Avenue is currently listed on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST) as a Voluntary Cleanup Site. The site is listed on the LUST database due to groundwater, soil, and soil vapor concerns stemming from the release of petroleum, VOC's, and semi-VOCs.⁶⁹ A search through the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor database indicated that the project site was not included on any Federal or State clean up or Superfund lists.⁷⁰ The United States Environmental Protection Agency's multi-system search was consulted to determine whether the project site is identified on any Federal Brownfield list; Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List; Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List; and/or Federal RCRA Generators List. The project site was not identified on any of the aforementioned lists.⁷¹

The precise nature of the tenant(s) that will occupy the new buildings are not known at this time. In the event any future tenant(s) is involved in the transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials, the tenant(s) will be required to comply with Federal and State regulations regarding hazardous materials.

⁶⁷ CalEPA. DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List). <u>http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese List.cfm</u>

⁶⁸ California State Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker. <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=santafesprings,ca</u>

⁶⁹ California State Water Resources Control Board.

⁷⁰ CalEPA. Envirostor. <u>http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&zl=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=santafesprings</u>

⁷¹ United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Multisystem Search*. Website accessed December 14, 2018.

The tenant(s) would also be required to comply with the EPA's Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Title 42, Section 11022 of the United States Code and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code which requires the reporting of hazardous materials when used or stored in certain quantities. Furthermore, the future tenant(s) will be required to file a Hazardous Materials Disclosure Plan and a Business Emergency Plan to ensure the safety of the employees and citizens of Santa Fe Springs. Adherence to all pertinent local, State, and Federal regulations will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, or result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

As stated previously, the project site is not identified on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List); the Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST); the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor database; or the United States EPA Envirofacts database.⁷²⁷³⁷⁴⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the project site is currently occupied by oil pumpjacks, pipes, transformers, and electrical equipment. Power lines traverse the project site central part of the project site in a north-south orientation and access is presently controlled by a chain link fence gate. The site is predominantly covered over in dirt, though the existing drive aisles consist of gravel. Sparse weedy vegetation is located in patches throughout the site. Oil extraction activities are presently ongoing. Therefore, it is likely that trace concentrations of pollutants such as Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are present in the underlying soils. As a result, the project's contractors must be familiar with SCAQMD Rule 1166-Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil.

The project's construction will require the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that would be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, gasoline, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants. These materials will be properly contained, handled, and disposed of in accordance with all pertinent local, State, and Federal regulations.

The precise nature of the tenants that will occupy the new buildings are not known at this time. In the event any future tenant(s) is involved in the transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials, the tenant(s) will be required to comply with Federal and State regulations regarding hazardous materials. The tenant(s) would also be required to comply with the EPA's Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Title 42, Section 11022 of the United States Code and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code which requires the reporting of hazardous materials when used or stored in certain

⁷² CalEPA. DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List). <u>http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm</u>

⁷³ California State Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker. <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=santafesprings.ca</u>

⁷⁴ CalEPA. Envirostor. <u>http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&zl=18&ms=640.480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=santafesprings</u>

⁷⁵ United States Environmental Protection Agency. Multisystem Search. Website accessed May 14, 2018.

quantities. Furthermore, the future tenant(s) will be required to file a Hazardous Materials Disclosure Plan and a Business Emergency Plan to ensure the safety of the employees and citizens of Santa Fe Springs. Adherence to all pertinent local, State, and Federal regulations will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

The project site is located in the midst of a methane zone.⁷⁶ The City of Santa Fe Springs contains multiple methane risk zones. Methane is an odorless, combustible gas that may become explosive if concentrations are great enough in enclosed, unventilated spaces. Methane is a direct result of the decomposition of organic materials that were disposed of in the area landfills. Methane is also a byproduct of the formation oil, which in turn is comprised of organic matter such as plankton, algae, or other microorganisms. Trapped methane is released from oil deposits during oil extraction.⁷⁷ Since the project site is located in the midst of a methane risk zone, the project Applicant must adhere to the regulations outlined in Chapter 117 - Oil and Gas, Section 117.131 of the City's Municipal Code. Adherence to the standards identified in the aforementioned section will ensure impacts remain at levels that are less than significant.

C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? • No Impact.

There are no schools located within one-quarter of a mile from the project site. Richard L. Graves Middle School is the closest school to the project site. This school is located 0.45 miles to the east.⁷⁸ As stated in Section 3.8.2.A, if any of the proposed project's future tenants are involved in the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, the tenant would need to comply with Federal and State regulations regarding hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project will not create a significant hazard to any local school and no impacts are anticipated.

D. Would the project be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section §65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

The *Cortese List*, also referred to as the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List or the California Superfund List, is a planning document used by the State and other local agencies to comply with CEQA requirements that require the provision of information regarding the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop and update the Cortese List on annually basis. The list is maintained as part of the DTSC's Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program referred to as EnviroStor.

⁷⁸ Google Earth. Website accessed December 20, 2018.

⁷⁶ City of Santa Fe Springs. *Methane Zone Map*. <u>http://www.santafesprings.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3424</u>

⁷⁷ University of Calgary. Energy Education-Oil Formation. http://energyeducation.ca/encyclopedia/Oil formation

A search of the Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor Hazardous Waste and Substances Site "Cortese" List database identified five Cortese sites within the City: Angeles Chemical Company, Inc. (located at 8915 Sorensen Avenue), Waste Disposal, Inc. (located at 12731 Los Nietos Road), Cal-Tron Plating, Inc. (located at 11919 East Rivera Road), Neville Chemical Company (located at 12800 Imperial Highway), and McKesson Chemical Company (located at 9005 Sorensen Avenue).⁷⁹ The proposed project will be restricted to the designated project site and will not affect any of the aforementioned sites. The site is not located on any of the other databases. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

E. For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? • No Impact.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Fullerton Airport is located approximately 6.50 miles southeast of the project site and the Long Beach Airport is located approximately ten miles to the southwest.⁸⁰ The proposed project is not located within the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) of any of the aforementioned airports. In addition, the proposed project will not penetrate the designated slopes for any of the aforementioned airports. Essentially, the proposed project will not introduce a building that will interfere with the approach and take-off of airplanes utilizing any of the aforementioned airports and will not risk the safety of the people working in the project area. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

F. Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.

At no time will Telegraph Road or Romandel Avenue be completely closed to traffic. All construction staging areas will be located within the project site. As a result, the project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no impacts are associated with the proposed project's implementation.

G. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild lands fire, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands? • No Impact.

The area surrounding the project site is urban and there are no areas containing natural vegetation that could lead to a wildfire.⁸¹ As a result, there are no impacts associated with potential wildfires from off-site locations.

⁷⁹ California Department of Toxic Substances Control. DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List). <u>http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm.</u>

⁸⁰ Toll-Free Airline. *Los Angeles County Public and Private Airports, California*. <u>http://www.tollfreeairline.com/california/losangeles.htm</u>.

⁸¹ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. Site Survey was completed on December 7, 2018.

3.9.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that the proposed project will have less than significant impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials. The project Applicant must adhere to the conditions outlined in Chapter 117 - Oil and Gas, Section 117.131 of the City's municipal code. This section contains requirements pertaining to soil and gas studies.

3.10 Hydrology & Water Quality

3.10.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse environmental impact on hydrology and water quality if it results in any of the following:

- A violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality;
- A substantial decrease of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin;
- A substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows;
- Flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones risk release of pollutants due to project inundation; or,
- Conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

3.10.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is currently covered over in pervious surfaces (dirt). Once complete, approximately 20% of the site will be covered over in pervious surfaces. The increase in the amount of impervious surfaces may result in an accumulation of potential contaminants of concern (soil, leaves, debris, waste, etc) in surface runoff. Therefore, the project Applicant will be required to implement storm water pollution control measures pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

(NPDES) requirements. The Clean Water Act delineates a national permitting system for point discharges known as the NPDES. NPDES permits typically incorporate specific discharge limitations for point source discharges to ensure that dischargers meet permit conditions and protect State-defined water quality standards. The NPDES framework also regulates stormwater runoff originating from municipal and industrial sources. The Applicant would also be required to prepare a Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) utilizing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The SUSMP will also identify post-construction BMPs that will be the responsibility of the Applicant to implement over the life of the project. As part of the permitting process, the paving contractors will be required to adhere to all pertinent Clean Water Act regulation.

Construction is regulated by the California Building Standards Code and the Building Regulations within Chapter 150 of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code.82 These building codes provide requirements for construction, grading, excavations, use of fill, and foundation work including type of materials, design, procedures, etc., which are intended to limit the probability of occurrence and the severity of consequences from sedimentation and erosion. In addition, Section 154.17 (Grading and Erosion Control) of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code ensures compliance with grading and erosion control regulations.⁸³ Prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project that would result in soil disturbance of one or more acres of land, the Applicant will be required to demonstrate that coverage has been obtained under California's General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity by providing a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board, and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number or other proof of filing shall be provided to the Chief Building Official and the City Engineer. In addition, the Applicant will be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will be submitted to the Chief Building Official and City Engineer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. With the abovementioned regulations, the impacts would be reduced to levels that are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in such a way that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? • Less than Significant Impact.

The grading that will be done will not extend to depths required to encounter groundwater. Therefore no direct construction related impacts to groundwater supplies, or groundwater recharge activities will occur. The project will continue to be connected to the City's water lines and will not result in a direct decrease in underlying groundwater supplies. Furthermore, the project's contractors will be required to adhere to the applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the construction site. Adherence to the required BMPs will restrict the discharge of contaminated runoff into the local storm drain system. As a result, the impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

⁸² Santa Fe Springs, City of. Municipal Code. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 150, Building Regulations.

⁸³ Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code*. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 154, Subdivisions, Section 154.17 Grading and Erosion Control.

C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows? • Less than Significant Impact.

Once implemented, the proposed project will change the site's drainage characteristics. The project site is covered over in pervious surfaces. Currently, stormwater runoff percolates into the ground. The project Applicant will be required to prepare a SUSMP pursuant to Title 5, Chapter 52 of the City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code. The SUSMP will identify post-construction BMPs that will filter contaminated runoff. These BMPs may facilitate percolation of runoff into the ground, result in the slow and controlled discharge of runoff into the City's storm drains, or permit the retention of stormwater below ground. No excess runoff will be discharged off-site. As a result, the proposed project will not result in off-site erosion or flooding. In addition, the project will not create polluted runoff or runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing storm drains with implementation of the BMPs outlined in the SUSMP. The project site is located one mile west of the Coyote Creek Channel.⁸⁴ Construction activities will be restricted to the project site and will not alter the course of the channelized Coyote Creek. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

D. Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? ● No Impact.

The proposed project site is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. A seiche in the Coyote Creek is not likely to happen due to the current level of channelization. In addition, the project site is located inland approximately 15 miles from the Pacific Ocean and the project area would not be exposed to the effects of a tsunami.⁸⁵ As a result, no impacts are expected.

E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? • No Impact.

As previously mentioned, the proposed project would be required to implement storm water pollution control measures pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The Applicant would also be required to prepare a Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) utilizing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. The SUSMP will also identify post-construction BMPs that will be the responsibility of the Applicant to implement over the life of the project. In addition, Section 154.17 (Grading and Erosion Control) of the Santa Fe Springs Municipal

⁸⁴ Google Earth. Website accessed December 12, 2018.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

Code ensures compliance with grading and erosion control regulations.⁸⁶ As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

3.10.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality indicated that the proposed project would not result in any adverse impacts. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.11 LAND USE & PLANNING

3.11.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant impact on land use and planning if it results in any of the following:

- The physical division and disruption of an established community; or,
- Causing a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

3.11.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project physically divide an established community? • No Impact.

The project site is located within a built-up area. Existing uses found in the vicinity of the project site are summarized below:⁸⁷

- *North of the project site*. Romandel Avenue extends along the site's northeast boundary. Meanwhile, undeveloped parcels abut the project site to the north and northwest.⁸⁸
- South of the project site. Telegraph Road extends along the project site's southern boundary.
 Oil extraction operations were observed within the parcels located along the south side of Telegraph Road.⁸⁹
- *East of the project site*. Two warehouse buildings abut the project site to the east. These warehouses possess frontage along the west side of Freeman Avenue.⁹⁰

90 Ibid.

⁸⁶ Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code*. Title XV, Land Usage. Chapter 154, Subdivisions, Section 154.17 Grading and Erosion Control.

⁸⁷ Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. *Site survey*. Survey was conducted on December 7, 2018.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

• *West of the project site*. An undeveloped property abuts the project site to the west. This property is likely used by Atchison and Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad as an easement for railroad access. An Atchison and Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way (ROW) is located further west.

The granting of the requested entitlements and subsequent construction of the proposed project will not result in any expansion of the use beyond the current boundaries. As a result, the project will not lead to any division of the adjacent neighborhood and no impacts will occur.

 B. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is currently zoned as *Heavy Manufacturing* (M-2) (refer to Exhibit 3-3 for the zoning map). The project site's General Plan land use designation is *Industrial* (refer to Exhibit 3-3 for the General Plan land use map). The project's implementation will require a Development Plan Approval (*DPA No. 957 through 962*) for six concrete tilt-up warehouses, a Zoning Change (Case No. 138) to allow for a Planned Development Overlay, and a Tentative Parcel Map to merge the 28 existing parcels into one larger parcel. Table 3-7 depicts the proposed project's conformity with the City's M-2 zoning standards.

g							
Description	City Requirements	Project Element	Conforms?				
Maximum Building Height	N/A	35 feet	Yes				
Maximum Lot Coverage N/A		30%	Yes				
Parking Required	240 spaces	263 spaces	Yes				
Front Yard Setback	20 feet	34 to 36 ft.	Yes				
Landscaping Required	18,683 sq. ft.	75,382 sq. ft.	Yes				

 Table 3-7

 The Project Conformity with the City's Zoning Standards

Source: City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code

As shown in Table 3-7, the proposed project conforms to the City's Zoning Standards. Nevertheless, the project will still be subject to the aforementioned discretionary actions. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

3.11.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that no significant impacts on land use and planning would result from the implementation of the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 3-3 ZONING/GENERAL PLAN MAP

SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS AND CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

3.12.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on mineral resources if it results in any of the following:

- The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State; or,
- The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

3.12.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State? • No Impact.

The project site is located within an existing oil field and there are oil pumps currently in operation located throughout the property. Oil drilling activities in the City of Santa Fe Springs began in October of 1907 when Union Oil Company of California spudded its first oil well in the City.⁹¹ According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) Well Finder, there are 15 oil wells located within the project site (refer to Exhibit 3-4), of which 12 are active, and three are abandoned.⁹² The oil pumps will remain in operation once the project is complete and occupied. If the Applicant intends to close the 12 remaining wells, they (the Applicant) would need to receive a closure letter from the Santa Fe Springs Fire Department. Once the closure letter has been issued, the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) will oversee the closure of any wells.

In addition, according to SMARA study area maps prepared by the California Geological Survey, the City of Santa Fe Springs is located within the larger San Gabriel Valley SMARA (identified as the Portland cement concrete-grade aggregate).⁹³ However, as indicated in the San Gabriel Valley P-C region MRZ-2 map, the project site is not located in an area where there are significant aggregate resources present.⁹⁴ In addition, the project site is not located in an area with active mineral extraction activities. As a result, no impacts to mineral resources will occur.

⁹¹ Summary of Operations, California Oil Fields. *History of Development*. Document dated May 1923. <u>http://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/oil/Summary_of_Operations/1923/Volo8No11.pdf</u>

⁹² California Department of Conservation. *Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources Well Finder*. <u>http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/index.html#close</u>.

⁹³ California Department of Conservation. San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/Plate%201.pdf</u>

⁹⁴ Ibid.



Ехнівіт 3-4 OIL WELL MAP

SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF OIL, GAS, AND GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

 B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? • No Impact.

As indicated in the subsection above, there are 15 active and abandoned wells on-site. The project will not interfere with oil extraction activities. Should the Applicant file to close any of the 12 active wells, they (the Applicant) would need to receive a closure letter from the Santa Fe Springs Fire Department. Once the closure letter has been issued, the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) will oversee the closure of any wells.

A review of the San Gabriel Valley P-C region MRZ-2 map indicated that the project site is not located in an area that contains aggregate resources.⁹⁵ Therefore, the project's implementation will not contribute to a loss of availability to locally important mineral resources. Furthermore, the resources and materials that will be utilized for the construction of the proposed project will not include any materials that are considered rare or unique. As a result, no impacts will occur with the project's implementation.

3.12.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis indicated that no impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.13 NOISE

3.13.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant impact on the environment if it results in any of the following:

- The generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies; or,
- The generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

⁹⁵ California Department of Conservation. San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/Plate%201.pdf</u>

3.13.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? • Less Than Significant Impact.

The most commonly used unit for measuring the level of sound is the decibel (dB). Zero on the decibel scale represents the lowest limit of sound that can be heard by humans. The eardrum may rupture at 140 dB. In general, an increase of between 3.0 dB and 5.0 dB in the ambient noise level is considered to represent the threshold for human sensitivity. In other words, increases in ambient noise levels of 3.0 dB or less are not generally perceptible to persons with average hearing abilities.⁹⁶ Noise levels that are associated with common, everyday activities are illustrated in Exhibit 3-5.

Composite construction noise is best characterized in a study prepared by Bolt, Beranek, and Newman. In the study, the noisiest phases of construction are anticipated to be 89 dBA as measured at a distance of 50 feet from the construction activity. Noise levels associated with various types of construction equipment are summarized in Exhibit 3-6. The noise levels are those that would be expected at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. The nearest noise sensitive receptor is the Villages at Heritage Springs residential development, which is located 1,200 feet to the west of the project site. The project's construction noise levels were estimated using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model Version 1.1. The pieces and number of equipment that will be utilized was taken from the CalEEMod worksheets prepared for this project. The distance used between the construction activity and the nearest sensitive receptors varied depending on the individual equipment. The model assumes a recommended 4.0 dBA reduction based on spreading loss. As indicated by the model, the project's construction will result in ambient noise levels of up to 57 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor. Construction noise will barely be audible since it will be masked by the existing ambient noise environment.

An *Extec* Digital Sound Meter was used to conduct the noise measurements. A series of 100 discrete noise measurements were recorded along the north side of Telegraph Road. The measurements were taken on a Friday morning at 11:45 AM. Table 3-8 indicates the variation in noise levels over time during the measurement period. As indicated previously, the L_{50} noise level represents the noise level that is exceeded 50 percent of the time. Half the time the noise level exceeds this level and half the time the noise level is less than this level. The average noise levels during the measurement period were 72.7 dBA.

⁹⁶ Bugliarello, et. al., *The Impact of Noise Pollution*, Chapter 127, 1975.



EXHIBIT 3-5 TYPICAL NOISE SOURCES AND LOUDNESS SCALE

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER - SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

70 80 90 100 Compactors (Rollers) Front Loaders Earth Moving Equipment Backhoes Equipment Powered by Internal Combustion Engines Tractors Scrapers, Graders Pavers Trucks **Concrete Mixers** Materials Handling Equipment **Concrete Pumps** Cranes (Movable) Cranes (Derrick) Stationary Equipment Pumps Generators Compressors **Pneumatic Wrenches** Impact Equipment Jack Hammers **Pile Drivers** Other Vibrators Equipment Saws

Typical noise levels in dBA 50 ft. from source

EXHIBIT 3-6 TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

Noise Metric	Noise Level (dBA)					
L _{max} (Maximum Noise Level)	82.6 dBA					
L ⁹⁹ (Noise levels <99% of time)	81.5 dBA					
L90 (Noise levels <90% of time)	78.9 dBA					
L ⁷⁵ (Noise levels <75% of time)	75.8 dBA					
L ⁵⁰ (Noise levels <50% of time)	72.6 dBA					
L _{min} (Minimum Noise Level)	62.1 dBA					
Average Noise Level	72.7 dBA					

Table 3-8Noise Measurement Results

Measurements were taken in May 2018

As indicated in Table 3-8, the ambient noise environment along Telegraph Road is typical for a roadway located within an industrial area. The City of Santa Fe Springs Municipal Code has established the following noise control standards for industrial development within the M-1 or M-2 zone: 70 dBA between 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM and 70 dBA between 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM.⁹⁷ The average ambient noise levels are below the thresholds for industrial development established by the City. In addition, much of the daily operations will occur within the warehouse buildings or within the loading areas. Therefore, roadway noise emanating from Telegraph Road will be further attenuated by the new buildings. Additionally, the California Occupational Noise Control Standards contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Industrial Relations, Chapter 4, outline permissible noise exposure at a workplace which include a maximum noise exposure level of 90 dBA for more than eight hours in any workday. Finally, future tenants must comply with all Occupation Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) requirements regarding noise control. Adherence to the above-mentioned operational regulations will protect employees from excessive noise levels.

Operational noise will affect not the Villages at Heritage Springs. As indicated previously, the closest sensitive receptors are located 1,200 feet to the west of the project site. The distance between the project site and the aforementioned residential community will naturally aid the reduction of noise levels since noise levels decrease with distance.

In addition, operational noise generated within the project site will be attenuated by the existing streetscape and development since objects located within the line-of-sight between the source and a point will lead to the attenuation of noise. The project site is not visible from the Villages at Heritage Springs. As a result, the proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors and employees to excessive noise levels due to the two factors described above and the impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

⁹⁷ Santa Fe Springs, City of. Municipal Code. Title XV Land Usage, Chapter 155 Zoning, Section 155.424.

B. Would the project result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? • Less than Significant Impact.

The nearest land use that may potentially be impacted by ground-borne vibration and noise (primarily from the use of heavy construction equipment) is the Villages at Heritage Springs Residential Development, located 1,200 feet to the west of the site. As noted in Subsection 3.13.2.A, noise emanating from the project site will not affect the aforementioned sensitive receptors due to their distance to the project site and the lack of an unobstructed line of sight between the aforementioned sensitive receptors and the project.

In addition, the proposed project's traffic will not be great enough to result in a measurable or perceptible increase in traffic noise (it typically requires a doubling of traffic volumes to increase the ambient noise levels to 3.0 dBA or greater).⁹⁸ The potential traffic generation is far less than the doubling of traffic that would be required to generate a perceptible increase in traffic noise. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

3.13.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to noise indicated that proposed project will not result in any impacts that would warrant mitigation.

3.14 POPULATION & HOUSING

3.14.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant impact on housing and population if it results in any of the following:

- A substantial growth in the unplanned population within an area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of new homes or infrastructure) related to a project; or,
- The displacement of a substantial number of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing.

3.14.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of new homes or infrastructure related to a project)? ● No Impact.

Growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services to an undeveloped or rural area. Growth-inducing impacts include the following:

⁹⁸ Bugliarello, et. al., The Impact of Noise Pollution, Chapter 127, 1975.

- New development in an area presently undeveloped and economic factors which may influence development;
- Extension of roadways and other transportation facilities;
- Extension of infrastructure and other improvements;
- Major off-site public projects (treatment plants, etc.);
- The removal of housing requiring replacement housing elsewhere;
- Additional population growth leading to increased demand for goods and services; and,
- Short-term growth-inducing impacts related to the project's construction.

According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the City of Santa Fe Springs is projected to add a total of 7,400 new jobs through the year 2040.⁹⁹ According to the State of California Employment Development Department, the City's current unemployment rate is 5.8%, which means there are up to 500 residents actively seeking work.¹⁰⁰ The project is projected to result in a total of 76 new jobs.¹⁰¹ The projected number of new jobs is well within SCAG's employment projections for the City of Santa Fe Springs. As a result, no impacts would occur.

B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? • No Impact.

As previously mentioned, the project site is currently occupied by oil extraction activities. No housing units will be displaced as a result of the proposed project's implementation and no impacts will occur.

3.14.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of population and housing impacts indicated that no significant impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

3.15.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on public services if it results in any of the following:

• A substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to *fire protection services*;

⁹⁹ Southern California Association of Governments. Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2016-2040. Demographics & Growth Forecast. April 2016.

¹⁰⁰ State of California Employment Development Department. *Current Month Unemployment Rate and Labor Force Summary*. <u>http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/unemployment-and-labor-force.html.</u>

¹⁰¹ The Natelson Company, Inc. *Employment Density Study Summary Report*. October 31, 2001.

- A substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to *police protection services*;
- A substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to *school services*; or,
- A substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to other *public facilities*.

3.15.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

 A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to fire protection services? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs Fire Department provides fire prevention and emergency medical services within the City. The department consists of three separate divisions: Operations, Fire Prevention and Environmental Protection. The Operations Division provides fire suppression, emergency medical services (EMS), hazardous materials response, and urban search and rescue. The Fire Prevention Division provides plan check, inspections, and public education. Finally, the Environmental Protection Division is responsible for responding to emergencies involving hazardous materials. The Fire Department operates from four stations: Station No. 1 (11300 Greenstone Avenue), Station No. 2 (8634 Dice Road), Station No. 3 (15517 Carmenita Road), and Station No. 4 (11736 Telegraph Road).

The first response station to the site is station No. 4, which is located 1.30 miles northwest of the project site. The Fire Department currently reviews all new development plans, and future development will be required to conform to all fire protection and prevention requirements, including, but not limited to, building setbacks and emergency access. The proposed project would only place an incremental demand on fire services since the project will involve the construction of a modern structure that will be subject to all pertinent fire and building codes. Like all development projects within the City, the proposed project will undergo review by the City of Santa Fe Springs Fire Department to ensure that sprinklers, hydrants, fire flow, etc. are adequate in meeting the Department's requirements. The Department will also review the project's emergency access and clearance. Compliance with the above-mentioned requirement, as well as the pertinent codes and ordinances, would reduce the impacts to levels that are less than significant.

 B. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives relative to police protection services? • Less Than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services (DPS) is responsible for management of all law enforcement services within the City. The DPS is staffed by both City personnel and officers from the City of Whittier Police Department (WPD) that provide contract law enforcement services to Santa Fe Springs. The police services contract between the two cities provides for a specified number of WPD patrolling officers though the DPS has the ability to request an increased level of service. WPD law enforcement personnel assigned to the City includes 35 sworn officers and 6 support personnel.¹⁰² The proposed project would only place an incremental demand on police protection services since the project is not anticipated to be an attractor for crime due to the lack of unsecure vacant space. To ensure the proposed project elements adhere to the City's security requirements, the City of Santa Fe Springs Department of Police Services will review the site plan for the proposed project to ensure that the development adheres to the Department requirements, including, but not limited to, photometric plan review. Adherence to the above-mentioned requirement will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

C. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives relative to school services? • Less than Significant Impact.

Due to the nature of the proposed project, no direct enrollment impacts regarding school services will occur. The proposed project will not directly increase demand for school services. Pursuant to SB-50, payment of fees to the applicable school district is considered full mitigation for project-related impacts. School fees that will be paid by the developer and as a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

D. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives in other public facilities? ● No Impact.

No new public facilities will be needed since the proposed project will be an industrial development that will not result in a direct increase in population and therefore will not create a significant need for increased public services. As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

3.15.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant impact on public services. As a result, no mitigation is required.

¹⁰² City of Whittier. <u>http://www.cityofwhittier.org/depts/police/sfs/default.asp</u>.

3.16 RECREATION

3.16.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on the environment if it results in any of the following:

- The use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or,
- The construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

3.16.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? • No Impact.

Due to the nature of the proposed project, no significant increase in the usage of City parks and recreational facilities is anticipated to occur. The nearest park to the project site is Heritage Park, located 0.69 miles to the southwest. The proposed warehouse development will be constructed within the confines of the project site and the proposed project will not physically impact the aforementioned park. Since the project will not negatively impact any park, no impacts will occur.

 B. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? • No Impact.

The proposed project will not involve the construction of new recreational facilities nor will the project result in a direct demand for park facilities. As a result, no changes in the demand for local parks and recreation facilities are anticipated and no impacts are anticipated.

3.16.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant impact on recreational facilities and services. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION

3.17.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may have a significant adverse impact on traffic and circulation if it results in any of the following:

- A conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures for addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths;
- A conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(1) for a land use project;
- A conflict with or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(2) for a transportation project;
- Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or,
- Results in inadequate emergency access.

A traffic impact analysis was prepared by Crown City Engineers to evaluate the impacts on the traffic circulation system due to the proposed industrial development.¹⁰³ The traffic impact analysis approaches the task of identifying and quantifying the anticipated impacts to the circulation system with a structured, "building block" methodology. The first step is to inventory and quantify existing conditions. Upon this foundation of fact, a travel forecast model, based on physical and operational characteristics of road network and manual observation of peak hour traffic movements, is structured for the entire project area and calibrated manually, by adjusting any traffic flow inconsistency, to produce reliable output, verifiable with the existing data. With the project traffic calculated and distributed onto the study area, at the anticipated opening year of the project in 2020, the travel forecast methodology is utilized to assess the project's traffic impacts at that time. The methodology utilizes a growth factor for traffic based upon regional guidelines, any other projects in the project vicinity, as well as the traffic anticipated to be introduced from the proposed project to produce the travel forecast and level-of-service data for the future target year.

The trip generation estimate is based on the 10th edition of Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)'s "Trip Generation" manual. Research and interviews have been conducted with local and regional agencies in order to identify and characterize the most probable trip distribution patterns within the study area. Project impacts are identified for the future year 2020 conditions. At those intersections operating deficiently (e.g., at a level worse than LOS D) and significantly impacted by the proposed project, a mitigation measure is identified and applied, and a before-and-after mitigation analysis conducted.

Roadway operations and the relationship between capacity and traffic volumes are generally expressed in terms of levels of service (LOS). Levels of service are defined as LOS A through F. These levels recognize that, while an absolute limit exists as to the amount of traffic traveling through a given intersection (the absolute capacity), the conditions that motorists experience deteriorate rapidly as traffic approaches the absolute capacity. Under such conditions, congestion as well as delay is experienced. There is generally instability in the traffic flow, which means that relatively small incidents (e.g., momentary engine stall) can cause considerable fluctuations in speeds and delays. This

¹⁰³ Crown City Engineers, Inc. Traffic Impact Study, Warehouse Development, 8201 Sorensen Avenue, Santa Fe Springs, California. October 2018.

near-capacity situation is labeled LOS E. Beyond LOS E, capacity is exceeded, and arriving traffic will exceed the ability of the intersection to accommodate it. An upstream queue will form and continue to expand in length until the demand volume reduces.

A complete description of the meaning of level of service can be found in the Highway Research Board's Special Report 209 titled *Highway Capacity Manual*. The manual establishes the definitions for levels of service A through F. Brief descriptions of the six levels of service, as extracted from the manual, are listed in Table 3-9.

LOS	Description
A	No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication. Typically, the approach appears quite open, turns are made easily, and nearly all drivers find freedom of operation.
В	This service level represents stable operation, where an occasional approach phase is fully utilized and a substantial number are approaching full use. Many drivers begin to feel restricted within platoons of vehicles.
C	This level still represents stable operating conditions. Occasionally, drivers have to wait through more than one red signal indication, and backups may develop behind turning vehicles. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.
D	This level encompasses a zone of increasing restriction approaching instability at the intersection. Delays to approaching vehicles may be substantial during short peaks within the peak period; however, enough cycles with lower demand occur to permit periodic clearance of developing queues, thus preventing excessive backups.
E	Capacity occurs at the upper end of this service level. It represents the most vehicles that any particular intersection can accommodate. Full utilization of every signal cycle is seldom attained no matter how great the demand.
F	This level describes forced flow operations at low speeds, where volumes exceed capacity. These conditions usually result from queues of vehicles backing up from restriction downstream. Speeds are reduced substantially and stoppages may occur for short or long periods of time due to congestion. In the extreme case, both speed and volume can drop to zero.

