Attachment 3



# **City of Westminster**

Planning Commission Staff Report 8200 Westminster Blvd. Westminster, CA 92673

Item #: 8.2

Meeting Date: March 5, 2025

# **SUBJECT**

**Case No. 2024-0277** (Development Review and Administrative Adjustment) – A request to construct a new approximately 69,498-square-foot industrial warehouse building within the C-M zoning district, located at 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard (APN 096-021-14).

From: Sheri Vander Dussen, Interim Community Development Director

Prepared by: Stephanie Tomaino, AICP, Contract Principal Planner

# **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Adopt PC Resolution No. 25-002 (Attachment 1) entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Westminster, California, approving Case No. 2024-0277 for a Development Review to construct a new approximately 69,498-square-foot industrial warehouse building within the C-M (Commercial-Industrial) zoning district, and an Administrative Adjustment to allow a building height increase of up to 10% above the 35-foot height limit, located at 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard (APN 096-021-14)."

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to demolish eight existing industrial buildings and construct a 69,498-square-foot single-tenant industrial warehouse building. The project includes 6,000 square feet of office space, 10 truck loading docks, and a secured rear yard area, with no specific tenant identified at this time. The project complies with all applicable development standards, except for building height, for which the applicant is requesting an Administrative Adjustment to allow an increase of up to 10% above the 35-foot height limit. The project meets the City's Industrial Design Guidelines as the proposed building utilizes a high-quality, modern design with varied materials, architectural articulation, and massing techniques that enhance visual interest and break up building scale. A traffic analysis confirmed that the project's trip generation is within allowable thresholds, and the project qualifies for a Class 32 categorical exemption, eliminating the need for further CEQA review. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) approving the project, subject to conditions of approval.

# BACKGROUND

The approximately 3.34-acre site is located in the C-M (Commercial-Industrial) zoning district, which serves as a hybrid zone allowing a mix of commercial and light industrial uses. This zoning designation permits the development of both commercial shopping centers and light industrial buildings, blending elements of both zoning categories. The site contains multiple structures that were constructed primarily in the 1960s. Vehicular access to the site is provided via two driveways: a primary entrance at the signalized intersection of Garden Grove Boulevard and Western Avenue, and a secondary right-in/right-out driveway along Garden Grove Boulevard. Surrounding land uses and zoning districts are detailed in Table 1 below.

Directions	Land Uses	Zoning Districts
<u>North</u>	Automotive and industrial uses, business park	Garden Grove city limits
<u>South</u>	State Route 22 (SR 22)	n/a
<u>East</u>	Public Storage, and other industrial and storage uses	C-M (Commercial-Industrial)
<u>West</u>	U-Haul, Extra Space Storage	C-M (Commercial-Industrial)

Table 1: Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning Districts

# PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant and property owner, Seventh Street Development on behalf of 7474 BP, LLC, requests approval to demolish eight existing industrial buildings totaling 52,000 square feet and construct a new 69,498-square-foot single-tenant industrial warehouse building. The proposed industrial development includes approximately 6,000 square feet of office space, 10 truck loading docks, and a secured fenced yard area along the rear for operations. The project site was previously occupied by a heat-treatment and aerospace parts manufacturing facility (Bodycote Thermal Processing). The outdated industrial buildings are being replaced with a modern, tilt-up concrete warehouse facility designed to accommodate a range of potential industrial users. The building is speculative, meaning no specific tenant has been identified at this time. However, the flexible building layout and C-M zoning district allows for various uses, including warehouse/distribution, light industrial, manufacturing, research & development, office, and limited retail components (e.g., a furniture retail store). The development will also include site grading, landscaping, paving, and on-site parking improvements. The applicant provided a narrative describing the proposed project as Attachment 2. Project plans (including color renderings) are provided as Attachment 5.

# PROJECT ANALYSIS

Nonresidential projects over 1,000 gross square feet require a Development Review (DR) application. This application allows the city to comprehensively review proposed development projects to ensure compliance with the required standards, design guidelines, and ordinances of the City; minimize potential adverse effects on surrounding properties and the environment; and ensure quality development and protect the integrity and character of the residential, commercial and public areas of the City. DR applications are typically reviewed administratively and are subject to approval by the Community Development Director. However, in accordance with Westminster Municipal Code (WMC) Section 17.520.010.B, the Director has the discretion on a case-by-case basis to require public notification for any DR application and defer the application to the Commission for action. During the pre-application phase, the Director determined that, given the size and scale of the proposed development, the project should be elevated to the Planning Commission for review.

#### **Development Standards Compliance**

Development of the proposed light industrial building is subject to compliance with the Industrial District Development Standards contained within Table 2-7 of WMC Section 17.230.015. With the exception of the building height, the project complies with applicable development standards, including but not limited to zoning requirements within WMC Title 17 Land Use ("Zoning Code"); Public Works' traffic engineering standards; and Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) and Midway City Sanitary District (MCSD) standards.

## Parking:

Although a specific tenant has not been identified for the building, the applicant anticipates that the building will be occupied by a use most similar to a warehouse and distribution facility. In accordance with Table 3-5 of WMC Section 17.320.020, "warehousing and distribution facilities" require 1 parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross building area. This may include incidental office space up to 10%. The proposed floor plan includes 63,498 square feet of warehouse space and 6,000 square feet of incidental office space. The Zoning Code requires the development to provide 69 parking spaces. This parking requirement is met through 56 standard stalls, three accessible stalls, nine EV stalls, and two EV accessible stalls (70 parking spaces total).

#### Landscaping:

Pursuant to WMC Section 17.310.020, sites proposing new development shall provide a minimum of 15% site landscaping. The project complies with this standard by providing 22,018 square feet of landscaped area, or 15.1% of the total site area. The proposed site plan includes a 6-foot-wide landscaped strip along Garden Grove Boulevard, situated between the street right-of-way and parking area, to meet the City's requirements for parking lot perimeter landscaping and vehicle bumper overhangs. The project complies

with other applicable landscaping standards, including minimum number of trees (44 trees required and provided); tree container size; and groundcover and shrub requirements.

## Administrative Adjustment:

The maximum building height in all industrial zones is 35 feet; however, a portion of the proposed building exceeds this limit. Specifically, the roof height at the front of the building along Garden Grove Boulevard is 35'-6", while the highest point, near the center of the building along the ridge line, reaches 37'-9". Due to variations in site grade, some portions of the building, such as the elevation facing the SR-22 freeway, remain below the height limit.

The applicant is requesting an Administrative Adjustment to allow an increase in the maximum allowable building height. Per Table 5-2 of WMC Section 17.555.010, an Administrative Adjustment may permit up to a 10% increase in building height, allowing a maximum of 38'-6" in industrial zones. According to the applicant's project narrative, the increased roof height is necessary to achieve a 32' interior warehouse clearance, which is the industry standard for a modern industrial facility of this scale, as well as to accommodate roof slope for drainage. Administrative Adjustments are typically issued by the Community Development Director but are elevated to the highest review authority when submitted in conjunction with other applications. Following a review of the proposed development, staff has determined that the requested building height increase meets the required findings for approval outlined in WMC Section 17.555.020. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Administrative Adjustment request.

## **Design Guidelines Consistency**

The proposed industrial building meets the City's Industrial Design Guidelines by incorporating high-quality materials, varied colors, and architectural articulation to create a visually appealing and well-proportioned structure. The design avoids long, unbroken façades by integrating building offsets, parapet height variations, and window placements, which add depth and shadowing while reducing the perception of mass. To further enhance visual interest, the building features contrasting material finishes, architectural reveals, and enhanced entryways with glazing and canopy elements. The use of parapet projections helps break up the roofline, while horizontal and vertical massing variations create a more dynamic façade. These design elements ensure that, despite its industrial function, the building maintains an attractive and modern aesthetic consistent with the City's guidelines.

Additionally, because the property abuts the SR-22 freeway and is highly visible, staff is recommending a condition of approval (COA #23) prohibiting unscreened storage within the fenced rear yard area. This requirement ensures that the rear yard remains orderly and is used as intended for vehicle parking, preventing long-term storage or visual clutter.

## Traffic Analysis

A trip generation assessment (Attachment 3) was conducted by Fehr & Peers to evaluate potential traffic impacts based on various tenant scenarios. Since this is a speculative building with no identified tenant, multiple scenarios were analyzed to capture the range of potential land uses that may occupy the space in the future. Using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition), the analysis compared potential future uses, including warehousing, manufacturing, distribution, office, and retail. The study determined that the project's net new trips under all tested tenant mix scenarios would remain below the City's established thresholds for requiring additional Level of Service (LOS) or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) assessments. The highest tested scenario (93% manufacturing with 7% office) generated 110 net new daily trips, 14 AM peak hour trips, and 21 PM peak hour trips, all within the allowable screening criteria. Given these findings, no further transportation impact studies are required for the project's entitlement process.

To ensure that future traffic impacts remain consistent with this analysis, staff is recommending a condition of approval (COA #21) requiring the future tenant to submit a traffic analysis prior to the issuance of building permits for tenant improvements. This analysis must demonstrate that anticipated traffic volumes are consistent with the assumptions evaluated in this study. Because traffic volumes can vary significantly depending on the operational characteristics of the end user, this requirement provides an additional safeguard. For example, a distribution use may generate a higher volume of trips due to frequent deliveries by last-mile trucks, whereas a manufacturing use may have fewer but larger line-haul truck deliveries. This condition ensures that any deviations from the analyzed scenarios are properly assessed before permit issuance.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project was evaluated for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and staff determined that it qualifies for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption for infill development projects under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. This exemption applies to projects that meet specific criteria, including consistency with the General Plan and zoning regulations, location within city limits on a site less than five acres substantially surrounded by urban development, lack of significant habitat value for endangered species, no significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impacts, and adequate access to utilities and public services.

A detailed environmental analysis (Attachment 4) confirms that the project meets these criteria. The project site is currently developed with industrial uses and does not contain sensitive biological resources. Air quality modeling confirmed that both construction and operational emissions would remain below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) significance thresholds. Noise impacts from the project are anticipated to be similar to existing conditions, and water quality measures, including the implementation of a vegetated modular wetland system, ensure compliance with stormwater management requirements. Additionally, none of the exceptions to categorical

exemptions listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply, as the project will not result in cumulative environmental impacts, significant effects due to unusual circumstances, or impacts on historic resources, scenic highways, or hazardous waste sites. Based on these findings, no further environmental review is required, and the project is categorically exempt from CEQA.

# PUBLIC NOTICES

In accordance with WMC Section 17.630.010, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed project and date, time, and location of the hearing was mailed on February 20, 2025, to all property owners of record and occupants within a 500 feet radius of the project boundaries. Notices were also posted at the project site, City Council Chambers, City Hall, Westminster Branch Library, Community Services and Recreation Building, and on the city's website. As of February 26, 2025, staff has not received public comments related to the project.

## Attachments:

- 1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 25-002
- 2. Applicant's Project Description
- 3. Trip Generation Study
- 4. CEQA Exemption Memo
- 5. Project Plans

# **ATTACHMENT 3.A**

#### PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 25-002

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING CASE NO. 2024-0277 FOR A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A NEW APPROXIMATELY 69,498-SQUARE-FOOT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE BUILDING WITHIN THE C-M (COMMERCIAL-INDUSTRIAL) ZONING DISTRICT, AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOW A BUILDING HEIGHT INCREASE OF UP TO 10% ABOVE THE 35-FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT, LOCATED AT 7474 GARDEN GROVE BOULEVARD (APN 096-021-14)

WHEREAS, the authorized agent, Seventh Street Development, on behalf of the applicant and property owner, 7474 BP, LLC, submitted Development Review and Administrative Adjustment applications (Case No. 2024-0277) requesting to construct a new industrial warehouse building within the C-M zoning district, located at 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard (APN 096-021-14); and

WHEREAS, as the Lead Agency, the Planning Division has completed an initial environmental assessment of the above matter in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's guidelines for the implementation of CEQA and recommends that the Planning Commission determine the project is categorically exempt from further CEQA review under Section 15332, Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects; and

WHEREAS, a notice of public hearing describing the project, date, time, and location of the hearing was mailed on February 20, 2025, to all property owners of record and occupants within a 500 feet radius of the project boundaries at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. A notice was also posted at the project site, City Council Chambers, City Hall, Westminster Branch Library, Community Services and Recreation Building, and on the city's website; and

WHEREAS, on March 5, 2025, the Planning Commission of the City of Westminster, California held a duly noticed public hearing on the subject applications (Case No. 2024-0277), considered written and oral comments, and facts and evidence presented by the applicant, City staff, and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after careful consideration of all statements and evidence presented, has determined that the project and associated applications meet the intent and purpose of the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and will not impair the public health, safety, and general welfare.

# NOW THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION 1.** Incorporation of Recitals. The Planning Commission of the City of Westminster, California, hereby finds that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein as substantive findings of the Commission.

**SECTION 2. CEQA.** The Planning Commission finds that the proposed industrial warehouse development is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15332, Class 32, for In-Fill Development Projects, as a result of meeting five established conditions that demonstrate no features or unusual circumstances distinguish the project from others in exempt classes that would disgualify the project. Class 32 specifically exempts from environmental review in-fill development where: 1) the project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations; 2) the proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses; 3) the project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species; 4) approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and 5) the site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. The applicant submitted, and the City accepted, a CEQA technical memorandum documenting how the project meets the required criteria for eligibility under the Class 32 In-Fill Development Projects, categorical exemption.

<u>SECTION 3</u>. Required DR Findings. Pursuant to Section 17.520.020 of the Westminster Municipal Code ("WMC"), the Planning Commission makes the following specific findings of fact related to the granting of the Development Review.

A. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare.

The proposed development will be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable building, fire, and accessibility codes, ensuring a safe and secure industrial facility. The building will include automatic fire sprinklers, fire-resistant construction materials, and adequate emergency access in compliance with the latest fire and life safety regulations. Additionally, the project will meet current seismic safety standards. The project's construction and operational air emissions will remain below South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds, ensuring no significant air quality impacts. Accessibility features such as ADA-compliant parking, pathways, and entryways will also be incorporated to accommodate individuals with disabilities. Therefore, the proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

B. The proposed development is in full compliance with this Title, including with the design guidelines manual.

The proposed project complies with all applicable zoning, development, and design standards outlined in WMC Title 17 (Zoning Code), with the exception of building height, which is addressed through an Administrative Adjustment. The C-M (Commercial-Industrial) zoning allows for light industrial uses, and the project meets required parking, landscaping, and site design standards. The proposed building incorporates architectural articulation, varied materials, and massing techniques to align with the City's Industrial Design Guidelines, ensuring an attractive and functional design. The requested height adjustment is justified by industry standards for warehouse facilities and will not negatively impact surrounding properties. Therefore, the proposed development is in full compliance with this Title, including with the Design Guidelines Manual.

C. The proposed development will not adversely affect the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan and it is consistent with the General Plan.

The site is designated Industrial in the General Plan Land Use Element, which allows for medium and light industrial uses such as manufacturing, warehousing, and research and development, provided they are conducted indoors or adequately screened. The proposed development is consistent with this designation and is designed to accommodate a range of permitted light industrial activities. Although a specific tenant has not been identified, the project's design and operational characteristics ensure compatibility with the intended land use. The CEQA environmental analysis confirmed that all potential land use scenarios would remain within acceptable air quality and noise thresholds, ensuring no adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan and will not adversely affect any applicable Specific Plan.

D. The existing or proposed public facilities necessary to accommodate the proposed project (e.g., fire protection devices, parkways, public utilities, sewers, water, sidewalks, storm drains, street lights, traffic control devices, and the width and pavement of adjoining streets and alleys) will be available to serve the subject site.