Table 3-9Level of Service Definitions

The thresholds of level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections are shown in Table 3-10.

Two-Way or All-Way Stop Signalized Intersection Volume to Capacity Level of **Controlled Intersection Average Delay per Vehicle** (V/C) Ratio Service **Average Delay per Vehicle** (sec) (sec) A 0 - 10 < or = 10 0 - 0.60 В > 10 - 15 > 10 - 20 > 0.60 - 0.70 С > 15 - 25 > 20 - 35 > 0.70 - 0.80 D > 0.80 - 0.90 > 25 - 35 > 35 - 55 Е > 55 - 80 > 0.90 - 1.00 > 35 - 50 > 80 or a V/C ratio equal to or F > 50 > 1.00 greater than 1.0

Table 3-10Level of Service Criteria

LOS D is the minimum threshold at all key intersections in the urbanized areas. The traffic study guidelines require that traffic mitigation measures be identified to provide for operations at the minimum threshold levels.

For the study area intersections, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) procedure has been utilized to determine intersection levels of service. Levels of service are presented for the entire intersection, consistent with the local and regional agency policies. While the level of service concept and analysis methodology provides an indication of the performance of the entire intersection, the single letter grade A through F cannot describe specific operational deficiencies at intersections. Progression, queue formation, and left-turn storage are examples of the operational issues that affect the performance of an intersection, but do not factor into the strict calculation of level of service. However, it provides a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio that is more meaningful when identifying a project's impact and developing mitigation measures. Therefore, this V/C ratio information is included in describing an intersection's operational performance under various scenarios.¹⁰⁴

3.17.2 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Would the project cause a conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths? • Less than Significant Impact.

The Site IV will provide a total of two driveways – one right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one full-access on the driveway on Romandel Avenue. The following paragraphs provide a brief description of the existing roadways which comprise the circulation network of the study area, providing the majority of both regional and local access to the project:

- *Norwalk Boulevard*. Norwalk Boulevard is a north-south arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction. The street is approximately 80 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by either a 2-way left-turn lane or raised median islands along the center of the street. The intersection of Norwalk Boulevard at Telegraph Road is signalized. Parking is not permitted along both sides of the street. The average daily volume on Norwalk Boulevard is approximately 19,200 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Norwalk Boulevard represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- Santa Fe Springs Road/Bloomfield Avenue. Santa Fe Springs Road/ Bloomfield Avenue is a major north-south arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction plus left turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 84 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 45 miles per hour. The three key intersections of Santa Fe Springs Road/Bloomfield Avenue at Los Nietos Road, Telegraph Road and Florence Avenue are signalized. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Santa Fe Springs Road is approximately 20,880 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Santa Fe Springs/Bloomfield

¹⁰⁴ Crown City Engineering, Inc. Traffic Impact Study [TIA], MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV Warehouse Development, Santa Fe Springs, California. December, 2018

Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

- *Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue*. Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue is a major northeast-southwest secondary arterial highway per the City's Circulation Element of General Plan with one travel lane in each direction. The street is approximately 62 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. The intersection of Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue at Telegraph Road is signalized. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Greenleaf Avenue is approximately 11,240 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Los Nietos Road.* Los Nietos Road is a major northwest-southeast secondary arterial highway per the City's Circulation Element of General Plan with one travel lane in each direction. The street is approximately 60 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Los Nietos Road is approximately 15,120 vehicles per day (assuming AM peak hour volume counted on Los Nietos Road represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Telegraph Road*. Telegraph Road is a major east-west arterial street with three travel lanes in each direction plus left turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 88 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Telegraph Road is approximately 30,520 vehicles per day (assuming AM peak hour volume counted on Telegraph Road represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).
- *Florence Avenue*. Florence Avenue is a major east-west arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction plus turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 82 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Florence Avenue is approximately 24,830 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Florence Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).¹⁰⁵

For the purpose of evaluating existing operating conditions as well as future operating conditions with and without the proposed project, the study area was carefully selected in accordance with local traffic study guidelines. Manual turning movement counts for the selected intersections were collected in the field for the morning and evening peak periods during the month of June 2018. The intersections were counted during the peak hours of 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) in a non-holiday school week. It was determined that the following

¹⁰⁵ Crown City Engineering, Inc. Traffic Impact Study [TIA], MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV Warehouse Development, Santa Fe Springs, California. December, 2018

five (5) key signalized intersections would be analyzed in the study:106

- Telegraph Road and Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized);
- Telegraph Road and Norwalk Boulevard (Signalized);
- Los Nieto Road and Santa Fe Springs Road (Signalized);
- Telegraph Road and Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue (Signalized); and,
- Florence Avenue and Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized).

Existing lane configurations at the key intersections are shown in Exhibit 3-7. Existing turning movement counts for AM and PM peak hour conditions are shown in Exhibit 3-8. Detailed turning movement counts are included in the Technical Appendix of the Traffic Study. Year 2018 existing traffic conditions were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of level of service (LOS) analysis for signalized intersections. Table 3-11 presents existing condition intersection level of service (LOS) analysis summary. Detailed calculations relating to the study intersections are included in the Technical Appendix of the Traffic Study. Based on the results of this analysis, all five (5) study intersections are operating at an acceptable level of service (i.e., LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 3.¹⁰⁷

	.	Peak	Existing Year 2015		
No.	Intersection	Hour	V/C	LOS	
1	Telegraph Rd at Bloomfield Ave/ Santa Fe Springs Rd	AM PM	0.743 0.742	C C	
2	Telegraph Rd at Norwalk Blvd	AM PM	0.867 0.802	D C	
3	Los Nietos Rd at Santa Fe Springs Rd	AM PM	0.887 0.870	D D	
4	Telegraph Rd at at Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	AM PM	0.645 0.630	B B	
5	Florence Avenue at Bloomfield Avenue	AM PM	0.876 0.877	D D	

Table 3-11Intersection Levels of Service – Existing Year (2018)

Source: Crown City Engineering, Inc.

In order to accurately assess future traffic conditions with the proposed project, trip generation estimates were developed for the project. Trip generation rates for the project are based on the nationally recognized recommendations contained in "Trip Generation" manual, 10th edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).

¹⁰⁶ Crown City Engineering, Inc. Traffic Impact Study [TIA], MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV Warehouse Development, Santa Fe Springs, California. December, 2018

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 3-7 EXISTING LANE CONFIGURATIONS AT KEY INTERSECTIONS Source: Crown City Engineering, Inc



EXHIBIT 3-8 EXISTING 2018 TRAFFIC VOLUMES AT KEY INTERSECTIONS SOURCE: CROWN CITY ENGINEERING, INC

ITE also provides information on percentage of truck traffic associated with warehouse/storage land use. The vehicle-mix percentages provided for heavy warehouse use in the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003, were used to determine the number of various types of truck trips to be generated. A truck trip is generally equivalent to 2 or 3 passenger car trips depending on the type of trucks. Accordingly, a 2.0 factor was applied to the number of 2-axle and 3-axle truck trips and a 3.0 factor was applied to the number of 4+-axle truck trips to estimate passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips generated by the trucks. Table 3-12 shows a summary of trip generation estimates for the project. It is estimated that the project will generate approximately 591 net one-way PCE trips per average day (295 inbound and 296 outbound). The average weekday net new peak hour PCE trips will be approximately 39 trips during the AM peak hour (23 inbound and 16 outbound), and 65 trips during the PM peak hour (30 inbound and 35 outbound).¹⁰⁸

		0	-						
ITE Land Use	ITE Code	Rate Unit	Daily Rate	AM Peak Hour Rate		PM Peak Hour Rate			
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Warehousing	150	KSF	1.51	60%	40%	0.1	47%	53%	0.17
Project	Size		Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour Rate			PM Peak Hour Rate		
				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
MC&C Site III	178,980 sq. ft.		270	11	7	18	14	16	30
In PCE			359	14	10	24	18	21	39
MC&C Site IV	115,800 sq. ft.		175	7	5	12	9	10	20
In PCE			232	9	6	15	12	14	26
Total Trips (in PCE)			591	23	16	39	30	35	65

Table 3-12Project Trip Generation

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation*, 10th Edition (2012), Land Use Category 150 KSF: 1,000 square feet of gross leasable building area

Arrival and departure distribution patterns for project-generated traffic were estimated based upon a review of circulation patterns within the study area network and regional traffic generation and attraction characteristics. Exhibit 3-9 depicts the regional trip distribution percentages to and from the site.

The project's off-site traffic impact would not be considered significant at any of these intersections based on volume to capacity ratio and level of service expected after the project. A project's impact on the circulation system is determined by comparing the level of service (LOS) and V/C ratios at key intersections under the future pre-project conditions and future post-project conditions. A LOS level D or better is acceptable for urban area intersections. A level of service worse than D (i.e., LOS E or F) is considered deficient and unacceptable.

¹⁰⁸ Crown City Engineering, Inc. Traffic Impact Study [TIA], MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV Warehouse Development, Santa Fe Springs, California. December, 2018

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV \bullet City of Santa Fe Springs



EXHIBIT 3-9 PERCENTAGES OF PROJECT RELATED TRIP DISTRIBUTION Source: Crown City Engineering, Inc

A project's traffic impact is determined to be significant if the increase in V/C ratio is 0.04 or more at LOS C, or 0.02 or more at LOS D, or 0.01 or more at LOS E and F. The LOS, V/C ratio (or ICU) for the study intersections under 2019 cumulative conditions (with project as well as without project) are summarized in Table 3-13 to compare the project's traffic impact at key intersections.¹⁰⁹

No.		Peak Hour	Pre Project 2019		With Project 2019		Change
	Intersection		LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	in V/C
1	Telegraph Rd at Bloomfield Ave/ Santa Fe Springs Rd	AM PM	C C	0.783 0.763	C C	0.786 0.772	0.003 0.009
2	Telegraph Rd at Norwalk Blvd	AM PM	D D	0.883 0.823	D D	0.884 0.824	0.001 0.001
3	Los Nietos Rd at Santa Fe Springs Rd	AM PM	D D	0.899 0.885	D D	0.900 0.888	0.001 0.003
4	Telegraph Rd at at Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	AM PM	B B	0.662 0.641	B B	0.663 0.643	0.001 0.002
5	Florence Avenue at Bloomfield Avenue	AM PM	D D	0.887 0.890	D D	0.888 0.892	0.001 0.002

Table 3-132019 Future With and Without Project Level of Service Summary

Source: Crown City Engineering, Inc.

Since the project's traffic impacts would not be significant at any of the off-site intersections, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.¹¹⁰

B. For a land use project, would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)(1)? ● Less than Significant Impact.

According to CEQA Guidelines \$15064.3 subdivision (b)(1), vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact.

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an industrial building. It is important to note that the project is an "infill" development, which is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. Infill development provides a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) since the project is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC).¹¹¹ Infill development reduces VMT by recycling existing undeveloped or underutilized properties located in established urban areas. When development is located in a more rural setting, such as further east in the desert

¹⁰⁹ Crown City Engineering, Inc. Traffic Impact Study [TIA], MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV Warehouse Development, Santa Fe Springs, California. December, 2018

¹¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹¹ California Strategic Growth Council. <u>http://www.sgc.ca.gov/Initiatives/infill-development.html</u>.

areas, employees, patrons, visitors, and residents may have to travel farther since rural development is often located a significant distance from employment, entertainment, and population centers. Consequently, this distance is reduced when development is located in urban areas since employment, entertainment, and population centers tend to be set in more established communities. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

C. For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines \$15064.3 subdivision (b)(1)? • No Impact.

According to CEQA Guidelines \$15064.3 subdivision (b)(1), vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact. The proposed project will consist of six warehouses and no transportation infrastructure will be constructed. As a result, no impacts will occur.

D. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? • Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

The Site IV will provide a total of two driveways – one right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one full-access driveway on Romandel Avenue. Due to the configuration of the driveway along Telegraph Road and the potential impacts, the following mitigation will be required:

• It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks must be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road.

Adequate sight distance is available from the driveways on Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue along both directions. Adequate sight distance is available. The proposed project will not expose future workers to dangerous intersections or sharp curves and the proposed project will not introduce incompatible equipment or vehicles to the adjacent roads. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant with the adherence to the above-mentioned mitigation measure.

E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? • No Impact.

The proposed project would not impede emergency access to any neighboring properties during construction. At no time will the surrounding roadways be closed to traffic during the project's construction. The City of Santa Fe Springs Fire Department will review the on-site circulation to ensure that sufficient emergency access and clearance is provided. In addition, the drive aisle that extends through the project site has sufficient space to serve as a fire lane, which will facilitate emergency access. As a result, no impacts related to emergency access will occur.

3.17.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The traffic analysis determined that the following mitigation would be required:

Mitigation Measure No. 2 (Transportation & Circulation). It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks must be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.18.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on tribal cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or,
- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is a resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

3.18.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? • Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

A Tribal Resource is defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "non-unique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

The project site is located within the cultural area that was formerly occupied by the Gabrieleño-Kizh. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the City that has been disturbed due to past development and there is a limited likelihood that artifacts will be encountered. The grading and excavation will involve the clearance of the site, shallow excavation, and the installation of the new building footings and utility connections. In addition, the project area is not located within an area that is typically associated with habitation sites, foraging areas, ceremonial sites, or burials. Although the project area has been subject to disturbance to accommodate the existing buildings, the project site is situated in an area of high archaeological significance. As a result, the following mitigation is required:

• The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor(s) during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground-disturbing activities.

Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the above-mentioned mitigation will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is a resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? • Less Than Significant Impact.

As previously mentioned, the project site is located within the cultural area that was formally occupied by the Gabrieleño-Kizh and it was determined that the site may be situated in an area of high archaeological significance. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the City that has been disturbed due to past development and there is a limited likelihood that artifacts will be encountered. The grading and excavation will involve the installation of the new building footings and utility connections. In addition, the project area is not located within an area that is typically associated with habitation sites, foraging areas, ceremonial sites, or burials. Nevertheless, mitigation was provided in the previous subsection. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, tribal cultural impacts will be reduced to levels that are considered to be less than significant.

3.18.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Although the project area has been subject to disturbance to accommodate the previous building and the surrounding buildings, the project site is situated in an area of high archaeological significance. As a result, the following mitigation is required:

Mitigation Measure No. 3 (Tribal Cultural Resources). The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor(s) during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground-disturbing activities.

3.19 UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

3.19.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on utilities if it results in any of the following:

- The relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts;
- Insufficient water supplies to serve the project and the reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years;
- A determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand;
- The generation of solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure;
- A negative impact on the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or,
- Compliance with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

3.19.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is presently occupied by oil extraction activities. There are no existing water or wastewater treatment plants, electric power plants, telecommunications facilities, natural gas facilities, or stormwater drainage infrastructure located on-site. Therefore, the project's implementation will not require the relocation of any of the aforementioned facilities. In addition, the increase in demand for waste disposal, water, and wastewater treatment services can be adequately handled and no expansion of these services is required (refer to the following subsections). As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

B. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and the reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? • Less than Significant Impact.

According to the City's Urban Water Management Plan, the City of Santa Fe Springs Water System has approximately 6,015 service connections through a pipeline network of approximately 108 miles. The large industrial makeup of the City creates high daytime water demands and low nighttime water demands. The City's potable water system is supplied by one water well, two MWD connections, and two 4-million gallon reservoirs each with its own booster pumping station.¹¹² The City's Urban Water Management Plan indicates that the City will have an adequate supply of water to meet projected demand through the year 2040. The report also states that the City will have an adequate supply of water to meet the project demand during a single dry year as well as multiple dry years.¹¹³

¹¹² Stetson Engineers, Inc. City of Santa Fe Springs, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. May 2017.

¹¹³ Ibid (refer to Tables 7-2, 7-3, and 7-4.

Water in the local area is supplied by the Santa Fe Springs Water Utility Authority (SFSWUA). Water is derived from two sources: groundwater and surface water. The SFSWUA pumps groundwater from the local well and disinfects this water with chlorine before distributing it to customers. SFSWUA also obtains treated and disinfected groundwater through the City of Whittier from eight active deep wells located in the Whittier Narrows area. In addition, SFSWUA receives treated groundwater from the Central Basin Water Quality Protection Program facility located in the Central Basin, through the City of Whittier. Lastly, the SFSWUA also receives Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's (MWD) filtered and disinfected surface water, which is a blend of water from both the Colorado River and the State Water Project in Northern California. As indicated in Table 3-14, the proposed project is projected to consume approximately 2,779 gallons of water on a daily basis.

	water consum	iption (gais/ day)	
Use	Unit	Factor	Generation
Warehouse	115,801 sq. ft.	24 gallons/1,000 sq. ft./day	2,779 gals/day
Total	115,801 sq. ft.		2,779 gals/day

Table 3-14 Water Consumption (gals/day)

Source: City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide

The project will connect to an existing water line located along Telegraph Road. The existing water supply facilities and infrastructure will be able accommodate this additional demand. In addition, each warehouse will be equipped with water efficient fixtures and drought tolerant landscaping will be planted throughout the project site. As a result, the impacts are considered to be less than significant.

C. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Santa Fe Springs is located within the service area of the Sanitation District 18 of Los Angeles County. The nearest wastewater treatment plant to Santa Fe Springs is the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) located in Cerritos. The Los Coyotes WRP is located at 16515 Piuma Avenue in the City of Cerritos and occupies 34 acres at the northwest junction of the San Gabriel River (I-605) and the Artesia (SR-91) Freeways. The plant was placed in operation on May 25, 1970, and initially had a capacity of 12.5 million gallons per day and consisted of primary treatment and secondary treatment with activated sludge. The Los Coyotes WRP provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for 37.5 million gallons of wastewater per day. In addition, the Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 million gallons per day (mgd). The Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) currently produces an average recycled water flow of 20.8 million gallons per day (mgd). The plant serves a population of approximately 370,000 people. Over five million gallons per day of the reclaimed water is reused at over 270 reuse sites. Reuse includes landscape irrigation of schools, golf courses, parks, nurseries, and greenbelts; and industrial use at local companies for carpet dying and concrete mixing. The remainder of the effluent is discharged to the San Gabriel River.

Table 3-15 indicates the future wastewater generation in gallons per day. According to Table 3-15, the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 2,316 gallons of sewage per day, which is well within the daily average totals for the Los Coyotes WRP.

		ý 10 1	,,
Use	Unit	Factor	Generation
Warehouse	115,801 sq. ft.	20 gallons/1,000 sq. ft./day	2,316 gals/day
Total	115,801 sq. ft.		2,316 gals/day

Table 3-15 Wastewater (Effluent) Generation (gals/day)

Source: City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide

The project will connect to an existing sewer located along Telegraph Road. The existing collection and treatment facilities have capacity to accommodate the projected flows. In addition, the new plumbing fixtures that will be installed will consist of water conserving fixtures as is required by the current City Code requirements, no new or expanded sewage, and/or water treatment facilities will be required to accommodate the proposed project. It should be noted that the Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System for increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is imposed in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project. Payment of a connection fee will be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued. In determining the impact to the Sewerage System and applicable connection fees, the Districts' Chief Engineer and General Manager will determine the user category (e.g. Condominium, Single-Family home, etc.) that best represents the actual or anticipated use of the parcel or facilities on the parcel. As a result, the impacts are expected to be less than significant.

D. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure? • Less than Significant Impact.

The Sanitation Districts operate a comprehensive solid waste management system serving the needs of a large portion of Los Angeles County. This system includes sanitary landfills, recycling centers, materials recovery/transfer facilities, and energy recovery facilities. The two operational sites are the Calabasas Landfill, located near the City of Agoura Hills, and the Scholl Canyon Landfill, located in the City of Glendale. The Sanitation Districts continue to maintain environmental control systems at the other closed landfills, which include the Spadra, Palos Verdes, and Mission Canyon landfills.

Waste may also be transported to the Olinda Alpha landfill (the Puente Landfill is now closed). The Olinda Alpha landfill accepts up to 8,000 tons of solid waste on a daily basis and processes an average of 5,322 tons of waste per day.¹¹⁴ Additionally, the nearby Puente Hills Transfer Station/Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) is able to accept 4,440 tons per day of solid waste. Waste may also be transferred to the Downey Area Recycling and Transfer Facility, the South Gate Transfer Station, and the Southeast Resource and recovery facility. Operational waste that cannot be recycled or taken to

¹¹⁴ Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA). *SWANA 2014 Landfill Management Excellence Award for Olinda Alpha Landfill*. Site access on October 11, 2016.

area landfills can be transported to other permitted disposal facilities.

The proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 694 pounds per day of solid waste (refer to Table 3-16 shown below). This amount is not significant and will be accommodated by the aforementioned landfills and transfer stations. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Use	Unit	Factor	Generation
Warehouse	115,801 sq. ft.	6 lbs/1,000 sq. ft./day	694 lbs/ day
Total	115,801 sq. ft.		694 lbs/ day

Table 3-16Solid Waste Generation (lbs/day)

E. Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? • No Impact.

Santa Fe Springs City Ordinance Number 914 requires all development to identify materials that will be reused, recycled, or disposed from daily operations. The project Applicant must submit a Waste Management Plan pursuant to the aforementioned code prior to the issuance of any permits for construction. This Waste Management Plan must demonstrate compliance with the City's goal of reusing or recycling at least 75% of project waste. This plan must be approved by the Environmental Programs Manager. As a result, no impacts related to State and local statutes governing solid waste are anticipated.

F. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? • No Impact.

AB 341 establishes a policy goal for the state that not less than 75% of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by the year 2020. This goal is reflected in Santa Fe Springs City Ordinance Number 914, which requires the preparation of a Waste Management Plan prior to the issuance of any construction permits. This plan must demonstrate compliance with the City's goal of reusing or recycling at least 75% of project waste. As a result, no impacts related to State and local statutes governing solid waste are anticipated.

3.19.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of utilities and service systems indicated that no significant impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.20 WILDFIRES

3.20.1 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to the City of Santa Fe Springs, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact if it results in any of the following located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

- Impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbation of wildfire risks, and thereby exposure to project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire;
- The requirement of the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or,
- Exposure of people or structures to significant risks, including down slope of downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slops instability or drainage changes.

3.20.2 Analysis of Environmental Impacts

A. Would the project impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.

The proposed project site is located within an urbanized area and no areas containing natural vegetation is located near the project site. Furthermore, the proposed project would not involve the closure or alteration of any existing evacuation routes that would be important in the event of a wildfire. All construction staging and queuing must occur on-site. In addition, all trailer drop offs and loading will occur on-site. As a result, no impacts will occur.

B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site and surrounding areas are relatively flat. Furthermore, the project site and the adjacent properties are urbanized and there are no areas of native or natural vegetation found within the vicinity of the project area. The project site is located three miles southwest of the Puente Hills. The proposed project may be exposed to criteria pollutant emissions generated by wildland fires due to the project site's proximity to fire hazard severity zones. However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire City as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

C. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? • No Impact.

There is no risk from wildfire within the project site or the surrounding area given the project site's distance from any area that may be subject to a wildfire event. In addition, wildland fires are identified as a low level of risk event in the City's General Plan Safety Element. The project will be constructed in compliance with the 2016 Building Code and the City Fire Department's recommendations and will not exacerbate wildfire risks. In addition, the use of hazardous materials will be limited to those that are commercially available and are used in a household setting. The proposed project, like most development in the City, may be subject to pollutant concentrations from industrial, gas line, or chemical fires due to the active oil wells located on-site. As a result, no impacts will occur.

 D. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including down slope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? • No Impact.

There is no risk from wildfire within the project site or the surrounding area given the project site's distance from any area that may be subject to a wildfire event. The project site and surrounding areas are relatively flat and there are no slopes located nearby. In addition, the project site will be covered over in pavement and landscaping. Therefore, the project will not expose future employees to flooding or landslides facilitated by runoff flowing down barren and charred slopes and no impacts will occur.

3.20.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of wildfires impacts indicated that no significant impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this environmental assessment:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The proposed project is relatively small and the attendant environmental impacts will not lead to a cumulatively significant impact on any of the issues analyzed herein.

• The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.



SECTION 4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 FINDINGS

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have significant adverse environmental impacts. The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this Initial Study:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- A Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program *will be* required.

4.2 MITIGATION MONITORING

In addition, pursuant to Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, findings must be adopted by the decision-maker coincidental to the approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, which relates to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. These findings shall be incorporated as part of the decision-maker's findings of fact, in response to AB-3180 and in compliance with the requirements of the Public Resources Code. In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081(a) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the City of Santa Fe Springs can make the following additional findings:

- A mitigation reporting or monitoring program will be required; and,
- An accountable enforcement agency or monitoring agency shall be identified for the mitigation measures adopted as part of the decision-maker's final determination.

A number of mitigation measures have been recommended as a means to reduce or eliminate potential adverse environmental impacts to insignificant levels. AB-3180 requires that a monitoring and reporting program be adopted for the recommended mitigation measures.

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

SECTION 5 REFERENCES

5.1 PREPARERS

Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning 2211 South Hacienda Boulevard, Suite 107 Hacienda Heights, CA 91745 (626) 336-0033

Marc Blodgett, Project Principal Liesl Sullano, Project Planner Bryan Hamilton, Project Planner

5.2 REFERENCES

Bugliarello, et. al., The Impact of Noise Pollution, Chapter 127, 1976.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program. *California Important Farmland Finder*.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Historical Landmarks.

California Department of Water Resources, *Progress Report on Groundwater Geology of the Coastal Plain of Orange County*, 1967.

California Division of Mines and Geology, Seismic Hazards Mapping Program, 2012.

California Office of Planning and Research, *California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA Guidelines*, as amended 2018.

Google Earth.

Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor. Property Assessment Information System.

Santa Fe Springs, City of. *Municipal Code*. Title XV, Land Usage.

Santa Fe Springs, City of. Santa Fe Springs General Plan.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, Air Quality Management Plan, March 2017.

Southern California Association of Governments. *Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2016-2040*. April 2016.

United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey.



MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL (DPA No. 957 - 962) ZONE CHANGE (ZC No. 138) TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM No. 082567) CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT 11710 TELEGRAPH ROAD SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA 90670

REPORT PREPARED BY:

BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 2211 S. HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107 HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745

JANUARY 15, 2019

SFSP 061

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an industrial park (referred to herein as MC&C Commerce Center Site IV) located within the City of Santa Fe Springs. The MC&C Commerce Center Site IV project site has a total land area of 378,288 square feet (8.68 acres) and consists of 28 parcels. The project will include six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area. Parking will consist of 263 parking stalls and 17 dock high doors. In addition, approximately 75,382 square feet (19%) of the site will be covered over in landscaping. The project site is currently occupied by a number of active oil wells located within the property. Other existing on-site improvements include utility lines, transformers, oil pumpjacks, pipes, fences, and electrical equipment.

2. FINDINGS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The attached Initial Study prepared for the proposed project indicated that the proposed project will not result in significant environmental impacts upon implementation of the required mitigation measures. The following Mandatory Findings of Significance can be made as set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines, as amended, based on the results of this environmental assessment:

- The proposed project *will not* have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The proposed project is relatively small and the attendant environmental impacts will not lead to a cumulatively significant impact on any of the issues analyzed herein.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.

3. FINDINGS RELATED TO MITIGATION MONITORING

Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code states that findings must be adopted by the decision-makers coincidental to the approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. These findings shall be incorporated as part of the decision-maker's findings of fact, in response to AB-3180. In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081(a) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the following additional findings may be made:

- A mitigation reporting or monitoring program will be required;
- Site plans and/or building plans, submitted for approval by the responsible monitoring agency, shall include the required standard conditions; and,

• An accountable enforcement agency or monitoring agency shall be identified for the mitigations adopted as part of the decision-maker's final determination.

4. MITIGATION MEASURES

In the event that previously unidentified paleontological resources are encountered, the following mitigation will be required:

Mitigation Measure No. 1 (Geology & Soils). If previously unidentified paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, work shall cease within 50 feet of the find and the project Applicant must retain a qualified paleontologist, approved by the City, to assess the significance of the find. If a find is determined to be significant, the Lead Agency and the paleontologist will determine appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant fossil materials recovered will be, as necessary and at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.

The traffic analysis determined that the following mitigation would be required:

Mitigation Measure No. 2 (Transportation & Circulation). It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks must be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road.

Although the project area has been subject to disturbance to accommodate the previous building and the surrounding buildings, the project site is situated in an area of high archaeological significance. As a result, the following mitigation is required:

Mitigation Measure No. 3 (Tribal Cultural Resources). The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor(s) during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing or auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground-disturbing activities.

5. MITIGATION MONITORING

The monitoring and reporting on the implementation of these measures, including the period for implementation, monitoring agency, and the monitoring action, are identified below in Table 1.

MITIGATION	TABLE 1 MONITORING PROGR	АМ	
Measure	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring Phase	Verification
Mitigation Measure No. 1 (Geology & Soils). If previously unidentified paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, work shall cease within 50 feet of the find and the project Applicant must retain a qualified paleontologist, approved by the City, to assess the significance of the find. If a find is determined to be significant, the Lead Agency and the paleontologist will determine appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant fossil materials recovered will be, as necessary and at the discretion of the qualified paleontologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards.	City Engineer and the Chief Building Official • (Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to the start of any construction related activities. • Mitigation ends when ground disturbance is completed or otherwise noted by the appointed paleontologist.	Date: Name & Title:
Mitigation Measure No. 2 (Transportation & Circulation). It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks must be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road.	City Engineer and the Chief Building Official • (Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Mitigation ends when construction is completed.	Date: Name & Title:
Mitigation Measure No. 3 (Tribal Cultural Resources). The project Applicant will be required to obtain the services of a qualified Native American Monitor(s) during construction-related ground disturbance activities. Ground disturbance is defined by the Tribal Representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation as activities that include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching, within the project area. The monitor(s) must be approved by the tribal representatives and will be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground-disturbing activities.	Director of Planning and the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum (LACNHM) • (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to the start of any construction related activities. Mitigation ends when ground disturbance is completed or otherwise noted by the appointed Native American Monitor(s).	Date: Name & Title:

APPENDICES

MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS



LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT 11710 TELEGRAPH ROAD SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA 90670

REPORT PREPARED BY: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 2211 SOUTH HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107 HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745

FEBRUARY 13, 2019

SFSP 061

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section

<u>Page</u>

Appe	ndices	. 5
1 1 -	Appendix A – Air Quality Worksheets	7
	Appendix B – Phase I	.31
	Appendix C – Noise Measurement Worksheets	.73
	Appendix D – Traffic Impact Analysis	•79

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Air Quality Worksheets Appendix B – Phase I Appendix C – Noise Worksheets Appendix D – Traffic Impact Analysis

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX A AIR QUALITY WORKSHEETS

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Page 1 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

MC&C IV

South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	115.80	1000sqft	2.66	115,801.00	0
Parking Lot	263.00	Space	2.37	105,200.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days)	31
Climate Zone	б			Operational Year	2021
Utility Company	Southern California Edison				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	702.44	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.006
1.3 User Enter	ed Comments & No	n-Default Data			
Project Characte	eristics -				
Land Use -					
Construction Ph	ase - Construction time:	s are estimated.			
20					

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Mobile Land Use Mitigation -

Energy Mitigation -

Water Mitigation -

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER - SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

Page 2 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

<pre>MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District,</pre>	Summer
MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Ai	r District,
MC&C IV - South Coast A	QMD Ai
MC&C IV - South	Coast A
MC&C IV	- South
-	AC&C IV

IbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 44.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 230.00 88.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 230.00 84.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 230.00 84.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 21.00 21.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 84.100 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 IbIConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 37.82.020 21.100 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 37.82.020 87.17.019 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 37.82.020 87.17.019 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 47.23.702 87.17.019 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 47.17.019 97.02019 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 47.23.7020 97.12019 IbIConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 47.23.7020 97.17.019 IbIConstruct	Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tbConstructionPhase NumBays 230.00 86.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 22.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 22.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tbConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 526;2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 56/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 56/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 57/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 59/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 51/02019 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 51/02019 9/30/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 51/02019 9/1/2019 tbConstructionPhase	tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	44.00
tblConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 22.00 tblConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tblConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tblConstructionPhase NumDays 20.00 21.00 tblConstructionPhase NumDays 70.00 21.00 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/21.2020 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 3/26/2020 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 3/26/2020 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 3/26/2020 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/11/2019 9/12/019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 9/12/019	tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	88.00
thConstructionPhaseNumDays 20.00 21.00 thConstructionPhaseNumDays 10.00 21.00 thConstructionPhaseNumDays 10.00 21.00 thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $5.21.2020$ $8.31.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $3.26i.2020$ $8.31.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $5.97.2019$ $8.31.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4.23.2020$ $8.31.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4.23.2020$ $9.30.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4.11.2019$ $9.30.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4.11.2019$ $9.30.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4.11.2019$ $9.30.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4.11.2019$ $9.30.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4.11.2019$ $9.10.70019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $3.270.019$ $9.10.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $3.270.019$ $9.10.2019$ thConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $3.29.2019$ $9.10.2019$ <td>tblConstructionPhase</td> <td>NumDays</td> <td>20.00</td> <td>22.00</td>	tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	22.00
thConstructionPhase NumDays 10.00 21.00 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/21/2020 21.00 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/21/2020 11/30/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/21/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/91/2019 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/32/2020 8/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/31/2019 9/30/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/31/2019 9/30/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/31/2019 9/30/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/31/2019 9/31/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 9/1/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 9/1/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/1/2019 9/1/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/1/2019 9/1/2019 tbConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/1/20	tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/21/2020 11/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 3/26/2020 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/9/2019 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/9/2019 8/31/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/9/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/23/2020 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 7/12019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 7/12019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 7/12019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 7/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/1/2019 7/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/1/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStart	tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $3/26/202$ $8/31/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $5/9/2019$ $8/31/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4/11/2019$ $9/30/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4/11/2019$ $9/30/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseEndDate $4/11/2019$ $9/30/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4/11/2019$ $9/1/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4/1/20019$ $9/1/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4/1/20019$ $9/1/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $4/1/20019$ $9/1/2019$ tblConstructionPhasePhaseStartDate $3/2/2019$ $3/1/2019$	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	5/21/2020	11/30/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 5/9/2019 4/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/23/2020 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/11/2019 9/30/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/11/2019 5/10/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/10/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 4/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	3/26/2020	8/31/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/23/2020 9/30/2019 </td <td>tblConstructionPhase</td> <td>PhaseEndDate</td> <td>5/9/2019</td> <td>4/30/2019</td>	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	5/9/2019	4/30/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseEndDate 4/112019 3/312019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/24/2020 10/12019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2019 3/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	4/23/2020	9/30/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 4/24/2020 10/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 5/1/0/2019 5/1/0/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 5/1/0/2019 5/1/0/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 4/1/2/019 5/1/0/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 4/1/2/019 4/1/2/019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2/019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStantDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2/019	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	4/11/2019	3/31/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 5/10/2019 5/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/12/2019 4/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 10.00 10.00	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	4/24/2020	10/1/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 4/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrading AcresOfGrading 10.00	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	5/10/2019	5/1/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/27/2020 9/1/2019 tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrastructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrastructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrastructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/29/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrastructionPhase PhaseStartDate 10.00	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	4/12/2019	4/1/2019
tblConstructionPhase PhaseStartDate 3/1/2019 3/1/2019 tblCrading AcresOfGrading 11.00 10.00	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	3/27/2020	9/1/2019
tblGrading AcresOfGrading 11.00 10.00	tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	3/29/2019	3/1/2019
	tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	11.00	10.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

Page 3 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

CO2e		4,702.577 9	4,702.577
N2O	lb/day	0.0000	0.0000
CH4		1.1983	1.1983
Total CO2		4,684.290 9	4,684.290
NBio- CO2		4,684.290 9	4,684.290
Bio-CO2		0.0000	0.000
PM2.5 Total	lb/day	12.1846	12.1846
Exhaust PM2.5		2.2006	2.2006
Fugitive PM2.5		9.9840	9.9840
PM10 Total		20.6594	20.6594
Exhaust PM10		2.3919	2.3919
Fugitive PM10		18.2675	18.2675
S02		0.0473	0.0473
со		22.8718	22.8718
NOX		45.6341	45.6341
ROG		25.4217	25.4217
	Year	2019	Maximum

Mitigated Construction

CO2e		4,702.577	4,702.577 9	9
N2O		0.0000	0.000	
CH4	A	1.1983	1.1983	
Total CO2	ep/qi	4,684,290	4,684.290 9	
NBio- CO2		4,684.290	4,684.290 9	612
Bio-CO2		0.0000	0.0000	
PM2.5 Total		6,1269	6.1269	
Exhaust PM2.5		2.2006	2.2006	
Fugitive PM2.5		3.9263	3.9263	
PM10 Total	lb/day	9.6390	9.6390	
Exhaust PM10		2.3919	2.3919	
Fugitive PM10		7.2470	7.2470	
S02		0.0473	0.0473	
со		22.8718	22.8718	
XON		45.6341	45.6341	
ROG		25.4217	25.4217	
	Year	2019	Maximum	

CO2e	0.00
N20	0.00
CH4	0.00
Total CO2	0.00
NBIo-CO2	0.00
Bio-CO2	0.00
PM2.5 Total	49.72
Exhaust PM2.5	0.00
Fugitive PM2.5	60.67
PM10 Total	53.34
Exhaust PM10	0.00
Fugitive PM10	60.33
SO2	0.00
8	0.00
XON	0.00
ROG	0.00
	Percent Reduction

Page 4 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

2.2 Overall Operational

-
C
-
5
0
-
T
10
-
<u>w</u>
-
0
-
77
~
a
-
_
3
ga
liga
itiga
nitiga
mitiga
nmitiga
Inmitiga

C02e		0.0884	32.6658	2,234.061 1	2,266.805 2
OZN			6.0000e- 004		6.0000e- 004
CH4	ay	2.2000e- 004	6.2000e- 004	0.1035	0.1043
Total CO2	P/q	0.0829	32.4728	2,231.464 5	2,264.020 2
NBio- CO2		0.0829	32.4728	2,231.464 5	2,264.020 2
Bio-CO2					
PM2.5 Total		1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	0.4902	0.4924
Exhaust PM2.5		1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	0.0159	0.0181
Fugitive PM2.5				0.4744	0.4744
PM10 Total		1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	1.7898	1.7920
Exhaust PM10	ay	1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	0.0170	0.0192
Fugitive PM10	p/q			1.7728	1.7728
S02		0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0220	0.0221
00		0.0388	0.0227	5.9560	6.0175
XON		3.6000e- 004	0.0271	2.1042	2.1316
ROG		2.6359	2.9800e- 003	0.4029	3.0418
	Category	Area	Energy	Mobile	Total

Mitigated Operational

	lb/day	29 2.2000e- 0.0884 004	728 6.2000e- 6.0000e- 32.6658 004 004	.855 0.0946 2.020.221	.411 0.0955 6.0000e- 2,052. <i>9</i> 75 004 8
02 NBIO- CO2 10131		0.0829 0.0	32.4728 32.4	2,017.855 2,017 6	2,050.411 2,050
Bio- C			4		
PM2.5 Total		1.40004	2.06006	0.4411	0.4433
Exhaust PM2.5		1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	0.0144	0.0166
Fugitive PM2.5				0.4267	0.4267
PM10 Total		1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	1.6101	1.6123
Exhaust PM10	day	1.4000e- 004	2.0600e- 003	0.0154	0.0176
Fugitive PM10)/ql			1.5947	1.5947
S02		0.0000	1.6000e-	0.0198	0.0200
CO		0.0388	0.0227	5.4294	5.4910
NOX		3.6000e- 004	0.0271	1.9716	1.9990
ROG		2.6359	2.9800e- 003	0.3835	3.0223
	Category	Area	Energy	Mobile	Total

Page 5 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

2e	2
CO	6.
N20	0.00
CH4	8.46
Total CO2	9.43
NBIO-CO2	9.43
Bio- CO2	0.00
PM2.5 Total	9.98
Exhaust PM2.5	8.25
Fugitive PM2.5	10.05
PM10 Total	10.03
Exhaust PM10	8.29
Fugitive PM10	10.05
S02	9.54
8	8.75
XON	6.22
ROG	19:0
	Percent Reduction

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	3/1/2019	3/31/2019	5	21	
~	Grading	Grading	4/1/2019	4/30/2019	5	8	
	Building Construction	Building Construction	5/1/2019	8/31/2019	5	88	
4	Paving	Paving	9/1/2019	9/30/2019	5	21	
9	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	10/1/2019	11/30/2019	5	4	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 10

Acres of Paving: 2.37

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 173,702; Non-Residential Outdoor: 57,901; Striped Parking Area: 6,312 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Page 6 of 22

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	٢	6.00	78	0.48
Grading	Excavators	-	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	-	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	ę	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	4	8.00	84	0.74
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	-	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	ę	7.00	67	0.37
Grading	Graders	F	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	ę	8.00	67	0.37
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	26	0.37
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	Ŧ	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	2	18.00	00.00	00.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	ННDT
Grading	9	15.00	00.00	00'0	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	6	93.00	36.00	00.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	9	15.00	00.00	00.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	19.00	00.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Page 7 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

Water Exposed Area

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

CO2e		0.0000	3,796.244 5	3,796.244 5
N2O				
CH4	ĥ		1.1917	1.1917
Total CO2	p/di	0.0000	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9
NBio-CO2			3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9
Bio-CO2				
PM2.5 Total		9.9307	2.1991	12.1298
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	2.1991	2.1991
Fugitive PM2.5		9,9307		9.9307
PM10 Total		18.0663	2.3904	20.4566
Exhaust PM10	ay	0.0000	2.3904	2.3904
Fugitive PM10	p/q	18.0663		18.0663
S02			0.0380	0.0380
со			22.0630	22.0630
NOX			45.5727	45.5727
ROG			4.3350	4.3350
	Category	Fugitive Dust	Off-Road	Total

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	202	<i>S</i>	3	200	PM10	PM10	Total	PM2.5	PM2.5	Total	200 -010	200-00N		5	NZO	A700
Category					lb/c	lay							D/GI	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0882	0.0613	0.8088	2.1400e- 003	0.2012	1.5700e- 003	0.2028	0.0534	1.4400e- 003	0.0548		212.5780	212.5780	6.6500e- 003		212.7442
Total	0.0882	0.0613	0.8088	2.1400e- 003	0.2012	1.5700e-	0.2028	0.0534	1.4400e-003	0.0548		212.5780	212.5780	6.6500e- 003		212.7442

Page 8 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.2 Site Preparation - 2019

Mitigated Construction On-Site

CO2e		0.0000	3,796.244 5	3,796.244 5
N20				
CH4	λι.		1.1917	1.1917
Total CO2	lb/di	0.000.0	3,766.452 9	3,766.452 9
NBio-CO2			3,766,452 9	3,766.452 9
Bio- CO2			0.0000	0.000
PM2.5 Total		3.8730	2.1991	6.0721
Exhaust PM2.5		0.000.0	2.1991	2.1991
Fugitive PM2.5		3.8730		3.8730
PM10 Total		7.0458	2.3904	9.4362
Exhaust PM10	ay	0.0000	2.3904	2.3904
Fugitive PM10	p/ql	7.0458		7.0458
S02			0.0380	0.0380
со			22.0630	22.0630
NOX			45.5727	45.5727
ROG			4.3350	4.3350
	Category	Fugitive Dust	Off-Road	Total

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

CO2e		0.0000	0.0000	212.7442	212.7442
N2O					
CH4	lay	0.000	0.0000	6.6500e- 003	6.6500e- 003
Total CO2	lb/c	0.000.0	0.0000	212.5780	212.5780
NBio-CO2		0.000	0.0000	212.5780	212.5780
Bio- CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.000	0.0000	0.0548	0.0548
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.4400e- 003	1.4400e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.000.0	0.0000	0.0534	0.0534
PM10 Total		0.000.0	0.0000	0.2028	0.2028
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	0.0000	1.5700e- 003	1.5700e- 003
Fugitive PM10	lb/d	0.000	0.0000	0.2012	0.2012
S02		0.000	0.0000	2.1400e- 003	2.1400e- 003
co		0.000.0	0.0000	0.8088	0.8088
NOX		0.000	0.0000	0.0613	0.0613
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0882	0.0882
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

Page 9 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2019

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

		0	36	36
CO2e		0.000(2,960.0	2,960.0
N20				
CH4	У		0.9292	0.9292
Total CO2	lb/dl	0.000.0	2,936.806 8	2,936.806 8
NBio-CO2			2,936.806 8	2,936.806 8
Bio-CO2				
PM2.5 Total		3.3623	1.2856	4.6479
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	1.2856	1.2856
Fugitive PM2.5		3.3623		3.3623
PM10 Total		6.5041	1.3974	7.9015
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.0000	1.3974	1.3974
Fugitive PM10	lb/d	6.5041		6.5041
S02			0.0297	0.0297
co			16.2934	16.2934
NOX			28.3480	28.3480
ROG			2.5805	2.5805
	Category	Fugitive Dust	Off-Road	Total

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

32e		0000	0000	2869	2869
ö		0.0	0.0	177.	177.
N20					
CH4	ay	0.000	0.0000	5.5400e- 003	5.5400e- 003
Total CO2	lb/dl	0.0000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
NBio-CO2		0.0000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
Bio-CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.000	0.0000	0.0457	0.0457
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.000	0.0000	0.0445	0.0445
PM10 Total		0.000	0.0000	0.1690	0.1690
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.0000	0.0000	1.3000e- 003	1.3000e- 003
Fugitive PM10)/ql	0.000	0.0000	0.1677	0.1677
S02		0.000	0.0000	1.7800e- 003	1.7800e- 003
co		0.0000	0.0000	0.6740	0.6740
NOX		0.0000	0.0000	0.0511	0.0511
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0735	0.0735
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

 $\label{eq:appendix} A \bullet Air \, Quality \, Worksheets$

Page 10 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2019

Mitigated Construction On-Site

CO2e		0.0000	2,960.036 1	2,960.036 1
N20				
CH4	A		0.9292	0.9292
Total CO2	p/q	0.000.0	2,936.806 8	2,936.806 8
NBio-CO2			2,936,806 8	2,936.806 8
Bio-CO2			0.0000	0.0000
PM2.5 Total		1.3113	1.2856	2.5969
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	1.2856	1.2856
Fugitive PM2.5		1.3113		1.3113
PM10 Total		2.5366	1.3974	3.9340
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.0000	1.3974	1.3974
Fugitive PM10	lb/d	2.5366		2.5366
S02			0.0297	0.0297
co			16.2934	16.2934
NOX			28.3480	28.3480
ROG			2.5805	2.5805
	Category	Fugitive Dust	Off-Road	Total

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

ROG	XON	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
)/QI	day							lb/d	lay		
-	0.0000	0.0000	0.000	0.000	0.0000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.0000		0.000
	0.0000	0.000	0.0000	0.000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
5	0.0511	0.6740	1.7800e- 003	0.1677	1.3000e- 003	0.1690	0.0445	1.2000e- 003	0.0457		177.1484	177.1484	5.5400e- 003		177.2869
50	0.0511	0.6740	1.7800e-	0.1677	1.3000e-	0.1690	0.0445	1.2000e- 003	0.0457		177.1484	177.1484	5.5400e- 003		177.2869

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

 $\label{eq:appendix} A \bullet Air \, Quality \, Worksheets$
Page 11 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2019 Site

S	
1	
-	
0	
0	
-	
-	
0	
÷	
C	
-	
-	
Ŧ	
S	
-	
5	
~	
U	
-	
2	
e	
=	
0	
0	1
÷	
.=	
E	
=	
-	
-	

	ROG	NOX	co	S02	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Category					b/dl	lay							p/q	ay		
Off-Road	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5
Total	2.3612	21.0788	17.1638	0.0269		1.2899	1.2899		1.2127	1.2127		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2	0.6313		2,607.363 5

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

ROG NOX CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Fugitive PM10 FM10 Fugitive PM25 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM3.5 Total N20 C02 C44 N20 C02 Category						
ROG NOX CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Evitaust PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM0-CO2 Total Cuta CH4 N20 Category PM10 PM10 Total PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 PM0-CO2 Total Co2 Total Co2 Cate C44 N20 Heuling 0.0000	CO2e		0.0000	996.0358	1,099.178 6	2,095.214 4
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 FM10 FM10 FM10 FM10; FM2.5 Total PM2.5 Total PM0-CO2 Total Co2 Total Co1 Co1 </td <th>N2O</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	N2O					
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Fugitive PM10 Fugitive PM2.5	CH4	ay	0.000	0.0658	0.0344	0.1002
ROG NOX CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Extraust PM10 Fugitive PM2.5 Fugitive PM2.5 Fugitive PM2.5 Fugitive PM2.5 Fugitive PM2.5 Bio-CO2 Bio-CO2 NBio-CO2 Category 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Hauling 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Vender 0.1388 4.1193 0.3900e 0.2304 0.2377 0.2677 0.0663 0.0264 0.0000 Vender 0.1388 4.1193 0.3916 0.0316 0.1036 0.0000 0.	Total CO2	lb/d	0.0000	994.3909	1,098.319 8	2,092.710 7
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Extraust PM2.5 PM2.5 PM2.5 Bio-CO2 Category	NBio-CO2		0.0000	994.3909	1,098.319 8	2,092.710 7
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 FM10 Fugitive PM2.5 Foldatist Total PM2.5 Total Category Total Total Total Total Total Total Total Total <td< td=""><th>Bio-CO2</th><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Bio-CO2					
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 PM10 Fugitive PM2.5 Fugitive PM2.5 <th< td=""><th>PM2.5 Total</th><td></td><td>0.0000</td><td>0.0924</td><td>0.2831</td><td>0.3756</td></th<>	PM2.5 Total		0.0000	0.0924	0.2831	0.3756
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 PM10 Fugitive PM2.5 Category	Exhaust PM2.5		0.000	0.0261	7.4500e- 003	0.0336
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Evhaust P010 PM10 Category	Fugitive PM2.5		0.000	0.0663	0.2757	0.3420
ROG NOx CO SO2 Fugitive PM10 Exhaust Category 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Hauling 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Vendor 0.1388 4.1193 0.9958 9.3000- 0.2003 0.0273 Vendor 0.1378 4.1783 0.9958 9.3000- 0.2073 0.0273 Vonker 0.4555 0.3170 4.1788 0.0110 1.0395 8.0900- Vonker 0.4555 0.3170 4.1788 0.0110 1.0395 8.0900- Vonker 0.4555 0.3170 4.1788 0.0110 1.0395 8.0900- Total 0.5943 4.4362 5.1746 0.0204 1.2699 0.0354	PM10 Total		0.0000	0.2577	1.0476	1.3053
ROG NOX CO SO2 Fugitive Category Category 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Hauling 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Vendor 0.1388 4.1193 0.8968 9.3000e- 0.2304 Vendor 0.1388 4.1788 0.3170 4.1788 0.3306- Vonker 0.4555 0.3170 4.1788 0.0110 1.0395 Vonker 0.5943 4.4352 5.1746 0.0204 1.2899	Exhaust PM10	Jay	0.000	0.0273	8.0900e- 003	0.0354
ROG NOX CO SO2 Category	Fugitive PM10	(D/d	0.0000	0.2304	1.0395	1.2699
ROG NOX CO Category 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Hauling 0.10000 0.0000 0.0000 Vendor 0.1388 4.1193 0.9568 Vendor 0.1388 4.1793 0.9568 Vorker 0.4555 0.3170 4.1788 Total 0.5843 4.4362 5.1746	SO2		0.0000	9.3300e- 003	0.0110	0.0204
ROG NOx Category 0.0000 0.0000 Hauling 0.0000 0.0000 Vendor 0.1388 4.1193 Vorker 0.4555 0.3170 Vorker 0.5943 4.4362 Total 0.5943 4.4362	со		0.000	0.9958	4.1788	5.1746
ROG Category Hauling 0.0000 Vendor 0.1388 Vorker 0.4555 Total 0.5943	XON		0.0000	4.1193	0.3170	4.4362
Category Hauling Vendor Vonker Total	ROG		0.0000	0.1388	0.4555	0.5943
		Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

Page 12 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2019

Mitigated Construction On-Site

CO2e		2,607.363	2,607.363
N2O			
CH4	lay	0.6313	0.6313
Total CO2	lb/dl	2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2
NBID-CO2		2,591.580 2	2,591.580 2
Bio-CO2		0.0000	0.000
PM2.5 Total		1.2127	1.2127
Exhaust PM2.5		1.2127	1.2127
Fugitive PM2.5			
PM10 Total		1.2899	1.2899
Exhaust PM10	day	1.2899	1.2899
Fugitive PM10	lb/d	29404040	
S02		0.0269	0.0269
со		17.1638	17.1638
NOX		21.0788	21.0788
ROG		2.3612	2.3612
	Category	Off-Road	Total

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	XON	co	S02	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category)/qI	day							p/qI	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.000	0.0000	0.000		0.000
Vendor	0.1388	4.1193	0.9958	9.3300e- 003	0.2304	0.0273	0.2577	0.0663	0.0261	0.0924		994.3909	994.3909	0.0658		996.0358
Worker	0.4555	0.3170	4.1788	0.0110	1.0395	8.0900e- 003	1.0476	0.2757	7.4500e- 003	0.2831		1,098.319 8	1,098.319 8	0.0344		1,099.178 6
Total	0.5943	4.4362	5.1746	0.0204	1.2699	0.0354	1.3053	0.3420	0.0336	0.3756		2,092.710 7	2,092.710 7	0.1002		2,095.214 4

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

 $\label{eq:appendix} A \bullet Air \, Quality \, Worksheets$

Page 13 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2019

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

ROG	NOX	co	S02	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
				lb/d	lay							p/ql	ay		
4544	15.2441	14.6648	0.0228		0.8246	0.8246		0.7586	0.7586		2,257.002 5	2,257.002 5	0.7141		2,274.854 8
2957					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
7501	15.2441	14.6648	0.0228		0.8246	0.8246		0.7586	0.7586		2,257.002	2,257.002 5	0.7141		2,274.854 8

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

CO2e		0.000	0.0000	177.2869	177.2869
N2O					
CH4	ay	0.0000	0.0000	5.5400e- 003	5.5400e- 003
Total CO2	lb/d	0.0000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
NBio-CO2		0.0000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
Bio-CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.0457	0.0457
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.000	0.0000	0.0445	0.0445
PM10 Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.1690	0.1690
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	0.0000	1.3000e- 003	1.3000e-
Fugitive PM10	lb/dl	0.000	0.0000	0.1677	0.1677
S02		0.0000	0.0000	1.7800e- 003	1.7800e- 003
co		0.000	0.0000	0.6740	0.6740
NOX		0.0000	0.0000	0.0511	0.0511
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0735	0.0735
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

Page 14 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2019

Mitigated Construction On-Site

CO2e		2,274,854 8	0.0000	2,274.854
N20			e e	
CH4	, Ке	0.7141		0.7141
Total CO2	lb/dl	2,257.002 5	0.0000	2,257.002 5
NBio-CO2		2,257.002 5		2,257.002
Bio- CO2		0.0000		0.000
PM2.5 Total		0.7586	0.0000	0.7586
Exhaust PM2.5		0.7586	0.0000	0.7586
Fugitive PM2.5				
PM10 Total		0.8246	0.0000	0.8246
Exhaust PM10	ay	0.8246	0.0000	0.8246
Fugitive PM10	lb/dl			
S02		0.0228		0.0228
co		14.6648		14.6648
NOX		15.2441		15.2441
ROG		1.4544	0.2957	1.7501
	Category	Off-Road	Paving	Total

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

CO2e		0.0000	0.0000	177.2869	177.2869
N2O					
CH4	lay	0.000	0.0000	5.5400e- 003	5.5400e- 003
Total CO2	lb/d	0.0000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
NBio-CO2		0.000	0.0000	177.1484	177.1484
Bio-CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.000	0.0000	0.0457	0.0457
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.000	0.0000	0.0445	0.0445
PM10 Total		0.000	0.0000	0.1690	0.1690
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	0.0000	1.3000e- 003	1.3000e-
Fugitive PM10)/qI	0.0000	0.0000	0.1677	0.1677
S02		0.000	0.0000	1.7800e- 003	1.7800e- 003
со		0.0000	0.0000	0.6740	0.6740
NOX		0.0000	0.0000	0.0511	0.0511
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0735	0.0735
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

Page 15 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2019 Unmitigated Construction On-Site

_				
CO2e		0.0000	282.0423	282.0423
N2O				
CH4	А		0.0238	0.0238
Total CO2	b/di	0.000.0	281.4481	281.4481
NBio-CO2			281.4481	281.4481
Bio-CO2				
PM2.5 Total		0.000	0.1288	0.1288
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.1288	0.1288
Fugitive PM2.5				
PM10 Total		0.000	0.1288	0.1288
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	0.1288	0.1288
Fugitive PM10	lb/dl			
SO2			2.9700e- 003	2.97009-
co			1.8413	1.8413
XON			1.8354	1.8354
ROG		25.0622	0.2664	25.3286
	Category	Archit. Coating	Off-Road	Total

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

CO2e		0.000	0.0000	224.5634	224.5634
N20					
CH4	ау	0.0000	0.0000	7.0200e- 003	7.02008-003
Total CO2	p/qi	0.0000	0.0000	224.3879	224.3879
NBio-CO2		0.0000	0.0000	224.3879	224.3879
Bio-CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.0579	0.0579
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.5200e- 003	1.5200e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.000	0.0000	0.0563	0.0563
PM10 Total		0.000	0.000	0.2140	0.2140
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	0.0000	1.6500e- 003	1.6500e- 003
Fugitive PM10	lb/dl	0.000	0.0000	0.2124	0.2124
S02		0.000	0.0000	2.2500e- 003	2.2500e-003
со		0.000	0.0000	0.8537	0.8537
NOX		0.0000	0.0000	0.0648	0.0648
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0931	0.0931
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

Appendix A \bullet Air Quality Worksheets

Page 16 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2019 Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOX	co	S02	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Category					0/qI	lay							p/qI	ay		
Archit. Coating	25.0622					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2664	1.8354	1.8413	2.9700e- 003		0.1288	0.1288		0.1288	0.1288	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0238		282.0423
Total	25.3286	1.8354	1.8413	2.9700e- 003		0.1288	0.1288		0.1288	0.1288	0.000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0238		282.0423

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

CO2e		0.0000	0.0000	224.5634	224.5634
N2O					
CH4	эу	0.000.0	0.0000	7.0200e- 003	7.0200 0 - 003
Total CO2	p/qI	0.0000	0.0000	224.3879	224.3879
NBio-CO2		0.0000	0.0000	224.3879	224.3879
Bio- CO2					
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.0579	0.0579
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	1.5200e- 003	1.5200e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5		0.0000	0.0000	0.0563	0.0563
PM10 Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.2140	0.2140
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.0000	0.0000	1.6500e- 003	1.6500e- 003
Fugitive PM10	lb/d	0.0000	0.0000	0.2124	0.2124
S02		0.0000	0.0000	2.2500e- 003	2.2500e- 003
co		0.000	0.0000	0.8537	0.8537
NOX		0.0000	0.0000	0.0648	0.0648
ROG		0.0000	0.0000	0.0931	0.0931
	Category	Hauling	Vendor	Worker	Total

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

Page 17 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Increase Diversity

CO2e		2,020.221 7	2,234.051
N2O			
CH4	ay	0.0946	0.1035
Total CO2	p/qi	2,017.855 6	2,231.464
NBio-CO2		2,017.855 6	2,231.464 5
Bio-CO2	4		
PM2.5 Total		0.4411	0.4902
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0144	0.0159
Fugitive PM2.5		0.4267	0.4744
PM10 Total		1.6101	1.7898
Exhaust PM10	ay	0.0154	0.0170
Fugitive PM10	lb/di	1.5947	1.7728
S02		0.0198	0.0220
co		5.4294	5.9660
NOX		1.9716	2.1042
ROG		0.3835	0.4029
	Category	Mitigated	Unmitigated

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Aver	age Daily Trip Ra	ate	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Parking Lot	00.00	00.00	0.00		
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	194.55	194.55	194.55	833, 768	749,968
Total	194.55	194.55	194.55	833,768	749,968

4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %		4	Trip Purpose	%	
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by	
Parking Lot	16.60	8.40	6.90	00.00	0.00	0:00	0	0	0	
Inrefrigerated Warehouse-No	16.60	8.40	6.90	59.00	00.00	41.00	92	5	ę	

4.4 Fleet Mix

Page 18 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	DHM	DHH	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Parking Lot	0.548858	0.043235	0.200706	0.120309	0.016131	0.005851	0.021034	0.033479	0.002070	0.001877	0.004817	0.000707	0.000925
ated Warehouse-No Rail	0.548858	0.043235	0.200706	0.120309	0.016131	0.005851	0.021034	0.033479	0.002070	0.001877	0.004817	0.000707	0.000925

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

			_
CO2e		32.6658	32.6658
N20		6.0000e- 004	6.0000e- 004
CH4	Ae	6.2000e- 004	6.2000e- 004
Total CO2	p/qI	32.4728	32.4728
NBio-CO2		32.4728	32.4728
Bio- CO2			
PM2.5 Total		2.0600 0 - 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM2.5		2.0600 0 - 003	2.0600e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5			
PM10 Total		2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM10	Jay	2.0600 0 - 003	2.0600e- 003
Fugitive PM10)ql		
S02		1.6000e- 004	1.6000e- 004
со		0.0227	0.0227
NOX		0.0271	0.0271
ROG		2.9800e- 003	2.9800e- 003
	Category	Natural Gas Mitigated	Natural Gas Unmitigated