The project site is located within a fully urbanized area with access to established public infrastructure and utilities, including water, sewer, storm drains, and electrical services, all of which are adequate to support the proposed development. The project has been designed to connect to existing public streets and sidewalks, ensuring safe pedestrian and vehicular circulation. Fire and emergency services are readily available, and the site will be equipped with fire protection devices such as sprinklers and hydrants per the Fire Code. Additionally, the development will comply with stormwater management regulations, ensuring proper drainage and water quality control. Therefore, the existing or proposed public facilities necessary to accommodate the project will be available to serve the subject site.

**SECTION 4.** Required AA Findings. Pursuant to WMC Section 17.555.020, the Planning Commission makes the following specific findings of fact related to the granting of the Administrative Adjustment.

A. The strict application of the applicable development standard creates an unnecessary, involuntarily created hardship or unreasonable regulation that makes it obviously impractical to require compliance with the development standards.

The strict application of the 35-foot height limit creates an unnecessary hardship, as modern warehouse facilities require a 32-foot interior clearance to accommodate efficient storage, racking systems, and operational needs. Meeting this standard while incorporating structural, mechanical, and drainage requirements makes strict compliance impractical. The requested height increase of up to 37'-9" is minimal, remains within the 10% Administrative Adjustment allowance, and is necessary for the building to function as intended. The design ensures the additional height is integrated seamlessly into the structure without negatively impacting the surrounding area.

B. Approval of the administrative adjustment would not be detrimental to the public health, interest, safety, or general welfare and would not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity and in the same zoning district.

The requested height adjustment remains within the allowable 10% increase and will not negatively impact surrounding properties or public welfare. The tallest point of the building's height occurs within the center of the building, with portions of the structure remaining below the height limit due to site grading, reducing any visual impact. Additionally, the project complies with all other zoning and development standards, ensuring it integrates well with the surrounding industrial area. The height increase does not introduce health, safety, or compatibility concerns. Therefore, approval of the administrative adjustment is appropriate.

C. The project is consistent with the General Plan and complies with all other applicable provisions of this Title.

The project site is designated Industrial in the General Plan, which allows for a variety of light and medium industrial uses, including warehousing and manufacturing. The proposed development conforms with General Plan policies by promoting economic growth and efficient land use within an industrially zoned area. The project complies with all applicable zoning code requirements, including parking, landscaping, and site design standards. Additionally, the building's design adheres to the City's Industrial Design Guidelines, ensuring a high-quality and visually compatible development. Therefore, the project is consistent with the General Plan and complies with all other applicable provisions of this Title.

**NEW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Planning Commission hereby approves Case No. 2024-0277 and grants the Development Review and Administrative Adjustment requests, subject to compliance with the Westminster Municipal Code and the following conditions of approval.

1. The applicant and the property owner agree to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without

limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Case No. 2024-0277. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City's approval of this project, the applicant agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For the purposes of this section "the City" includes the City of Westminster's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

- The property owner affected by the proposed project acknowledges all of the conditions of approval and accepts this resolution subject to those conditions and with full awareness of the provisions of Westminster's Municipal Code. These conditions are binding to all future property owners of the subject property.
- 3. The development and/or use shall conform to all applicable provisions of the Westminster Municipal Code and shall conform to the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act when applicable.
- 4. The subject property shall be developed in substantial conformance with the approved plans as reviewed by the Planning Commission and Planning Division, unless revised or modified by the approving body pursuant to WMC Section 17.510.035.
- 5. The subject entitlements (Case No. 2024-0277) may be modified or revoked by the City should it be determined, after notice and a hearing as consistent with Chapter 17.650 of the Municipal Code, that the proposed use or conditions under which it was permitted are detrimental to the public health, welfare, or materially injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity or if the use is maintained as to constitute a public nuisance.
- 6. The approval shall expire one year from the date of approval if the use has not been exercised, unless a time extension is requested and granted pursuant to WMC Section 17.510.030.

## Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permit

- The applicant or responsible party shall submit the plans listed below to the Orange County Fire Authority for review and obtain OCFA approval: fire master plan (service code PR145); chemical classification packet (service codes PR315-328); HPS Plans (service code PR330); underground piping (service codes PR470-PR475); fire sprinkler system (service codes PR400-PR465); and fire alarm system (service codes PR500-PR530). (OCFA)
- 8. The applicant shall submit a Grading Plan and supporting documents for review and approval of the City Engineer. Plan shall use City of Westminster Title Block and shall be prepared by developer's Registered Civil Engineer. When plan check

is complete, the Applicant shall submit three sets of final Plan for approval and signature of the City Engineer. (PW)

- 9. The applicant shall construct the following Public Works Improvements (per approved plans & City Standards) and indicate these improvements on the grading plans/improvement plans. Additional improvements may be required during grading plan check; see City of Westminster Grading Plans/Utility Plans Submittal requirement.
  - Construct new sidewalk per City Std. 203 only where sidewalk is damaged or requiring replacement due to the elimination of the east driveway.
  - Garden Grove Blvd. is under moratorium:
    - If only street disruption is water connection to the main water line (located at about 20 ft North of property line): Grind and cap 2" of AC: full lane width of number 3 lane, for property frontage.
    - If street is damaged outside of number 3 lane: Grind and cap 2" of AC to the center line of street for property frontage.
    - If the bus pad is damaged: Remove and replace it to the nearest joint per OCTA standard (figure 19, type 1A).
  - Backfill per City Std 609 for all utility connections. (PW)
- 10. The applicant shall construct the following On-Site Improvements (per approved plans & City Standards) and indicate these improvements on the plan:
  - On-site parking shall be per City Std. 509
  - Water quality BMPs per approved WQMP (PW)
- 11. The applicant shall execute an "Agreement for Grading and Street Improvements" for construction of improvements and post the following Surety Bonds or an equivalent cash deposit in the amount to be determined based upon a cost estimate for grading and street and utility improvement work.
  - Provide detailed cost estimate for on-site earthwork, drainage, water quality related improvements, erosion and sediment control, removal of proposed structures, and all off-site public improvements.
  - Provide Performance Bond 100% of cost estimate
  - Provide Labor and Material Bond 100% of cost estimate (PW)
- 12. Prior to the commencement of any work in the public right-of-way, the applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit and shall make arrangements for inspection by the City of Westminster. (PW)
- 13. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits for projects that will result in soil disturbance of one or more acres of land, the applicant shall demonstrate that coverage has been obtained under California's General Permit for Stormwater 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. Projects subject to this requirement shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A copy of the current SWPPP shall be kept at the project site and be available for City review upon request. (PW)

- 14. For priority projects, as defined by the Orange County Stormwater Program, the applicant shall submit to the City for review and approval a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) that:
  - Discusses regional or watershed programs (if applicable);
  - Identifies selected LID and Hydromodification (as applicable) BMPs;
  - Identifies any applicable waivers, alternative programs, and Treatment Control BMPs;
  - Incorporates the applicable Source Control BMPs;
  - Describes long-term operation and maintenance requirements for BMPs;
  - Identifies the entity that will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the BMPS; and
  - Describes the mechanism for funding the long-term operation and maintenance of the BMPs. (PW)
- 15. The Project WQMP shall be approved prior to issuance of grading permit. (PW)
- 16. The applicant shall process a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) to eliminate any lot lines that the proposed building crosses, as determined by the City Engineer or designee. (PW)
- 17. Vacate easements identified as Easement 8 (6' for Edison per Book 3628, Page 347), Easement 11, and Easement 12, or any other easements that conflict with the proposed development, as determined by the City Engineer or designee. (PW)

# Prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

- 18. For priority projects, as defined by the Orange County Stormwater Program, prior to grading or building permit close-out and/or the issuance of a certificate of use or a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall:
  - Demonstrate that all LID and other structural best management practices (BMPs) described in the Project WQMP have been constructed and installed in conformance with approved plans and specifications;
  - Demonstrate that applicant is prepared to implement all non-structural BMPs described in the Project WQMP;
  - Demonstrate that an adequate number of copies of the project's approved final Project WQMP are available for the future property occupants; and
  - Submit for review and approval an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan for all structural BMPs (optional if included in final Project WQMP). (PW)

- 19. The property owner shall dedicate public right-of-way easements for water and sewer infrastructure as required by the Public Works Department Water Division and Midway City Sanitary District. All dedications shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and relevant agencies. (PW)
- 20. Prior to obtaining permit close-out and/or any type of occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate that a Master Covenant and Agreement Regarding O&M Plan to Fund and Maintain Water Quality BMPs and all required items were recorded at the County Recorder's office. (PW)

## Prior to the issuance of tenant improvement permits

21. Prior to the issuance of building permits for tenant improvements, the future tenant shall submit a traffic analysis demonstrating that anticipated traffic volumes are consistent with the assumptions in the Fehr & Peers Trip Generation Study (dated January 22, 2025). If traffic volumes exceed the thresholds for Level of Service (LOS) or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) assessments, the tenant may be required to submit a supplemental traffic study and implement any necessary mitigation measures, subject to City approval. (PLNG)

## Ongoing operations and maintenance

- 22. The building shall be occupied by a land use consistent with the warehousing and distribution facility parking standard of 1 space per 1,000 square feet. Any future tenant proposing a land use with a higher parking requirement, such as industrial or manufacturing establishments, must demonstrate compliance with applicable parking standards or obtain a parking exception pursuant to WMC Chapter 17.320, subject to separate City approval. (PLNG)
- 23. The fenced rear yard area shall not be used for unscreened storage of materials, equipment, or containers for 72 hours or more. Any storage or operational activity exceeding this timeframe must be fully screened from public view, comply with all applicable zoning regulations, and receive prior approval from the Planning Division, which may require additional applications, fees, and City review. (PLNG)
- 24. The fenced yard at the rear of the property shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner at all times to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area and to prevent visual impacts from the SR-22 freeway. (PLNG)

# PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March, 2025

Chairman of the Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary of the Planning Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) ) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE )

I, Patricia Peraza, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Westminster held on March 5, 2025, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Secretary of the Planning Commission

# ATTACHMENT 3.B

City of Westminster Case No. 2024-0277 Proposed Construction of new 69,900 sf industrial building 7474 Garden Grove Blvd (APN: 096-021-14)

#### **Project Description:**

The proposed project consists of demolition of approximately 52,000 sf in eight existing industrial buildings and construction of a single state-of-the-art single-tenant industrial building of approximately 69,900 sf on the approximately 3.3-acre lot.

Since 1968, the site has been used as a manufacturing plant for heat-treating and storage of aluminum aerospace parts by Bodycote Thermal Processing and its predecessor, Alum-a-Therm. The proposed project will replace this outdated facility with a new, state-of-the-art industrial building that can accommodate a wide range of uses. The current new ownership of the site intends to build the building without a precommitment from a tenant or buyer. (Industrial users under 100,000 sf rarely commit to leasing or purchasing a building until the project is completed or at least under construction.) Once leased, the current owner's business plan is to hold the asset long term. The flexible building design and the CM Zoning allow for a wide range of possible uses including warehouse/distribution, light industrial and assembly, manufacturing, research & development, office, retail uses like a furniture store and combinations of these uses (eg, a business with warehouse, office and furniture retail store).

As of the date of this submittal, all equipment has been removed and all, but three building structures associated with the prior manufacturing plant were demolished by prior owner (Bodycote Thermal Processing) under a separate demolition permit. This initial demolition was completed in December 2024. This new project application (Case No. 2024-0277) includes demolition of the three remaining building structures in their entirety (totaling approximately 45,800 sf), grading of the entire site and construction of a new 69,900 sf concrete tilt up building and associated landscaping and paving.

The 69,900 square foot building includes 6,000 sf of office improvements of which 3,000 sf will be on a mezzanine. The building will have 32' interior ceiling height, a state-of-the-art early suppression fast response (ESFR) fire sprinkler system,10 loading docks, 70 passenger car parking spots and a truck ramp with a grade level door. Two of the passenger car spots will have EV charging stations and another nine spots will be designed as EV-ready for future addition of an EV charging stations. As shown on the attached site plan, the building will have a fenced rear yard with an automated motorized gate. As shown on the attached renderings, the building will feature tenant signage visible from both Garden Grove Blvd and the Garden Grove (22) Freeway.

As shown on the attached landscape plan, over 15% of the site will be landscape area. The project will have 15 large (24" box/15 gallon) trees along Garden Grove Blvd consisting of a mix of Olive, Camphor, Chitalpa and Tristania trees. Twenty additional Tristania trees will line the driveway to the rear lot. The rear lot will feature an additional five Tristania trees and three Chitalpa trees. (Please note the tree species are subject to change in the final landscape plan based on availability and City staff input.) The rear fence line adjacent to the 22 Freeway will be a 10' high black wrought iron tube steel fence with a fast-growing hedge on the exterior. As indicated on the landscaping plan, the project will have a series of hedge and groundcover plantings throughout with accent plants like Blue Agave, Coral Aloe and Red Yucca.

#### ATTACHMENT 3

The building height limit is 35 feet for the CM Zone; however, an administrative adjustment may be requested to allow building heights to be up to a maximum of 38.5' in height. These height limits exclude "non-habitable architectural features such parapets that screen the roof-mounted HVAC equipment (Section 17.300.025).

The proposed building roof height is 35'6" at the face of the building fronting Garden Grove Blvd and 34'0" on the face of the building fronting the 22 Freeway. The maximum height of the roof is 37'9" along the ridge line near the center of the building (See A4\_2 Building Sections). These roof heights modestly exceed the 35' height limit but are within the 38.5' height limit when the administrative adjustment is applied. Therefore, we request the 10% administrative adjustment in the height limit to 38.5'. These roof heights are required to achieve the 32' interior warehouse ceiling height (which is the minimum industry standard for a modern industrial building of this size) as well as provide for sloping of the roof for drainage.

Please see attached site plan, building floor plan and elevations for further details.

# ATTACHMENT 3.C

# Memorandum

Subject:	7474 Garden Grove Boulevard Trip Generation Study
From:	Jason D. Pack, P.E.
То:	Craig Furniss – Seventh Street Development manager of 7474 BP, LLC
Date:	January 22, 2025

OC24-1102

Fehr & Peers has completed a trip generation assessment for the above referenced project (Project). Specifically, we compared what land use could currently occupy the site and compared that to the trip generation under several proposed occupant scenarios based on the current plans for the site. The purpose of this memorandum is to document the results of that assessment and determine if additional traffic review is required by the project as part of its entitlement process.

# The Proposed Project

The current project site contains eight existing light industrial buildings totaling 52,000 square feet (sq. ft.). These eight buildings would be demolished and replaced with a single-tenant warehouse building totaling 69,900 sq. ft. The existing site is shown on **Figure 1**. The proposed site is shown on **Figure 2**. For purposes of this assessment, the new building is assumed to be 70,000 sq. ft. for ease of trip generation testing.

The proposed building could contain warehousing, distribution, manufacturing, a small retail component, and/or office space to serve the proposed tenant. The trip generation for these potential development scenarios was compared against the trip generation associated with occupancy of the existing site in order to better understand what level of development would trigger additional environmental review (like additional traffic studies).

The project will also provide 70 parking spaces and ten loading dock doors.

# **Trip Generation Rates**

Trip Generation rates were obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* (11<sup>th</sup> Edition). Daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour rates are summarized in **Table 1** for existing and proposed uses that could occupy the proposed site.

#### ATTACHMENT 3

# Figure 1 – Existing Site



# ATTACHMENT 3



## Figure 2 – Proposed Site Plan

Source: Herdman Architecture + Design

Table 1 – Trip Generation Rates (per 1,000 sq. ft.)							
Land Use Type	Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour				
General Light Industrial	4.87	0.74	0.65				
Manufacturing	4.75	0.68	0.74				
Warehouse	1.71	0.17	0.18				
Office	10.84	1.52	1.44				
Furniture Store <sup>1</sup>	6.30	0.26	0.52				
Distribution <sup>2</sup>	1.81	0.15	0.16				

Source: ITE Trip Generation (11th Edition)

<sup>1</sup> Retail would likely be supportive of warehousing and/or manufacturing activities that are also on-site. Although a tenant is not identified, this land use seems to reflect the size and scale of what a "small retail component" might be.

<sup>2</sup> Distribution rates presented are for High Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse non-sort facility. Please note that the data utilized in development of the rates ranged in size from 284,000 sq. ft. to 1,472,000 sq. ft. The project does not specifically fit into this data range, but the information is presented for informational purposes in case some type of distribution use could be a potential tenant.

Please note that there are other industrial ITE categories that were not considered in this assessment, but the rates above are typical rates for similar uses that could occur on the project site. Additionally, depending on the retail use, Furniture Store may, or may not, be an appropriate proxy but was utilized as a likely use for this assessment.

# **Existing Site Trip Generation**

The existing site most closely matches ITE's description of General Light Industrial, which is defined as follows:

A Light Industrial facility is a free-standing facility devoted to a single use. The facility has an emphasis on activities other than manufacturing and typically has minimal office space. Typical light industrial activities include printing, material testing, and assembly of data processing equipment. Industrial Park (Land Use 130) and Manufacturing (Land Use 140) are related uses.

Industrial Park was also considered for this assessment, but the existing site is at the low end of the surveyed data (only one survey of a site that was less than 77,000 sq. ft.) and Manufacturing is described as activities related to the conversion of raw materials or parts into finished products.

#### ATTACHMENT 3

Although the existing site is made up of several buildings, the site characteristics of Light Industrial are most representative of the site and were utilized in this assessment.

Using the Light Industrial rates, the resulting existing trip generation for the site is presented in **Table 2**:

Table 2 – Existing Site Trip Generation							
Use	Size (KSF)	Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour			
	52 KSF	Trip Generation Rates					
Light Industrial		4.87	0.74	0.65			
Light industrial		Trip Generation Estimate					
		253	38	34			
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2024 KSF = 1,000 sq. ft.							

As shown, the existing site is estimated to generate 253 daily trips, 38 of them occurring in the AM peak hour and 34 of them occurring in the PM peak hour.

# **Project Trip Generation**

The City's *FINAL Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide* (Updated June 2020) identifies the following key thresholds for determining when additional traffic assessment would be required. Please note that there are key categories that must be considered under this initial screening: (1) determining if the project is screened from needing to perform level of service (LOS) assessment, and (2) determining if the project is screened from vehicle miles of travel (VMT) assessment as required by CEQA. The City's guidelines are summarized below with key considerations presented in **bold type**:

#### LOS Assessment:

The following scenarios would trigger the need to perform a LOS assessment:

- As required by the City Traffic Engineer
- When the project is likely to add 750 or more daily trips or 50 peak hour trips
- If the project is likely to degrade operations at a nearby congested intersection

#### VMT Assessment:

The following scenarios would trigger the need to perform a VMT assessment:

#### ATTACHMENT 3

- Local serving K-12 schools
- Local parks
- Day care centers
- Local serving gas stations
- Local serving banks
- Local serving hotels
- Student housing projects
- Local serving community colleges
- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips like:
  - o 11 single family homes
  - 16 multifamily homes
  - 10,000 sq. ft. of office
  - 15,000 sq. ft. of light industrial
  - 63,000 sq. ft. of warehousing
  - o 79,000 sq. ft. of high cube transload and short-term storage warehouse

Since the screening criteria are different between what triggers LOS assessment and what triggers VMT assessment, we utilized 110 net new daily trips and 50 net new peak hour trips as our threshold for not triggering any additional traffic study review (LOS nor VMT). Those thresholds are noted below:

- 110 total daily net-new trips or less
- 50 total net-new AM peak hour trips or less
- 50 total net-new PM peak hour trips or less

The trip generation assessment shown in **Table 3** tests tenant mixes that stay within the identified screening thresholds where the project would screen from needing to complete either a VMT study or a LOS study.

Table 3 – Trip Generation for Potential Tenant Mixes						
Potential Tenants Size (KSF)			AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Trips	Meets Screening Criteria?	
Allowable Net-New Trips without LOS or VMT Assessment			50	50		
Warehouse (100%) <sup>2</sup>	70 KSF	120	12	13		
Existing Site Trip Estimate		-253	-38	-34	Yes	
	Net-New Trips	-133	-26	-21		
Manufacturing (100%) <sup>2</sup>	70 KSF	333	48	52		
Existing Site Trip Estimate		-253	-38	-34	Yes	
Net-New Trips			10	18		

Warehouse with Furniture Store	17 KSF Warehouse 53 KSF Store	363	17	31	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
Net-New Trips			-21	-3	
Manufacturing with Furniture Store	51 KSF Manufacturing 19 KSF Store	375	50	48	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
	Net-New Trips	109	12	14	
Warehouse with Office <sup>2</sup>	44 KSF Warehouse 26 KSF Office	357	47	45	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
	Net-New Trips	104	9	11	
Manufacturing with Office <sup>2</sup>	65 KSF Manufacturing 5 KSF Office	363	52	55	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
	Net-New Trips	110	14	21	
Manufacturing with Warehouse and Office <sup>2</sup>	60 KSF Manufacturing 4 KSF Warehouse 6 KSF Office	357	51	54	Yes
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	
Net-New		104	13	20	
Light Industrial (100%)	70 KSF	341	48	52	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
Net-New Trips			10	18	
Distribution (100%) <sup>1</sup>	70 KSF	127	11	11	
	Existing Site Trip Estimate	-253	-38	-34	Yes
Net-New Trips			-27	-23	

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2024

KSF = 1,000 sq. ft.

<sup>1</sup> As previously noted, distribution rates presented are for High Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse non-sort facility. Please note that the data utilized in development of the rates ranged in size from 284,000 sq. ft. to 1,472,000 sq. ft. The project does not specifically fit into this data range, but the information is presented for informational purposes in case some type of distribution use could be a potential tenant.

<sup>2</sup> The ITE manual discusses that these uses typically include an office or other support services as part of the land use. However, no specific split between office and manufacturing or warehouse is identified. As such, office has been broken out separately to provide additional information and to make s conservative assessment for the site. As shown in Table 3, the site could consist of the following tenant mix and be under the threshold for needing to prepare additional transportation studies to support the VMT or LOS assessment:

- Warehousing (100%)
- Manufacturing (100%)
- Light Industrial (100%)
- Warehousing (24%) with Furniture Store (76%)
- Warehousing (63%) with Office (37%)
- Manufacturing (73%) with Furniture Store (27%)
- Manufacturing (93%) with Office (7%)
- Manufacturing (86%) with Warehouse (6%) and Office (8%)
- Distribution (100%) as previously noted, the rates available for this type of use are from larger buildings and this information is provided for informational and comparative purposes.

The highest tested tenant mix that generated the highest net new trips was Manufacturing (93%) with Office (7%) which resulted in 110 daily net new trips, 14 AM peak hour net new trips, and 21 PM peak hour net new trips (which is still within the allowable net-new trip threshold before any VMT or LOS studies are required by the City). All of the other tenant mixes generated fewer trips and all tested scenarios are below the net new trip threshold where additional studies would otherwise be required

We hope you find this information useful. If you have any questions, please let me know by calling me direct at 949.308.6312.

# ATTACHMENT 3.D

#### MEMORANDUM

- TO: Stephanie Tomaino City of Westminster
- FROM: Kelly Clark Senior Planner
- DATE: February 5, 2025
- **RE:** CEQA Categorical Exemption, 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard In-Fill Development Project

#### Introduction

Terra Nova Planning & Research has undertaken a comprehensive review of the proposed redevelopment of 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard to determine whether the Project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City has preliminarily determined that the Project is exempt as allowed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 In-Fill Development Project. The purpose of this technical memorandum is to determine whether the exemption is appropriate in this case.

#### Project Location and Existing Conditions.

The Project site is located at 7474 Garden Grove Boulevard on a 3.3-acre parcel in the City of Westminster (APN: 096-021-14). The site is bordered by Garden Grove Boulevard to the north, industrial uses to the east and west, and the Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22) to the south (See Figure 1). The site has a General Plan land use designation of Industrial and is zoned CM (Commercial-Industrial District).

The site is currently developed with eight industrial buildings (Bodycote) totaling  $\pm$ 52,000 square feet (SF) with a maximum building height of 32 feet 1 inch. Bodycote provides thermal processing and heat treatment services to improve the properties of metals, alloys, and polymers.

#### Project Description

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing buildings and construct a two-story  $\pm$ 69,498 SF industrial building consisting of approximately 63,498 SF of warehouse space and 6,000 SF of office space. The ground-level includes all warehousing space and 3,000 SF of office space, and the mezzanine includes 3,000 SF of office space (See Figure 2). Improvements would include 70 on-site parking stalls and 22,018 SF of landscaping. The maximum building height is 40 feet 6 inches to the top of architectural decorative parapets. No specific user has been disclosed for the new building at this time.

The proposed industrial building is consistent with the development standards and allowable uses permitted in the General Plan's Industrial designation and CM (Commercial-Industrial District) zone, as further discussed below.



# FIGURE 1: Project Location Map

Source: GoogleEarth. 2/3/2025.



FIGURE 2: Proposed Site Plan

Source: Herdman Architecture + Design, 11.12.2024

# CEQA CATEGORICAL EXEMPTIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the city evaluate the potential environmental effects of proposed development projects and other major land use actions. CEQA Guidelines section 15300 et. seq., describes Categorical Exemptions, which are projects that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and which are, therefore, exempt from the provisions of CEQA and its requirements for the preparation of environmental documents.

# 15332. In-Fill Development Projects

The Project meets the key considerations for Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15332, Class 32 categorical exemption reads as follows:

*"Class 32 consists of projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the conditions described in this section.* 

- (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

**Note**: Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21084, Public Resources Code."

The proposed Project is consistent with the definition of a Class 32 exemption as follows:

(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.

The site has a General Plan land use designation of Industrial and is zoned CM (Commercial-Industrial District).

## <u>General Plan</u>

According to the 2016 Westminster General Plan Land Use Element, the Industrial land use designation (0.50 FAR maximum) provides for a range of medium and light industrial uses, such as manufacturing, warehousing, research and development, and other industrial uses that can be conducted indoors or behind effective screening. The Project proposes an industrial warehouse designed to house operations indoors and the site plan has a 0.48 FAR, which is consistent with the General Plan Industrial land use designation.

# <u>Zoning Code</u>

The Project is consistent with the development standards set forth in Chapter 17.230 Industrial Zoning Districts of the city's Zoning Code. The proposed industrial warehouse is listed as a permitted land use in the CM zone in Table 2-6 Permitted Uses and Permit Requirements for Industrial Zoning Districts (§17.230.010 Industrial Zoning District Land Uses and Permit Requirements). The Project design complies with Table 2-7 Industrial District Development Standards, including building height, setbacks, parking, and landscaping (§17.230.015 Industrial Zoning District Development Standards). The maximum permitted height in the CM zone is 2 stories or 35 feet, with height limit exceptions for architectural features (§17.300.025.C Exceptions to Height Limits). The applicant requested an Administrative Adjustment to permit a portion of the building roof that exceeds the 35-foot height limit of the CM zone. With an Administrative Adjustment, a 10% increase above the building height limit is permitted. The proposed building is two stories with a maximum height of 40 feet 6 inches to top of architectural decorative parapets. The site has been designed in accordance with the required setback of 50 feet from the Garden Grove Boulevard centerline, 15 percent landscaping requirement, and provides more than the required 69 parking spaces.

Based on the findings above, the Project meets the conditions of a).

(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

The project site is located within the Westminster city limits on a 3.3-acre site. The Project meets the conditions of b).

(c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.

The Project site is located in an industrial area of the city and is currently developed with industrial uses. No native biological habitats occur on-site. Due to the highly disturbed nature of the site and surrounding area, and lack of native biological resources on-site, the Project has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species. The Project meets the conditions of c).

(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

# <u>Traffic</u>

The Project's daily trip generation was calculated using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, for Warehousing (Land Use Code 150). As shown in Table 1, the Project would generate 12 total AM peak hour trips, 13 total PM peak hour trips, and 120 total daily trips.

Table 1   Project Trip Generation Summary								
	Tri	p Gene	ration F	lates				
Land Line (ITE Code)		ato.	AM F	eak Ho	our Trips	PM Pe	ak Hour	<sup>.</sup> Trips
Land Use (ITE Code)	Dally Rate		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Warehousing (150)	1.71 per TSF		0.13	0.04	0.17	0.05	0.13	0.18
	Trip	Gener	ation R	esults				
	_and Use Qty.	Daily	AM F	eak Ho	our Trips	PM Pe	ak Hour	<sup>.</sup> Trips
Land Use			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Warehouse	69.9 TSF	120	9	3	12	4	9	13

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (2021).

The Guidelines for Evaluating VMT Under CEQA for the County of Orange (LSA, September 2020) indicates that land development projects that have one or more of the following attributes may be presumed to create a less than significant impact on transportation and circulation:

- <u>Project in High-Quality Transit Area (HQTA)</u>: Not applicable to project.
- <u>Neighborhood Retail Project:</u> Not applicable to project.
- <u>Affordable Housing Project:</u> Not applicable to project.
- Low VMT Area Project: Not applicable to project.
- <u>Small Project:</u> A small project generates 500 or fewer average daily trips (ADT). The Project is considered a "small project" because it is projected to generate 120 daily trips as shown in Table 1, above. Therefore, the Project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on transportation and circulation.
- <u>Public Facilities:</u> Not applicable to project.

It should be noted that the project site is currently developed and generating daily vehicle trips associated with the thermal processing and heat treatment facility (Bodycote). Therefore, the 120 trips generated by the Project would be replacing the existing trips onsite. The number of daily trips currently generated by the existing use is unknown. For analysis purposes, it was assumed that all 120 project trips would be new trips to avoid under- or overstating net daily vehicle trips.

#### <u>Noise</u>

Noise generating construction activities would include demolition and removal of existing structures, excavation, grading, and the construction and finishing of the proposed structures and facilities. Noise levels surrounding the project site could be elevated for short periods of time, as equipment moves through the site. These noise levels would be limited to the least sensitive daytime hours, and would cease once building construction began. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance exempts construction activities from

noise infractions<sup>1</sup>, because of their temporary nature. Therefore, impacts associated with project construction noise would be less than significant.

At buildout, principal Project-related noise sources will be similar to the existing on-site uses which include vehicular traffic accessing the site, grounds maintenance equipment, and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) units. As discussed above, the site is bounded by Garden Grove Boulevard to the north, the Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22) to the south, and by industrial uses to the east and west. The post-development, operational vehicle mix will be comparable with existing traffic on surrounding roads and future traffic volumes are expected to be consistent with those analyzed for the 2016 General Plan update.

The Project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the site, and traffic levels are not expected to increase beyond that forecast in the General Plan at build out. Per the City of Westminster General Plan, noise levels of up to 65 dB CNEL are "clearly compatible" and levels up to 80+ dB CNEL are "normally compatible" for warehousing uses. According to General Plan Figure 2-4, Future Roadway Noise Contours, noise levels at the project site are expected to reach 70 CNEL due to its proximity to the Garden Grove Freeway, which is within the normally compatible (80+ CNEL) range for warehouse uses.