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

Page 19 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

CO2e		0.0000	32,6658	32.6658
N20		0.0000	6.0000e- 004	6.0000e- 004
CH4	ЛE	0.000.0	6.2000e- 004	6.2000e- 004
Total CO2	Ib/di	0.0000	32.4728	32.4728
NBio-CO2		0.000.0	32.4728	32.4728
Bio-CO2				
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	2.0600 e- 003	2.0600 0 - 003
Fugitive PM2.5				
PM10 Total		0.0000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Fugitive PM10	1b/d			
SO2		0.000.0	1.6000e- 004	1.6000e- 004
8		0.0000	0.0227	0.0227
NOX		0.0000	0.0271	0.0271
BOR		0000'0	2.9800e- 003	2.9800e- 003
NaturalGa s Use	kBTUÅr	0	276.019	
	Land Use	Parking Lot	Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	Total

Mitigated

CO2e		0.0000	32.6658	32.6658
N2O		0.0000	6.0000e- 004	6.0000e- 004
CH4	ay	0.0000	6.2000e- 004	6.2000e- 004
Total CO2	p/qI	0.0000	32.4728	32.4728
NBio-CO2		0.000.0	32.4728	32.4728
Bio-CO2				
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM2.5		0.0000	2.0600 0 - 003	2.0600e- 003
Fugitive PM2.5				
PM10 Total		0.0000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Exhaust PM10	lay	0.0000	2.0600e- 003	2.0600e- 003
Fugitive PM10	lb/d			
802		0.0000	1.6000e- 004	1.6000e- 004
8		0.0000	0.0227	0.0227
NOX		0.0000	0.0271	0.0271
ROG		00000	2.9800e- 003	2.9800e- 003
NaturalGa s Use	kBTU/yr	0	0.276019	
	Land Use	Parking Lot	Unrefrigerated Varehouse-No Rail	Total

6.0 Area Detail

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER – SITE IV• CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Page 20 of 22

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

002e		0.0884	0.0884
N2O			
CH4	A.	2.2000e- 004	2.2000e- 004
Total CO2	lb/di	0.0829	0.0829
NBio- CO2		0.0829	0.0829
Bio-CO2			
PM2.5 Total	1	1.4000e- 004	1.4000e- 004
Exhaust PM2.5		1.4000e- 004	1.4000e- 004
Fugitive PM2.5			
PM10 Total		1.4000e- 004	1.4000e- 004
Exhaust PM10	ay	1.40008-	1.40008- 004
Fugitive PM10	p/qi		
S02		0.0000	0.0000
со		0.0388	0.0388
NOX		3.60000-	3.6000e- 004
ROG		2.6359	2.6359
	Category	Mitigated	Unmitigated

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

		_		_	_
CO2e		0.0000	0.0000	0.0884	0.0884
N2O					
CH4	ay			2.2000e- 004	2.2000e- 004
Total CO2	lb/d	0.000.0	0.000	0.0829	0.0829
NBIO- CO2				0.0829	0.0829
Bio-CO2					e
PM2.5 Total		0.0000	0.0000	1.4000e- 004	1.4000e-
Exhaust PM2.5		0.000	0.0000	1.4000e- 004	1.4000e-
Fugitive PM2.5					
P M10 Total		0.0000	0.0000	1.4000e- 004	1.40006-004
Exhaust PM10	day	0.0000	0.0000	1.4000e- 004	1.40008-004
Fugitive PM10)/ql	8			
S02				0.0000	0.0000
co				0.0388	0.0388
XON				3.6000e- 004	3.6000e-
ROG	-	0.3021	2.3301	3.6300e- 003	2.6359
	SubCategory	Architectural Coating	Consumer Products	Landscaping	Total

Page 21 of 22

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM MC&C IV - South Coast AQMD Air District, Summer

> 6.2 Area by SubCategory Mitigated

	ROG	XON	00	S02	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	71	CH4	CH4 N20
SubCategory					lb/d	ay							lb/d	ay		
Architectural Coating	0.3021					0.0000	0,0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			
Consumer Products	2.3301					0.000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000		1	
Landscaping	3.6300e- 003	3.6000e- 004	0.0388	0.0000		1.4000e- 004	1.4000e- 004		1.4000e- 004	1.4000e- 004		0.0829	0.0829	2.2000	- 0	-9(-
Total	2.6359	3.6000-004	0.0388	0.0000		1.40006-004	1.40000-004		1.40000-004	1.40006-004		0.0829	0.0829	2.200(-0	-0

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Number Hours/Day Days/Year Horse Power Load Factor
--



Appendix A \bullet Air Quality Worksheets

Date: 12/13/2018 2:57 PM

Page 22 of 22

CalEEMod Version: CalEEMod.2016.3.2

APPENDIX B PHASE I

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT OF

MC&C COMMERCE CENTER SITES III AND IV NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES OF TELEGRAPH ROAD AND EAST OF BLOOMFIELD AVENUE SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA 90670

ATC PROJECT NO. NPMS180009

MAY 22, 2018

Prepared by:

ATC Group Services LLC 25 Cupania Circle Monterey Park, California 91755 Phone: (323) 517-9780 Fax: (737) 207-8269 Prepared for:

Robert Poole, Executive Director Morgan Stanley | Merchant Banking 3280 Peachtree Rd. NE, Suite 2000 Atlanta, Georgia 30305

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 General Information	1
1.2 Findings and Conclusions Summary	3
1.3 Significant Data Gap Summary	5
1.4 Recommendations	5
2.0 INTRODUCTION	6
	0
2.1 Purpose	6
	6
2.3 Significant Assumptions.	/
2.4 Limitations and Exceptions.	1
2.5 Special Terms and Conditions (User Reliance)	9
3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION	.10
3.1 Location and Legal Description.	. 10
3.2 Surrounding Area General Characteristics	10
3.3 Current Use of the Property	. 10
3.4 Description of Property Improvements	. 10
3.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties	11
	40
	.13
4.1 Title Records	. 13
4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)	13
4.3 Specialized Knowledge or Experience of the User	. 13
4.4 Significant Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues	13
4.5 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information	13
4.6 Reason For Performing Phase I ESA	13
4.7 Other User Provided Documents	. 13
5.0 RECORDS REVIEW	14
5.1 Standard Environmental Records	. 14
5.1.1 Federal Database Findings	15
5.1.2 State and Tribal Database Findings	. 17
5.1.3 Local Environmental Record Sources	18
5.2 Physical Setting Sources	19
5.2.1 Topography	. 19
5.2.2 Geology	. 19
5.2.3 Soils	. 20
5.2.4 Hydrology	20
5.2.5 Other Physical Setting Sources	. 20
5.3 Historical Records Sources	21
5.3.1 Aerial Photographs	. 21
5.3.2 Fire Insurance Maps	.23
5.3.3 Property Tax Files	. 23
5.3.4 Recorded Land Title Records	. 23
5.3.5 Historical USGS Topographic Maps	23
5.3.6 City Directories	. 23
5.3.7 Building Department Records	24
5.3.8 Zoning/Land Use Records	.24

ATC Group Services LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.3.9 Prior Reports	
5.3.10 Other Historical Sources	
6.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE	
6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions	
6.2 Hazardous Substance Use, Storage, and Disposal	
6.3 Underground Storage Tanks	29
6.4 Aboveground Storage Tanks	
6.5 Other Petroleum Products	
6.6 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	30
6.7 Unidentified Substance Containers.	
6.8 Nonhazardous Solid Waste	30
6.9 Wastewater	30
6.10 Waste Pits, Ponds and Lagoons	30
6.11 Drains and Sumps	30
6.12 Septic Systems	31
6.13 Stormwater Management System	31
6.14 Wells	31
7.0 SUBSURFACE VAPOR MIGRATION	32
8.0 INTERVIEWS	
9.0 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	
9.1 Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM)	
9.2 Radon	34
9.3 Lead in Drinking Water	
9.4 Lead-Based Paint (LBP)	34
9.5 Mold Screening	
9.6 Additional User Requested Services	34
10.0 REFERENCES	35
11.0 TERMINOLOGY	
Appondix A Site Vicinity Man	
Appendix A Site Vicinity Map	
Appendix D Site Plati	
Appendix C Site Photographs	
Appendix D Oser Fronded Documentation	
Appendix E Aerial Diotographs	
Appendix C Historical Research Documentation	
Appendix & Historical Research Documentation	
Appendix I Resumes	
Appendix I Resulties	
Appendix 5 Necords of Communication	
Appendix I. Other Supporting Documentation	
Appendix L Other Supporting Documentation	

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 General Information

Project Information:

2018 MSUSREID Project Folder NPMS180009

Consultant Information:

ATC Group Services LLC 25 Cupania Circle Monterey Park, California 91755 Phone: (323) 517-9780 Fax: (737) 207-8269 Inspection Date: May 8, 2018 Report Date: May 22, 2018

Site Information:

MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California 90670 County: Los Angeles Latitude, Longitude: 33.941849, -118.061289 Site Access Contact: Mr. Ed Quinones with BreitBurn Energy Partners LP

Client Information:

Morgan Stanley | Merchant Banking Robert Poole, Executive Director 3280 Peachtree Rd. NE, Suite 2000 Atlanta, Georgia 30305

Site Assessor

Steve Anderson

Steve Anderson Staff Scientist

Project Manager

C. Red

Gwen C. Reed Program Manager

Senior Reviewer

Doug Romer Senior Project Manager

National Account Manager

Dale M. Allison

Vice President, National Programs

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Environmental Professional Statement:

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

Afere W. Steve Anderson - Staff Scientist

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

1.2 Findings and Conclusions Summary

ATC Group Services LLC (ATC) has performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.0 of this report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the property, except as noted in the summary of report findings and conclusions below.

Report	Section	Further Action?	De minimis Condition	REC and/or CREC	Historical REC	ASTM Non - Scope Condition	Description
4.0	User Provided Information	No					
5.1.1	Federal Database Findings	No					
5.1.2	State and Tribal Database Findings	Yes		X			VOC impacts in area soil and groundwater from an adjoining property (REC). See Note 1.
5.1.3	Local Environmental Record Sources	Yes		x			Potential for residual petroleum impacts to soil from past operations (REC). See Note 2.
5.3	Historical Records Sources	No					_
6.2	Hazardous Substance Use, Storage, and Disposal	No	x				Localized staining near an active production well. See Note 3.
6.3	Underground Storage Tanks	No					
6.4	Aboveground Storage Tanks	No					
6.5	Other Petroleum Products	No					
6.6	Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	No					
6.7	Unidentified Substance Containers	No					
6.8	Nonhazardous Solid Waste	No					
6.9	Wastewater	No					
6.10	Waste Pits, Ponds and Lagoons	No					
6.11	Drains and Sumps	No					
6.12	Septic Systems	No					
6.13	Stormwater Management System	No					
6.14	Wells	No				X	Active and abandoned oil production wells are location on-site. See Note 4.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Repo	rt Section	Further Action?	De minimis Condition	REC and/or CREC	Historical REC	ASTM Non - Scope Condition	Description
7.0	Subsurface Vapor Migration	Yes		X			VEC exists due to VOC impacts in soil and groundwater and location of the property in a methane zone. See Note 1.
8.0	Interviews	No					
9.1	Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM)	No					
9.2	Radon	No	1				
9.3	Lead in Drinking Water	No					
9.4	Lead-Based Paint (LBP)	No					
9.5	Mold Screening	No					
9.6	Additional User Requested Services	No					

Note 1: Previous regional groundwater studies conducted in the vicinity of the property parcels suggest that groundwater beneath the property has been impacted with low to moderate levels of a variety of volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The principal source of these impacts is considered to be a former chemical manufacturing facility identified as PMC Specialties Group, aka Productol, located adjacent to the north and west of MC&C IV. Additionally, soil vapor investigations on the north-adjacent Productol site have identified remnant chemical vapors in soil up to the shared property boundary with MC&C IV. The VOC impacts in groundwater beneath the property are considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*. The potential for vapors to impinge on the property is considered to represent a *vapor encroachment condition*. In addition, according to the City of Santa Fe Springs, the property is located within the boundaries of a methane zone due proximity to active, inactive and/or abandoned oil wells.

Note 2: According to prior reports reviewed by ATC, former oil sumps have been identified on both MC&C III and IV. An investigation of MC&C IV reported three sumps and an estimated volume of 18,000 cubic yards of petroleum-impacted soils (McLaren, 1989). Six sumps had been identified on MC&C III (center of current parcel) with a volume of 2,492 cubic yards of impacted soil remediated. The remaining two sumps on MC&C III were not remediated due to subsurface utilities (McLaren Hart, 1991). Given that at least two of the sumps were not remediated because of subsurface utilities as well as the report did not address other areas of the property such as the southern half of MC&C III and MC&C IV, the potential for residual petroleum impacts from prior operations is considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*.

Note 3: Localized oil staining was observed on the ground surface near at least one active on-site oil production well. The small amount of oil staining is considered to represent a *de minimis condition*.

Note 4: According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) wellfinder website, MC&C III has a total of 36 oil wells, seven of which are production wells and two are water injection wells. The remainder of the wells on-site are buried. Three of these are idle and 24 are abandoned. MC&C IV has a total of 16 oil wells, 11 of which are production wells and one is a water injection well. The remaining four buried wells are abandoned. Although not observed during the site reconnaissance, one groundwater monitoring well (MW-11) is shown on prior reports as located in the southwestern corner of MC&C III. The various wells are not considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*. But given the potential for re-abandonment and venting of the plugged oil wells to current regulatory standards prior to development of the property, the abandoned wells are considered a *business environmental risk*.

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

1.3 Significant Data Gap Summary

Data gaps may have been encountered during the performance of this Phase I ESA and are discussed within the section of the report where they were encountered. However, according to ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13, data gaps are only significant if "other information and/or professional experience raises reasonable concerns involving the data gap." The following table is a summary of significant data gaps identified in this report.

SIGNIFICANT DATA GAP SUMMARY					
Report Section	Description				
3.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties	No significant data gaps encountered.				
4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations	No significant data gaps encountered.				
(AULs)					
5.1 Standard Environmental Records	No significant data gaps encountered.				
5.2 Physical Setting Sources	No significant data gaps encountered.				
5.3 Historical Records Sources	No significant data gaps encountered.				
6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions	No significant data gaps encountered.				
7.0 Subsurface Vapor Migration	No significant data gaps encountered.				
8.0 Interviews	No significant data gaps encountered.				

1.4 Recommendations

Based on information collected for this Phase I ESA, ATC offers the following recommendations:

- ATC recommends conducting a soil gas survey along the northern and western shared boundaries of MC&C IV with the former Productol site
- ATC recommends that during development, soils encountered during grading and/or excavation be screened for signs of contamination and if suspected, handled according to an established soil management plan.
- All formerly abandoned oil wells likely to represent a methane hazard to the property should be re-abandoned and vented according to applicable regulations under the direction of the City of Santa Fe Springs. Other methane mitigation measures should be employed according to City guidelines.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Phase I ESA was to identify *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the property at the time of the site reconnaissance. The scope of work for this Phase I ESA may also include certain potential environmental conditions beyond the scope of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice E1527-13 as listed below. This report documents the findings, opinions and conclusions of the Phase I ESA.

2.2 Scope

This Phase I ESA was conducted in general accordance with the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13, consistent with a level of care and skill ordinarily practiced by the environmental consulting profession currently providing similar services under similar circumstances. Significant additions, deletions or exceptions to ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 are noted below or in the corresponding sections of this report. The scope of this assessment included an evaluation of the following:

- Physical setting characteristics of the property through a review of referenced sources such as topographic maps and geologic, soils and hydrologic reports.
- Usage of the property, adjoining properties and surrounding area through a review of referenced historical sources such as land title records, fire insurance maps, city directories, aerial photographs, prior reports and interviews.
- Observations and interviews regarding current property usage and condition including: the use, treatment, storage, disposal or generation of hazardous substances, petroleum products, hazardous wastes, nonhazardous solid wastes and wastewater.
- Usage of adjoining and surrounding area properties and the likely impact of known or suspected releases of hazardous substances or petroleum products from those properties in, on, or at the property.
- Information in referenced environmental agency databases and local environmental records, within the specified approximate minimum search distance from the property.
- · Potential for subsurface vapor migration in at the property.

The scope of the assessment also included consideration of the following potential environmental issues or conditions that are beyond the scope of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13:

 The scope of work for the mold screening was intended to be consistent with ASTM E 2418-06; Standard Guide for Readily Observable Mold and Conditions Conducive to Mold in Commercial Buildings: Baseline Survey Process. The scope of work, including potential deviations from the Standard Guide, is described as follows. The interview was limited to at least one knowledgeable person from property management or engineering staff. The document review was limited to only those relevant documents made readily available to ATC in a timely manner. The physical observations were limited to certain heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system areas and other readily accessible building areas likely to become subject to water damage, plumbing leaks, and flooding. Unless noted otherwise herein, ATC observed the HVAC equipment room(s) and accessible mechanical rooms and, in buildings with package units in the ceiling, at least one unit per floor. Also, unless noted otherwise, ATC observed accessible areas of the basement (or lowest level), the top floor, the roof (including any penthouse areas) and at least one mid-level floor (if applicable). For multi-story buildings, the total number of floors observed (inclusive of those already mentioned) was intended to be up to 10% of the total number of floors (if readily accessible). For hotel and multi-family buildings, ATC targeted the lowest and highest levels and roof as described above and up to 10% of units, including one per floor if readily accessible. The mold screening did not include destructive methods of observation. No sampling or laboratory analyses were conducted. The mold screening service as described herein was limited in scope and by the time and cost considerations typically

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

associated with performing a Phase I ESA. No method can guarantee that a hazard will be discovered if evidence of the hazard is not encountered within the performance of the mold screening as authorized and that opinions and conclusions must, out of necessity, be extrapolated from limited information and discrete, non-continuous data points. Unidentified mold or other microbial conditions may exist on the property.

- Visual observation of suspect asbestos-containing materials (ACM), consisting of providing an opinion
 on the condition of suspect ACM on the property based upon visual observation during the site
 reconnaissance. No sampling of suspect ACM was conducted.
- Radon document review, consisting of the review of published radon data with regard to the potential for elevated levels of radon gas in the surrounding area of the property. No radon sampling was conducted.
- Lead in drinking water data review, consisting of contacting the water supplier for information
 regarding whether or not the potable water provided to the property meets the drinking water
 standards for lead.
- Wetlands document review, consisting of a review of a current National Wetlands Inventory map of the surrounding area to note if the property is identified on the map as having a wetland.
- Oil and gas well data review, consisting of a review of oil well maps prepared by the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR).
- Regulatory Agency File and Records Review, consisting of conducting a file review (i.e., via Freedom
 of Information Act (FOIA) request or alternative method/source) for the property and/or one adjoining
 property at one regulatory agency, as warranted by the findings of the ESA. If ATC determines that
 additional Regulatory Agency File and Records Reviews are warranted, ATC will advise Client and
 seek written authorization for the additional services and fees.

2.3 Significant Assumptions

The assumptions in this report were not considered as having significant impact on the determination of *recognized environmental conditions* associated with the property.

2.4 Limitations and Exceptions

ATC has prepared this Phase I ESA report using reasonable efforts to identify *recognized environmental conditions* associated with hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the property. Findings contained within this report are based on information collected from observations made on the day(s) of the site reconnaissance and from reasonably ascertainable information obtained from certain public agencies and other referenced sources.

The ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13 recognizes inherent limitations for Phase I ESAs, including, but not limited to:

- Uncertainty Not Eliminated: a Phase I ESA cannot wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property.
- Not Exhaustive: a Phase I ESA is not an exhaustive assessment of the environmental conditions on a
 property.
- Past Uses of the Property: a Phase I ESA does not require review of standard historical sources at less than five year intervals. Therefore, past uses of the property may not be discovered.

Users of this report may refer to ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13 for further information regarding these and other limitations. This report is not definitive and should not be assumed to be a complete and/or specific definition of all conditions above or below grade. Current subsurface conditions may differ from the conditions determined by surface observations, interviews and reviews of historical sources. The most

7

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

reliable method of evaluating subsurface conditions is through intrusive techniques, which are beyond the scope of this report. Information in this report is not intended to be used as a construction document and should not be used for demolition, renovation, or other property construction purposes. Any use of this report by any party, beyond the scope and intent of the original parties, shall be at the sole risk and expense of such user.

ATC makes no representation or warranty that the past or current operations at the property are, or have been, in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and codes. This report does not warrant against future operations or conditions, nor does it warrant against operations or conditions present of a type or at a location not investigated. Regardless of the findings stated in this report, ATC is not responsible for consequences or conditions arising from facts not fully disclosed to ATC during the assessment.

An independent data research company provided the government agency databases referenced in this report. Information on surrounding area properties was requested for approximate minimum search distances and is assumed to be correct and complete unless obviously contradicted by ATC's observations or other credible referenced sources reviewed during the assessment. ATC shall not be liable for the database firm's failure to make relevant files or documents properly available, to properly index files, or otherwise to fail to maintain to produce accurate or complete records.

ATC makes no warranty, guarantee or certification regarding the quality, accuracy or reliability of any prior report provided to ATC and discussed in this Phase I ESA report. ATC expressly disclaims any and all liability for any errors or omissions contained in any prior reports provided to ATC and discussed in this Phase I ESA report.

ATC used reasonable efforts to identify evidence of aboveground and underground storage tanks and ancillary equipment on the property during the assessment. "Reasonable efforts" were limited to observation of accessible areas, review of referenced public records and interviews. These reasonable efforts may not identify subsurface equipment or evidence hidden from view by things including, but not limited to, snow cover, paving, construction activities, stored materials and landscaping.

Any estimates of costs or quantities in this report are approximations for commercial real estate transaction due diligence purposes and are based on the findings, opinions and conclusions of this assessment which are limited by the scope of the assessment, schedule demands, cost constraints, accessibility limitations and other factors associated with performing the Phase I ESA. Subsequent determinations of costs or quantities may vary from the estimates in this report. The estimated costs or quantities in this report are not intended to be used for financial disclosure related to FASB Statement No. 143, FASB Interpretation No. 47, Sarbanes/Oxley Act or any United States Securities and Exchange Commission reporting obligations, and may not be used for such purposes in any form without the express written permission of ATC.

ATC is not a professional title insurance or land surveyor firm and makes no guarantee, express or implied, that any land title records acquired or reviewed in this report, or any physical descriptions or depictions of the property in this report, represent a comprehensive definition or precise delineation of property ownership or boundaries.

The Environmental Professional Statement in Section 1.1 of this report does not "certify" the findings contained in this report and is not a legal opinion of such *Environmental Professional*. The statement is meant to document ATC's opinion that an individual meeting the qualifications of an *Environmental Professional* was involved in the performance of the assessment and that the activities performed by, or under the supervision of, the *Environmental Professional* were performed in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312 per the methodology in ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13 and the scope of work for this assessment.

Per ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13, Section 6, User Responsibilities, the User of this assessment has specific obligations for performing tasks during this assessment that will help identify the possibility of *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the property. Failure by the User to fully comply with the requirements may impact their ability to use this report to help qualify for *Landowner Liability Protections* (LLPs) under CERCLA. ATC makes no representations or warranties regarding a User's qualification for liability protection under any federal, state or local laws or regulations.

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

In accordance with the ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13, this report is presumed to be valid for a six month period. If the report is older than six months, the following information must be updated in order for the report to be valid: (1) regulatory review, (2) site visit, (3) interviews, (4) specialized knowledge, and (5) environmental liens. Reports older than one year may not meet ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13 and therefore, the report must be updated to reflect current conditions and property-specific information.

Other limitations and exceptions that are specific to the scope of this report may be found in corresponding sections.

2.5 Special Terms and Conditions (User Reliance)

This report is for the use and benefit of, and may be relied upon by, Morgan Stanley, and any of its affiliates and their respective successors and assigns, in connection with a commercial real estate transaction involving the property. No third party is authorized to use this report for any purpose. Any use by or distribution of this report to third parties, without the express written consent of ATC, is at the sole risk and expense of such third party

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 Location and Legal Description

The property consists of two non-contiguous parcels (MC&C III and IV) totaling approximately 18.36 acres in area. MC&C III (approximately 9.87 acres) is located at the southeast corner of Telegraph Road and Bloomfield Avenue. MC&C IV (approximately 8.49 acres) is located along the north side of Telegraph Avenue, south and southwest of Romandel Avenue, a short distance northeast of MC&C III. Neither parcel has an assigned street address. A legal description was not provided to ATC. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers for MC&C III are 8011-018-900, -901, -902, -903, -904, -905, -906, and 8011-019-911; along with that portion of vacated Park Avenue lying easterly of the east line of Bloomfield Avenue. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers for MC&C IV are 8011-002-901, -902, and -903; and 8011-003-955 through 8011-003-979, inclusive.

3.2 Surrounding Area General Characteristics

The surrounding area is generally level and developed with a mixture of industrial and residential uses. The specific adjacent property uses are discussed in Section 3.5.

3.3 Current Use of the Property

The property parcels are generally unpaved and currently developed with several active oil wells and associated piping and equipment. No buildings or occupied structures are located on-site.

3.4 Description of Property Improvements

The following table provides general descriptions of property improvements.

PR	OPERTY IMPROVEMENTS
Size of Property (approximate)	18.36 acres
General Topography of Property	Generally level
Adjoining and/or Access/Egress Roads	MC&C III: Bloomfield Avenue to the west and Telegraph Road to the
	north.
	MC&C IV: Telegraph Road to the south and Romandel Avenue to
	the north of the eastern portion of the property.
Paved or Concrete Areas (including parking)	Generally unpaved; however, an asphalt-paved access road is
	present along a portion of the northern and western boundaries of
	MC&C IV. Gravel paving is present locally on both MC&C properties.
Unimproved Areas	Most of property except for localized areas of oil wells and
	equipment.
Landscaped Areas	Ground cover in planters located along Bloomfield Avenue and
	Telegraph Road.
Surface Water	None
Potable Water Source	Santa Fe Springs Water Utility Authority
Sanitary Sewer Utility	City of Santa Fe Springs
Storm Sewer Utility	City of Santa Fe Springs
Electrical Utility	Southern California Edison (SCE)
Natural Gas Utility	Southern California Gas
Current Occupancy Status	100%
Unoccupied Buildings/Spaces/Structures	None
Number of Occupied Buildings	None
Building Name or General Building	Not Applicable (N/A)
Description	
Number of Floors	N/A
Total Square Feet of Space (approximate)	N/A
Construction Completion Date (year)	N/A
Construction Type	N/A
Interior Finishes Description	N/A
Exterior Finishes Description	N/A

Project No. NPMS180009

ATC Group Services LLC

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Cooling System Type	N/A
Heating System Type	N/A
Emergency Power	None

3.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties

Current uses of the adjoining properties were observed to be as described in the following table. The potential for these adjacent sites to have an adverse environmental impact to the property is discussed in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.

		CURRENT USES OF ADJOINING PROPERTIE		
Direction From Property	Address	Occupant(s) Name	Current Use	Potential Environmental Conditions
Adjacent to the north of MC&C III, beyond Telegraph Road	10318 Santa Fe Springs Road	Skyline	Office	None
Adjacent to the north of MC&C III, beyond Telegraph Road	12658 Cisneros Lane	No signage	Industrial	None
Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV	10051 Romandel Avenue	Former PMC Specialties Group / Productol facility. No signage currently	Undeveloped industrial property	Site is on the Department of California Environmental Protection Agency Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor list as an active Voluntary Cleanup Site. This facility is also listed as a registered underground storage tank (UST) facility on the Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning (SWEEPS) list, the Historical UST (HIST UST) list, and the California Facility Inventory Database (CA FID) list. The facility is listed as a leaking UST (LUST) site on the LUST and Historical Cortese lists, and as a Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Clean-Ups (SLIC) site. This site was also a former Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Small-Quantity Generator.
Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV, beyond Romandel Avenue	10140 Romandel Avenue	Hi Tech Metal Polishing	Industrial	This facility is listed as a RCRA Large-Quantity Generator.
Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV, beyond Romandel Avenue	10207 Freeman Avenue	Anthony Electric Inc.	Industrial	None
East of MC&C III, beyond a railroad right-of-way	12720 Telegraph Road	BreitBurn Energy Partners LP (BreitBurn Energy)	Industrial - Oil production facility	This facility is listed as an aboveground storage tank (AST) facility.

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Direction From Property	Address	Occupant(s) Name	Current Use	Potential Environmental Conditions	
East of MC&C IV	12800-12838 Romandel Avenue	Multi-tenant building, the nearest tenant of which to the property is Vitas	Industrial	None	
East of MC&C IV	12803-12851 Telegraph Road	Multi-tenant building, the nearest tenant of which to the property is Globegistics Inc.	Industrial	None	
South of MC&C	12605 Clark Street	Royal Imex Inc.	Industrial	This facility is listed as a RCRA Small-Quantity Generator and an AST facility.	
South of MC&C	12633 Clark Street	Zapp	Industrial	None	
South of MC&C	12645 Clark Street	Trench Shoring	Industrial	None	
South of MC&C IV, beyond Telegraph Road	12720 Telegraph Road	BreitBurn Energy	Industrial - Oil production facility	This site is listed as an AST facility.	
West of MC&C III, beyond Bloomfield Avenue	Multiple addresses	The Villages at Heritage Springs	Residential gated community of single-family residences	None	
West of MC&C IV	10051 Romandel Avenue	None	Undeveloped industrial strip of land followed by a railroad right-of-way	See above listing for the north-adjacent portion of 10051 Romandel Avenue.	

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

4.0 USER PROVIDED INFORMATION

The following section summarizes information (if any) provided by Morgan Stanley (User) with regard to the Phase I ESA. Documentation may be found in Appendix D or where referenced in this report.

4.1 Title Records

The User provided no title records information.

4.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs)

Per client's scope of work, ATC requested a search for environmental liens and AULs from one Assessor parcel in both MC&C III and IV. The search of the assessor parcel in MC&C III was from Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) of Shelton, Connecticut. The search of the assessor parcel in MC&C IV was from Security First Title Resource (Security First) of Minneapolis, Minnesota. Neither lien search report identified environmental liens or AULs associated with the representative property parcels. Copies of the lien search reports are included in Appendix L.

4.3 Specialized Knowledge or Experience of the User

The User provided no information regarding recognized environmental conditions at the property.

4.4 Significant Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

The User provided no information regarding a significant valuation reduction for environmental issues associated with the property.

4.5 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information

The User provided no information specifically identifying the owner, manager, or occupant. The use of the property was identified as oil production. Mr. Hoonie Kang of Kearny Real Estate was identified as the initial property access contact. The on-site access contact, arranged through Mr. Kang, was Mr. Ed Quinones of BreitBurn Energy.

4.6 Reason For Performing Phase I ESA

According to information provided by the User, this Phase I ESA will be used in connection with a commercial real estate transaction to identify *recognized environmental conditions* associated with the property.