Noise generated by the occupants of the Project is expected to be consistent with the noise levels currently generated on site from existing operations and will not exceed City standards. The Project is expected to generate approximately 120 average daily trips with 12 trips during the AM peak-hour and 13 trips during the PM peak-hour. Generally, a doubling of traffic volumes is required to result in an increase of 3 dBA, which is a barely audible change. The 2015 average daily traffic volume for Garden Grove Boulevard between the SR-22 off ramp/Egle Drive and Hoover Street was 23,200 daily trips per day (General Plan, Table 4-4). Therefore, the increase in noise levels associated with Project generated vehicle trips will not significantly impact surrounding land uses because Project generated trips will not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along affected road segments.

For these reasons, the proposed Project would not have a significant effect relating to noise.

It should be noted that the project site is currently developed and generating noise associated with the thermal processing and heat treatment facility (Bodycote). For analysis purposes, it was assumed that the Project would constitute a new impact to avoid under- or overstating net noise level impacts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Chapter 8.28 Noise Control, 8.28.060 Exemptions, E: Noise sources associated with construction repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property, provided said activities do not take place between the hours of eight p.m. and seven a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday;

# Air Quality

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2022 was used to project air quality emissions that will be generated by the Project (Appendix A). The following inputs were used for projecting air emissions.

- 3.3-acre site.
- 69,498 Unrefrigerated Warehouse No Rail
- 22,018 SF of landscaping
- 52,000 SF demolished and removed
- 200 cubic yards of net export materials (per preliminary grading plans).
- 120 daily trips, per Warehouse (ITE Code 150) average trip rate of 1.71 per 1000SF.
- 13-month construction period (CalEEMod default construction phasing).
- Default construction equipment mix.

According to CalEEMod outputs, the Project's construction and operational air emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's daily thresholds for criteria pollutants, and neither would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Table 2								
Maximum	Daily Emis	sions Sur	nmary (pou	inds per d	lay)			
	CO NO <sub>x</sub> ROG SO <sub>2</sub> PM <sub>10</sub> PM <sub>2.5</sub>							
Construction	31.2	31.7	36.1	0.05	9.26	5.25		
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	100	75	150	150	55		
Operation	6.87	0.69	2.58	0.01	0.92	0.26		
SCAQMD Thresholds	SCAQMD Thresholds 550 55 55 150 150 55							
Exceeds?	No	No	No	No	No	No		
Source: CalEEMod model, version 2022.								

It is recommended by SCAQMD staff that a project's greenhouse gas emissions would be considered significant if it could not comply with at least one of the following "tiered" tests:

- Tier 1: Is there an applicable exemption?
- Tier 2: Is the project compliant with a greenhouse gas reduction plan that is, at a minimum, consistent with the goals of AB 32?
- Tier 3: Is the project below an absolute threshold (10,000 MTCO2e/year for industrial projects; 3,000 MTCO2e/year for residential and commercial projects)?
- Tier 4: Is the project below a (yet to be set) performance threshold?
- Tier 5: Would the project achieve a screening level with off-site mitigation?

Construction activities will result in short-term GHG emissions associated with operation of construction equipment, employee commute, material hauling, and other ground

disturbing activities. As shown in Table 3, the Project will generate 424 CO2e metric tons during the 13-month construction period. There are currently no construction-related GHG emission thresholds for projects of this nature. To determine if construction emissions will result in a cumulative considerable impact, buildout GHG emissions were amortized over a 30-year period and added to annual operational emissions to be compared to applicable GHG thresholds (see Table 3, below).

At buildout, there are five primary emission source categories that will be contributing either directly or indirectly to operational GHG emissions, including energy/electricity usage, water usage, solid waste disposal, area emissions (pavement and architectural coating off-gassing), and mobile sources. The Project is an industrial development however the proposed use is a warehouse and not an industrial use with a stationary source of air pollutant emissions. Therefore, the Project could be considered industrial commercial, and comparable to the Tier 3 SCAQMD's commercial thresholds of 3,000 MTCO2e/yr. As shown in the table, below, the Project complies with the Tier 3 threshold because emissions will not exceed the 3,000 MT/yr threshold.

Table 3 Projected GHG Emissions Summary (Metric Tons)					
Phase	CO <sub>2</sub> e (MT/YR)				
Construction (Maximum)	424				
Operational					
Area	1.42				
Energy	123				
Mobile	155				
Waste	20.5				
Water	39.6				
Construction: 30 years amortized	14.13				
Total Operational	353.65				
SCAQMD Threshold (Mixed-Use) 3,000.00					

For these reasons, the proposed project would not have a significant effect relating to air quality.

## Water Quality

According to the General Plan, the regional water quality control board enforces the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under the NPDES Stormwater Permit issued to the County of Orange and its co-permittees (including Westminster), the City requires the majority of new development projects, including the Project, to incorporate best management practices to minimize pollutant levels in runoff. Per the Project Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), a vegetated modular wetland system is proposed to bio-treat storm water runoff to be located in the landscaped area at the southern end of the site that will further ensure that water quality is not compromised. The Project's design, the imposition of standard conditions of approval and

adherence to local, state and federal requirements will assure that impacts associated with water quality standards are less than significant.

The City of Westminster provides water service and distributes water to the City's residents and businesses. The wastewater system in Westminster is maintained by Midway City Sanitary District (MCSD) and the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD). The Project will generate demand for construction and operational industrial water and wastewater, which will be governed by the City of Westminster, MCSD, and OCSD standard requirements. Standard requirements assure the Project will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

For these reasons, the proposed Project would not have a significant effect relating to water quality.

Based on the findings above, the Project meets the conditions of d).

(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The project site is located in an area that is well-served by public utilities and services. Water, sewer, electric power and natural gas are all available to the site and currently utilized by the existing on-site development. The site is fully accessible to and within the response areas of the City Fire and Police departments.

# 15300.2 CEQA EXCEPTIONS TO CATEGORICAL EXEMPTIONS

CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 establishes six (6) exceptions to categorical exemptions, listed below. Following each exception is an analysis of how it applies or does not apply to the proposed Project.

## 1. Location

Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant if its impact on the environment may, in a particularly sensitive environment, be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply in all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

<u>Applicability to the proposed Project</u>: The Project is subject to Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects, and is not subject to Classes 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11. Therefore, the Project is not subject to the location exception.

## 2. Cumulative Impact

All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

#### ATTACHMENT 3

<u>Applicability to the proposed Project</u>: There is no evidence that the demolition of an existing industrial use and construction of a new industrial warehouse on the same 3.3-acre site (in-fill development) would have a significant cumulative impact on the environment. The proposed warehouse is a permitted use in the CM zone and is consistent with the site's existing industrial development and surrounding industrial developments and will not significantly intensify land use in the area beyond what is envisioned in the General Plan. As demonstrated above, the Project would not result in significant impacts related to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

In addition, impacts associated with any land disturbance impact, such as biological resources, geology or hydrology, have already occurred during the site's initial development, and redevelopment of the site (in-fill development) would not result in new land disturbance impacts. The overall impact of the proposed Project will not cumulatively impact the environment.

# 3. Significant Effect

A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

<u>Applicability to the proposed Project</u>: There is no evidence that the Project would result in significant impacts. As demonstrated above, the Project would not result in significant impacts related to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality and impacts associated with any land disturbance impact, such as biological resources, geology or hydrology, have already occurred during the site's initial development. The Project is subject to the same standards and requirements as any project in the city. This exception does not apply to the Project.

# 4. Scenic Highways

A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

<u>Applicability to the proposed Project</u>: The Project site is not located on or near a state or county designated or eligible scenic route. The site is currently developed and does not contain any scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or historical resources. This exception does not apply to the Project.
#### 5. Hazardous Waste Sites

A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

<u>Applicability to the proposed Project</u>: Section 65962.5 requires that the Department of Toxic Substances Control compile a list of all hazardous waste facilities, properties, disposals, release sites and abandoned sites.

According to Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project (Ramboll Americas Engineering Solutions, Inc., September 2024) the site is not listed with active status on environmental databases that are indicative of a contamination concern. The Phase I found the site on several environmental databases, however the listings are limited to records of previous occupants operating as small quantity waste generators or previous incident reports that were later granted NFA status, or No Further Action required.

The Project is not located on a cleanup site according to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database. The Project is not located on a LUST cleanup, military cleanup, or any other cleanup sites listed on the Water Board Geotracker database. The site is currently not the subject of regulatory scrutiny or enforcement actions related to soil or groundwater conditions.

This exception does not apply to the Project.

#### 6. Historic Resources

A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

#### Applicability to the proposed Project:

Residential-style structures were developed on the northern portion of the site by the early 1960's. By the late 1960s, industrial buildings had been constructed on the southern portion of the site. While some of the formerly residential-style structures continued to be used in the 1960's, the site does not currently contain residential buildings. Bodycote acquired the site in 2001 and has continued to use it for heat treating since that time, constructing an additional solution furnace building in 2016.

The Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. There are no resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places on, or in the vicinity of, the subject property. There are also no resources listed in the California Register of Historic Resources (Built Environment Resources Directory) on the Project site or in its immediate vicinity. Because the site and structures have been significantly modified over the past +60 years, the existing industrial buildings are not considered locally historically significant. This exception does not apply.

#### ATTACHMENT 3

#### CONCLUSIONS

As described in the above analysis, the proposed Project is consistent with the terms of Class 32 under CEQA Guidelines sections 15332. The exceptions to categorical exemptions detailed in CEQA Guideline section 15300.2 do not apply to the Project. Therefore, the Project is exempt from CEQA.

# Appendix A:

CalEEMod Detailed Report for 7474 Garden Grove Industrial Project

# 7474 Garden Grove Industrial Detailed Report

### Table of Contents

- 1. Basic Project Information
  - 1.1. Basic Project Information
  - 1.2. Land Use Types
  - 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector
- 2. Emissions Summary
  - 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds
  - 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated
  - 2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds
  - 2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated
- 3. Construction Emissions Details
  - 3.1. Demolition (2025) Unmitigated
  - 3.3. Site Preparation (2025) Unmitigated
  - 3.5. Grading (2025) Unmitigated
  - 3.7. Building Construction (2025) Unmitigated
  - 3.9. Building Construction (2026) Unmitigated

- 3.11. Paving (2026) Unmitigated
- 3.13. Architectural Coating (2026) Unmitigated
- 4. Operations Emissions Details
  - 4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use
    - 4.1.1. Unmitigated
  - 4.2. Energy
    - 4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use Unmitigated
    - 4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use Unmitigated
  - 4.3. Area Emissions by Source
    - 4.3.1. Unmitigated
  - 4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use
    - 4.4.1. Unmitigated
  - 4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use
    - 4.5.1. Unmitigated
  - 4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use
    - 4.6.1. Unmitigated
  - 4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type
    - 4.7.1. Unmitigated

- 4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type
  - 4.8.1. Unmitigated
- 4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type
  - 4.9.1. Unmitigated
- 4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type
  - 4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type Unmitigated
  - 4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type Unmitigated
  - 4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species Unmitigated
- 5. Activity Data
  - 5.1. Construction Schedule
  - 5.2. Off-Road Equipment
    - 5.2.1. Unmitigated
  - 5.3. Construction Vehicles
    - 5.3.1. Unmitigated
  - 5.4. Vehicles
    - 5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies
  - 5.5. Architectural Coatings
  - 5.6. Dust Mitigation

- 5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities
- 5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies
- 5.7. Construction Paving
- 5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors
- 5.9. Operational Mobile Sources
  - 5.9.1. Unmitigated
- 5.10. Operational Area Sources
  - 5.10.1. Hearths
    - 5.10.1.1. Unmitigated
  - 5.10.2. Architectural Coatings
  - 5.10.3. Landscape Equipment
- 5.11. Operational Energy Consumption
  - 5.11.1. Unmitigated
- 5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption
  - 5.12.1. Unmitigated
- 5.13. Operational Waste Generation
  - 5.13.1. Unmitigated
- 5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

#### 5.14.1. Unmitigated

- 5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment
  - 5.15.1. Unmitigated

#### 5.16. Stationary Sources

- 5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps
- 5.16.2. Process Boilers

#### 5.17. User Defined

#### 5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

#### 5.18.2. Sequestration

#### 5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

#### 6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

6.1. Climate Risk Summary

#### 6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

- 6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures
- 7. Health and Equity Details
  - 7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores
  - 7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores
  - 7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores
  - 7.4. Health & Equity Measures
  - 7.5. Evaluation Scorecard
  - 7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures
- 8. User Changes to Default Data

# 1. Basic Project Information

### 1.1. Basic Project Information

Data Field	Value
Project Name	7474 Garden Grove Industrial
Construction Start Date	4/1/2025
Operational Year	2026
Lead Agency	
Land Use Scale	Project/site
Analysis Level for Defaults	County
Windspeed (m/s)	1.80
Precipitation (days)	6.20
Location	33.773154825175865, -118.00136522401786
County	Orange
City	Westminster
Air District	South Coast AQMD
Air Basin	South Coast
TAZ	5865
EDFZ	7
Electric Utility	Southern California Edison
Gas Utility	Southern California Gas
App Version	2022.1.1.29

### 1.2. Land Use Types

Land Use Subtype	Size	Unit	Lot Acreage	Building Area (sq ft)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	Special Landscape Area (sq ft)	Population	Description
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	69.9	1000sqft	3.40	69,900 ATTACHMENT 3	22,000	—	—	

### 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

#### No measures selected

## 2. Emissions Summary

### 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

#### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Un/Mit.	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	36.1	31.7	31.2	0.05	9.26	5.25	5,833
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	_	_	—	_	_	—
Unmit.	1.24	11.0	14.7	0.03	0.92	0.52	3,162
Average Daily (Max)	—	_	_	—	_	_	—
Unmit.	2.05	7.01	8.54	0.02	0.79	0.42	1,871
Annual (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.37	1.28	1.56	< 0.005	0.14	0.08	310
Exceeds (Daily Max)	—	_	_	—	_	_	—
Threshold	75.0	100	550	150	150	55.0	—
Unmit.	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Exceeds (Average Daily)	_	_	_	_	_	_	—
Threshold	75.0	100	550	150	150	55.0	—
Unmit.	No	No	No	No	No	No	

### 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Year	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e		
Daily - Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	_		
ATTACHMENT 3									

2025	3.37	31.7	31.2	0.05	9.26	5.25	5,833
2026	36.1	10.3	14.7	0.03	0.86	0.47	3,169
Daily - Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2025	1.24	11.0	14.7	0.03	0.92	0.52	3,162
2026	1.18	10.3	14.5	0.03	0.86	0.47	3,149
Average Daily	—	_	—	—	—	—	—
2025	0.77	7.01	8.54	0.02	0.79	0.42	1,871
2026	2.05	2.32	3.31	0.01	0.19	0.11	688
Annual	—	_	—	—	_	—	—
2025	0.14	1.28	1.56	< 0.005	0.14	0.08	310
2026	0.37	0.42	0.60	< 0.005	0.04	0.02	114

## 2.4. Operations Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Un/Mit.	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.58	0.69	6.87	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,086
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.08	0.69	3.56	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,034
Average Daily (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	2.42	0.71	5.72	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,054
Annual (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.44	0.13	1.04	< 0.005	0.17	0.05	340
Exceeds (Daily Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Threshold	55.0	55.0	550	150	150	55.0	—
Unmit.	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Exceeds (Average Daily)	—		—	—	—		

Threshold	55.0	55.0	550	150	150	55.0	_
Unmit.	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Exceeds (Annual)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Threshold	—	_	—	—	—	—	3,000
Unmit.	_	_	_	—	—	_	No