4.7 Other User Provided Documents

ATC was provided access to numerous prior reports and documents by the User as per ASTM 1527-13. Relevant documents pertaining to the environmental condition of the property are discussed in Section 5.3.9.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

5.0 RECORDS REVIEW

5.1 Standard Environmental Records

The regulatory agency database report discussed in this section, provided by EDR, was reviewed for information regarding reported use or release of hazardous substances and petroleum products on or near the property. Unless otherwise noted, the information provided by the regulatory agency database report and other sources referenced in this report, were considered sufficient for *recognized environmental condition (REC), controlled recognized environmental condition (CREC), historical recognized environmental condition (HREC)* or *de minimis condition* determinations without conducting supplemental agency file reviews. ATC also reviewed the "unmappable" (also referred to as "orphan") listings within the database report, cross-referencing available address information and facility names. Unmappable sites are listings that could not be plotted with confidence, but are potentially in the general area of the property, based on the partial street address, city, or zip code. Any unmappable site that was identified by ATC as being within the approximate minimum search distance from the property, based on the site reconnaissance and/or cross-referencing to mapped listings, is included in the discussion within this section. The complete regulatory agency database report may be found in Appendix E.

The following is a summary of the findings of the database review.

SUMM	ARY OF FEDER	RAL, STATE AN	D TRIBAL	DATABA	SE FINDI	NGS		
Regulatory Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	>1	Total Plotted
National Priority List (NPL)		1	0	1	1	0	NR	2
Superfund Enterprise		0.5	0	1	1	NR	NR	2
Management System (SEMS)								
Superfund Enterprise		0.5	0	0	2	NR	NR	2
Management System Archive								
(SEMS-ARCHIVE)							14	
Corrective Action Report		1	0	1	0	1	NR	2
(CORRACTS)						2		
RCRA - Treatment, Storage		0.5	0	1	0	NR	NR	1
and Disposal (RCRA-TSDF)								
RCRA - Large Quantity		0.25	0	5	NR	NR	NR	5
Generators (RCRA-LQG)								
RCRA - Small Quantity		0.25	0	4	NR	NR	NR	4
Generators (RCRA-SQG)								
Engineering Controls Sites List		0.5	0	1	1	NR	NR	2
(US ENG CONTROLS)								
Sites with Institutional Controls		0.5	0	1	1	NR	NR	2
(US INST CONTROL)								
Emergency Response		TP	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
Notification System (ERNS)								
State Response Sites (CA		1	0	1	1	2	NR	4
RESPONSE)								
Bond Expenditure Plan (CA		1	0	0	0	1	NR	1
CA BOND EXP. PLAN)								
EnviroStor Database (CA		1	0	2	8	25	NR	35
ENVIROSTOR)								
Leaking Underground Fuel		0.5	0	2	7	NR	NR	9
Tank Report (GEOTRACKER)								
(CA LUST)								
Hazardous Waste &		0.5	0	1	9	NR	NR	10
Substance Site List (CA HIST								
CORTESE)								
Statewide SLIC Cases		0.5	2	3	5	NR	NR	10
(GEOTRACKER) (CA SLIC)								
Active UST Facilities (CA UST)		0.25	0	1	NR	NR	NR	1

Project No. NPMS180009

ATC Group Services LLC

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Regulatory Database	Target Property	Search Distance (Miles)	< 1/8	1/8 - 1/4	1/4 - 1/2	1/2 - 1	>1	Total Plotted
Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database (CA HIST UST)		0.25	0	4	NR	NR	NR	4
SWEEPS UST Listing (CA SWEEPS UST)		0.25	0	3	NR	NR	NR	3
Facility Inventory Database (CA CA FID UST)		0.25	0	2	NR	NR	NR	2
Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities (CA AST)		0.25	0	5	NR	NR	NR	5
Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties (CA VCP)		0.5	0	1	0	NR	NR	1
Solid Waste Information System (CA SWF/LF (SWIS))		0.5	0	0	1	NR	NR	1
Cleaner Facilities (CA DRYCLEANERS)		0.25	0	0	NR	NR	NR	0
EDR Exclusive Historical Cleaners (EDR Hist Cleaner)		0.125	0	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
EDR Exclusive Historical Auto Stations (EDR Hist Auto)		0.125	0	NR	NR	NR	NR	0
Leaking Underground Storage Fanks on Indian Land (INDIAN LUST R9)		0.5	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land (INDIAN UST R1)		0.25	0	0	NR	NR	NR	0
Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing (INDIAN VCP R1)		0.5	0	0	0	NR	NR	0
Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands (INDIAN ODI)		0.5	0	0	0	NR	NR	0

5.1.1 Federal Database Findings

The property is not listed on any of the federal databases searched for this ESA by EDR. A 2003 ESA prepared by PIC (see Section 5.3.9) identified a federal Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS) listing pertaining to a break in a Texaco pipeline that may have pertained to MC&C IV. Uncertainty as to the location was due to the pipeline release being described only as having occurred 1/4 mile east of the intersection of Telegraph Road and Santa Fe Springs Road. The release reportedly involved approximately 35 gallons of oil. PIC believed that the remaining 24 ERNS listings cited by the database report could be eliminated as potential concerns. ATC attempted to review the database report in question, prepared by Environmental FirstSearch, which according to the executive summary identified two other ERNS listing pipeline breaks of potential impact to the property. One of these had an identical location but a different identification number (suggesting that it may be a duplicate listing) and the other pertained to a break in a Mobil pipeline occurring at "Telegraph Road and Santa Fe Rail." As it is unknown how exact the location is, this second release could have impacted MC&C III or MC&C IV if it occurred a short distance east or west of the rail line's intersection with Telegraph Road. The detailed listings of each release were unavailable as PIC had included only the executive summary of the database report as an appendix rather than the full document. Based on the small quantity of oil reportedly released by the first ERNS listing and uncertainties regarding the location of all three of the ERNS listings, none of the ERNS listings reported by the PIC ESA are considered to represent a recognized environmental condition.

One National Priorities List (NPL) site and a groundwater plume associated with a second NPL site are located within one mile of the property parcels, described as follows.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Waste Disposal Inc. 12731 Los Nietos Road Databases: NPL, SEMS Approximate Distance from the Property: 0.3 mile north-northeast (at nearest point) Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross- to up gradient Regulatory Data Summary: The Waste Disposal Inc. (WDI) NPL site primarily consists of a buried 42 million gallon, concrete-lined reservoir originally constructed for petroleum storage that was decommissioned in the late 1920s. It was then used until the mid-1960s for the disposal of liquid and solid hazardous wastes

in the late 1920s. It was then used until the mid-1960s for the disposal of liquid and solid hazardous wastes, including petroleum-related chemicals, solvents, sludges, construction debris, drilling muds and other waste materials. Some wastes were deposited outside the limits of the reservoir. ATC has researched this site in the past and learned that a number of measures were taken to stabilize the site, the principal ones being the construction of an engineered cap and landfill gas extraction. According to information previously reviewed by ATC, no groundwater migration of contaminants off-site has occurred.

Discussion: Based on the absence of apparent off-site groundwater migration, this nearby NPL site is not considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition* to the property.

Omega Chemical

12731 Los Nietos Road

Databases: NPL, SEMS

Approximate Distance from the Property: 2.0 miles north-northeast (at nearest point to the source of the plume)

Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross- to up gradient

Regulatory Data Summary: Omega Chemical was a hazardous waste treatment and storage facility. Chlorinated and aromatic solvents were the principal wastes stored onsite. A large plume of groundwater impacted with a number of VOCs and other contaminants extends southwestward from the site in a shallow arc, passing, at its closest, approximately 0.25 mile west-northwest of MC&C III.

Discussion: Past groundwater sampling in the area of the property (see Section 5.3.9) suggests that VOCs are likely present in the groundwater beneath the property parcels; however, based on the cross-gradient position of the Omega Chemical plume with respect to the property, it is unlikely to be the principal source of the VOCs, if at all. Accordingly, the groundwater plume associated with this NPL site is not considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition* to the property.

The following adjacent properties are listed on federal databases, identified as follows:

PMC Specialties Group aka Productol

10051 Romandel Avenue

Databases: RCRA Small-Quantity Generator

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV

Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross- to upgradient

Regulatory Data Summary: This facility is listed as a RCRA small-quantity generator of hazardous waste. EDR reported that this facility has received one violation for unspecified generator requirements in 1985, for which compliance was achieved.

Discussion: This facility is listed as a release site on several state databases, which are discussed further in Section 5.1.2; however, based on the granting of regulatory closure, the RCRA listing is not, in and of itself, considered to represent an environmental concern to the property.

Whiting Enterprises aka Hi-Tech Metal Polishing

10140 Romandel Avenue

Databases: RCRA Large-Quantity Generator

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV, beyond Romandel Avenue Assumed Groundwater Gradient: upgradient

Regulatory Data Summary: This facility is a plating operation. Wastes reportedly generated include metal sludge, liquids with cyanides, liquids with nickel, metal-containing liquids with a pH of less than 2, chromium, lead and other inorganic solids. The facility has received 12 violations between 2004 and 2017 for unspecified generator or pre-transport issues. EDR did not report a compliance date for five of these, including the most recent violation in October of 2017.

Discussion: While the proximity and compliance history of this plating facility is potentially concerning, based on the absence of reported releases and reported use of caustic solutions for degreasing (as opposed

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

to chlorinated solvents), this RCRA large-quantity generator is considered to be a notable finding but is not considered to be a *recognized environmental condition* at this time.

Shoring Engineering aka Trench Shoring 12645 Clark Street Databases: RCRA Small-Quantity Generator Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the south of MC&C III Assumed Groundwater Gradient: downgradient Regulatory Data Summary: This facility is a RCRA small-quantity generator of hazardous waste. The

specific wastes generated were described as unspecified aqueous solutions, unspecified oil-containing waste, and hydrocarbon solvents. No violations were reported.

Discussion: Based on the absence of violations and downgradient location, this RCRA small-quantity generator is not considered to represent an environmental concern to the property.

Based on distance, topography, assumed groundwater gradient, current regulatory status, and/or the absence of reported releases, none of the remaining sites listed in the federal agency databases are considered to represent a likely past, present or material threat of release in, on, or at the property. Accordingly, supplemental agency file reviews were deemed unnecessary.

5.1.2 State and Tribal Database Findings

The property is not listed on any of the state, tribal, or local databases searched for this ESA; however, the property parcels fall within the area of a regional groundwater study jointly commissioned by the City of Santa Fe Springs and Mobil Oil, which is listed as a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) SLIC case identified as the Oil Field Reclamation Project (OFRP). According to EDR, the OFRP was composed of multiple separate parcels (including MC&C III and MC&C IV) within an area of approximately 235 acres. According to a 1996 groundwater characterization report prepared by McLaren Hart and provided to ATC by the User (see Section 5.3.9), low to intermediate concentrations of arsenic, benzene, and chlorinated VOCs were identified in the groundwater contamination is considered to be the former PMC/Productol site, located adjacent to the north of MC&C IV. Migration of the plume boundaries has likely occurred since the report was issued, but the likely presence of VOCs in the groundwater beneath the property parcels is considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*.

The following adjacent properties are listed on state databases, identified as follows:

PMC Specialties Group Division of PMC Inc.aka Productol

10051 Romandel Avenue

Databases: EnviroStor, LUST, Historical Cortese, SLIC, VCP, SWEEPS, HIST UST, CA FID

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the north and west of MC&C IV

Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross- to upgradient (for the main portion of the site)

Regulatory Data Summary: According to information posted to the EnviroStor website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public, this facility is an open voluntary cleanup site. This site was reportedly an oil refinery between 1938 and 1947, after which it was used as a chemical manufacturing facility until 1992. The facility reportedly had 171 ASTs and 24 USTs used for storage of raw chemicals, product, and wastes. According to the EnviroStor website, the USTs were closed and removed between 1987 and 1990. The property is listed as a LUST site on the LUST and Historical Cortese databases. Groundwater was reportedly impacted. No closure date was reported by EDR. The facility is also listed as an inactive SLIC site. It is anticipated that the RWQCB SLIC case file duplicates the information of the open DTSC voluntary cleanup file. Based on a soil gas survey observed on the EnviroStor website, benzene and other VOCs were identified at depths as shallow as ten feet in those portions of the site located immediately adjacent to west and north of MC&C IV.

Discussion: The groundwater impacts beneath the property, for which this site is considered to be a probable source, are considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*. The potential for soil vapor encroachment at the property from this site is considered to be a *vapor encroachment condition* (see Section 7.0).

BreitBurn Energy Company 12720 Telegraph Road

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Databases: AST

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the east of MC&C III and adjacent to the south, beyond Telegraph Road, of MC&C IV.

Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross-gradient and downgradient of MC&C III and MC&C IV, respectively.

Regulatory Data Summary: This oil production property appears on the AST database. The number of ASTs or their contents was not listed, but the total capacity is reported to be 10,000 gallons.

Discussion: The AST database does not track releases and the presence of this adjacent site on the AST database is not considered to represent an environmental concern to the property parcels.

Shoring Engineering aka Trench Shoring 12645 Clark Street

Databases: AST

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the south of MC&C III

Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Downgradient

Regulatory Data Summary: This equipment yard appears on the AST database. No information was provided by EDR regarding the number, contents, or total capacity of any ASTs present at this facility.

Discussion: The AST database does not track releases and the presence of this adjacent site on the AST database is not considered to represent an environmental concern to the property parcels.

Villages at Heritage

10485 Bloomfield Avenue

Databases: LUST

Approximate Distance from the Property: Adjacent to the west of MC&C III, beyond Bloomfield Avenue Assumed Groundwater Gradient: Cross-to downgradient

Regulatory Data Summary: This LUST site, which appears to pertain to a historical address, has a case-closed status and reportedly affected the local soils only.

Discussion: Based on the cross- to downgradient location, medium affected, and closed regulatory status, this former LUST site is not considered to represent an environmental concern to the property.

Based on distance, topography, assumed groundwater gradient, current regulatory status, and/or the absence of reported releases, none of the remaining sites listed in the state or local agency databases are considered to represent a likely past, present or material threat of release in, on, or at the property. Accordingly, supplemental agency file reviews were deemed unnecessary.

5.1.3 Local Environmental Record Sources

Los Angeles County Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division (HHMD)

The HHMD organizes their files by address. As neither of the property parcels has an assigned address, ATC did not contact the HHMD.

California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

According to the DTSC EnviroStor website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public, the DTSC has no files for the property.

Santa Fe Springs Fire Department (SFSFD)

The SFSFD organizes their files by address. As neither of the property parcels has an assigned address, ATC did not contact the SFSFD.

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

According to the RWQCB GeoTracker website, http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov, no LUST sites were reported to be located on the property parcels. One Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups (SLIC) case pertaining to several different MC&C Areas, including those of the property, was indicated on the website. Two reports with information pertaining to the current property parcels were listed.

Project No.	NPMS180009
-------------	------------

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

The first report, entitled *Soil Investigation, McGranahan and Carlson Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California,* prepared by McLaren and dated April 21, 1989, documented soil sampling in a number of sumps in order to refine earlier estimates of impacted soil requiring remediation on Areas 2, 3, 4, 5A, and 5B that previously ranged as high as 250,000 cubic yards. Six sumps were identified on Area 3 and three on Area 4. The Area 3 being evaluated consisted of a portion (approximately three acres) of the northern half of what is currently identified as MC&C III. The locations of the sumps are depicted in report figures. The results of the investigation by McLaren were that the estimated quantities of impacted soil in the smaller Area 3 and Area 4 (with a contingency adjustment of 25%), was calculated by McClaren to be 20,000 cubic yards and 18,000 cubic yards, respectively. Only that portion of this report pertaining to Area 4 was among those documents provided to ATC by the User. A copy of the relevant portions pertaining to both property parcels is included in Appendix J.

The second report, entitled *Soil Remediation Closure Report for Area 3, Santa Fe Springs Associates II, MC&C Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California*, was prepared by McLaren (by this time known as McLaren Hart) and dated July 9, 1991. This report was among those provided by the User and is summarized in Section 5.3.9. The report documents the remediation of the sumps from the reduced Area 3 for those soils having total petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations exceeding a target clean-up level of 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). The actual quantities of soil excavated from four of the six sumps totaled 2,492 cubic yards, or significantly less than previous estimates. Given that at least two of the sumps were not remediated because of subsurface utilities as well as the fact that the report did not address other areas of the property such as the south half of MC&C III and MC&C IV, unremediated sumps are likely to be present on-site. Accordingly, the potential for petroleum impacts from unremediated sumps is considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)

The SCAQMD organizes their files by address. As neither of the property parcels has an assigned address, ATC did not contact the SCAQMD.

Department of Planning and Zoning

According to a zoning map posted to the City of Santa Fe Springs website, http://www.santafesprings.org, the property is zoned M2 for heavy manufacturing uses.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR)

The property is located within the Santa Fe Springs Oil field. ATC reviewed the DOGGR wellfinder website, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/Pages/WellFinder.aspx. According to the website, property parcel MC&C III has a total of 36 oil wells, seven of which are production wells and two are water injection wells. The remainder of the wells on-site are buried. Three of these are idle and 24 are abandoned. Property parcel MC&C IV has a total of 16 oil wells, 11 of which are production wells and one water injection well. The remaining four buried wells are abandoned. The approximate locations of the wells, color-coded to reflect their status, have been plotted on the Site Plan in Appendix B.

5.2 Physical Setting Sources

5.2.1 Topography

According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Map of the Whittier, California Quadrangle, the average elevation of MC&C III is approximately 152 feet above mean sea level. The average elevation of MC&C IV is approximately 158 feet above mean sea level. The area has a slope to the southwest. A copy of the topographic map is included in Appendix A.

5.2.2 Geology

The property is situated on approximately 1,200 feet of older alluvium and marine sediments of the Pleistocene-age Lakewood and San Pedro Formations and Pliocene-age upper Pico Formation. These sediments overlie several thousand feet of Tertiary-aged consolidated sedimentary rocks which, in turn, rest
PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

on a probable basement complex of low-grade meta-igneous rocks of probable Cretaceous age (California Department of Water Resources, 1961; USGS, 1965).

5.2.3 Soils

According to information reviewed on the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Websoil Survey website, http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm, the soils of the property and surrounding area most likely belong to the Urban Land-Thums-Pierview complex, soil type. Soils of the Thums series are over 80 inches deep, are well-drained and are composed generally of clay loam surface layers approximately 23 inches thick over a clay subsoil. The available water-holding capacity is approximately 9.7 inches thick.

Pierview series soils are over 80 inches deep, are well-drained and are composed generally of silty loam surface layers underlain by alternating layers of clay loam and loam. The available water-holding capacity is approximately 10.3 inches thick.

Urban land consists of closely built-up areas in cities. Buildings, streets, and sidewalks cover almost all of the surface. The soil has been so altered by urban works that identification is not feasible. Reported in the area along with the other two subtypes, the Urban Land subtype is more aptly applied to the developed portions of the adjoining parcels.

5.2.4 Hydrology

According to a 2013 Site Characterization report for the north-adjacent site at 10051 Romandel Avenue posted to the DTSC EnviroStor website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public, the depth to groundwater in a monitoring well (MW-20) located adjacent to the north of MC&C IV was 73.67 feet above the top of the well casing in June of 2010. More recent data for this well was not available; however, the depth to groundwater at Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) well Number 1645H, located approximately 0.6 mile northeast of MC&C IV was 83.0 feet below the top of the casing in October of 2017. The direction of groundwater flow beneath the property parcels reportedly varies from southwest to west-southwest.

Estimated groundwater levels and/or flow direction(s) may vary due to seasonal fluctuations in precipitation, local usage demands, geology, underground structures, or dewatering operations.

5.2.5 Other Physical Setting Sources

Flood Plain Map

According to information provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) website, https://msc.fema.gov/portal, the property is located in flood zone X, or areas outside of 500-year flood risk. The community/panel numbers for the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the property parcels are 06037C 1829F and 06037C 1835F. The effective date for both maps is is September 26, 2008. A copy of the joined flood plain map is included in Appendix L.

Wetlands Map

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Wetlands Mapper website, http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html, no wetlands are present on, or adjacent to, the property. A copy of the National Wetlands Inventory map is included in Appendix L.

Methane

As stated previously, the property is located within the Santa Fe Springs Oil Field. According to a methane zone map produced by the City of Santa Fe Springs, the property parcels are located within the designated methane zone. Development of the property parcels will therefore require methane mitigation measures to be employed, most likely in accordance with city guidelines. A copy of the methane zone map is included in Appendix L. Methane is outside of the scope of ASTM and is therefore not considered to represent a

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

recognized environmental condition; however it is considered to represent a vapor encroachment condition, as discussed in Section 7.0.

5.3 Historical Records Sources

The table presented below summarizes the findings of the research pertaining to historical property and surrounding area uses. The earliest historical sources (topographic maps) depict the property parcels as undeveloped, which may reflect either vacant land or agricultural use. Following the first discovery of oil in what became the Santa Fe Springs Oil Field circa 1919, the area was rapidly developed with oil wells. It is not known when the first oil wells were drilled on the property parcels, but a 1923 topographic map depicts oil wells on both MC&C III and MC&C IV. Aerial photographs indicate oil production remained the use of the property parcels until the present.

Data gaps in intervals of greater than five years were encountered during the research of historical use information for the property and surrounding area. However, based on the review of reasonably ascertainable historical sources, these intervals did not have an impact on the determinations of *recognized environmental conditions* for this assessment and are therefore not *significant* data gaps.

	HISTORICAL USE SUMMARY								
Period	Property Historical Uses	Surrounding Area Historical Uses	Source(s)	Intervals/Comments					
Prior to 1940	Vacant Industrial	Vacant Agricultural Industrial	Aerial Photographs Topographic Maps	Am 1896 topographic map is the earliest record identified. Data gaps of 20 years (1903-1922) and nine years (1929-1937). Use change from vacant or agricultural to industrial across the first data gap. No use changes from industrial (i.e., oil production) across the second data gap.					
1940 - 1960	Industrial	Vacant Agricultural Industrial	Aerial Photographs Topographic Maps	One nine-year data gap (1954-1962). No use changes from industrial across the data gap.					
1961 - 1980	Industrial	Vacant Industrial	Aerial Photographs Topographic Maps	Data gaps of six years (1966-1971) and eight years (1973-1980). No use changes from industrial across either data gap.					
1981 - 2000	Industrial	Vacant Industrial	Aerial Photographs Topographic Map Prior Reports	One data gap of six years (1982-1987). No use changes across the data gap.					
2001 - present	Industrial	Vacant Industrial Residential	Aerial Photographs Topographic Map Prior Reports	No data gaps.					

5.3.1 Aerial Photographs

ATC reviewed available aerial photographs of the property and surrounding areas provided by EDR. Available aerial photographs ranged from 1928 to 2014. The following are descriptions and interpretations from the aerial photograph review.

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SUMMARY								
Year	Scale	Property Comments	Surrounding Area Comments					
1928	1"=500'	Several small buildings or sheds are located along the northern property line and on the southern half of MC&C III. Several oil derricks, three sumps, and a row of ASTs are also discernible. A row of small buildings or sheds is present along the eastern property line of MC&C IV. Several oil derricks and one sump are also present on MC&C IV.	The adjacent parcels on all sides of MC&C III appear similar to the property in that all have visible oil derricks, a few small structures, ASTs and sumps. Adjacent to the north and east of MC&C IV is vacant land with a few widely-spaced oil wells. Adjacent to the west is a vacant strip, beyond which are a railroad right-of-way and an oil property. Adjacent to the south, beyond Telegraph Road, is a large oil property with a small building directly across Telegraph Road from the property.					
1938, 1947, and 1953	1"=500'	Small buildings or sheds and three ASTs are present in a rectangular area at the northwestern corner of MC&C III. No buildings are present on the southern half of MC&C III and only one sump is located on the property, near the northeastern corner. MC&C IV appears as it did in the 1928 photograph.	Adjacent to the west of MC&C IV is a strip of land which appears to be filled with equipment and ASTs. The remaining adjacent parcels to MC&C III and IV are developed with numerous oil wells and a few scattered buildings and sumps.					
1963 and 1972	1"=500'	Both property parcels appear to be characterized primarily by oil wells. Most of the buildings have been removed from both parcels and one small cluster of ASTs is present near the northwest corner of MC&C III. No sumps are visible on either parcel.	Apart from the strip of land adjoining MC&C IV to the west that is developed with numerous ASTs, the adjacent parcels on all sides of MC&C III and IV are oil properties primarily developed only with oil wells.					
1989, 1994, and 2002	1"=500'	Both property parcels are largely open space, developed with oil wells and minimal equipment. No buildings or sumps are visible.	The adjacent parcels on all sides of MC&C III are oil properties that appear very similar to to the property. Adjacent to the north of MC&C IV is a vacant parcel that appears to have two parking lots on it, and, beyond Romandel Avenue, the current industrial buildings. Adjacent to the east is vacant land. Adjacent to the south, beyond Telegraph Road, is an oil property. Adjacent to the west in the 1989 aerial photograph are numerous ASTs; however, by 1994, the ASTs have been removed and the west-adjacent strip is vacant land.					
2005 and 2010	1"=500'	Both property parcels appear essentially as they do currently.	The adjacent parcels to the north and south of MC&C III appear essentially as they do currently. The east-adjacent parcel, beyond the railroad tracks, is a large oil property. Adjacent to the west is vacant land in the 2005 photograph and under construction with the current residential tract in the 2010 photograph.					
2014	1"=500'	Both property parcels appear essentially	The adjacent parcels on all sides appear essentially as they do currently					

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

The potential for subsurface petroleum impacts from oil or chemical spills and drilling sumps is considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*. Copies of the aerial photographs are included in Appendix F.

5.3.2 Fire Insurance Maps

ATC requested copies of historical Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps) depicting the property and surrounding area from EDR. According to EDR, Sanborn Map coverage of the property is not available. A copy of EDR's "unmapped property" letter is included in Appendix G.

5.3.3 Property Tax Files

Because the property parcels are owned by the city, they are exempt from property taxes. No current or former ownership information was on file with the Los Angeles County Assessor's office.

5.3.4 Recorded Land Title Records

The acquisition of recorded land title records was not required by the scope of work for the Phase I ESA.

5.3.5 Historical USGS Topographic Maps

ATC reviewed available historical USGS Topographic Quadrangles for information regarding past uses of the property. Topographic maps were reviewed for the years 1896, 1899, 1902, 1923, 1925, 1942, 1943, 1947, 1949, 1951, 1965, 1972, 1981, 2012. ATC's findings by year are as follows:

	TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS SUMMARY						
Date(s)	Quad	Property Comments	Surrounding Area Comments				
1896, 1899, and 1902	Downey 15'	MC&C III is developed with a single building located near the northwestern corner. MC&C IV is shown as undeveloped.	One building is located on the parcel to the north of MC&C III. The remaining parcels adjacent to MC&C III and IV are shown as undeveloped				
1923, 1925, 1942, 1943, 1947, 1949 and 1951	Whittier 7.5 ' and Downey 15'	Both property parcels are shown with oil wells but no other structures.	The adjoining parcels on all sides of MC&C III and IV are are shown with oil wells but no other structures.				
1965, 1972, and 1981	Whittier 7.5'	Apart from a single small building located at the northwest corner of MC&C III, no features other than oil wells are shown on either property parcel.	ASTs are shown on the strip of land that adjoins MC&C IV to the west. Oil wells are shown on all adjacent properties in each year except the west-adjacent parcel of MC&C III, which is depicted as undeveloped on the 1981 map, except for internal streets.				
2012	Whittier 7.5'	The 2012 edition depicts streets but typically does not show buildings or other land uses. Accordingly, no development is shown on the property parcels.	Apart from streets, no developments are indicated on the surrounding area.				

Apart from oil production uses, the review of historical USGS Topographic Quadrangles did not identify specific past uses indicating *recognized environmental conditions* at the property or the surrounding area. Copies of topographic maps are included in Appendix G.

5.3.6 City Directories

ATC reviewed historical city directory information for the property and surrounding area provided by EDR. EDR searched historical city directories and identified listings for nearby properties for the years 2006, 2010, and 2014. Their findings are as follows:

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

	CITY DIRECTORY SUMMARY							
Year	Property Comments	Surrounding Area Comments						
2006	Telegraph Road: Property not listed; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed; Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.	Telegraph Road: 12764-Artimex; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed; Cisneros Lane: Street not listed; Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.						
2010	Telegraph Road: Property not listed; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed;Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.	Telegraph Road: 12803-Tire Exchange; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed; Cisneros Lane: 12658-Chandra-Tara Capital Inc., Symbex Properties Anaheim, Runnerless Knits Inc., Coated Fabrics Co., Crystalform Inc., Global Shoulder Pad Mfg., Coast Pad & Trim Corp; Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.						
2014	Telegraph Road: Property not listed; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed;Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.	Telegraph Road: 12803-Tire Exchange; Bloomfield Avenue: Street not listed; Cisneros Lane: 12658-Chandra-Tara Capital Inc., Symbex Properties Anaheim, Runnerless Knits Inc., Coated Fabrics Co., Coast Pad & Trim Corp., Texlon Corp., Thermech Corporation; Romandel Avenue: Street not listed.						

The review of historical city directories did not reveal *recognized environmental conditions* at the property or surrounding area.

5.3.7 Building Department Records

As neither property parcel has an assigned address, ATC did not attempt to review historical building permits at the City of Santa Fe Springs Building Department.

5.3.8 Zoning/Land Use Records

Historical zoning information for the property was not readily ascertainable; however, as per historical sources, the property has been used for oil production since the early 1920s, the property parcels have presumably been zoned for industrial uses since at least that time.

5.3.9 Prior Reports

ATC was provided with numerous prior environmental reports and documents by the User. A general summary of the reports is as follows:

Ebasco Services Incorporated, Final Phase I Site Assessment, Santa Fe Energy, Mobil Oil Field Properties, Florence Avenue at Shoemaker, Santa Fe Springs, California, August 1988.

The report summarizes a study that focused on six areas of concern (Area 2, 3, 4, 5 and Mobil Oil Production Battery Area). Area 3 corresponded to a portion of the north half of what is currently MC&C III and Area 4 corresponded to the current MC&C IV. Historical aerials were reviewed, and subsurface trenching and soil sampling was conducted in areas historically utilized as oil production pits. Soil sampling results indicated that total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) was present at concentrations above 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). Four soil gas vapor wells were placed in Areas 3, 4, and 5. High levels of VOCs were detected in well #1 (720 parts per million [ppm] - Area 4).

Ebasco Services Incorporated, Phase II Site Assessment Final Report, Santa Fe Energy, Mobil Oil Field Properties, Florence Avenue at Shoemaker, Santa Fe Springs, California, November 1988.

The report summarizes a study that focused on four areas of concern (Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5). Upwards of 35 sumps were identified from the inspection of historical aerial photographs. Phase II activities investigated 18

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

of the sumps. During delineation of known petroleum-hydrocarbon impacted areas, a worst-case total volume of 83,700 cubic yards (CY) of impacted soil was estimated based on 13 areas where field observations had achieved delineation of clean soil, and greater than 22,800 CY of in-place impacted soil was estimated based on the not fully delineated areas.

The report also describes the installation of 20 dual-depth subsurface gas wells across the site, and the location of three abandoned oil wells (Area 5). An asbestos survey of the Santa Fe Energy office buildings (at the northwest corner of Shoemaker and Florence) was conducted.

McGranahan Carlson & Co. (MC&C) Memorandum, Undated.

The memo summarizes a dispute stemming over Ebasco's failure to properly estimate an accurate volume of contamination in soil at the site (i.e., all of the areas under investigation). The inaccurate initial volume was estimated to be less than 70,000 CY; however, Ebasco did not review a 1928 aerial photo that included several additional sump locations and greater quantities of impacted soil. As a result of the 1928 aerial photograph review, a new estimate of approximately 250,000 CY of impacted soil at the site was determined.