### 2.5. Operations Emissions by Sector, Unmitigated

Sector	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mobile	0.39	0.30	3.52	0.01	0.89	0.23	965
Area	2.17	0.03	3.04	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	12.5
Energy	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	745
Water	_	_	_	_	—	_	239
Waste	_	_	_	_	—	_	124
Total	2.58	0.69	6.87	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,086
Daily, Winter (Max)	_	_	_	_	—	_	_
Mobile	0.38	0.33	3.25	0.01	0.89	0.23	926
Area	1.67	_	_	_	—	_	_
Energy	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	745
Water	_	_	_	_	—	_	239
Waste	_	_	_	_	—	_	124
Total	2.08	0.69	3.56	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,034
Average Daily	—	_	_	_	—	_	—
Mobile	0.38	0.33	3.34	0.01	0.89	0.23	937
Area	2.02	0.02	2.08	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	8.59
Energy	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	745
Water	—	—	- ATTACH	IMENT 3	—	—	239

Waste	—	—	—	—	—	_	124
Total	2.42	0.71	5.72	0.01	0.92	0.26	2,054
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	_	—
Mobile	0.07	0.06	0.61	< 0.005	0.16	0.04	155
Area	0.37	< 0.005	0.38	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.42
Energy	< 0.005	0.07	0.06	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	123
Water	_	—	—	—	_	_	39.6
Waste	_	—	—	—	_	_	20.5
Total	0.44	0.13	1.04	< 0.005	0.17	0.05	340

## 3. Construction Emissions Details

### 3.1. Demolition (2025) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	2.40	22.2	19.9	0.03	0.92	0.84	3,437
Demolition	—	—	—	—	1.62	0.25	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.13	1.22	1.09	< 0.005	0.05	0.05	188
Demolition	—	—	—	—	0.09	0.01	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.02	0.22	0.20	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	31.2
Demolition	_	—	- ATTACH	IMENT 3	0.02	< 0.005	—

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	_	—	_	_	—
Worker	0.05	0.05	0.84	0.00	0.20	0.05	202
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.04	2.53	1.12	0.01	0.57	0.18	2,194
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	_	—	_	_	_
Average Daily	—	—	_	—	_	_	_
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.04	0.00	0.01	< 0.005	10.7
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	0.15	0.06	< 0.005	0.03	0.01	120
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.77
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	0.03	0.01	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	19.9

### 3.3. Site Preparation (2025) - Unmitigated

NUG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
—		—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.31	31.6	30.2	0.05	1.37	1.26	5,314
—	_	—	_	7.67	3.94	—
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
—	—	—	—	—	—	_
—	—	—	—	—	—	_
0.05	0.43	0.41	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	72.8
		- -   - -   3.31 31.6   - -   0.00 0.00   - -   0.00 0.00   - -   0.00 0.00   - -   0.00 0.00   - -   0.05 0.43	- - -   - - -   3.31 31.6 30.2   - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00   - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00   - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00   - - -   0.05 0.43 0.41	- - - -   3.31 31.6 30.2 0.05   - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - -   0.05 0.43 0.41 < 0.005	- - - - -   - - - - -   3.31 31.6 30.2 0.05 1.37   - - - - 7.67   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - -   0.05 0.43 0.41 < 0.005	- - - - - -   - - - - - -   3.31 31.6 30.2 0.05 1.37 1.26   - - - - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - - - - -   0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00   - - - - - - - -   0.05 0.43 0.41 < 0.05

Dust From Material Movement	—	—			0.11	0.05	
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—		—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.08	0.08	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	12.1
Dust From Material Movement	—		—	_	0.02	0.01	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.06	0.06	0.98	0.00	0.23	0.05	236
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	_	—	—	_	—
Average Daily	—	—	_	—	—	_	_
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	3.11
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	_	_	—	_	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.51
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### 3.5. Grading (2025) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—			—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.74	16.3	17.9 ATTACH	IMENT 3	0.72	0.66	2,970

Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	_	2.76	1.34	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	_	—	_	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	_	—	_	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.04	0.36	0.39	< 0.005	0.02	0.01	65.1
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	0.06	0.03	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.07	0.07	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	10.8
Dust From Material Movement	—	—	—	—	0.01	0.01	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.05	0.05	0.84	0.00	0.20	0.05	202
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	0.26	0.12	< 0.005	0.06	0.02	229
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	4.27
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	5.02
Annual	—	—	—	_	_	_	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.71
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.83

### 3.7. Building Construction (2025) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.13	10.4	13.0	0.02	0.43	0.40	2,406
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.13	10.4	13.0	0.02	0.43	0.40	2,406
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.50	4.62	5.77	0.01	0.19	0.18	1,064
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.09	0.84	1.05	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	176
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.10	0.10	1.64	0.00	0.38	0.09	395
Vendor	0.01	0.38	0.19	< 0.005	0.10	0.03	382
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.10	0.12	1.42	0.00	0.38	0.09	375
Vendor	0.01	0.39	0.19	< 0.005	0.10	0.03	381
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	_	_			_	_	_
Worker	0.05	0.05	0.66	0.00	0.17	0.04	168
Vendor	< 0.005	0.18	0.08 ATTACH	1ME:NQ53	0.04	0.01	169

Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	_	—	—	—	—	_
Worker	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.03	0.01	27.9
Vendor	< 0.005	0.03	0.02	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	27.9
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### 3.9. Building Construction (2026) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.07	9.85	13.0	0.02	0.38	0.35	2,405
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	1.07	9.85	13.0	0.02	0.38	0.35	2,405
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.20	1.87	2.46	< 0.005	0.07	0.07	457
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.04	0.34	0.45	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	75.6
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.10	0.09	1.55	0.00	0.38	0.09	388
Vendor	0.01	0.37	0.18	< 0.005	0.10	0.03	376
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	- ATTACH	IMENT 3	—	—	—

Worker	0.10	0.10	1.33	0.00	0.38	0.09	368
Vendor	0.01	0.38	0.19	< 0.005	0.10	0.03	375
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.02	0.02	0.26	0.00	0.07	0.02	70.9
Vendor	< 0.005	0.07	0.04	< 0.005	0.02	0.01	71.3
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—				—		—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.05	0.00	0.01	< 0.005	11.7
Vendor	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	11.8
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## 3.11. Paving (2026) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.68	6.23	8.81	0.01	0.26	0.24	1,355
Paving	0.20	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.03	0.31	0.43	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	66.8
Paving	0.01	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.06	0.08	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	11.1
Paving	< 0.005	—	- ATTACH	IMENT 3	—	—	—

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	_	_	_	_	_	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	_	—
Worker	0.07	0.06	1.05	0.00	0.26	0.06	264
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	_	—	—	—	—	_	—
Average Daily	_	—	—	—	—	_	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.05	0.00	0.01	< 0.005	12.6
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	2.08
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## 3.13. Architectural Coating (2026) - Unmitigated

Location	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.12	0.86	1.13	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	134
Architectural Coatings	36.0	_	_	_	_	_	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Average Daily	_	_	_	_	_	_	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.04	0.06	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	6.61
Architectural Coatings	1.78		ATTACH	IMENT 3	_		_

Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	_	—	—	_	_
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.09
Architectural Coatings	0.32	—	—	—	—	—	—
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	_
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	_	—	—	—	_
Worker	0.02	0.02	0.31	0.00	0.08	0.02	77.6
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	_	—
Average Daily	—	—	_	—	—	_	—
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	3.69
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	_	—	—	_	_
Worker	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.00	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.61
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

# 4. Operations Emissions Details

### 4.1. Mobile Emissions by Land Use

4.1.1. Unmitigated

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	_
			ATTACH	IMENT 3			

Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.39	0.30	3.52	0.01	0.89	0.23	965
Total	0.39	0.30	3.52	0.01	0.89	0.23	965
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.38	0.33	3.25	0.01	0.89	0.23	926
Total	0.38	0.33	3.25	0.01	0.89	0.23	926
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.07	0.06	0.61	< 0.005	0.16	0.04	155
Total	0.07	0.06	0.61	< 0.005	0.16	0.04	155

### 4.2. Energy

### 4.2.1. Electricity Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	—	—	—	—	—	312
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	312
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	_	—	_	_	—	312
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	312
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	—	—	—	—	—	51.7
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	51.7

### 4.2.3. Natural Gas Emissions By Land Use - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants	(lb/day for	<sup>,</sup> daily, ton/	yr for annual	) and GHGs (	(lb/day fo	or daily, MT/	yr for annual)
---------------------	-------------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------	----------------

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	433
Total	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	433
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	_	—	—	—	—	_
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	433
Total	0.02	0.36	0.30	< 0.005	0.03	0.03	433
Annual	—	_	—	—	—	—	_
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	< 0.005	0.07	0.06	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	71.7
Total	< 0.005	0.07	0.06	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	71.7

### 4.3. Area Emissions by Source

#### 4.3.1. Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consumer Products	1.50	—	_	_	—	_	—
Architectural Coatings	0.18	—	_	_	—	_	—
Landscape Equipment	0.50	0.03	3.04	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	12.5
Total	2.17	0.03	3.04	< 0.005	0.01	< 0.005	12.5
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consumer Products	1.50	—	—	_	—	—	—
Architectural Coatings	0.18		ATTACH	IMENT 3			

Total	1.67						
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	_	—
Consumer Products	0.27	—	—	—	—	_	—
Architectural Coatings	0.03	—	—	—	—	_	—
Landscape Equipment	0.06	< 0.005	0.38	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.42
Total	0.37	< 0.005	0.38	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.42

### 4.4. Water Emissions by Land Use

#### 4.4.1. Unmitigated

#### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)			—		—		—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	—	—	—	—	—	239
Total	—	_	—	—	—	—	239
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail		_					239
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	239
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	_	_	—	_	—	_	39.6
Total	—	_	—	—	—	—	39.6

### 4.5. Waste Emissions by Land Use

### 4.5.1. Unmitigated

	· ·			· · · · · ·			/		
Land Use	ROG		NOx	со	ATTACH	<u> МЕ́М</u> Т 3	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
					22 /	39			

Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—			_		
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	—	—	—	—	—	124
Total	_	_	—	_	—	_	124
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	_	_	—	_	_
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	_	_	_		_	_	124
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	124
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	—	—	_	—	—	—	20.5
Total	—	—	—		—	_	20.5

### 4.6. Refrigerant Emissions by Land Use

#### 4.6.1. Unmitigated

#### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

### 4.7. Offroad Emissions By Equipment Type

#### 4.7.1. Unmitigated

Equipment Type	ROG	NOx	CO ATTACH	MENT 3	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
			23 /	39			

Daily, Summer (Max)						_	_
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	_	_	_	_	—	—
Total	—	_	_	_	_	—	—
Annual	—	_	_	_	_	—	—
Total	_	_	_	_	_	—	—

### 4.8. Stationary Emissions By Equipment Type

#### 4.8.1. Unmitigated

#### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Equipment Type	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—		—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	_		_	_			—

### 4.9. User Defined Emissions By Equipment Type

#### 4.9.1. Unmitigated

Equipment Type	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	_	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
				S TINENIT 2			

Annual	_		_	_	_	_	_
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

### 4.10. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type

#### 4.10.1. Soil Carbon Accumulation By Vegetation Type - Unmitigated

#### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Vegetation	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	_	—	_	_	_	—
Total	—	_	—	_	_	_	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—		—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—		—	—	—	—

### 4.10.2. Above and Belowground Carbon Accumulation by Land Use Type - Unmitigated

### Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Land Use	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	_	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

#### 4.10.3. Avoided and Sequestered Emissions by Species - Unmitigated

Species ROG NOX CO ATTACHMENT 3	PM10T	PM2.5T	CO2e
---------------------------------	-------	--------	------

Daily, Summer (Max)	—	_	_	_			
Avoided	—	—	—	—	_	_	_
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Removed	—	—	—	—			—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—			—
_	—	—	—	—			—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—			—
Avoided	—	—	—	—			—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—			—
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Removed	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
_	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Avoided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sequestered	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Subtotal	—	—	—	—	_	_	—
Removed	_		_		_	_	_
Subtotal	—						
_	_	_	_	_			

# 5. Activity Data

### 5.1. Construction Schedule

### 7474 Garden Grove Industrial Detailed Report, 2/5/2025

Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Days Per Week	Work Days per Phase	Phase Description
Demolition	Demolition	4/1/2025	4/29/2025	5.00	20.0	—
Site Preparation	Site Preparation	4/30/2025	5/7/2025	5.00	5.00	—
Grading	Grading	5/8/2025	5/19/2025	5.00	8.00	—
Building Construction	Building Construction	5/20/2025	4/7/2026	5.00	230	—
Paving	Paving	4/8/2026	5/3/2026	5.00	18.0	—
Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	5/4/2026	5/29/2026	5.00	18.0	—

# 5.2. Off-Road Equipment

### 5.2.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Engine Tier	Number per Day	Hours Per Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	2.00	8.00	367	0.40
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	33.0	0.73
Demolition	Excavators	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	36.0	0.38
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	367	0.40
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	4.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Grading	Graders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	148	0.41
Grading	Excavators	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	36.0	0.38
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	367	0.40
Building Construction	Cranes	Diesel	Average	1.00	7.00	367	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	Diesel	Average	3.00	8.00	82.0	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	14.0	0.74
Building Construction	Welders	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	46.0	0.45
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Back hoes	Diesel	Average ATTACH	3.00 IMENT 3	7.00	84.0	0.37

Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Back	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	84.0	0.37
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	Diesel	Average	2.00	6.00	10.0	0.56
Paving	Pavers	Diesel	Average	1.00	8.00	81.0	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	Diesel	Average	2.00	6.00	89.0	0.36
Paving	Rollers	Diesel	Average	2.00	6.00	36.0	0.38
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	Diesel	Average	1.00	6.00	37.0	0.48

### 5.3. Construction Vehicles

### 5.3.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Тгір Туре	One-Way Trips per Day	Miles per Trip	Vehicle Mix
Demolition	_	_	_	—
Demolition	Worker	15.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Demolition	Vendor	_	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Demolition	Hauling	29.9	20.0	HHDT
Demolition	Onsite truck	_	_	HHDT
Site Preparation	_	_	_	_
Site Preparation	Worker	17.5	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Site Preparation	Vendor	_	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Site Preparation	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Site Preparation	Onsite truck	_	_	HHDT
Grading	_	_	_	_
Grading	Worker	15.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Grading	Vendor	_	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Grading	Hauling	3.13	20.0	HHDT
Grading	Onsite truck	_	_	HHDT
Building Construction	_	_	_	—
Building Construction	Worker	29.4 ATTACHMENT 3	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2

Building Construction	Vendor	11.5	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Building Construction	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Building Construction	Onsite truck	_	_	HHDT
Paving	_		—	—
Paving	Worker	20.0	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Paving	Vendor		10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Paving	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Paving	Onsite truck		_	HHDT
Architectural Coating	_			—
Architectural Coating	Worker	5.87	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Architectural Coating	Vendor	—	10.2	HHDT,MHDT
Architectural Coating	Hauling	0.00	20.0	HHDT
Architectural Coating	Onsite truck	_	_	HHDT

### 5.4. Vehicles

#### 5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user. 5.5. Architectural Coatings

Phase Name	Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Parking Area Coated (sq ft)
Architectural Coating	0.00	0.00	104,850	34,950	—

### 5.6. Dust Mitigation

### 5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

Phase Name	Material Imported (cy)	Material Exported (cy)	Acres Graded (acres)	Material Demolished (Building Square Footage)	Acres Paved (acres)
ATTACHMENT 3					
29 / 39					

Demolition	0.00	0.00	0.00	52,000	_
Site Preparation	_	—	7.50	0.00	—
Grading	_	200	8.00	0.00	—
Paving	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.37

### 5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Control Strategies Applied	Frequency (per day)	PM10 Reduction	PM2.5 Reduction
Water Exposed Area	2	61%	61%
Water Demolished Area	2	36%	36%