McLaren, Revised Proposal for Soil Remediation at the MC&C Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California, June 16, 1989.

The revised proposal follows the Ebasco Services Incorporated Phase II work and outlined remediation of soils greater than 1,000 mg/kg of TPH at the site. The proposal was based on the calculation of approximately 60,000 CY of impacted soil across 100 acres of the site needing treatment.

McLaren, Laboratory Analysis Results of Water Samples, June 1, 1990.

The letter includes laboratory results of the three monitoring wells (MW-1 through MW-3). Included in the analytes that were detected above laboratory detection limits were 1,1-dichloroethene, cis-1,2-dichloroethene, trans-1,2-dichloroethene, trichloroethene, benzene, toluene, naphthalene, 2-methylenaphthalene, and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate. None of these wells was located on the current property parcels.

McLaren, Discharge of Chemicals From Sewer Line in Area 5B, June 14, 1990.

The letter describes a release of approximately 200 gallons of standing liquid from an abandoned sewer pipe that was suspected to be associated with cresylic acid, one of the products manufactured at PMC Specialties, a nearby property. The sewer line was found to be originating from the PMC facility. A letter to the RWQCB on April 19, 1991 indicated that the impacted soil associated with this release had been confirmed to have been removed from the site.

McLaren Hart, Results of the Vapor Study Work Completed at the MC&C Commerce Center II, Phase II Site. Santa Fe Springs, California, April 26, 1991.

The letter includes laboratory results of a soil gas survey at Area 5A (non-adjacent and south-southeast of MC&C III). Soil gas samples were collected from 21 locations, placed on approximately 200-foot centers across the site, at a depth of three feet bgs. Soil gas samples were not collected from SV-10 due to shoring activities nearby. VOCs were detected in concentrations above laboratory detection limits in 11 of the soil gas sampling locations and methane was detected in concentrations above laboratory detection limits in eight of the soil gas sampling locations. The greatest concentrations were observed in the northwest corner of the site, at SV-1 and SV-3. The highest level of methane detected in subsurface soils (3,500 ppm), was well below the lower explosive limit (LEL) of methane at 50,000 ppm.

McLaren Hart, Soil Remediation Closure Report for Area 3, Santa Fe Springs Associates II, MC&C Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California, July 9, 1991.

The report summarizes the excavation and cleanup activities of Area 3 (a portion of MC&C III, consisting of three acres of land southeast of the intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road). Remediation included the cleanup of soil containing TPH concentrations greater than 1,000 ppm (or mg/kg), at the

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

direction of the RWQCB. Approximately 8,330 CY of soil were estimated to exceed 1,000 mg/kg of TPH in this area. In actuality, 2,492 CY of soil were excavated as a part of the remedial effort in Area 3. Six sump locations (Sump A - Sump F) were evaluated for soil excavation. In total, Sump A and Sump B had no soil excavated. Sump B had utility conflicts preventing any soil from being excavated and Sumps C, D, E, and F had 280 CY, 364 CY, 1,176 CY, and 672 CY of soil excavated, respectively.

McLaren Hart, Santa Fe Springs Oil Field Reclamation Project Environmental Status Report, January 20, 1993.

The report provided a summary of the environmental status of the Oil Field Reclamation Project and provided information on the known environmental reports on the area and outlined a plan for investigation and cleanup.

McLaren Hart, Results of Groundwater Characterization, Oil Field Reclamation Project Study Area (OFRP), Santa Fe Springs, California, July 31, 1996.

The report summarizes the characterization of groundwater at the site as a joint effort by the Community Development Commission of the City of Santa Fe Springs and Mobil Oil Corporation. The report aimed to identify the sources and major occurrences of chemicals in the groundwater at the site, and to characterize physical characteristics of the water bearing zone underneath the site. In summary, the report found that among six areas defined (Areas A through E), TPH was primarily found in Area C groundwater. The contamination consisted primarily of gasoline and diesel range hydrocarbons. MC&C III and MC&C IV are Areas D and E, respectively, of the study. At its nearest, Area C is approximately 300 feet west (and cross-gradient of) MC&C IV and approximately 450 feet north of MC&C III. VOCs were detected site-wide, and benzene, trichloroethylene (TCE), and tetrachloroethylene (PCE) were the most prevalent in groundwater. Elevated benzene was noted in groundwater in Areas B, C, and the southern portion of Area F. TCE and PCE plumes were observed in the western half of Areas A and B. Areas A, B, and the southern portion of F are cross-gradient and distant from MC&C III and MC&C IV.

McLaren Hart, Limited Soil Investigation In Area C of OFRP, Santa Fe Springs, California, November 19, 1996.

The report summarizes soil data obtained for vertical distribution of petroleum hydrocarbons in Area C, in order to further determine if former oil field activities contributed to the analytes detected in groundwater beneath and downgradient of Area C. The report findings indicated that additional information beyond the investigation's scope was needed to provide a conclusion on the data retrieved during the study.

McLaren Hart, Summary of File Review and Additional Groundwater Sampling in Area F of the Oil Field Reclamation Project Study Area, Santa Fe Springs. August 7, 1997.

The report summarizes an additional groundwater investigation conducted in Area F to address the source of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes (BTEX), and whether the source of BTEX noted in Area F was originating offsite, or onsite from former USTs. Two 1,500 gallon steel USTs, utilized for gasoline storage, were removed from Area F in 1985. The USTs were previously used by Mobil Oil for fueling company vehicles used in the oil field. A second-generation UST was also installed in 1985 and subsequently removed from this area in 1994. Impacted soil was limited to the dispenser area, which was excavated and removed from the site. Based on the findings of the investigation, McLaren Hart concluded that the impacted groundwater observed in Area F was from an off-site source.

McLaren Hart, Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report (June 1997), Oil Field Reclamation Project, Santa Fe Springs, California, August 7, 1997.

The report summarizes groundwater monitoring activities at seven groundwater monitoring well locations (MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-10, MW-12, MW-14, and MW-17). None of the monitoring wells are on-site; however, MW-12 is located across Bloomfield Avenue from MC&C III. Light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) was detected for the first time since sampling began (1994) in MW-10 during this groundwater monitoring event. Benzene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, dichloroethane (1,1-DCA), dichloroethene (1,1-DCE and cis-1,2-DCE), PCE, and TCE were detected above their respective maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) during this groundwater monitoring event.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

McLaren Hart, Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report Spring 1998, Oil Field Reclamation Project, Santa Fe Springs, California, October 6, 1998.

The report summarizes groundwater monitoring activities at seven groundwater monitoring well locations (MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-10, MW-12, MW-14, and MW-17). LNAPL was detected with a thickness of 0.46 feet in MW-10. Benzene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, 1,1-DCA, 1,1-DCE, cis-1,2-DCE, PCE, and TCE were detected above their respective MCLs during this groundwater monitoring event.

Environ, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, August 19, 2002.

This Phase I ESA report was prepared in connection with MC&C's planned development of MC&C III. Environ identified two *recognized environmental conditions* for this portion of the property. However, four items were bulleted under this statement in Environ's report, without identifying which ones (or combinations thereof) were identified as the *recognized environmental conditions*. The four bulleted items were as follows:

- The property and surrounding area were historically (and currently) used for oil production activities production wells, sumps, tank farms and associated piping were all a part of these operations.
 Associated with those activities also is the presence of oil field wastes, including petroleum
 hydrocarbons, drilling fluids, additives, and methane. Previous soil investigations have shown TPH
 impact greater than 1,000 mg/kg.
- Brown soil staining was observed near the eastern edge of the property. A vault and sets of pipes
 running parallel to Bloomfield Avenue and a valve were present. Significant staining was observed on
 the vault floor.
- · Minor staining was observed on exterior of several electrical transformers.
- Previous documents (McLaren's 1996 OFRP groundwater characterization was cited) indicated that a groundwater well near the southwestern corner of the property was impacted by TPH, benzene, PCE, TCE, arsenic, and other compounds (Area D of the OFRP report).

Environ, Phase II Site Investigation Report, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, April 24, 2003.

The report summarizes the management and oversight of trenching activities; collection of samples from excavations; collection of surface samples in the area of soil staining observed near transformers during the Phase I ESA; collection of surface soil samples at two former ASTs; measuring methane concentrations in two existing vapor monitoring wells; and advancing 12 additional soil borings on the property (MC&C III).

- Excavations: Trenching was conducted January 17 through February 3, 2003 nine trenches were
 excavated in the areas of former tank farms and sumps. Ninety soil samples were collected from the
 trenches. Three areas identified near Former Tank Farm A, Former Tank Farm B, and an area
 adjacent to the vault required additional trenching and soil sampling.
- Soil Borings: Twelve soil borings were advanced on the property to a depth of approximately 30 feet bgs near the Former Tank Farm A and Former Tank Farm B. Maximum detected concentrations in these areas included 380 mg/kg of TPH as gasoline (TPH-g), 6,500 mg/kg of TPH as diesel (TPH-d), and 1,900 of TPH as oil (TPH-o).
- Sump Investigations: Sumps A, B, Q/R, S, and T were included in the soil investigation. Maximum
 detected concentrations in these areas included 820 mg/kg TPH-g, 2,900 TPH-d, and 1,800 mg/kg
 TPH-o.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

Environ, Soil Management Plan, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, May 16, 2003.

The plan summarizes the procedures for addressing the known and potential environmental conditions during grading and development of the property.

PIC Environmental Services, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Parcels 8011-002-901 to 903 & 8011-003-955 [to 979], Santa Fe Springs California, dated June 12, 2003.

This Phase I ESA report was prepared for FeLyBy Associates, LLC of Newport Beach, California and pertains only to MC&C IV. Although no specific *recognized environmental conditions* are called out in the report, the following recommendations were made by PIC Environmental Services in the Executive Summary:

- Collection and analyzing soil samples from areas of known oil productions and features such as ASTs and sumps that were identified in the Phase I ESA
- Evaluation of the status of all oil production and water injection wells.

Environ, Revised Soil Management Plan, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, California, January 6, 2005.

The revised plan further addresses SFSFD comments to the initial soil management plan (SMP) and summarizes the procedures for addressing the known and potential environmental conditions during grading and development of the property. A second revised edition of the SMP was submitted to the SFSFD on April 22, 2005, addressing a second round of comments and edits. A conditional approval letter was sent to Environ from the SFSFD on May 16, 2005. A copy of the Final Soil Management Plan for MC&C III and the SFSFD conditional approval is included in Appendix D.

Environ, LARWQCB Case Review Form Package, OFRP Area "D" (SEC of Telegraph Road and Bloomfield Ave., Santa Fe Springs, CA, May 5, 2005

On behalf of MC&C and the City of Santa Fe Springs CDC, Environ prepared this document for submittal to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Because the SFSFD-CUPA determined that this site was not a threat to groundwater and that they would be the lead agency for closure, the package was not submitted to LARWQCB. According to the City of Santa Fe Springs Remediation Section Case Review Form, which was included with the package, the staff recommended closure of soil and groundwater issues at the property. A recommended action was provided that stated "If soil remediation becomes necessary to facilitate redevelopment, remediate property in accordance with a Soils Management Plan approved by the City of Santa Fe Springs CUPA." A copy of the Case Review Form Package is included in Appendix D.

ATC makes no warranty, guaranty or certification regarding the quality, accuracy or reliability of any prior report provided to ATC and discussed in this Phase I ESA report. ATC expressly disclaims any and all liability for any errors or omissions contained in any prior reports provided to ATC and discussed in this Phase I ESA report.

5.3.10 Other Historical Sources

No other historical sources were reviewed.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

6.0 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

The following is a summary of visual and/or physical observations of the property on the day of the site visit. Photographs can be found in Appendix C.

6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions

ATC conducted the site reconnaissance on May 8, 2018. ATC was accompanied during the site reconnaissance by Mr. Carlos Torres, an operations and maintenance employee with BreitBurn Energy. Mr. Torres has been familiar with the property for approximately 12 years. The site reconnaissance consisted of visual and/or physical observations of: the property and improvements; adjoining sites as viewed from the property; and, the surrounding area based on visual observations made during the trip to and from the property. Unimproved portions of the property were observed along the perimeter and in a general grid pattern in safely accessible areas. There were no access restrictions encountered at the property. The weather during the site reconnaissance was sunny and mild. There were no visibility restrictions due to weather conditions.

6.2 Hazardous Substance Use, Storage, and Disposal

ATC reviewed the property for hazardous materials storage and use, as well as indications that such materials may have been spilled or dumped. Chemical use and storage at the property was observed as follows:

The property parcels are developed with oil wells, several of which have pumping units. In addition to the wells, there were various types of associated infrastructure such as transformers, control panels, aboveground pipelines, gathering points for pumped oil called headers, and subsurface enclosures (either round or rectangular) containing piping and flow valves.

Pumping units and much of the associated equipment was contained within chain-link fencing. In a number of these fenced enclosures were small polyethylene ASTs ranging in estimated size from 60 to 240 gallons. Most of the ASTs were labeled as containing a corrosion inhibitor while one (observed on the southern portion of MC&C III) contained a hydrogen sulfide scavenger. All of the ASTs, except for one that was empty, were within secondary containment. No associated staining was observed near the ASTs.

Localized oil staining was observed near at least one well. The small amount of oil staining is considered to represent a *de minimis condition*.

An accumulation of debris, principally lumber, PCV piping, metal framing, and a telephone pole, was located along the eastern side of MC&C III. No staining or chemical product containers were observed among this debris.

Chemical use and storage observed on-site in connection with oil production is not considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*.

6.3 Underground Storage Tanks

ATC did not observe visual evidence of current or former USTs associated with either of the property parcels.

6.4 Aboveground Storage Tanks

As previously indicated in Section 6.2, small ASTs containing corrosion inhibitors and other chemicals were observed within secondary containment at the property. At least two clusters of ASTs were observed on the northern half of the northwestern quarter of MC&C III on historical aerial photographs. Ranging between 1938 and 1972. These ASTs were most likely used for the storage of crude oil. It is possible that other ASTs not discernible in the historical aerial photographs were formerly located on either or both of the property parcels.

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

One large BreitBurn waste water AST is located immediately off-site to the west of the southern end of MC&C IV. This AST is not considered to represent a concern to the property.

6.5 Other Petroleum Products

Apart from the chemical items discussed in Section 6.2, ATC did not observe the use, storage or disposal of other petroleum products at the property.

6.6 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

A number of pad-mounted transformers and a transformer vault were observed on MC&C IV. The pad-mounted transformers were located throughout the lease area and within an inner fence line that separates the access road from the main production area. The transformer vault was located outside of the inner fence line along the access road. According to Mr. Torres, the pad mounted transformers within the inner fence line are owned by BreitBurn Energy while any outside the same fence (i.e., the transformer vault) are owned by SCE. Mr. Torres estimated that some of the transformers owned by BreitBurn Energy are fairly new, although he could not attest to the age of all. Given the uncertainties regarding any of the utility or BreitBurn Energy transformers, it is possible that the transformers contain PCBs. ATC did not observe evidence of damage or leaks associated with any of the transformers. BreitBurn Energy and SCE would be responsible for the clean-up of any PCB impacts associated with their transformers.

One pole-mounted transformer assumed to belong to SCE was observed on the MC&C III property along with several pad-type transformers, one of which was mounted on a small flatbed trailer, which are assumed to be owned by BreitBurn Energy. Additionally, an SCE transformer vault is located in a planter alongside the sidewalk bordering Bloomfield Avenue. No indications of leaks or damage were observed near any of the visible transformers.

6.7 Unidentified Substance Containers

ATC did not observe the presence of unidentified substance containers on the property.

6.8 Nonhazardous Solid Waste

No dumpsters were observed at either property parcel. It is assumed that any non-hazardous solid waste generated is transported manually off-site to the main field office area of BreitBurn Energy at 12720 Telegraph Road.

6.9 Wastewater

Apart from stormwater runoff, ATC did not observe evidence of aqueous waste streams at the property parcels.

6.10 Waste Pits, Ponds and Lagoons

ATC did not observe evidence of waste pits, ponds or lagoons on the property parcels.

6.11 Drains and Sumps

No surface drains or sumps were observed on-site. Oil sumps were formerly located on the property parcels. Some of these were reportedly remediated by excavation and off-site treatment of the soils by bio-remediation, but from a review of the prior reports made available to ATC (see Section 5.3.9) it does not appear that all former oil sumps were remediated. Closure letters referencing the property sumps were not identified.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

6.12 Septic Systems

ATC did not observe evidence of a septic system on the property parcels.

6.13 Stormwater Management System

As most of the property is unpaved, stormwater would be expected to percolate directly to the on-site soils.

6.14 Wells

As discussed in Section 5.1.3, the property is located within the Santa Fe Springs Oil field. ATC reviewed the DOGGER wellfinder website, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/Pages/WellFinder.aspx. According to the website, property parcel MC&C III has a total of 36 oil wells, seven of which are production wells and two are water injection wells. The remainder of the wells on-site are buried. Three of these are idle and 24 are abandoned. Property parcel MC&C IV has a total of 16 oil wells, 11 of which are production wells and one water injection well. The remaining four buried wells are abandoned. The approximate locations of the wells, color-coded to reflect their status, have been plotted on the Site Plan in Appendix B.

Although not observed during the site reconnaissance, one groundwater monitoring well (MW-11) is shown on prior reports as located in the southwestern corner of MC&C III.

The various wells are not, in and of themselves, considered to represent a *recognized environmental condition*. However, re-abandonment and venting of the plugged oil wells to current regulatory standards may be required prior to development of the property.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

7.0 SUBSURFACE VAPOR MIGRATION

ATC conducted a limited screening for potential vapor encroachment conditions (VECs) that may affect the property. The VEC screening focused on the current and historical usage of the property and also utilized the aforementioned regulatory agency database report provided by EDR to evaluate identified Chemicals of Concern (COCs), including petroleum hydrocarbons. To identify the area of concern (AOC) for contaminated sites with non-petroleum hydrocarbon COCs, ATC utilized the approximate minimum search distance defined by ASTM E 2600-10 of 1,760 feet (1/3 mile) from the property boundary for COC-contaminated sites. For sites contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbon COCs, ATC utilized the AOC approximate minimum search distance of 528 feet (1/10 mile). The AOC was adjusted accordingly based on review of physical setting characteristics, known release information, property and land features, groundwater flow direction, and soil type, et al.

ASTM's Vapor Encroachment guidance indicates that when groundwater flow direction can be estimated or determined, the cross-gradient or downgradient radius distances can be significantly reduced. Reduced AOC distances may be calculated when considering groundwater flow direction by utilizing the following default distances, which were determined using the Buonicore Methodology: (non-petroleum hydrocarbon COCs) 1,760 feet in the upgradient direction; 365 feet in the cross-gradient direction; and 100 feet in the downgradient direction and (petroleum hydrocarbon COCs) 528 feet in the upgradient direction; 165 feet in the cross-gradient direction; is suspected; 95 feet in the cross-gradient direction if Light, Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid, (LNAPL i.e. floating product) is suspected; 95 feet in the cross-gradient direction if no LNAPL is suspected; 100 feet in the downgradient direction (LNAPL suspected); and 30 feet in the downgradient position (LNAPL not suspected).

The screening was further refined by evaluating the Critical Distance (CD) factor. The CD is the upper distance a vapor may migrate through soil in the vadose zone assuming the path of least resistance is directly from the closest boundary of the contaminated media (i.e. groundwater or soil) to the nearest property boundary. For non-petroleum hydrocarbon COCs, the CD is 100 feet. For LNAPL petroleum hydrocarbon COCs, the CD is also 100 feet. For dissolved petroleum hydrocarbon COCs, the CD is 30 feet.

ATC reviewed potential sources of COCs from the facilities reported on the EDR database report. The following VECs were identified:

- Groundwater impacts with low to moderate concentrations of chlorinated and aromatic VOCs have been reported in nearby monitoring wells in the 1990s Oil Field Reclamation Project Study. These impacts were projected at that time to extend beneath the property parcels.
- A 2007 soil vapor survey on the north-adjacent Productol site suggests that there may be a potential for vapor encroachment, primarily of benzene and naphthalene, on the northwestern portion of MC&C IV.
- The property parcels are located in a designated methane zone (refer to the City of Santa Fe Springs methane map in Appendix L). Numerous active and abandoned oil wells are present at each property parcel.

Based on the above, the VECs identified for the property are considered to be a *recognized environmental condition*.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

8.0 INTERVIEWS

The persons identified in the table below were interviewed to obtain information regarding *recognized environmental conditions* in connection with the property. Pertinent information from the interviews is discussed in applicable sections of this report with details documented (including failed attempts to interview) on Record of Communication forms in Appendix J.

	INTERVIEW SUMMARY							
Role	Name	Title/Company	Years Assoc. With Property	Interview Type				
Site Escort	Mr. Carlos Torres	Operations and Maintenance Crew / BreitBurn Energy Partners LLC	Approximately 12	In Person				

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

9.0 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

9.1 Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM)

ATC conducted a non-comprehensive visual review of suspect ACMs at the property. As there are no structures on either property parcel, suspect ACMs were not observed at the property.

9.2 Radon

Radon is a naturally occurring colorless, odorless gas that is a by-product of the decay of radioactive materials potentially present in bedrock and soil. The EPA guidance action level for annual residential exposure to radon is 4.0 picoCuries per liter of air (pCi/L). The guidance action level is not a regulatory requirement for private owners of commercial real estate, but is commonly used for comparison purposes to suggest whether further action at a building may be prudent.

ATC's review of published radon data indicates that the property is located in a county designated by the EPA as Zone 2. Zone 2 areas have a predicted radon concentration of greater than or equal to 2.0 pCi/L and less than or equal to 4.0 pCi/L. According to statistical data provided by EDR, an EPA survey of 63 sites in Los Angeles County revealed two percent with radon concentrations in excess of 4.0 pCi/L. Additionally, a state survey of three sites located within the same zip code as the property identified none with radon concentrations in excess of 4.0 pCi/L. Based on these statistics, and the fact that there are no structures currently and the proposed buildings will be non-residential, radon is not considered to represent an environmental concern at the property and no additional investigations are recommended at this time.

9.3 Lead in Drinking Water

According to a recent City of Santa Fe Springs Water Utility Authority annual water-quality report, the potable water supplied to the property area meets all state and federal standards for drinking water, including those for lead.

9.4 Lead-Based Paint (LBP)

No painted structures were observed on the property.

9.5 Mold Screening

No structures with materials favorable to mold growth were observed on the property.

9.6 Additional User Requested Services

No additional User-requested services were included in the scope of work for this ESA.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

10.0 REFERENCES

International, ASTM Designation E 1527-13, *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*, November 2013.

ASTM International, ASTM Designation E 2418-06, *Standard Guide for Readily Observable Mold and Conditions Conducive to Mold in Commercial Buildings: Baseline Survey Process*, March 2006.

ASTM International, ASTM Designation E 2600-15, *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions*, December 2015.

BreitBurn Energy Resources LP, Mr. Carlos Torres, personal communication.

California, State of, Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, wellfinder website, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/Pages/WellFinder.aspx, records review.

California, State of, Department of Water Resources, Bulletin 104, Planned Utilization of the Ground Water Basins of the Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County, California, 1961.

California, State of, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public.

Ebasco Services Incorporated, Final Phase I Site Assessment, Santa Fe Energy, Mobil Oil Field Properties, Florence Avenue at Shoemaker, Santa Fe Springs, California, August 1988.

Ebasco Services Incorporated, Phase II Site Assessment Final Report, Santa Fe Energy, Mobil Oil Field Properties, Florence Avenue at Shoemaker, Santa Fe Springs, California, November 1988.

Environ, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, August 19, 2002.

Environ, Phase II Site Investigation Report, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, April 25, 2003.

Environ, Soil Management Plan, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, May 16, 2003.

Environ, Revised Soil Management Plan, Vacant Land Southeast of the Intersection of Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road, Fe Springs, California, January 6, 2005.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., regulatory database report, Inquiry No. 5273694.2s, April 27, 2018.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., Aerial Photograph Decade Package, April 27, 2018.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., Sanborn Map search, April 27, 2018.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., Topographic Map Report, dated April 27, 2018.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., City Directory Abstract, dated April 27, 2018.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc., Environmental Lien and AUL Search, dated April 30, 2018.

Federal Emergency Management Agency website, https://msc.fema.gov/portal.

Los Angeles, County of, Assessor, records review.

McGranahan Carlson & Co. Memorandum, undated.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

McLaren, Revised Proposal for Soil Remediation at the MC&C Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California, June 16, 1989.

McLaren, Laboratory Analysis Results of Water Samples, June 1, 1990.

McLaren, Discharge of Chemicals From Sewer Line in Area 5B, June 14, 1990.

McLaren Hart, Results of the Vapor Study Work Completed at the MC&C Commerce Center II, Phase II Site, Santa Fe Springs, California, April 26, 1991.

McLaren Hart, Soil Remediation Closure Report for Area 3, Santa Fe Springs Associates II, MC&C Commerce Center II, Santa Fe Springs, California, July 9, 1991.

McLaren Hart, Santa Fe Springs Oil Field Reclamation Project Environmental Status Report, January 20, 1993.

McLaren Hart, Results of Groundwater Characterization, Oil Field Reclamation Project Study Area (OFRP), Santa Fe Springs, California, July 31, 1996.

McLaren Hart, Limited Soil Investigation in Area C of OFRP, Santa Fe Springs, California, November 19, 1996.

McLaren Hart, Summary of File Review and Additional Groundwater Sampling in Area F of the Oil Field Reclamation Project Study Area, Santa Fe Springs, August 7, 1997.

McLaren Hart, Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report (June 1997), Oil Field Reclamation Project, Santa Fe Springs, California, August 7, 1997.

McLaren Hart, Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report Spring 1998, Oil Field Reclamation Project, Santa Fe Springs, California, October 6, 1998.

PIC Environmental Services, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Parcels 8011-002-901 & 8011-003-955, Fe Springs, California, August 19, 2002.

Regional Water Quality Control Board, GeoTracker website, http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov, records review.

Santa Fe Springs, City of, website, http://www.santafesprings.org, records review.

Santa Fe Springs, City of, Water Utility Authority, water quality report, 2016.

Security First Title Resource, Environmental Lien Search Report, Vacant Land - City of Santa Fe Springs, CA, May 2, 2018.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, website: http://www.aqmd.gov, records search.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Websoil Survey website, http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Mapper website, http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html.

United States Geological Survey, Professional Paper 420-A, Geology of the Los Angeles Basin-An Introduction, 1965.

United States Geological Survey, 7.5-Minute Series, Topographic Map, *Whittier, California*, Quadrangle, 1965, photorevised 1981

Project No. NPMS180009

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV North and South Sides of Telegraph Road and East of Bloomfield Avenue Santa Fe Springs, California

11.0 TERMINOLOGY

The following provides definitions and descriptions of certain key terms that may be used in this report. Italics indicate terms that are defined by ASTM Standard Practice E 1527-13. The Standard Practice should be referenced for further detail (such as the precise wording), related definitions or additional explanation regarding the meaning of these or other terms.

recognized environmental condition(s) (REC) - the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any 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.

material threat - a physically observable or obvious threat which is reasonably likely to lead to a release that, in the opinion of the environmental professional (EP), is threatening and might result in impact to public health or the environment. An example might include an aboveground storage tank system that contains a hazardous substance and which shows evidence of damage such that it may cause or contribute to tank integrity failure with a release of contents to the environment.

de minimis condition - is a condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of the appropriate governmental agencies. An example might include a release of *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* that could reasonably and foreseeably result in a concentration exceeding the applicable regulatory agency risk-based residential standards or substantial damage to natural resources. The risk of that exposure or damage would represent a threat to human health or the environment. If an enforcement action would be less likely than not, then the condition is considered to be generally not likely the subject of an enforcement action. A condition determined to be *de minimis* is not a *REC* or *controlled recognized environmental condition (CREC)*.

historical recognized environmental condition (HREC) - 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 (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls). Before calling the past release a *HREC*, the environmental professional (EP) must determine whether the past release is a *REC* at the time the assessment is conducted (for example, if there has been a change in the regulatory criteria). If the EP considers the past release to be a *REC* at the time the Phase I ESA is conducted, the condition will be reported in Section 1.2 the Findings and Conclusions Summary table as a *REC*.

controlled recognized environmental condition (CREC) - a recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority (for example, as evidenced by the issuance of a no further action letter or equivalent, or meeting risk-based criteria established by regulatory authority), with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitation, institutional controls, or engineering controls). Per E1527-13, a CREC will be reported in the Section 1.2 Findings and Conclusions Summary table as a CREC and a REC.

migrate/migration - refers to the movement of *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* in any form, including, for example, solid and liquid at the surface or subsurface, and vapor in the subsurface.

business environmental risk (BER) - refers to a risk which can have a material environmental or environmentally-driven impact on the business associated with the current or planned use of a parcel of commercial real estate, not necessarily limited to those environmental issues required to be investigated per the ASTM standard.

Project No. NPMS180009

APPENDIX C NOISE MEASUREMENT WORKSHEETS

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

ctual Noi	se Levels Du	ring Measure	ment	Noise Measurement Results in Leq%				
1-25	26-50	51-75	76-100	L%	1-25	26-50	51-75	76-100
62.7	73.4	71.9	72.1	L ₉₉	79.6	82.6	79.4	81.5
66.5	73.6	77.2	68.0		79.3	80.9	78.2	80.4
66.1	75.8	72.6	72.4	L ₉₀	79.3	76.3	77.2	80.2
73.2	69.6	70.0	68.2		79.3	76.0	73.6	78.8
66.4	66.8	71.4	75.6		78.9	75.8	73.5	78.5
66.4	66.9	72.1	76.0		77.7	75.2	72.6	78.5
67.2	71.0	69.5	69.7		77.6	74.5	72.6	77.9
74.2	71.5	72.5	66.8		77.6	74.2	72.5	76.9
69.9	76.0	73.6	62.1		76.9	74.0	72.1	76.0
72.1	80.9	71.9	65.2		75.3	73.6	71.9	75.6
73.1	76.3	71.7	70.2		75.3	73.4	71.9	75.4
77.6	82.6	72.6	78.8	L ₅₀	74.9	73.0	71.9	74.7
79.3	75.2	71.5	81.5		74.3	72.1	71.7	73.9
74.9	64.4	70.2	73.9		74.2	71.5	71.6	73.8
75.3	68.3	71.6	78.5		73.5	71.0	71.5	73.5
77.7	72.1	71.9	74.7		73.2	69.6	71.4	72.4
79.6	68.7	69.9	73.8		73.1	68.8	70.3	72.1
73.5	67.8	70.3	80.4		72.1	68.7	70.3	72.1
79.3	67.2	70.3	80.2		69.9	68.3	70.2	70.2
78.9	74.2	69.0	77.9	L ₂₅	67.2	68.2	70.0	69.7
75.3	74.5	66.8	76.9		66.5	67.8	69.9	68.2
77.6	73.0	68.2	78.5		66.4	67.2	69.5	68.0
76.9	68.8	73.5	75.4	L ₁₀	66.4	66.9	69.0	66.8
79.3	68.2	78.2	72.1		66.1	66.8	68.2	65.2
74.3	74.0	79.4	73.5		62.7	64.4	66.8	62.1





68.8 68.7 68.3 68.2 68.2 68.2 68.0 67.8 67.2 67.2 66.9 66.8 66.8 66.8 66.5 66.4 66.4 66.1 65.2 64.4 62.7 62.1 7278.3 72.7831

Construction noise Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM),Version 1.1

Report date: Case Description: 12/20/2018 MC&C IV

**** Receptor #1 ****

Description		Lan	d Use	Baselines Dayti	(dBA) me	Evening	Night
Villages at Herita	s Res	idential	72	.7	55.0	55.0	
			Equipm	ient			
Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Rec Dis (f	eptor tance eet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Backhoe Compressor (air) Excavator Crane Front End Loader Generator Paver Roller Dozer Tractor Welder / Torch Grader Concrete Saw	NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO	40 40 16 40 50 50 20 40 40 40 40 40	84.0 85.0	77.6 77.7 80.7 80.6 79.1 80.6 77.2 80.0 81.7 74.0 89.6	 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0 200.0	5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0

Results

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

Noise Limits (dBA)

Night		Day	Calculated (dBA) Evening		Di 	Day Night		Evening	
Equipment Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax
Backhoe			45.0	41.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Compressor	(air)	11/1	45.1	41.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11/1	11/0	NI / A
Excavator	NI / A	NI / A	40.1	44.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A Change	N/A	N/A	17 0	10 0	N/A	N/A	NI / A	NI /A	NI / A
Crane N/A	NI/A	NI/A	47.9	40.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eront End	Lozdor	N/A	16 5	12 5	N/A	N/A	NI/A	NI/A	NI/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	40.J	42.J	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Conorator	N/A	N/A	48 0	45 0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	177	N/A
Paver	11/ 7	11/1	44 6	41.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11/13	in A	11/14
	980:			Pa	ge 1				

Appendices • City of Santa Fe Springs MC&C Commerce Center – Site IV• City of Santa Fe Springs

				Construc	tion nois	e			
Roller			47.4	40.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Dozer			49.1	45.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Tractor			51.4	47.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Welder /	Torch		41.4	37.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Grader			52.4	48.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concrete	Saw		57.0	50.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Crane			47.9	40.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
		Total	57.0	56.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

APPENDIX D TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY MC&C COMMERCE CENTER SITE III & IV WAREHOUSE DEVELOPMENT SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for

CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11710 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Prepared by

CROWN CITY ENGINEERS, INC.

1475 Glen Oaks Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91105 Phone: 818-730-1970

Under the Supervision of: Patrick B. Lang, P.E

> December 2018 CCE2018-23 PBL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREPARER'S CERTIFICATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv
INTRODUCTION
REPORT METHODOLOGY
Study Approach
Level of Service Criteria
EXISTING ROADWAY SYSTEM AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES
Existing Circulation Network
Existing Traffic Volumes
EXISTING 2018 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS
OPENING YEAR 2019 PRE-PROJECT CONDITIONS
PROPOSED PROJECT
Project Description
Project Trip Generation
Trip Distribution and Assignment
2019 CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS WITH PROJECT TRAFFIC
2019 Post-Project Cumulative Traffic Volumes with Project
PROJECT IMPACT AND MITIGATION MEASURES
Site Access Analysis
PARKING DEMAND ANALYSIS
CONCLUSION
APPENDIX A TRAFFIC COUNTS A

APPENDIX B LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS ICU CALCULATION SHEET B

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

TABLES

NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1.	Level of Service Definitions	4
2.	Level of Service Criteria	5
3.	Existing 2018 Conditions Level of Service Summary	13
4.	Trip Generation by Related Projects	16
5.	Future 2019 Pre-Project Conditions Level of Service Summary	17
6.	Trip Generation by Warehouse Project	22
7.	Future 2019 Level of Service Summary with Project	26
8.	Future 2019 Level of Service Summary with and without Project	
9.	Parking Space Requirement	29

FIGURES

NO.	TITLE PA	AGE
1.	Vicinity Map	6
2.	Aerial View of Circulation Network	7
3.	Existing Lane Configuration at Key Intersections	11
4.	Existing 2018 Traffic Volumes at Key Intersections	12
5.	Related Project Locations and Traffic Volumes	15
6.	Project Site Plan – MC&C Commerce Center Site III	19
7.	Project Site Plan – MC&C Commerce Center Site IV	20
8.	Percentages of Project Related Trip Distribution	23
9.	Distribution of Project Related Traffic	24

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse Development

SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA

PREPARER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the above titled traffic study has been prepared under the supervision of Patrick B. Lang, P.E., a Professional Traffic Engineer, registered in the State of California.

Patrick B. Lang, P.E. Registration #: TR 875 Date

Professional Engineer's Stamp

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018 Page iii

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse Development Santa Fe Springs, California

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this traffic impact analysis is to evaluate the impacts on traffic circulation system relating to the proposed operation of two (2) Telegraph Warehouses – MC&C Commerce Center Site III and Site IV – in the City of Santa Fe Springs, California. The proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III will be located on the southeast corner of Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road for one (1) building totaling 178,978 square feet including a total of 17,898 square feet ancillary office uses. The Site IV will be on the north side of Telegraph Road and south of Romandel Avenue for six (6) buildings totaling 115,801 square feet including a total of 20,600 square feet ancillary office uses.

The MC&C Commerce Center project consists of construction of seven (7) warehouse buildings with a total floor area of 294,779 square feet, including 38,498 square feet for ancillary office uses.

The following are the key objectives of the study:

- Documentation of existing 2018 traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site.
- Determination of Project Opening Year (2019) traffic conditions and level of service (LOS) without and with the project.
- · Determination of project related impacts to the circulation system, and
- Identification of mitigation measures to reduce any significant impacts to a level of insignificance.

The study included evaluation of the following five (5) key signalized intersections in the general vicinity of the site:

- Telegraph Road and Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized)
- Telegraph Road and Norwalk Boulevard (Signalized)
- Los Nieto Road and Santa Fe Springs Road (Signalized)
- Telegraph Road and Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue (Signalized)
- Florence Avenue and Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized)

The proposed MC&C Commerce Center Warehouse project is estimated to generate approximately 591 net one-way passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips per average weekday

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report Page iV

December 2018

(296 inbound and 295 outbound). The average weekday net new peak hour PCE trips will be approximately 39 PCE trips during the AM peak hour (23 inbound and 16 outbound), and 65 PCE trips during the PM peak hour (30 inbound and 35 outbound).

Based on the results of the traffic impact analysis, the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project would not significantly impact any of the key intersections analyzed in the surrounding roadway system. The addition of project traffic will not increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios at these intersections beyond the significance thresholds of project related impacts as defined in the City's Traffic Study Guidelines. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.

The Site III will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/right-out access at the northerly driveway and one (1) full-access on the southerly driveway along the west side of Bloomfield Avenue. Traffic volume accessing the southerly driveway by making left turns is expected to be low and is not expected to cause any significant on-street delays or long queues. Adequate sight distance is available from both the driveways along both directions on Bloomfield Avenue.

The Site IV will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one (1) full-access driveway on Romandel Avenue. It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks should be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road. Adequate sight distance is available from the driveways on Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue along both directions.

A total of 522 parking space will be provided on-site for the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project in accordance with the parking code requirements of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The project's parking supply will adequately satisfy the City's parking requirement of 497 spaces per code.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse Development Santa Fe Springs, California

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this traffic impact analysis is to evaluate the impacts on traffic circulation system due to the proposed operation of MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouses in the City of Santa Fe Springs, California. The Site III will be located on the southeast corner of Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road. The proposed Site III consists of construction of one (1) warehouse building with a total floor area of 178,978 square feet including 17,898 square feet ancillary office uses. The Site IV will be on the north side of Telegraph Road and the south of Romandel Avenue. The Site IV consists of construction of six (6) warehouse buildings with a total floor area of 115,801 square feet including 20,600 square feet ancillary office uses.

The following are the key objectives identified for this study:

- Documentation of existing 2018 traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site.
- Determination of Project Opening Year (2019) traffic conditions and level of
- service (LOS) without and with the project.
- Determination of project related impacts to the circulation system, and
- Identification of mitigation measures to reduce any significant impacts to a level of insignificance.

The report provides data regarding existing operational characteristics of traffic in the general vicinity of the project, as well as an analysis of the proposed project's impacts to these existing and anticipated future traffic conditions. The report identifies and quantifies the impacts at key intersections and attempts to address the most appropriate and reasonable mitigation strategies at any impacted intersections which are identified to be operating at a deficient level of service.

This report investigates existing 2018 and anticipated future 2019 opening year traffic operating conditions. The study has been prepared per City of Santa Fe Springs's latest Traffic Impact Study Guidelines.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

REPORT METHODOLOGY

STUDY APPROACH

This report approaches the task of identifying and quantifying the anticipated impacts to the circulation system with a structured, "building block" methodology. The first step is to inventory and quantify existing conditions. Upon this foundation of fact, a travel forecast model, based on physical and operational characteristics of road network and manual observation of peak hour traffic movements, is structured for the entire project area and calibrated manually, by adjusting any traffic flow inconsistency, to produce reliable output, verifiable with the existing data. With the project traffic calculated and distributed onto the study area, at the anticipated opening year of the project in 2019, the travel forecast methodology is utilized to assess the project's traffic impacts at that time. The methodology utilizes a growth factor for traffic based upon regional guidelines, any other projects in the project vicinity, as well as the traffic anticipated to be introduced from the proposed project to produce the travel forecast and level-of-service data for the future target year.

The trip generation estimate is based on the 10th edition of Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)'s "Trip Generation" manual. Research and interviews have been conducted with local and regional agencies in order to identify and characterize the most probable trip distribution patterns within the study area.

Project impacts are identified for the future year 2019 conditions. At those intersections operating deficiently (e.g., at a level worse than LOS D) and significantly impacted by the proposed project, a mitigation measure is identified and applied, and a before-and-after mitigation analysis conducted.

LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA

Roadway operations and the relationship between capacity and traffic volumes are generally expressed in terms of levels of service (LOS). Levels of service are defined as LOS A through F. These levels recognize that, while an absolute limit exists as to the amount of traffic traveling through a given intersection (the absolute capacity), the conditions that motorists experience deteriorate rapidly as traffic approaches the absolute capacity. Under such conditions, congestion as well as delay is experienced. There is generally instability in the traffic flow, which means that relatively small incidents (e.g., momentary engine stall) can cause considerable fluctuations in speeds and delays. This near-capacity situation is labeled LOS E. Beyond LOS E, capacity is exceeded, and arriving traffic will exceed the ability of the intersection to accommodate it. An upstream queue will form and continue to expand in length until the demand volume reduces.

A complete description of the meaning of level of service can be found in the Highway Research Board's Special Report 209 titled *Highway Capacity Manual*. The manual establishes the definitions for levels of service A through F. Brief descriptions of the six levels of service, as extracted from the manual, are listed in **Table 1**. The thresholds of level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections are shown in **Table 2**.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report Page 2

December 2018

LOS D is the minimum threshold at all key intersections in the urbanized areas. The traffic study guidelines require that traffic mitigation measures be identified to provide for operations at the minimum threshold levels.

For the study area intersections, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) procedure has been utilized to determine intersection levels of service. Levels of service are presented for the entire intersection, consistent with the local and regional agency policies.

While the level of service concept and analysis methodology provides an indication of the performance of the entire intersection, the single letter grade A through F cannot describe specific operational deficiencies at intersections. Progression, queue formation, and left turn storage are examples of the operational issues that affect the performance of an intersection, but do not factor into the strict calculation of level of service. However, it provides a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio that is more meaningful when identifying a project's impact and developing mitigation measures. Therefore, this V/C ratio information is included in describing an intersection's operational performance under various scenarios.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018 Page 3

TABLE 1 LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS

LOS	Description
A	No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication. Typically, the approach appears quite open, turns are made easily and nearly all drivers find freedom of operation.
В	This service level represents stable operation, where an occasional approach phase is fully utilized and a substantial number are approaching full use. Many drivers begin to feel restricted within platoons of vehicles.
С	This level still represents stable operating conditions. Occasionally, drivers have to wait through more than one red signal indication, and backups may develop behind turning vehicles. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.
D	This level encompasses a zone of increasing restriction approaching instability at the intersection. Delays to approaching vehicles may be substantial during short peaks within the peak period; however, enough cycles with lower demand occur to permit periodic clearance of developing queues, thus preventing excessive backups.
E	Capacity occurs at the upper end of this service level. It represents the most vehicles that any particular intersection can accommodate. Full utilization of every signal cycle is seldom attained no matter how great the demand.
F	This level describes forced flow operations at low speeds, where volumes exceed capacity. These conditions usually result from queues of vehicles backing up from restriction downstream. Speeds are reduced substantially and stoppages may occur for short or long periods of time due to congestion. In the extreme case, both speed and volume can drop to zero.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

Page 4
Level of Service	Two-Way or All-Way Stop Controlled Intersection Average Delay per Vehicle (sec)	Signalized Intersection Average Delay per Vehicle (sec)	Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio
A	0 - 10	< or = 10	0-0.60
В	> 10 - 15	> 10 - 20	> 0.60 - 0.70
С	> 15 - 25	> 20 - 35	> 0.70 - 0.80
D	> 25 - 35	> 35 - 55	> 0.80 - 0.90
E	> 35 - 50	> 55 - 80	> 0.90 - 1.00
F	> 50	> 80 or a V/C ratio equal to or greater than 1.0	> 1.00

TABLE 2 LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA

EXISTING ROADWAY SYSTEM AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

EXISTING CIRCULATION NETWORK

In order to assess future operating conditions both with and without the proposed project, existing traffic conditions within the study area were evaluated.

Figure 1, Vicinity Map, illustrates the existing circulation network within the study area as well as the location of the proposed project.

Figure 2 shows an aerial view of the circulation network. Major north-south regional access to the site is provided by Norwalk Boulevard, Santa Fe Springs Road/Bloomfield Avenue and Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue. Major east-west regional access is provided by Los Nietos Road, Telegraph Road and Florence Avenue.



FIGURE 1 VICINITY MAP

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

FIGURE 2 AERIAL VIEW OF CIRCULAR NETWORK



The Site III will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/right-out access at the northerly driveway and one (1) full-access on the southerly driveway along the west side of Bloomfield Avenue. The Site IV will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one (1) full-access on the driveway on Romandel Avenue. The following paragraphs provide a brief description of the existing roadways which comprise the circulation network of the study area, providing the majority of both regional and local access to the project.

<u>NORWALK BOULEVARD.</u> Norwalk Boulevard is a north-south arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction. The street is approximately 80 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by either a 2-way left-turn lane or raised median islands along the center of the street. The intersection of Norwalk Boulevard at Telegraph Road is signalized. Parking is not permitted along both sides of the street. The average daily volume on Norwalk Boulevard is approximately 19,200 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Norwalk Boulevard represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

<u>SANTA FE SPRINGS ROAD / BLOOMFIELD AVENUE.</u> Santa Fe Springs Road/ Bloomfield Avenue is a major north-south arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction plus left turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 84 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 45 miles per hour. The three key intersections of Santa Fe Springs Road/Bloomfield Avenue at Los Nietos Road, Telegraph Road and Florence Avenue are signalized. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Santa Fe Springs Road is approximately 20,880 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Santa Fe Springs/Bloomfield Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

<u>GREENLEAF AVENUE / SHOEMAKER AVENUE.</u> Greenleaf Avenue / Shoemaker Avenue is a major northeast-southwest secondary arterial highway per the City's Circulation Element of General Plan with one travel lane in each direction. The street is approximately 62 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. The intersection of Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue at Telegraph Road is signalized. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Greenleaf Avenue is approximately 11,240 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

LOS NIETOS ROAD. Los Nietos Road is a major northwest-southeast secondary arterial highway per the City's Circulation Element of General Plan with one travel lane in each direction. The street is approximately 60 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Directional travels are separated by a 2-way turn lane along the center of the street. Parking is permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Los Nietos Road is approximately 15,120 vehicles per day (assuming AM peak hour volume counted on Los Nietos Road represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

December 2018

<u>TELEGRAPH ROAD.</u> Telegraph Road is a major east-west arterial street with three travel lanes in each direction plus left turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 88 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Telegraph Road is approximately 30,520 vehicles per day (assuming AM peak hour volume counted on Telegraph Road represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

<u>FLORENCE AVENUE.</u> Florence Avenue is a major east-west arterial street with two travel lanes in each direction plus turn lanes at major intersections. Directional travel is separated by raised median islands along the center. The street is approximately 82 feet wide and posted with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Parking is not permitted along the sides of the street. The average daily volume on Florence Avenue is approximately 24,830 vehicles per day (assuming PM peak hour volume counted on Florence Avenue represents approximately 10% of its average daily traffic volume).

EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

For the purpose of evaluating existing operating conditions as well as future operating conditions with and without the proposed project, the study area was carefully selected in accordance with local traffic study guidelines. Manual turning movement counts for the selected intersections were collected in the field for the morning and evening peak periods during the month of June 2018. The intersections were counted during the peak hours of 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday) in a non-holiday school week. It was determined that the following five (5) key signalized intersections would be analyzed in the study:

- Telegraph Road and Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized)
- Telegraph Road and Norwalk Boulevard (Signalized)
- Los Nieto Road and Santa Fe Springs Road (Signalized)
- Telegraph Road and Greenleaf Avenue/Shoemaker Avenue (Signalized)
- Florence Avenue and Bloomfield Avenue (Signalized)

Existing lane configurations at the key intersections are shown in Figure 3.

Existing turning movement counts for AM and PM peak hour conditions are shown in **Figure 4.** Detailed turning movement counts are included in the Technical Appendix of this report.

EXISTING 2018 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Year 2018 existing traffic conditions were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of level of service (LOS) analysis for signalized intersections. **Table 3** presents existing condition intersection level of service (LOS) analysis summary.

Detailed calculations relating to the study intersections are included in the Technical Appendix of this report.

Based on the results of this analysis, all five (5) study intersections are operating at an acceptable level of service (i.e., LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in **Table 3**.







FIGURE 4 EXISTING 2018 TRAFFIC VOLUMES AT KEY INTERSECTIONS

#	Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	2018 Existing Conditions		
		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		LOS	V/C Ratio	
4	Telegraph Rd &	Circul	AM	С	0.743	
1	Santa Fe Springs Rd/Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	С	0.742	
2	Telegraph Rd &	Cinnal	AM	D	0.867	
2	Norwalk Blvd	Signal	PM	С	0.802	
2	Los Nietos Rd &	Cignal	AM	D	0.887	
3	Santa Fe Springs Rd	Signal	PM	D	0.870	
	Telegraph Rd &	0:1	AM	В	0.645	
4	Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	Signal	PM	В	0.630	
-	Florence Ave &	0:1	AM	D	0.876	
2	Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	D	0.877	

TABLE 3 EXISTING (2018) LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

OPENING YEAR 2019 PRE-PROJECT CONDITIONS

A 1.0 percent per year annual traffic growth rate was applied to existing traffic volumes to create a 2019 base condition (i.e., a factor of 1.01 was applied to 2018 volumes to obtain 2019 base traffic volumes due to ambient growth). This annual traffic growth rate accounts for the population growth within the study area and traffic from any other minor projects to be developed in the study area.

Per City's records, there are six (6) other related projects located within the one and onehalf mile radius of the project that will contribute to cumulative traffic volumes with the development of this project.

The locations of these related projects are shown in Figure 5.

Trip generation estimates for these related projects were developed by using nationally recognized and recommended rates contained in "Trip Generation" manual, 10th edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). ITE also provides information on percentage of truck traffic associated with warehouse/storage land use. For warehouse uses, vehicle trips were calculated in terms of passenger car equivalents (PCE) by using vehicle mix percentages provided for warehouse uses in the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003. A truck trip is generally equivalent to 2 or 3 passenger car trips depending on the type of trucks. Accordingly, a 2.0 factor was applied to the number of 2-axle and 3-axle truck trips and a 3.0 factor was applied to the number of 4+-axle truck trips to estimate passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips generated by the trucks.

Table 4 shows a summary of trip generation estimates for the related projects. It is estimated that the related projects will generate approximately 591 PCE trips per average day (295 inbound and 296 outbound). The average weekday net new peak hour trips will be approximately 39 PCE trips during the AM peak hour (23 inbound and 16 outbound), and 65 PCE trips during the PM peak hour (30 inbound and 35 outbound).

Figure 5 also shows the related projects' locations and trips distributed at the study intersections.

The peak hour traffic volumes from the related projects were added to existing traffic volumes with ambient growth at the study intersections to represent a 2019 pre-project traffic condition for the AM and PM peak hours.

This pre-project traffic condition was evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of level of service (LOS) analysis for signalized intersections. The LOS and V/C ratios for the study intersections under 2019 pre-project conditions (without project) are shown in **Table 5**. Detailed calculations relating to the study intersections are included in the Technical Appendix of this report.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018



FIGURE 5 RELATED PROJECT LOCATIONS AND DISTRIBUTION OF TRIPS

APPENDIX D • TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

TABLE 4										
CUMULATIVE PLANNED	PROJECT	TRIP	GENERA	FION						

Land		Trip Generation Rate								Average Traffic Volume							
Use (ITE Code)	Size & Unit	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM	PM Peak Hour			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour				
		Total	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total		
Related	Project 1	1: 1330) 0 Lak	eland	Rd. – 1	28- DU	Apart	ment Bu	ildings								
Apts (220)	128 DU	6.65	0.51	20%	80%	0.62	65%	35%	850	13	52	65	52	28	80		
Related	Project 2	2: 1121	12 Nor	walk E	3I — 134	,552 sf	Storag	ge Facili	ty								
W/Hse (150)	134.552 KSF	1.51	0.10	60%	40%	0.17	47%	53%	196	8	5	13	10	12	22		
	Pass	senger	Car E	quiva	lent (PC	CE) Trip	os:		262	10	7	17	14	16	30		
Related	Project 3	3: 1037	70 Slus	sher D	r: - 22,9	994 sf I	ndustr	ial Ware	house								
W/Hse (150)	22,994 KSF	1.74	0.17	77%	23%	0.19	27%	73%	40	3	1	4	1	3	4		
	Pass	senger	Car E	quiva	lent (PC	E) Trip	s:		54	4	1	5	2	4	6		
Related	Project 4	4: NW(C of Te	elegra	ph Rd a	ind Sar	nta Fe	Springs	Rd: - 30	02,12	1 sf Ind	dustrial	Ware	house			
W/Hse (150)	302.121 KSF	1.74	0.17	77%	23%	0.19	27%	73%	526	40	12	52	15	42	57		
	Pass	senger	Car E	quival	lent (PC	E) Trip	S:		698	53	16	69	21	56	77		
Related	Project §	5: Sout	thwest	Corne	er of No	orwalk E	BI and '	Telegrap	oh Rd	- 110	-room	Hotel					
Hotel (310)	110 Room	8.17	0.56	61%	39%	0.57	57%	43%	900	38	24	62	33	29	62		
Related	Project 6	s: NW	C of Te	elegra	ph Rd a	ind Sar	ta Fe	Springs	Rd: - 3	02,12	1 sf Ind	dustrial	Ware	house			
W/Hse (150)	171.142 KSF	1.74	0.17	77%	23%	0.19	27%	73%	298	22	7	29	9	24	33		
	Pass	senger	Car E	quiva	lent (PC	E) Trip	os:		400	31	8	39	12	32	44		
								-			-						
		1	Total T	rips in	PCE:				3,164	149	108	257	134	165	299		

Note: All rates are average rates. For warehouse uses, vehicle mix percentages were taken from the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003 and truck trips were converted into passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips using PCE factors, i.e, one 2-axle or 3-axle truck trip = 2 passenger car trips, and one 4+-axle truck trip = 3 passenger car trips.

[Ref: Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) "Trip Generation", 10th Edition, 2017]

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

#	Intersection	Control Type	Peak Hour	2019 Pre- Project Future Conditions		
		1.256.01		LOS	V/C Ratio	
1	Telegraph Rd &	Cignal	AM	С	0.783	
1	Santa Fe Springs Rd/Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	С	0.763	
2	Telegraph Rd &	Signal	AM	D	0.883	
2	Norwalk Blvd	Signal	PM	D	0.823	
2	Los Nietos Rd &	Cignol	AM	D	0.899	
3	Santa Fe Springs Rd	Signal	PM	D	0.885	
4	Telegraph Rd &	Signal	AM	В	0.662	
4	Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	Signal	PM	В	0.641	
-	Florence Ave &	Signal	AM	D	0.887	
5	Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	D	0.890	

TABLE 5 2019 PRE-PROJECT FUTURE CONDITIONS LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

As the results indicate, all the five (5) study intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service (i.e., LOS D or better) during the AM and PM peak hours.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

PROPOSED PROJECT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this traffic impact analysis is to evaluate the impacts on traffic circulation system due to the proposed operation of MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouses in the City of Santa Fe Springs, California.

The proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III Warehouse will be located on the southeast corner of Santa Fe Spring Road/Bloomfield Avenue and Telegraph Road. The Site III will be for one (1) building totaling 178,978 square feet (including a total of 17,898 square feet ancillary office uses).

The proposed Site IV Warehouse will be on the north side of Telegraph Road and south of Romandel Avenue. The Site IV will be for six (6) buildings totaling 115,801 square feet (including a total of 20,600 square feet ancillary office uses).

Adequate parking spaces will be provided on-site for the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project in accordance with the parking code requirements of the City of Santa Fe Springs. Surface parking will consist of a total of 522 marked parking spaces.

Figures 6 and 7 shows the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Sites III and IV, respectively.

Figure 8 depicts the regional trip distribution percentages to and from the site.

Figure 9 depicts project traffic volumes at key circulation locations during the AM and PM peak hours.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

APPENDICES • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER - SITE IV • CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS

FIGURE 6 PROJECT SITE PLAN - MC&C COMMERCE CENTER SITE III



MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018



FIGURE 7 PROJECT SITE PLAN - MC&C COMMERCE CENTER SITE IV

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

In order to accurately assess future traffic conditions with the proposed project, trip generation estimates were developed for the project. Trip generation rates for the project are based on the nationally recognized recommendations contained in "Trip Generation" manual, 10th edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). ITE also provides information on percentage of truck traffic associated with warehouse/storage land use. The vehicle-mix percentages provided for heavy warehouse use in the City of Fontana's "Truck Trip Generation Study", August 2003, were used to determine the number of various types of truck trips to be generated. A truck trip is generally equivalent to 2 or 3 passenger car trips depending on the type of trucks. Accordingly, a 2.0 factor was applied to the number of 4+-axle truck trips to estimate passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips generated by the trucks.

Table 6 shows a summary of trip generation estimates for the project. It is estimated that the project will generate approximately 591 net one-way PCE trips per average day (295 inbound and 296 outbound). The average weekday net new peak hour PCE trips will be approximately 39 trips during the AM peak hour (23 inbound and 16 outbound), and 65 trips during the PM peak hour (30 inbound and 35 outbound).

TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Arrival and departure distribution patterns for project-generated traffic were estimated based upon a review of circulation patterns within the study area network and regional traffic generation and attraction characteristics.

Figure 8 depicts the regional trip distribution percentages to and from the site.

TABLE 6 TRIP GENERATION BY SANTA FE SPRINGS MC&C COMMERCE CENTER SITE III AND IV WAREHOUES

ITE				Tri	p Gener	ation R	ate				Avera	ge Tra	ffic V	olume	1. I
Code/	Size &	Daily	AM	Peak H	Hour	PM	Peak H	lour	Daily	AM	Peak	Hour	PM	Peak	Hour
Land Use	Unit	Total	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	%IN	%OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total
Total Vehic	le Trip G	ienerat	ion - M	C&C C	ommerc	e Cent	er Site								
W/Hse (150)	178.98 KSF	1.51	0.1	60%	40%	0.17	47%	53%	270	11	7	18	14	16	30
	Pas	senger	Car Eq	uivalen	t (PCE)	Trips:			359	14	10	24	18	21	39
W/Hse (150)	115.80 KSF	1.51	0.1	60%	40%	0.17	47%	53%	175	7	5	12	9	10	20
Total Vehic	le Trip G	enerat	ion - M	C&C C	ommerc	e Cent	er Site	IV			1			1	
	Pas	senger	Car Eq	uivalen	t (PCE)	Trips:			232	9	6	15	12	14	26
		-	Total Tr	ins in F	PCF				501	22	16	20	30	25	65
			otar m	103 111	CL				551	25	10	35	50	55	05
Note:	All rates Fontana car equi trips, an	are av I's "Tru ivalent id one 4	erage r ck Trip (PCE) tr 1+-axle	ates. F Genera fips usin truck t	or ware ation Stu ng PCE f trip = 3 p	house udy", Au actors, basseng	uses, vo igust 2 i.e., oi er car	ehicle m 003 and ne 2-axle trips.	iix perco truck t e or 3-a	entag rips w xle tr	es we vere co ruck tr	re take onverte ip = 2 p	n fro ed int assei	m City o pass nger ca	of enger ar
	[Ref: In:	stitute	of Tran	sportat	tion Eng	ineer's	(ITE) "T	Trip Gen	eration	", 10t	h Edit	on, 20	17]		

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018



FIGURE 8 PERCENTAGES OF PROJECT RELATED TRIP DISTRIBUTION



FIGURE 9 DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECT RELATED TRAFFIC

2019 CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS WITH PROJECT TRAFFIC

2019 POST-PROJECT CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC VOLUMES WITH PROJECT

The 2018 cumulative post-project traffic volumes were estimated by adding project related traffic volumes to the 2019 pre-project traffic volumes with 1.0% per year ambient growth and related project traffic.

Year 2019 post-project cumulative (i.e., existing plus ambient traffic plus related project plus project traffic) conditions were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of level of service (LOS) analysis for signalized intersections. The LOS and V/C ratios for the study intersections under 2019 post-project cumulative conditions (with project) are summarized in **Table 7**. Detailed calculations relating to the study intersections are included in the Technical Appendix of this report.

The results indicate that, all the five (5) study intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) D or better (i.e., within the range of acceptable thresholds of LOS A through D) during the AM and PM peak hours under future cumulative traffic conditions with the project.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

TABLE 7	
2019 FUTURE WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMM	ARY

#	Intersection	Control Type	Peak Hour	2019 Future with Project Conditions		
				LOS	V/C Ratio	
	Telegraph Rd &	Cianal	AM	С	0.786	
1	Santa Fe Springs Rd/Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	С	0.772	
	Telegraph Rd &	Cianal	AM	D	0.884	
2	Norwalk Blvd	Signal	PM	D	0.824	
-	Los Nietos Rd &	Cirrol	AM	D	0.900	
3	Santa Fe Springs Rd	Signal	PM	D	0.888	
	Telegraph Rd &	Cianal	AM	В	0.663	
4	Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	Signal	PM	В	0.643	
-	Florence Ave &	Cianal	AM	D	0.888	
5	Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	D	0.892	

PROJECT IMPACT AND MITIGATION MEAUSURES

As indicated in the previous section, all the five (5) study intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) D or better (i.e., within the range of acceptable thresholds of LOS A through D) during the AM and PM peak hours under future cumulative traffic conditions with the project.