### 5.7. Construction Paving

Land Use	Area Paved (acres)	% Asphalt
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	1.37	100%

### 5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

### kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

Year	kWh per Year	CO2	CH4	N2O
2025	0.00	349	0.03	< 0.005
2026	0.00	346	0.03	< 0.005

### 5.9. Operational Mobile Sources

### 5.9.1. Unmitigated

Land Use Type	Trips/Weekday	Trips/Saturday	Trips/Sunday	Trips/Year	VMT/Weekday	VMT/Saturday	VMT/Sunday	VMT/Year
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	120	120	120	43,628	1,251	1,251	1,251	456,602

### 5.10. Operational Area Sources

#### 5.10.1. Hearths

#### 5.10.1.1. Unmitigated

#### 5.10.2. Architectural Coatings

Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Parking Area Coated (sq ft)
0	0.00	104,850	34,950	—

#### 5.10.3. Landscape Equipment

Season	Unit	Value
Snow Days	day/yr	0.00
Summer Days	day/yr	250

### 5.11. Operational Energy Consumption

### 5.11.1. Unmitigated

#### Electricity (kWh/yr) and CO2 and CH4 and N2O and Natural Gas (kBTU/yr)

Land Use	Electricity (kWh/yr)	CO2	CH4	N2O	Natural Gas (kBTU/yr)
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	327,157	346	0.0330	0.0040	1,347,403

### 5.12. Operational Water and Wastewater Consumption

#### 5.12.1. Unmitigated

Land Use	Indoor Water (gal/year)	Outdoor Water (gal/year)
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	16,164,375 ATTACHMENT 3	285,128

### 5.13. Operational Waste Generation

### 5.13.1. Unmitigated

Land Use	Waste (ton/year)	Cogeneration (kWh/year)
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	65.7	_

### 5.14. Operational Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment

### 5.14.1. Unmitigated

Land Use Type	Equipment Type	Refrigerant	GWP	Quantity (kg)	Operations Leak Rate	Service Leak Rate	Times Serviced

### 5.15. Operational Off-Road Equipment

### 5.15.1. Unmitigated

Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Engine Tier	Number per Day	Hours Per Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
----------------	-----------	-------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------------

### 5.16. Stationary Sources

#### 5.16.1. Emergency Generators and Fire Pumps

Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Number per Day	Hours per Day	Hours per Year	Horsepower	Load Factor

### 5.16.2. Process Boilers

Equipment Type Fuel Type Number Boiler Rating (MMBtu/hr) Daily Heat Input (MM	Btu/day) Annual Heat Input (MMBtu/yr)
---	---------------------------------------

### 5.17. User Defined

Equipment Type		Fuel Type		
ATTACHMENT 3				
	32 /	39		

### 5.18. Vegetation

#### 5.18.1. Land Use Change

#### 5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Vegetation Land Use Type	Vegetation Soil Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type			
5.18.1.1. Unmitigated			

Biomass Cover Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres

#### 5.18.2. Sequestration

#### 5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

Tree Type Number Electricity Saved (kWh/year) Natural Gas Saved (btu/year)	
--	--

# 6. Climate Risk Detailed Report

### 6.1. Climate Risk Summary

Cal-Adapt midcentury 2040–2059 average projections for four hazards are reported below for your project location. These are under Representation Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 which assumes GHG emissions will continue to rise strongly through 2050 and then plateau around 2100.

Climate Hazard	Result for Project Location	Unit
Temperature and Extreme Heat	8.25	annual days of extreme heat
Extreme Precipitation	3.60	annual days with precipitation above 20 mm
Sea Level Rise	_	meters of inundation depth
Wildfire	0.78	annual hectares burned
Temperature and Extreme Heat data are for grid cell in which your project are located. The projection is based on the 98th historical percentile of daily maximum/minimum temperatures from observed historical data (32 climate model ensemble from Cal-Adapt, 2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi. Extreme Precipitation data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The threshold of 20 mm is equivalent to about ¾ an inch of rain, which would be light to moderate rainfall if received over a full day or heavy rain if received over a period of 2 to 4 hours. Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

Sea Level Rise data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from Radke et al. (2017), as reported in Cal-Adapt (Radke et al., 2017, CEC-500-2017-008), and consider inundation location and depth for the San Francisco Bay, the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and California coast resulting different increments of sea level rise coupled with extreme storm events. Users may select from four scenarios to view the range in potential inundation depth for the grid cell. The four scenarios are: No rise, 0.5 meter, 1.0 meter, 1.41 meters Wildfire data are for the grid cell in which your project are located. The projections are from UC Davis, as reported in Cal-Adapt (2040–2059 average under RCP 8.5), and consider historical data of climate, vegetation, population density, and large (> 400 ha) fire history. Users may select from four model simulations to view the range in potential wildfire probabilities for the grid cell. The four simulations make different assumptions about expected rainfall and temperature are: Warmer/drier (HadGEM2-ES), Cooler/wetter (CNRM-CM5), Average conditions (CanESM2), Range of different rainfall and temperature possibilities (MIROC5). Each grid cell is 6 kilometers (km) by 6 km, or 3.7 miles (mi) by 3.7 mi.

### 6.2. Initial Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Exposure Score	Sensitivity Score	Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
Temperature and Extreme Heat	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wildfire	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Flooding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores do not include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

### 6.3. Adjusted Climate Risk Scores

Climate Hazard	Hazard Exposure Score Sensitivity Score		Adaptive Capacity Score	Vulnerability Score
Temperature and Extreme Heat N/A N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A
Extreme Precipitation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sea Level Rise	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Wildfire	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Flooding	ng N/A N/A		N/A	N/A
Drought	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Snowpack Reduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality Degradation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The sensitivity score reflects the extent to which a project would be adversely affected by exposure to a climate hazard. Exposure is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest exposure.

The adaptive capacity of a project refers to its ability to manage and reduce vulnerabilities from projected climate hazards. Adaptive capacity is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with a score of 5 representing the greatest ability to adapt.

The overall vulnerability scores are calculated based on the potential impacts and adaptive capacity assessments for each hazard. Scores include implementation of climate risk reduction measures.

### 6.4. Climate Risk Reduction Measures

## 7. Health and Equity Details

### 7.1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Scores

The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Exposure Indicators	
AQ-Ozone	35.2
AQ-PM	63.9
AQ-DPM	67.3
Drinking Water	37.1
Lead Risk Housing	77.4
Pesticides	50.1
Toxic Releases	93.2
Traffic	84.4
Effect Indicators	
CleanUp Sites	32.3
Groundwater ATTACH	IMEINT 3

Haz Waste Facilities/Generators	85.5
Impaired Water Bodies	0.00
Solid Waste	24.8
Sensitive Population	
Asthma	42.9
Cardio-vascular	61.4
Low Birth Weights	40.9
Socioeconomic Factor Indicators	
Education	78.6
Housing	89.8
Linguistic	94.1
Poverty	80.8
Unemployment	58.4

### 7.2. Healthy Places Index Scores

The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

Indicator	Result for Project Census Tract
Economic	
Above Poverty	20.4029257
Employed	64.53227255
Median HI	28.17913512
Education	
Bachelor's or higher	24.56050302
High school enrollment	100
Preschool enrollment	64.42961632
Transportation	
Auto Access	25.2662646
Active commuting	30.63005261 IMENT 3

Social	—			
2-parent households	29.80880277			
Voting	14.6413448			
Neighborhood				
Alcohol availability	24.70165533			
Park access	56.22994996			
Retail density	52.13653279			
Supermarket access	80.40549211			
Tree canopy	15.73206724			
Housing	_			
Homeownership	17.09226229			
Housing habitability	17.97767227			
Low-inc homeowner severe housing cost burden	32.73450533			
Low-inc renter severe housing cost burden	29.61632234			
Uncrowded housing	15.27011421			
Health Outcomes				
Insured adults	19.196715			
Arthritis	60.6			
Asthma ER Admissions	60.8			
High Blood Pressure	43.5			
Cancer (excluding skin)	71.8			
Asthma	55.1			
Coronary Heart Disease	57.7			
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease	37.6			
Diagnosed Diabetes	28.6			
Life Expectancy at Birth	70.9			
Cognitively Disabled	43.0			
Physically Disabled	38.4			
ATTACHMENT 3				

Heart Attack ER Admissions	40.2
Mental Health Not Good	37.4
Chronic Kidney Disease	55.3
Obesity	76.5
Pedestrian Injuries	19.6
Physical Health Not Good	35.1
Stroke	45.2
Health Risk Behaviors	
Binge Drinking	87.0
Current Smoker	32.9
No Leisure Time for Physical Activity	17.3
Climate Change Exposures	—
Wildfire Risk	0.0
SLR Inundation Area	0.0
Children	62.5
Elderly	47.3
English Speaking	4.9
Foreign-born	91.8
Outdoor Workers	22.8
Climate Change Adaptive Capacity	
Impervious Surface Cover	16.9
Traffic Density	83.2
Traffic Access	23.0
Other Indices	—
Hardship	73.8
Other Decision Support	
2016 Voting	45.1

### 7.3. Overall Health & Equity Scores

Metric	Result for Project Census Tract
CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Score for Project Location (a)	82.0
Healthy Places Index Score for Project Location (b)	29.0
Project Located in a Designated Disadvantaged Community (Senate Bill 535)	Yes
Project Located in a Low-Income Community (Assembly Bill 1550)	Yes
Project Located in a Community Air Protection Program Community (Assembly Bill 617)	No

a: The maximum CalEnviroScreen score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects a higher pollution burden compared to other census tracts in the state. b: The maximum Health Places Index score is 100. A high score (i.e., greater than 50) reflects healthier community conditions compared to other census tracts in the state.

### 7.4. Health & Equity Measures

No Health & Equity Measures selected. 7.5. Evaluation Scorecard

Health & Equity Evaluation Scorecard not completed. 7.6. Health & Equity Custom Measures

No Health & Equity Custom Measures created.

## 8. User Changes to Default Data

Screen	Justification
Land Use	Proposed warehouse building on 3.4 acres, total 69,900 SF with 22,000 SF of landscaping.
Construction: Paving	Approximately 60K SF for hardscape/parking, assumes 100% asphalt.
Operations: Vehicle Data	Per ITE Code 150 Warehousing. Average Trip rate of 1.71





# 7474 GARDEN GROVE BLVD.

# 7474 GARDEN GROVE BLVD. WESTMINSTER, CA 92683

# Attachment 3.E









1/27/2025 11:03:19 AM



1 PROPOSED SITE PLAN 3/64" = 1'-0"



- Щ с

25'-DRI 71'-

VD Ш U П ST R С Щ Z |<sup>≥</sup> Ш  $\checkmark$ 4  $\sim$ 

4

. Z Ш **-**| <u></u> ШE 





2/18/2025 12:09:48 PM



3 TRASH ENCLOSURE ELEVATION

ENLARGED SITE PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"







7 ENLARGED ROLLING GATE ELEVATION

2 ENLARGED TRASH ENCLOSURE



4 TRASH ENCLOSURE ELEVATION





SITE PLAN GENERAL NOTES	
<ol> <li>THE SITE PLAN SHALL MEET ALL ENGINEERING &amp; NPDES REQUIREMENTS.</li> <li>GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO REVIEW THE SOILS REPORT AND ALL AMMENDMENTS LISTED ON THE TITLE SHEET AND FOLLOW ALL RECOMMENDATIONS.</li> <li>U.O.N., ALL DIMENSIONS TO CONCRETE WALLS AND CURBS ARE EITHER TO THE CENTER (SHOWN WITH A CENTERLINE) OR THE FACE OF THE WALL OR CURB. ALL DIMESIONS TO FRAMED WALLS ARE EITHER TO THE CENTER LINE OF THE WALL CROWN WITH A CENTERLINE) OR THE FACE OF THE WALL FINISH.</li> <li>REFER TO COVIL, AND MEP PLANS TO CONFIRM UTILITY INFORMATION SHOWN ON THE ARCHITECTS SITE PLAN AND FOR ADDITIONAL UTILITY INFORMATION. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO COORDINATE ALL POINTS OF CONNECTION.</li> <li>REFER TO COVIL DRAWINGS FOR ALL FINISHED GRADES AND SLOPES. ALL FINISHED GRADES TO PROVIDE POSITIVE DRAINAGE AWAY FROM THE BUILDING. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO FIELD VERIFY.</li> <li>ALL ACCESSIBLE ROUTES INDENTIFIED ON THE SITE PLAN DRAWINGS SHALL CONFORM TO THE FOLLOWING:         <ul> <li>SLOPES IN THE DIRECTION OF TRAVEL DO NOT EXCEED 5%. CROSS SLOPES DO NOT EXCEED 5%. CROSS SLOPES DO NOT EXCEED 5%.</li> <li>THE CLEAR WIDTH OF ALL WALKWAYS IS 4-0" MIN.</li> <li>CHANGES IN LEVEL UP TO 1/2" COMPLY W/ 11/A02.1. CHANGES IN LEVEL GREATER THAN 1/2" IF THEY OCCUR ARE RAMPED. SEE PLANS.</li> <li>THE VERTICAL CLEARANCE ALONG THE ACCESSIBLE ROUTE IS 80" MIN.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ALL PAVED AND LANDSCAPED AREAS TO BE BOUND BY A MIN. 6" HIGH, 6" WIDE CONCETTE CURB U.O.N.</li> <li>A CONCRETE MOW STRIP EXTENDING 12" BEYOND EA END OF THE OPENING SHALL BE PROVIDED @ ALL EXTERIOR GLAZING WHERE THE SILL IS WITHIN 3' VERICAL OF THE FINISHED GRADE. SEE 2/AD1.1</li>         REOVIDE PIPE BOLLARD PROTECTION POSTS AS REQUIRED BY UTILITY COMPANIES AND OR FIRE AUTHORTIES AT ALL EXTERIOR ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND FIRE PREVENTION DEVICES. IF PIPE BOLLARD PROTECTION POST DETALS ARE NOT PROVIDE BY UTILITY COMPANIES AND OR FIRE AUTHORITY SEE DETAIL 3/AD1.1     ALL EXPOSED B</ol>	<ul> <li>106 @ SHADING, PROPOSED LANDSCAPING. SEE LANDSCAP PLANS.</li> <li>110 ACCESS AISLE FOR ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL. 5'-0" WIDE</li> <li>115 STANDARD ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL. 9'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL.</li> <li>116 VAN ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL. 12'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL</li> <li>117 STANDARD ACCESSIBLE EVCS (ELECTRICAL VEHICLE CHARGING STATION), 9'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL, PROVIDE ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMEN STATION, 12'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL.</li> <li>118 VAN ACCESSIBLE EVCS (ELECTRICAL VEHICLE CHARGIN STATION), 12'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL.</li> <li>119 VAN ACCESSIBLE EVCS (ELECTRICAL VEHICLE CHARGIN STATION), 12'-0" WIDE x DEPTH OF STANDARD STALL.</li> <li>120 TRUNCATED DOME DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE. 3' DEEP IN THE DIRECTION OF TRAVEL.</li> <li>121 PRECAST CONCRETE WHEEL STOP.</li> <li>123 CURB RAMP. 8.33% MAX SLOPE W/ 2% MAX CROSS SLOP</li> <li>137 TUBE STELL FRACE. MIN HEIGHT 10' ABOVE HIGHEST ADJACENT FINISHED GRADE.</li> <li>141 STELL TRASH ENCLOSURE ROOF COVERING. HSS COLUMNS, HSS BEAMS, AND METAL DECK ROOFING. ALL COMPONENTS TO BE SHOP PRIMED AND FIELD PAINTEED</li> <li>120 PAINTED STEEL TRASH ENCLOSURE GATES. ALIGN TOP GATES WITH TOP OF ADJACENT FINISHED GRADE OR AS SHOW ON EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS, PROVIDE CONDUIT GATE FOR FUTURE MOTOR &amp; OFFICE AREA FOR FUTURE INTERCOM CONTROL, PROVIDE KOX BOX AS REQUIRE BY FIRE AUTHORITY.</li> <li>146 2 POSITION BIKE RACK.</li> <li>150 STEEL PIPE BOLLARD PROTECTION POST.</li> <li>172 CONCRETE TUTURE MOTOR &amp; OFFICE AREA FOR FUTURE INTERCOM CONTROL, PROVIDE KOX BOX AS REQUIRE BY FIRE AUTHORITY.</li> <li>146 2 POSITION BIKE RACK.</li> <li>157 EVCS SERVICE EQUIPMENT. SEE ELCTRICAL DRAWINGS</li> </ul>
TRASH ENCLOSURE ELEVATION 14" = 1'-0"	SITE LEGEND         Image: Site Construction of the second set of the second second set of the second seco









							>
						58 120 TRUNCATE DEEP IN TH 149 CONCRETE GUARD ON WALLS AND FOR COLOF 169 CONCRETE 201 STRUCTUR 408 STEEL SEC 417 INTERIOR R 443 4'-0"w x 8'-0"	D DOME DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE. 3'-0" E DIRECTION OF TRAVEL. TRUCK RAMP w/ 42" HIGH CONCRETE TILT-UP OPEN SIDE(S). PAINT ALL SIDES OF GUARD HANDRAILS.SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SCHEDULE. STAIRS ON GRADE. AL BUILDING COLUMN. TIONAL OVERHEAD DOOR. OOF DRAIN w/ PAINTED OVERFLOW SCUPPER. "h PAINTED STEEL WALL LOUVER. TOP @ +10'-0".
•		DN MAX 8.33%		0			
	5' - 0" LANDING	, 24'-6" RAMP ►	6' - 0" LANDING	6'-0" CURB RAMP	TYP.		
	58' - 1 65' - 0"	6" RAMP		¢.			LEGEND
						FLOOR SLAB FLOOR SLAB OVERHEAD DO SLOPE POUR OVERHEAD DO SLAB FINISH T FILOOR SLAB THE GENERAL SLAB FINISH T FINISH. THE GENERAL SLAB FINISH T SLAB FINISH T FINISH. THE GENERAL SLAB FINISH T	EXTERIOR CONCRETE TILT-UP WALL PANEL OR INTERIOR CONCRETE TILT-UP MEZZANINE SHEAR WALL PANEL SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION STOREFRONT GLAZING SYSTEM SEE ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS AND EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION METAL STUD NON BEARING PARTITION WALL SEE ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS & WALL TYPE SCHEDULE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WOOD STUD BEARING WALL SEE ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS & WALL TYPE SCHEDULE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. STRUCTURAL BUILDING COLUMNS PROVIDE VAPOR BARRIER UNDER PROPOSED AND OR FUTURE OFFICE AREA FLOOR PLANS & WALL TYPE SCHEDULE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. STRUCTURAL BUILDING COLUMNS PROVIDE VAPOR BARRIER UNDER PROPOSED AND OR FUTURE OFFICE AREA FLOOR PLAN. SEE 4/AD1.0 FIRE SPRINKLER RISER. SEE FIRE PROTECTION PLANS AND 7/AD5.0. DOOR TAG. SEE SHEET A8.0 FOR WINDOW SCHEDULE STOREFRONT TAG. SEE SHEETS A8.0.1 & A8.0.2 FOR STOREFRONT SCHEDULE WINDOW TAG. SEE SHEETS A8.0.1 & A8.0.2 FOR STOREFRONT SCHEDULE WALL TAG <b>GENERAL NOTES</b> LAB THICKNESS TO BE X". SEE STRUCTURAL DRADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS. LAB THICKNESS TO BE X". SEE STRUCTURAL DRADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS. LAB THICKNESS TO RE S". SEE STRUCTURAL PRADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS. LAB TO BE CLASS Y PER ACI 302.1 R.04 TABLE 21. . CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE WITH THE THER OR NOT TO PROVIDE JOINT FILLER AT 20 NTAOL AND CONSTRUCTION JOINTS. STRIPS @ EXTERIOR PEDESTRIAN AND DORS. SEE 5. 7, 8 100AD 4.1 CRETE TRUCKS, AND SIMILAR HEAVY GRE PROHIBIED ON THE FLOOR SLAB DURING DORS. SEE 5. 7, 8 100AD 4.1 CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN A CLEAN FLOOR JOKS AND EQUIPMENT TO BE DIAPERED. CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN A CLEAN FLOOR SINGE OF SEALING. MIN. ON BEACE FRAME HOLES TO BE SMIN. COMPACTION TO BE 95% MIN. COMPACTION TO BE 95% MIN. CONDERGROUND IPING, CONDURS, ETC DOUR. STRIPS AT DOCK DORY ON ALLOW FOR IS NOTED OTHER YISO TO NALLING. STO BE PREDRILED. D EVEAL STRUCK AND A 1" TOPPING IS OURS. STRIPS AT CHED TO THE FLOOR FUTURE RECESSED DOCK LEVELERS. MIN AND THE ORD SEALING. STO BE PREDRILED. D REVEAL STRIPS AT COCHOLES TO BE MIN MORY OF SEALING. STRUE OCCU
N						<ol> <li>PROVIDE ILLU EXITING &amp; SIG</li> <li>SEE CIVIL DRA CONNECTION. LOCATIONS.</li> <li>PROVIDE PIPE RISERS &amp; ELE ELECTRICAL A FOR ADDITION</li> <li>FOR REQUIRE DOORS, SEE 1</li> <li>NO SMOKING ENTRANCES, I DIVISION 5.504</li> <li>U.O.N @ INTEF JAMB TO BE 6 WALL.</li> </ol>	MINATED AND TACTILE EXIT SIGNAGE. SEE NAGE PLANS. WINGS FOR ALL UTILITY POINTS OF GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY BOLLARD PROTECTION POSTS @ FIRE CTRICAL GEAR AS REQUIRED BY THE ND FIRE PROTECTION PLANS. SEE 7/AD5.0 JAL INFORMATION. D LANDINGS @ ALL INTERIOR & EXTERIOR 11/A0.2.1. IS ALLOWED WITIHN 25' OF ALL BUILDING PER GREEN BUILDING STANDARD CODE 4.7. POST REQUIRED SIGNAGE. RIOR PARTITIONS, FINISHED HINGE SIDE OF "FROM FINISHED SURFACE OF INTERSECTING



jζ C  $\frown$ 4 47

PRO. 2ND EN



1/27/2025 11:03:25 AM



1 PROPOSED ROOF PLAN 1/16" = 1'-0"

ATTACHMENT 3

	<ul> <li>301 LINE OF RIDGE / ROOF HIGH POINT.</li> <li>302 SLOPE ROOF MINIMUM 1/4"/FOOT</li> <li>303 LINE OF ROOF FRAMING BELOW.</li> </ul>
— – — (A)	ROOF PLAN GENERAL NOTES
	<ol> <li>GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE A 4-PLY BUILT-UP ASPHALT ROOF BY MALARKY (CCRR-0333), GAF (UL ER 1306-02), JOHNS MANVILLE (UL ER 10167-03), OR AN EQUAL APPROVED BY THE OWNER. ROOF TO HAVE A UL CLASS "A" FIRE RATING. ASPHALT TO BE "TRUMBAL" ASPHALT OR AN APPROVED EQUAL. PROVIDE A 15 YEAR NO DOLLAR LIMIT WARRANTY. SEE DETAIL 1/AD3.0 FOR TYPICAL ROOFING CROSS SECTION.</li> <li>FOR TYPICAL PARAPET DETAILS, SEE 2 &amp; 3/AD3.0 FOR TYPICAL ROOF TOP PIPE SUPPORT DETAIL, SEE 4/AD3.1 FOR PRE-FAB EQUIPMENT CURB DETAIL, SEE 5/AD3.0 FOR TYPICAL ROOF PENETRATION DETAIL, SEE 10, 11, &amp; 12/AD3.0</li> <li>ROOFING DETAILS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS ARE MINIMUM STANDARDS. ROOFING DETAILS PROVIDED BY THE BUILT UP ROOFING MANUFACTURER SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE IF THEY REQUIRE MORE THAN THE ROOF PLAN GENERAL REQUIREMENTS ON THESE PLANS.</li> <li>GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFIRM THE ROOF</li> </ol>
— — — (B)	<ul> <li>ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON THE ARCHITECTURAL ROOF PLAN WITH THE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.</li> <li>5. GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY THERE IS POSITIVE ROOF DRAINAGE AT ALL AREAS OF THE ROOF PRIOR TO INSTALLING RIGID INSULATION OR BUILT UP ROOFING.</li> <li>6. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE CRICKETING ON THE HIGH SIDE OF ALL SKYLIGHTS, SMOKE HATCHES, ROOF HATCHES, AND MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT. SEE 9/AD3.0</li> <li>7. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO COORDINATE ALL ROOF PENETRATIONS.</li> <li>8. ALL MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT CONDENSATE DRAIN LINES TO BE RUN BELOW THE ROOF.</li> <li>9. GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE WALKING PADS FROM THE ROOF HATCH TO ALL OFFICE AREA ROOF TOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT. THE WALKING PADS SHALL BE A PRODUCT APPROVED BY THE MANUFACTURER OF THE ROOFING SYSTEM.</li> <li>10. ALL EXPOSED WOOD CURBS TO BE PRESSURE</li> </ul>
(C)	<ol> <li>ALL ROOF TOP EXHAUST FANS SHALL BE CENTERED DIRECTLY ABOVE A SPRINKLER HEAD. COORDINATE LOCATION AND INSTALLATION WITH THE FIRE PROTECTION PLANS.</li> <li>GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE FULL TIME INSPECTION FOR OSB MOISTURE CONTENT AND GAP BETWEEN PANELS BY A QUALIFIED ROOFING INSPECTION FIRM APPROVED BY THE OWNER AND THE OSB MANUFACTURER. INSPECTION FIRM TO BE ON SITE PRIOR TO COMMENCING ANY BUILT-UP ROOFING WORK.</li> <li>GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUOUS ROOFING INSPECTION BY AN IRC ROOFING CONSULTANT OR AN EQUAL APPROVED BY THE OWNER.</li> <li>WHEN REQUIRED BY TITLE 24 (SEE MECHANICAL DRAWINGS) THE ROOFING CAP SHEET OVER ALL CONDITIONED SPACES SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 3-YEAR AGED SOLAR REFLECTANCE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 0.63, AND AN SRI EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 75 (COOL ROOF).</li> <li>ALL SUB-PURLIN HANGERS SHALL BE "Z-MAX" TRIPLE ZINC COATED BY "SIMPSON" OR EQUAL.</li> <li>PROVIDE A ROOF TOP HOSE BIB NEAR THE OFFICE AND OR EUTURE OFFICE AREA. SEE DI AN EOP LOCATION</li> </ol>
D	<ul> <li>17. PROVIDE WHITE FSKF SKRIM MEMBRANE OVER THE ENTIRE WAREHOUSE CEILING. SEE 4/AD3.2. CONFIRM REQUIREMENT WITH THE OWNER PRIOR TO ORDERING MATERIAL.</li> <li>18. REGARDING ROOF DRAINAGE - ROOF AND OVERFLOW DRAIN SIZES PER PLUMBING PLANS. OVERFLOW SCUPPER AND EXTERIOR DOWNSPOUT SIZES PER ARCHITECTURAL PLANS UNLESS PLUMBING PLANS CALL OUT FOR LARGER SIZES.</li> <li>ROOF PLAN LEGEND</li> <li>OFFICE AREA BELOW</li> <li>SOLAR READY ROOF AREA. SEE "SOLAR READY ROOF NOTES", THIS SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</li> </ul>
— — — (E)	CURB MOUNTED SKYLIGHT.         "SKYLIGHT/SMOKE HATCH NOTES" THIS         SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.         CURB MOUNTED SMOKE HATCH.         "SKYLIGHT/SMOKE HATCH NOTES" THIS         SHEET FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.         BILCO TYPE S 30"x36" ALUMINUM         FRAME SELF FLASHING ROOF HATCH         W'BIL-GUARD" 2.0 SAFETY         POST OR =. SEE 7 & 8/AD3.0 FOR         TYPICAL DETAILS
——————————————————————————————————————	SUMP w/ EXTERIOR OVERFLOW         SCUPPER. SEE 14/AD3.0         INTERIOR ROOF AND OVERFLOW         DRAINS IN ROOF SUMP. SEE 13/AD3.0         EXTERIOR DOWNSPOUT w/ (2)         OVERFLOW SCUPPERS. SEE 17/AD3.0 & 3/AD3.1         EXTERIOR DOWNSPOUT w/ (1)         OVERFLOW SCUPPER. SEE 18/AD3.0 & 3/AD3.1         Image: Some items shown in the LEGEND MAY NOT BE IN THE PROJECT SCOPE
	IOTAL OPENINGS REQ. BY OWNER, SKYLIGHTS + SMOKE HATCHESSKYLIGHTS + SMOKE HATCHESYotal Roof AREAMore Roof AREAOPENINGSOPENINGSOPENINGSContract of the second se
	TOTAL SKYLIGHTS & SMOKE HATCHES PROVIDED
	SKYLIGHTS 45 GRAND TOTAL 45









1/27/2025 11:03:26 AM











# 1 PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION

# 2 PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION 1/16" = 1'-0"

TENANT SIGNAGE	

# 3 PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION











1/27/2025 11:03:33 AM



# 1 PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION 1/16" = 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION 1/16" = 1'-0"