The project's off-site traffic impact would not be considered significant at any of these intersections based on volume to capacity ratio and level of service expected after the project. A project's impact on the circulation system is determined by comparing the level of service (LOS) and V/C ratios at key intersections under the future pre-project conditions and future post-project conditions. A LOS level D or better is acceptable for urban area intersections. A level of service worse than D (i.e., LOS E or F) is considered deficient and unacceptable. A project's traffic impact is determined to be significant if the increase in V/C ratio is 0.04 or more at LOS C, or 0.02 or more at LOS D, or 0.01 or more at LOS E and F.

The LOS, V/C ratio (or ICU) for the study intersections under 2019 cumulative conditions (with project as well as without project) are summarized in **Table 8** to compare Project's traffic impact at key intersections.

#	Intersection	Control Type	Control Peak Type Hour		19 Pre- ct Future ditions	201 with Cor	9 Future Project nditions	
				LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	in V/C by Project
	Telegraph Rd &	50210 B 8	AM	С	0.783	С	0.786	0.003
1	Santa Fe Springs Rd/Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	С	0.763	С	0.772	0.009
2	Telegraph Rd &	Signal	AM	D	0.883	D	0.884	0.001
2	Norwalk Blvd	Signal	PM	D	0.823	D	0.824	0.001
2	Los Nietos Rd &	Signal	AM	D	0.899	D	0.900	0.001
2	Santa Fe Springs Rd	Signal	PM	D	0.885	D	0.888	0.003
	Telegraph Rd &	Cignal	AM	В	0.662	В	0.663	0.001
4	Greenleaf Ave/Shoemaker Ave	Signai	PM	В	0.641	В	0.643	0.002
-	Florence Ave &	Cignal	AM	D	0.887	D	0.888	0.001
5	Bloomfield Ave	Signal	PM	D	0.890	D	0.892	0.002

TABLE 8 2019 FUTURE WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE SUMMARY

Since the project's traffic impacts would not be significant at any of the off-site intersections, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report

Page 27

December 2018

SITE ACCESS ANALYSIS

The Site III will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/right-out access at the northerly driveway and one (1) full-access on the southerly driveway along the west side of Bloomfield Avenue. Traffic volume accessing the southerly driveway by making left turns is expected to be low and is not expected to cause any significant on-street delays or long queues. Adequate sight distance is available from both the driveways along both directions on Bloomfield Avenue.

The Site IV will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one (1) full-access driveway on Romandel Avenue. It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks should be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road. Adequate sight distance is available from the driveways on Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue along both directions.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

PARKING DEMAND ANALYSIS

Adequate parking spaces will be provided on-site for the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project in accordance with the parking code requirements of the City of Santa Fe Springs.

The City's parking code requires 1 parking space per 500 square feet of warehouse facilities up to 20,000 square feet of floor area, 1 space per 750 square feet of warehouse facilities for 20,000 - 100,000 square feet of floor area, and 1 parking space per 1,000 square feet for the floor area beyond 100,000 square feet. For office uses, the code requires 1 parking space per 250 square feet; however, it applies only when office square feet exceed 15% of the total warehouse square feet. Therefore, the project's Site III (178,978 square feet) will require 226 spaces [i.e., 20,000 / 500 + 80,000 / 750 + (178,978 - 20,000 - 80,000) = 226], and the project's Site IV (115,801 square feet) will require 271 spaces [i.e., 41 + 32 + 65 + 42 + 53 + 38 = 271]. The total parking requirement for the project will be 497 spaces (i.e., 226 + 271 = 497) per City's parking code as shown in Table 9. In addition, for trailer parking, the City requires 1 spaces (12'x53') per 4 dock doors. Therefore, for the buildings' 23 dock doors, 6 additional spaces (12'x53') will be required for trailer parking.

MC&C Commerce Center	Gross Floor Area (GFA) [S.F.]	Office Space [S.F.]	Is Office Space 15% or more of GFA?	Parking Space Required	Parking Space Provided
Site III	178,978	17,898	No	226	259
Site IV	115,801	20,600	Yes	271	263
То	tal of Sites	III and I	/	<mark>4</mark> 97	522

TABLE 9 PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENT

The project's site plan shows that surface parking will consist of a total of 522 marked parking spaces to be provided for the warehouse buildings. Therefore, the project's parking requirement will be adequately satisfied.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the traffic impact analysis, the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project would not significantly impact any of the key intersections analyzed in the surrounding roadway system. The addition of project traffic will not increase the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios at these intersections beyond the significance thresholds of project related impacts as defined in the City's Traffic Study Guidelines. Therefore, no off-site mitigation measures would be necessary for the development of this project.

The Site III will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/right-out access at the northerly driveway and one (1) full-access on the southerly driveway along the west side of Bloomfield Avenue. Traffic volume accessing the southerly driveway by making left turns is expected to be low and is not expected to cause any significant on-street delays or long queues. Adequate sight distance is available from both the driveways along both directions on Bloomfield Avenue.

The Site IV will provide a total of two (2) driveways – one (1) right-in/left-in/right-out access driveway on Telegraph Road and one (1) full-access driveway on Romandel Avenue. It is recommended the driveway on Telegraph Road be restricted to passenger vehicles only with a NO SEMI-TRUCK sign. Semi-trucks should be directed to the driveway on Romandel Avenue to prevent potential traffic impact on Telegraph Road. Adequate sight distance is available from the driveways on Telegraph Road and Romandel Avenue along both directions.

A total of 522 parking space will be provided on-site for the proposed MC&C Commerce Center Site III and IV Warehouse project in accordance with the parking code requirements of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The project's parking supply will adequately satisfy the City's parking requirement of 497 spaces per code.

MC&C Commerce Center Site III & IV: Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report December 2018



10075-10095 Romandel Ave. & 12015-12085 Telegraph Rd. M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, Zone PPF Industrial, LLC

ENTITLEMENT REQUEST

o Tentative Parcel Map No. 82567

Consolidate 28 parcels into a single ±8.68-ac.
parcel

<u>Development Plan Approval Case Nos. 957-962</u>
<u>Construct 6 concrete tilt-up industrial bldgs.</u>

o Zone Change Case No. 138

 Change the zoning designation from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay)

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567

TPM REQUEST



<u>Existing</u>: 28 Parcels

TPM REQUEST



2ND ST

TELEGRAP



DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962

SITE PLAN



<u>6 Buildings</u>: 13,582 sf – 28,500 sf

<u>Total</u>: 115,801 sf

SITE PLAN



<u>Parking</u>:
<u>Required</u> 187 stalls
<u>Provided</u> 247 stalls

<u>Landscape</u>:
Required 27,010 sf
Provided 40,722 sf

TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN



TYPICAL ELEVATIONS







COLORED RENDERING


ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138

ZC REQUEST



Existing:

From:
M-2
(Heavy Manufacturing)

ZC REQUEST



Proposed:

From:
M-2
(Heavy Manufacturing)

o <u>To:</u>

 M-2-PD
(Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development
Overlay)

- The intent of the Overlay is to allow variety and flexibility, while at the same time, maintaining high standards of design and quality of improvements.
- The proposed project deviates from the City's Zoning Regulations in the following ways:
 - Truck Loading Doors
 - Landscape Setback
 - Front Yard Setback

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT Existing Oil Operations



Joint Use Agreement



















Landscape Setback



o Entire area between building wall and front property line.

o 20' along Telegraph Road when adjacent to parking area.

Landscape Setback



Telegraph Road

Landscape Setback



Telegraph Road

Landscape Setback



Landscape Setback



Landscape Setback



Front Yard Setback

- Based on a 1-to-1 ratio, as required by the code,
 - Building 3 is required to provide a 33'-6" setback along Romandel Ave.

Front Yard Setback





Front Yard Setback

- Staff intends to change the code to allow architectural elements beyond the one-to-one ratio.
 - The difference of 3'-5" is simply for the architectural features and doesn't impact scale concerns along Romandel Ave.
 - Provides a higher quality of architecture to the overall project.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

- One environmental document was prepared for the project (TPM 82567, DPA 957-962, & ZC 138).
- IS/MND prepared by Blodgett / Baylosis Environmental Planning.
 - o Total of 3 proposed mitigation measures.
 - Geology & Soils, Transportation & Circulation, and Tribal Cultural Resources.
 - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program MMRP prepared.
 - Delivered to Commissioners on 1/22/2019.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

 IS/MND - circulated for required 20-day public review and comment period.

o January 15, 2019 through February 4, 2019.



ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

- On February 12th, the City received a comment letter dated February 11th from Lozeau Drury LLP on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) regarding the IS/MND.
 - Requesting an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
 - Received after the 20-day review period.
 - Fails to include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and/or an expert opinion supported by facts.

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE



& ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN: that a Special Public Hearing will be held before the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission for the following:

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567: A request for approval to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-961, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-972, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-978, and 8011-003-979, into a single parcel measuring ±8.68-acres.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962: A request for approval to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13,582 sq. ft. to 28,500 sq. ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue.

ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138: A request for approval to change the zoning designation of an 8.68-acre property, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development).

APPLICANT / PROJECT LOCATION: Kearny Real Estate/ 10075 – 10095 Romandel Avenue & 12015 – 12085 Telegraph Road (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-958, 8011-003-959, 8011-003-960, 8011-003-061, 8011-003-962, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-966, 8011-003-967, 8011-003-968, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-973, 8011-003-974, 8011-003-975, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-977, 8011-003-979)

CEQA STATUS: Upon review of the proposed project, staff has determined that additional environmental analysis is required to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The applicant has since retained Marc Blodgett of Blodgett and Associates, and Crown City Engineers to prepare the necessary CEQA documents and associated Traffic Study. Staff is currently working with the applicant's CEQA consultant on finalizing the Initial Study, subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), and Traffic Study. The draft CEQA documents are finalized and an NOI (Notice of Intent) to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted in the LA County Recorder's Office to initiate the mandatory 20-day public review period on January 15, 2019. Additionally, the project site is not listed on the Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List) as set forth in Government Code Section 65962.5.

Juanita Trujillo, Mayor • William K. Rounds, Mayor Pro Tem (jir Council John M. Mora • Annette Rodriguez • Joe Angel Zamora City Manager Raymond R. Cruz THE HEARING will be held before the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Fe Springs in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 11710 Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, on Tuesday, February 12, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

ALL INTERESTED PERSONS are invited to attend the Special Public Hearing before Planning Commission and express their opinion on the subject items listed above. You should note that if you challenge the aforementioned project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the office of the Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing.

FURTHER INFORMATION on this item may be obtained at the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Department, 11710 Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, California 90670 or by telephone or e-mail: (562) 868-0511, extension 7353, vincevelasco@santafesprings.org.

Wayne M. Morrell Director of Planning City of Santa Fe Springs 11710 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

<u>Mailed Out:</u> 2/1/2019

<u>Also posted in:</u> City Hall, TCH, & Library

> Juanita Trujillo, Mayor • William K. Rounds, Mayor Pro Tem Lifty Council: John M. Mora • Annette Rodriguez • Joe Angel Zamora City Manager Raymond R. Cruz

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Whittier Daily News

Published in local newspaper: 2/1/2019

No comments/inquiries received to date.

Advertising Order Confirmation

CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82547, DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 875-862, & ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN: that a Public Hearing will be held before the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission for the following:

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 82567: A request for opproval to allow the consolidation of twenty-eight (28) existing parcels that make up the subject property (APV's: 8011-0029-90), 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-96, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-963, 8011-003-965, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-964, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-970, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-971, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-003-807, 8011-0

DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL CASE NOS. 957-962: A request for approval to allow the construction of a six (6) new concrete till-up industrial buildings, ranging from 13.582 sa, ft. to 28.500 sa, ft., located along the north side of Telegraph Road and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue.

ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 138: A request for approval to change the zoning designation of an 8.68-acre property, from M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) to M-2-PD (Heavy Manufacturing – Planned Development Overlay).

APPLICANT / PROJECT LOCATION: Kearrny Real Estate/ 10075 - 10095 Romandel Avenue & 12015 - 12085 Telegraph Road (APN's: 8011-002-901, 8011-002-902, 8011-002-903, 8011-003-955, 8011-003-956, 8011-003-957, 8011-003-95, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-961, 8011-003-969, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-972, 8011-003-976, 8011-003-975, 8011-00

CEQA STATUS: Upon review of the proposed project, staff has determined that additional environmental analysis is required to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The applicant has since retained Marc Blodgett on Blodgett and Associates, and Crown City Engineers to prepare the necessary CEQA documents and associated Traffic Study. Staff is currently working with the applicant's CEQA consultant on finalizing the Initial Study, subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), and Traffic Study. The draft CEQA documents are finalized and an NOI (Notice of Intent) to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted in the LA Courty Recorder's Office to initiate the mandatory 20-day public review period on January 15, 2019. Additionally, the project site is not listed on the Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List) as set forth in Government Code Section 59/25.

THE HEARING will be held before the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Fe Springs in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, 11710 Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, an Tuesday, February 12, 2019 of 6:00 p.m.

ALL INTERESTED PERSONS are invited to attend the Public Hearing before Planning Commission and express their opinion on the subject items listed above. You should note that if you challenge the adree-mentioned project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the Public Hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the office of the Commission at, or prior to, the Public Hearing.

FURTHER INFORMATION on this item may be obtained at the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Department, 11710 Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, California Wol70 or by telephone or e-mail: (562) 886-031), extension 7333, vincevelacsco@santafesprings.org.

> Wayne M. Morrell Director of Planning City of Santo Fe Springs 11710 Telegraph Road Santo Fe Springs, CA 90670 Whittier Daily News Ad#11230537

Published: February 1, 2019

- The proposed parcel map, subject to the attached conditions, is compatible with the goals and objectives of the various elements of the City of Santa Fe Springs General Plan, and therefore, is in compliance with Subdivision Map Act.
- The proposed development is currently an undeveloped oil operation field, and thus, will be a significant improvement to the subject site.

Before:



After:



- The proposed parcel map, subject to the attached conditions, is compatible with the goals and objectives of the various elements of the City of Santa Fe Springs General Plan, and therefore, is in compliance with the Subdivision Map Act.
- The proposed development is currently an undeveloped oil operation field, and thus, will be a significant improvement to the subject site.
- Although the project deviates from the development standards in relation to the Planned Development Overlay, the applicant maintained high standards of design, and therefore, doesn't compromise the quality and overall design of the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend approval of ZC 138 to the City Council.

Based on the findings stated within the attached Resolutions.

o Approve TPM 82567 & DPA 957-962

 Subject to the conditions as stated within the attached Resolutions.

Approve and adopt the proposed environmental documents
IS/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND); and
Mitigation Monitoring and reporting Program (MMRP).

 Adopt Resolution No. 114-2019, which incorporates the Planning Commission's findings and actions regarding this matter.

ATTACHMENT 5



T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 410 12th Street, Suite 250 Oakland, Ca 94607 www.lozeaudrury.com richard@lozeaudrury.com

Via Email & Overnight Mail

February 27, 2019

Janet Martinez, CMC,City Clerk City of Santa Fe Springs City Clerk's Office 11710 E. Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 JanetMartinez@santafesprings.org

> RE: Appeal of Planning Commission's Approval of Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962, and Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 Re: MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV, Assessor Parcel Number 8011-002-901 to -903, 8011-003-955 to -979

Dear Ms. Martinez:

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance For Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER"). SAFER hereby appeals the February 12, 2019 decision of the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962, and Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 with respect to the MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV, Assessor Parcel Number 8011-002-901 to -903, 8011-003-955 to -979 ("Project"). These project approvals certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The Project involves construction and operation of an industrial park consisting of six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area, 263 parking stalls, and 17 dock high doors located on north side of Telegraph Avenue and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue.

We appeal the February 12, 2019 approvals, and request that the City of Santa Fe Springs ("City") prepare an environmental impact report ("EIR") to analyze the significant environmental impacts of the Project and to propose all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts, for the following reasons: (1) there

SAFER Appeal on MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV February 27, 2019 Page 2 of 2

is a fair argument that the Project may have significant adverse environmental impacts, including, but not limited to: traffic during construction and operation; air quality during construction and operation; greenhouse gases during construction and operation; potential soil contamination; health risk impacts related to airborne emissions; noise; and other impacts; (2) the City has not adequately considered cumulative impacts with respect to other projects proposed in the area; (3) the City has segmented the MC&C Site III and MC&C Site IV project, which should be considered as a single project under CEQA; and (4) the City has not considered all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce environmental impacts.

This letter complies with Municipal Code §155.865, which provides that appeals are to be made in writing and filed with the City Clerk. At your direction, we are filing this via overnight mail, without any accompanying appeal fees.

Sincerely,

Richard Drury

ATTACHMENT 6

BLODGETT BAYLOSISENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING Planning • Environmental Analysis • Economics • Mapping • GIS

Date:	March 18, 2019
То:	Vince Velasco, Planning Consultant, City of Santa Fe Springs
From:	Bryan Hamilton, Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning
Subject:	Response to the Comment Letter Provided by Lozeau Drury LLP for MC&C Site IV.

The City of Santa Fe Springs received a comment letter dated February 27, 2019 from Lozeau Drury LLP on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) regarding the MC&C Site IV IS/MND. The IS/MND was circulated for a period of 20 days beginning on January 15, 2019 and ending on February 5, 2019. The comments submitted by Lozeau Drury LLP and the responses are included below.

Comment 1.

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance For Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER"). SAFER hereby appeals the February 12, 2019 decision of the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962, and Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 with respect to the MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV, Assessor Parcel Number 8011-002-901 to -903, 8011-003-955 to -979 ("Project"). These project approvals certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Response 1.

Comment noted for the record. No response is required.

Comment 2.

The Project involves construction and operation of an industrial park consisting of six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area, 263 parking stalls, and 17 dock high doors located on north side of Telegraph Avenue and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue.

Response 2.

Comment noted for the record. No response is required.

Comment 3.

We appeal the February 12, 2019 approvals, and request that the City of Santa Fe Springs ("City") prepare an environmental impact report ("EIR") to analyze the significant environmental impacts of the Project and to propose all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts, for the following reasons.

2211 S. HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107 • HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745 PHONE 626-336-0033 • CELLULAR 562-556-4542 • E-MAIL Blodgett.marc@gmail.com

BLODGETTBAYLOSISENVIRONMENTALPLANNING

Response 3.

The comment noted for the record. According to Section 21082.2(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Lead Agency has the authority to determine whether or not a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In addition, Section 21082.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that:

"Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion, or narrative, evidence which is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment, is not substantial evidence. Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts."

The statement made by Lozeau Drury LLP fails to include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and/or expert opinion supported by facts. The IS/MND evaluated sixteen issue areas and determined that there were no unmitigable environmental impacts that would result from the proposed project's construction or operation. Mitigation measures were required for certain issue areas, though the IS/MND determined that no significant impacts would result following mitigation.

Comment 4.

There is a fair argument that the Project may have significant adverse environmental impacts, including, but not limited to: traffic during construction and operation.

Response 4.

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared for the project by Crown City Engineers. This TIA was then reviewed by the City's traffic engineer for completeness and accuracy. The City also determined the scope and extent of the traffic study including those intersections that should be studied in the TIA. The TIA concluded that the trips generated during the project's operation will not cause a decrease in Level of Service (LOS) performance for any of the study intersections. While not in the letter, a representative from Lozeau Drury LLP criticized study for not using trip rates for refrigerated warehouse or fulfillment centers. The proposed project was analyzed as a warehouse complex due to the number of warehouses in the City. The determination to analyze the project as a warehouse was approved by the City Engineer prior to the preparation of the TIA. It is important to note that the specific business and/or tenant(s) that would ultimately occupy the proposed buildings are not known at this time. Any prospective use must be either permitted by right or conditionally permitted under the City of Santa Fe Springs Zoning Ordinance. Should a prospective use require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), that use would be required to undergo an environmental review since the nature and impacts of the new use would not be consistent with estimates prepared under the previous conditions.

According the SCAQMD, warehouse proposals with unidentified tenants should use trip rates for non-refrigerated warehouse (ITE Code 150) to calculate a project's trip generation using the non-cold storage rate.¹

¹ SCAQMD and Inland Empire Logistics Council. Warehouse Truck Trip Study. Report dated June 2014.

Furthermore, the methodology including the trip generation based on the ITE was identified by the City's Engineer, which is more widely used as an industry standard.

Comment 5.

Greenhouse gases during construction and operation.

Response 5.

The analysis of the proposed project's greenhouse gas impacts were analyzed in the IS/MND. The project's construction and operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) are presented in Table 1. According to the SCAQMD, warehouse proposals with unidentified tenants are permitted to calculate a project's trip generation using the non-cold storage rate. Therefore, for the purposes of the Air Quality and GHG emissions modeling, the project was assumed to be an unrefrigerated warehouse use. The CalEEMod was operated taking into account the additional 120 truck trips at a rate of 1.04 trucks per 1,000 square feet.

As indicated in Table 1, the CO_2E total for the project is 3,341 MTCO₂E per year, which is below the aforementioned threshold. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of 255.93 MTCO₂E per year. When amortized over a 30-year period, these emissions decrease to 8.53 MTCO₂E per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's overall GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total operational emissions would be 3,350 MTCO₂E per year, which is well below the 7,000, or 10,000 MTCO₂E thresholds identified for industrial land uses.

	GHG Emissions (tons/year)					
Source	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ E		
Long-Term – Area Emissions				0.01		
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	161.00			161.59		
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	2,995.10	0.22		3,000.67		
Long-Term – Waste Emissions	22.095	1.30		54.74		
Long-Term – Water Emissions	100.93	0.74	0.01	124.86		
Long-Term - Total Emissions	3,279.15	2.27	0.01	3,341.88		
Total Construction Emissions	254.66	0.05		255.93		
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years				8.53 MTCO₂E		
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				3,350.41 MTCO₂E		
Significance Threshold				7,000 MTCO₂E (Draft) 10,000 MTCO₂E (Established)		

Table 1
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Source: CalEEMod.V.2016.3.2
Comment 6.

Potential soil contamination.

Response 6.

As indicated in the IS/MND, the project site is not located on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List). In addition, the project site is not identified on any Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST). The property located to the north of the project site at 10051 Romandel Avenue is currently listed on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST) as a Voluntary Cleanup Site. A search through the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor database indicated that the project site was not included on any Federal or State clean up or Superfund lists. The United States Environmental Protection Agency's multi-system search was consulted to determine whether the project site is identified on any Federal Brownfield list; Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List; Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List; and/or Federal RCRA Generators List. The project site was not identified on any of the aforementioned lists.

A Phase II Study was completed for the project site by ATC Group Services. This report was prepared in December of 2018. As indicated in the report, ATC collected soil vapor samples on November 21, 2018 at five and nine and a half feet below ground surface (BGS). Samples were taken from four locations along the north and west boundaries of the site to assess potential VOC impacts. A total of 26 different VOCs were detected across all four sample locations at five feet and nine and a half feet bgs. Reported concentrations were greater than respective CRWQCB Tier 1 ESLs for benzene, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, PCE, 1,1,2-TCA, and TCE. Based on the results of the Limited Phase II ESA activities, benzene, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, PCE, 1,1,2-TCA, and TCE were detected in soil vapor samples at concentrations greater than their respective CRWQCB Tier 1 ESLs. The compounds detected in soil vapor on MC&C Site IV are consistent with the historical detections of compounds in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater documented for the adjacent former Productol site. Based on a review historical documentation, it is plausible that the soil vapor concentrations observed in the northwestern portion of MC&C Site IV are related to the historical operations at the former Productol site. ATC recommends that a soil vapor barrier and/or vapor mitigation system be considered for installation during the planning phase for construction in the northern and western portion of the Site. The installation of the vapor barrier or mitigation system will be done in accordance with Chapter 117 - Oil and Gas, Section 117.131 of the City's municipal code.

Comment 7.

Health risk impacts related to airborne emissions; noise; and other impacts.

Response 7.

The project site is located over 1,200 feet (350 meters) east of the Villages at Heritage Springs, the closest sensitive receptor to the project site. In addition, the project site is not located within the line-of-sight of the aforementioned sensitive receptor. Given the distance between the two locations and the presence of structures that obstruct the line-of-sight between the two sites, less than significant health risk impacts are anticipated to occur.

Comment 8.

The City has not adequately considered cumulative impacts with respect to other projects proposed in the area.

Response 8.

The project's cumulative traffic impacts were analyzed in the TIA. The average daily trips generated by both projects will not negative impact any intersection's level of service.

Comment 9.

The City has segmented the MC&C Site III and MC&C Site IV project, which should be considered as a single project under CEQA.

Response 9.

A lead agency is generally not permitted to segment or piecemeal a project into smaller components if the purpose of this piecemealing is *to avoid the full disclosure of environmental impacts*. Again, the requirement arises from the definition of a CEQA project which includes the phrase "...whole of the action." This phrase has been interpreted by the California Supreme Court to mean that it is generally inappropriate to divide a larger project into smaller segments so as to avoid the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR). The rule against segmenting does not mean that every activity related to a proposed project's implementation must be included in a single CEQA document. Rather, the California Supreme Court held that related actions only had to be included in a CEQA document when they were reasonably foreseeable, but not when they were remote and speculative.

The two MC&C projects that were filed separately vary in size and intended use. Furthermore, both projects are located on two separate sites. These two projects share no relation to each other. In other words, one project could proceed in the absence of the other. Furthermore, the combined floor area from both projects (294,661 square feet) is below the thresholds of what constitutes a "regionally significant project." According to Section 115206(B) - Projects of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance, the lead agency shall determine that a proposed project is of statewide, regional, or areawide significance if the project meets any of the following criteria:

- (1) A proposed local general plan, element, or amendment thereof for which an EIR was prepared. If a negative declaration was prepared for the plan, element, or amendment, the document need not be submitted for review.
- (2) A project has the potential for causing significant effects on the environment extending beyond the city or county in which the project would be located. Examples of the effects include generating significant amounts of traffic or interfering with the attainment or maintenance of state or national air quality standards. Projects subject to this subsection include:
 - (A) A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units;
 - (B) A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 square feet of floor space;
 - (C) A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 250,000 square feet of floor space;
 - (D) A proposed hotel/motel development of more than 500 rooms; and,
 - (E) A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or encompassing more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.

For informational purposes only, when combined, the two projects do not meet the criteria for a regionally significant project in terms of air quality impacts. Table 2 shows the construction emissions from both projects. As shown in the Table, the project's construction will not result in an exceedance for any criteria pollutant.

Estimated Daily Construction Emissions for MC&C III and IV						
Construction Phase	ROG	NO _x	СО	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Daily Emissions	67.08	84.95	47.23	0.10	40.93	24.01
Daily Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 2

Table 3 shows the operational emissions from both projects. As shown in the Table, the operational air emissions from both projects will not result in an exceedance for any criteria pollutant.

Table 3Estimated Operational Emissions for MC&C III and IV in lbs/day

Emission Source	ROG	NO _x	СО	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Total (lbs/day)	9.33	71.39	33.55	0.30	5.97	1.82
Daily Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

The construction and operational GHG emissions from both projects is presented below in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, the CO_2E total for the MC&C Site III and Site IV is 6,190 MTCO₂E per year, which is below the aforementioned threshold. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of 863.08 MTCO₂E per year. When amortized over a 30-year period, these emissions decrease to 28.76 MTCO₂E per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's true GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total operational emissions would be 6,218 MTCO₂E per year, which is still below the thresholds identified for industrial land uses.

	GHG Emissions (tons/year)				
Source	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ E	
Long-Term – Area Emissions					
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	379.83	0.01		381.22	
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	5,284.07	0.35		5,293.01	
Long-Term – Waste Emissions	56.22	3.32		139.29	
Long-Term – Water Emissions	304.3	2.23	0.05	376.45	
Long-Term - Total Emissions	6,024.45	5.92	0.05	6,189.99	
Total Construction Emissions	859.11	0.15		863.08	
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years				28.76 MTCO ₂ E	
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				6,218 MTCO2E	
Significance Threshold				7,000 MTCO₂E (Draft) 10,000 MTCO₂E (Established)	

Table 4Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Source: CalEEMod.V.2016.3.2

Comment 10.

The City has not considered all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce environmental impacts.

Response 10.

The mitigation measures that were proposed will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant. The project's air quality and GHG emissions are below the thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD. Therefore, no mitigation is required. Adherence to standards Rule 403 regulations is mandatory and will ensure construction impacts remain at less than significant levels. The inclusion of a vapor barrier would suffice in terms of mitigating potential vapor intrusion. In addition, the inclusion of the post-construction BMPs indentified the Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan will ensure potential stormwater runoff impacts remain at levels that are less than significant. Lastly, the noise generated within the project site will not be audible due to the distance between the site and the nearest sensitive receptors and the presence of structures that obstruct the line-of-sight between the two points.

Comment 11.

This letter complies with Municipal Code §155.865, which provides that appeals are to be made in writing and filed with the City Clerk. At your direction, we are filing this via overnight mail, without any accompanying appeal fees.

Response 11.

Comment noted for the record. No response is required.



T 510.836.4200 F 510.836.4205 410 12th Street, Suite 250 Oakland, Ca 94607 www.lozeaudrury.com richard@lozeaudrury.com

Via Email & Overnight Mail

February 27, 2019

Janet Martinez, CMC,City Clerk City of Santa Fe Springs City Clerk's Office 11710 E. Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 JanetMartinez@santafesprings.org

> RE: Appeal of Planning Commission's Approval of Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962, and Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 Re: MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV, Assessor Parcel Number 8011-002-901 to -903, 8011-003-955 to -979

Dear Ms. Martinez:

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance For Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER"). SAFER hereby appeals the February 12, 2019 decision of the City of Santa Fe Springs Planning Commission approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 82567, Development Plan Approval (DPA) Case Nos. 957-962, and Zone Change (ZC) Case No. 138 with respect to the MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV, Assessor Parcel Number 8011-002-901 to -903, 8011-003-955 to -979 ("Project"). These project approvals certified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The Project involves construction and operation of an industrial park consisting of six warehouse buildings totaling 115,801 square feet of floor area, 263 parking stalls, and 17 dock high doors located on north side of Telegraph Avenue and the southwest corner of Romandel Avenue.

We appeal the February 12, 2019 approvals, and request that the City of Santa Fe Springs ("City") prepare an environmental impact report ("EIR") to analyze the significant environmental impacts of the Project and to propose all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce those impacts, for the following reasons: (1) there

SAFER Appeal on MC&C Commerce Center, Site IV February 27, 2019 Page 2 of 2

is a fair argument that the Project may have significant adverse environmental impacts, including, but not limited to: traffic during construction and operation; air quality during construction and operation; greenhouse gases during construction and operation; potential soil contamination; health risk impacts related to airborne emissions; noise; and other impacts; (2) the City has not adequately considered cumulative impacts with respect to other projects proposed in the area; (3) the City has segmented the MC&C Site III and MC&C Site IV project, which should be considered as a single project under CEQA; and (4) the City has not considered all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce environmental impacts.

This letter complies with Municipal Code §155.865, which provides that appeals are to be made in writing and filed with the City Clerk. At your direction, we are filing this via overnight mail, without any accompanying appeal fees.

Sincerely,

Richard Drury