# 3 PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION 1/16" = 1'-0"



	<ul> <li>402 WALL REVEAL.</li> <li>404 PANEL JOINT.</li> <li>407 PAINTED HOLLOW METAL PEDESTRIAN DOOR.</li> <li>408 STEEL SECTIONAL OVERHEAD DOOR.</li> <li>410 LINE OF ROOF SHEATHING BEYOND.</li> <li>420 DECORATIVE SOLID BROW WRAPPED IN ALUMINUM PANELS. NOMINAL 12" THKNS. MAX 24" PROJECTION FROM BUILDING.</li> <li>423 DECORATIVE SOLID BROW WRAPPED IN ALUMINUM PANELS. NOMINAL 18" THKNS. MAX 48" PROJECTION FROM BUILDING.</li> <li>454 INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED FUTURE TENANT SIGNAGE.</li> <li>455 AREA FOR FUTURE TENANT SIGNAGE.</li> </ul>
	GLAZING LEGEND & NOTES         STOREFRONT FRAMING:         U.O.N @ VISION SYSTEM, MIN 2"x4 1/2" OFFSET         SYSTEM. U.O.N. @ SPANDREL SYSTEM, 2"x1 3/4"
	<ul> <li>OFFSET SYSTEM. STOREFRONT SYSTEM TO BE DESIGN BUILD BY THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR. DESIGN SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL RELEVANT CODE &amp; WIND LOADING REQUIREMENTS.</li> <li><b>VISION SYSTEM GLAZING:</b> FOR EXTERIOR VISION GLAZING USE 1" INSULATED GLASS CONSISTING OF AN OUTER LAYER OF 1/4" VISTACOOL AND AN INNER LAYER OF 1/4" SOLARBAN 60. FOR INTERIOR GLAZING USE 1/2" CLEAR GLASS</li> <li><b>SPANDREL SYSTEM GLAZING:</b> FOR EXTERIOR SPANDREL GLAZING USE 1/4" VISTACOOL. BACK PAINTING OF GLASS NOT REQUIRED.</li> <li><b>NOTES:</b></li> <li>FOR GLASS AND MULLION COLORS, SEE EXTERIOR COLORS, LEGEND &amp; NOTES, THIS SHEET.</li> <li>PROVIDE TEMPERED GLASS @ THE FOLLOWING: A. ALL SPANDREL SYSTEM GLAZING IN FRONT OF CONCRETE WALL PANELS</li> <li>ALL GLAZING WITH 14" OF AN ADJACENT WALKING SURFACE.</li> <li>ALL GLAZING WITH 24" OF ANY PORTION OF A DOOR.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>3. W STANDAUL STSTEM GLAZING IN TROUT OF CONCRETE IN WALL PANELS, PROVIDE 1" DIA. VENTILLATION HOLES IN THE CONCRETE A MAX OF 5'-0" O.C. CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE A SMOOTH FINISH ON THE GLASS FACING CONCRETE SURFACES AND TO PAINT THEM &amp; ALL STOREFRONT FRAMES AND CLIPS BEHIND THE GLASS BLACK.</li> <li>4. @ SPANDREL SYSTEM GLAZING NOT IN FRONT OF A CONCRETE WALL PANEL, PROVIDE TENCATE MIRAFI 140N FILTER FABRIC SHADE CLOTH.</li> <li>EXTERIOR WALL COLOR LEGEND &amp; NOTES</li> <li>(A) EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: SW 7673 PEWTER CAST</li> <li>(B) EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: SW 6206 OYSTER BAY</li> <li>(C) EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: SW 7567 NATURAL TAN</li> <li>(D) EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: SW 7666 FLEUR DEL SEL</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>EXTERIOR PAINT COLOR: SW SW 6996 SUPERWHITE</li> <li>ACM PANEL COLOR: MATCH STOREFRONT FRAMING.</li> <li>PAINT COLOR FOR EXPOSED STEEL BROW &amp; CANOPY FRAMING, WALL BEHIND OPEN TRELLIS (KEY NOTE 428, OR 429) WHEN OCCURS &amp; TRASH ENCLOSURE METAL ROOF, ROOF BEAMS, &amp; SUPPORT COLUMNS.</li> <li>MATCH STOREFRONT FRAMING.</li> <li>EXTERIOR STOREFRONT FRAMING COLOR: CLEAR ANODIZED ALUMINUM</li> <li>EXTERIOR GLASS COLOR FOR SINGLE GLAZING &amp; EXTERIOR LAYER OF INSULATED GLASS: GREEN REFLECTIVE GLASS.</li> <li>EXTERIOR GLASS COLOR FOR THE INNER LAYER OF INSULATED GLASS: CLEAR</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>SUBJECTIONS ON THE SURFACE OF THE CONCRETE WALL PANELS SHALL BE PATCHED / SACKED / SANDED SMOOTH PRIOR TO PAINTING.</li> <li>2. ALL INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR FABRICATED STEEL SHALL BE SHOP PRIMED WITH A GRAY, RUST INHIBITIVE PRIMER PRIOR TO DELIVERY TO THE JOB SITE. ANY AND ALL DAMAGE TO THE PRIMER COAT SHALL BE TOUCHED UP PRIOR TO ADDITIONAL FINAL COLOR PAINTING OR COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT.</li> <li>3. PAINT MAN DOORS, STAIR &amp; RAMP GUARD WALLS, GUARD RAILS, DOWN SPOUTS, LOUVERS, &amp; ROOF LEVEL WALL PANEL RETURNS TO MATCH ADJACENT BUILDING WALL COLOR, U.O.N.</li> <li>4. U.O.N., EXTERIOR SIDE OF TRUCK DOORS TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL COLOR, INTERIOR SIDE TO BE PREFINISHED WITH MANUFACTURER'S LIGHT GRAY.</li> <li>5. POWER WASH EXTERIOR CONCRETE WALLS PRIOR TO PAINTING TO REMOVE ALL CHEMICALS AND DIRT THAT WILL IMPEDE THE PRIMER COAT FROM ADHERING TO THE WALLS.</li> <li>6. PAINT EXTERIOR WALLS w/ 1- COAT SPRAYED AND BACK</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>C. MARTELORICKICLES W/ 15 COAL SPRATED AND BACK ROLLED ACRYLIC FLAT PRIMER AND 2-COATS SPRAYED-ON FLAT FINISH IN THE FINAL WALL COLOR. FINISHED JOB SHALL BE SMOOTH AND FREE OF LAPPING AND OR STREAKING, REGARDLESS OF THE COLOR.</li> <li>EXCEPT WHERE NOTED OTHERWISE ON THE PLANS ALL PANEL JOINTS SHALL BE CAULKED PER DETAIL 1/AD4.1.</li> <li>PAINT CONCRETE BEHIND ANY OPEN TRELLIS WORK THE COLOR OF THE TRELLIS.</li> <li>@ SOLID BROWS WITH GLAZING DIRECTLY ABOVE OR BELOW, PAINT THE EXPOSED WALL CHAMFER JUST ABOVE OR BELOW THE BROW TO MATCH THE BROW COLOR.</li> <li>PAINT ALL WALL REVEALS THE COLOR OF THE ADJACENT WALL. WHEN THERE IS A COLOR CHANGE AT THE REVEAL, SEE 2/AD4.1</li> <li>U.O.N., PAINT THE SIDE OPPOSITE THE SIDE SHOWN OF SCREEN WALLS THE SAME COLOR AS THE SIDE SHOWN. IF THERE ARE TWO COLORS SHOWN, USE THE BASE COLOR.</li> <li>ALL PAINTS USED SHALL BE AS SPECIFIED BY THE MANUFACTURER FOR THE PROPOSED USE</li> </ol>



1/27/2025 11:03:44 AM







+/- 180' - 0"









2 1/27/2025 11:03:46 AM



ፍ

1 SOUTH ELEVATION VIEW FROM 22 FREEWAY

# \_ \_ \_ PROPOSED - BUILDING 22 FWY

# GARDEN GROVE BLVD









1/27/2025 11:03:47 AM

















AL 





1/27/2025 11:03:53 AM



D BY CHICAGO TITLE INS	SURANCE	COMPANY, ORDER NO. 00189258 DATED JULY 16,2024.	EG FG	EXISTING GRADE FINISH GRADE
Y PURPOSES, F OFFICIAL	(1)	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, A CORPORATION, FOR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES AND OTHER PURPOSES, RECORDED SEPTEMBER 13, 1966 AS BOOK 8046, PAGE 390, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, PORTION TO BE VACATED.	FS TC FL EP	FINISH SURFACE TOP OF CURB FLOW LINE EDGE OF PAVEMENT
CALIFORNIA UGUST 1, 1955 .OCATABLE)	12	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, A CORPORATION, FOR AERIAL AND UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC LINES AND COMMUNICATION LINE PURPOSES, RECORDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1966 AS BOOK 8064, PAGE 19, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, PORTION TO BE VACATED.	FF PAD TW TF	FINISH FLOOR PAD GRADE TOP OF WALL TOP OF FOOTING
SON COMPANY, A NUARY 18, 1956 AS N TO BE VACATED.	13	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO MIDWAY CITY SANITATION DISTRICT, FOR SANITARY SEWER PURPOSES, RECORDED JANUARY 4, 1967 AS BOOK 8145, PAGE 175, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.	HP LP CF TG	HIGH PUINT LOW POINT CURB FACE TOP OF CRATE
SON COMPANY, A BRUARY 1, 1956 AS N TOP BE VACATED.	14	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO CITY OF WESTMINSTER, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, FOR WATER PIPE PURPOSES, RECORDED MARCH 25, 1971 AS BOOK 9582, PAGE 496, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.		TOP OF RETAINING WALL EXTRA DEPTH FOOTING
COMPANY OF METERING, RECORDED MARCH 29, 5, TO BE VACATED.	15	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, A CORPORATION, FOR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES AND OTHER PURPOSES, RECORDED DECEMBER 16, 1980 1956 AS BOOK 13876, PAGE 162, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.		TOP OF SLOPE RATE OF SLOPE TOE OF SLOPE
SON COMPANY, A IGUST 29, 1956 RTION TO PE	16	AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO CITY OF WESTMINSTER, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, FOR STREET AND HIGHWAY PURPOSES, RECORDED OCTOBER 17, 1989 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 89–5558903, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.	s w a	EXISTING SEWER EXISTING WATER EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
R HIGHWAY JANUARY 23, 1962	1 <i>7.</i> (18)	NOT A SURVEY MATTER. AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO CITY OF WESTMINSTER, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, FOR TRAFFIC LOOP AND SIDEWALK PURPOSES, RECORDED JUJI Y 15, 1996 AS INSTRUMENT NO, 19960358572, OF	● ₩	EXISTING FDC EXISTING WATER VALVE
IINE SLATER, AS BOOK 5984,	(19)	OFFICIAL RECORDS. AN EASEMENT GRANTED TO CITY OF WESTMINSTER, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, FOR WATER PIPE PURPOSES, RECORDED JULY 15, 1996 AS INSTRUMENT NO, 19960358573. OF OFFICIAL RECORDS TO BE VACATED	™ ₩M ₽B	EXISTING GAS METER EXISTING WATER METER EXISTING PULL BOX
	20–25.	NOT A SURVEY MATTER.	ıçv ⊷—X	EXISTING ICV EXISTING STREET LIGHT
TRICT, FOR SANITARY PUMENT NO.				EXISTING CONTOUR
PURPOSES, , OF				FINISH CONTOURS
				PROPOSED CONCRETE
				PROPOSED ASPHALT
				REMOVAL
ſ				EXISTING CONCRETE
₩ 				PROPOSED GRIND
				PROPOSED OVERLAY
PROP. BLDG 53.00FF		STI U WESTM WESTM	CODENWEST ST. LE LE LE LE LE LE LE LE LE LE	AVE. GARDEN GROVE BLVD AVE. GARDEN BLVD. BLVD. BLVD. BLVD. BOLSA
30		0 30 60 90 AND Developmen SCALE: 1"=30' Company	909 /7 <u>۲</u> (909	2313 E. Philadelphia St., Ste. F Ontario, CA 91761 ) 930–1466 • FAX (909) 930–1468 ANNING • CIVIL • SURVEYING
	PF	ELIMINARY GRADING PLA		DATE: JOB NO. 2/25/2025 6663
17/2025 TE	<u>SITE</u> 7474	ARDEN GROVE BLVD.	EN <i>T</i>	DRAWN BY: RAS 1' = 30'
	GARDEN	GROVE, CA GROVE, CA CRAIG FURNISS 3780 KILROY AIRPORT WAY, LONG BEACH, CA 90806 (562)427–7771 EXT 11 cfurniss@7thsd.com	STE 520	CHECKED BY: OF
IL				

<u>LEGEND</u>

BW

BACK OF WALK



PLANT	ING LEGEND				
TREES SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Chitalpa tashkentensis	24" Box	6	L	Standard
	<u>Cinnamomum camphora</u> Camphor Tree	24" Box	6	М	Standard
	Olea europaea (Fruitless)	24" Box	3	L	Multi
	Tristania conferta Brisbane Box	15 Gal	29	М	Standard
A.M.			-		
SHRUBS		0.75			
LARGE SCI	REEN SHRUBS	SIZE		WUCOLS	SPACING
////	Heteromeles arbutifolia	5 Gal		м	5' OC
/////	Rhamnus californica	5 Gal		L	hardscape 4' OC
	Coffeeberry Westringia fruticosa	5 Gal		L	hardscape 5' OC
	Coast Rosemary				hardscape
MEDIUM H	EDGE SHRUBS			1	
	Acca sellowiana Pineapple Gauva	5 Gal		М	3' OC 2' from
11111	Baccharis p. 'Centenial' Coyote Bush	5 Gal		L	hardscape 4' OC 2.5' from
	Callistemon 'Little John' Dwarf Bottle Brush	5 Gal		м	hardscape 3' OC 2' from
	Cassia phyllodenia Silverleaf Cassia	5 Gal		L	hardscape 4' OC 2.5' from
	Dianella 'Cassa Blue' Dwarf Dianella	5 Gal		м	hardscape 3' OC 2' from
	Dianella tasmanica	5 Gal		м	hardscape 3' OC 2' from
	Ligustrum j. Texanum	5 Gal		м	hardscape 3' OC 2' from
	Rhaphiolepis i. 'Springtime'	5 Gal		м	hardscape 3' OC
	Rosmarinus o. 'Tuscan Blue'	5 Gal		L	hardscape 3' OC
	Rosemary Salvia c. 'Allen Chickering'	5 Gal		L	2' from hardscape 4' OC
	Allen Chickering Sage Salvia greggii	5 Gal		L	2.5' from hardscape 3' OC
	Autumn Sage Salvia leucantha	5 Gal		L	2' from hardscape 3' OC
	Mexican Sage Muhlenbergia capillaris	5 Gal		м	2' from hardscape 3' OC
	Pink Muhly Phormium tenax	5 Gal		L	2' from hardscape 3' OC
	New Zealand flax				2' from hardscape
SMALL HE	DGE SHRUBS				
<u> </u>	Dietes bicolor Fortnight Lilv	5 Gal		м	3' OC 2' from
	Eremphilia g. 'Mingenew Gold' Emu Bush	5 Gal		м	5' OC 3' from
	Westringia f. 'Grey Box Dwarf Coast Rosemary	5 Gal		L	hardscape 3' OC 2' from
ACCENT	ANTS				hardscape
	Agave 'Blue Glow	5 Gal		L	
FFF	Blue Glow Agave Aloe maculata	5 Gal		L	
	Soap Aloe Aloe striata	1 Gal		L	
	Coral Aloe Dasylerion wheeleri	5 Gal			
	Desert Spoon Hesperaloe parviflora	5 Gal			
	Red Yucca	- Gui			
GROUNDO	OVER				
SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Acacia redolens 'Low Boy' Dwarf Acacia	1 Gal	8' O.C.	L	
	Baccharis p. 'Pigeon Point' Dwarf Coyote Bush	1 Gal	6' O.C.	L	
	Carissa m. 'Green Carpet' Prostrate Natal Plum	1 Gal	36" O.C.	М	
	Hemerocallis hybridus-Yellow Yellow Day Lily	1 Gal	24" O.C.	м	
	Myoporum parvifolium Myoporum	1 Gal	36" O.C.	L	
	Rosa 'Flower Carpet' -Red Red Flower Carpet Rose	1 Gal	30" O.C.	L	
	Rosmarinus o. 'Huntington Carpet' Prostrate Rosemary	1 Gal	48" O.C.	L	
	Trachelopspermum jasminiodes	1 Gal	24" O.C.	м	
	Star Jasmine				I

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET								
eference Evapotranspiration Rate	e (Eto):		50.1					
Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF/IE)	Landscape Area	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU) Gallons per Year	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU) Acre Feet per Year
egular Landscape Areas Potable								
Water								
Low Water Use Landscape	0.2	Drip	0.81	0.25	8,779	21,515	44,176	0.14
Low/Mod Use Landscape	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	13,086	14,344	45,164	0.14
Hydrozone 6	0.1	Bubbler	0.81	0.12	82	10	31	0.00
				Totals	21,947	35,869		
						ETWU Total	89,372	0.27
			Maximum A	llowed W	ater Allowa	nce (MAWA)	306,773	0.94
becial Landscape Areas Recycled								
Water								
Hydrozone 2				1	-	1. <del>71</del> .	-	0.00
Hydrozone 2				1	-	-	-	0.00
Hydrozone 4				1	<u>-</u>		<u> </u>	0.00
Hydrozone 6				1	-	2 <b>4</b> 2	-	0.00
				Totals	-	-		
						ETWU Total	-	0.00
			Maximum A	llowed W	ater Allowa	nce (MAWA)	-	0.00
ETAF Calculations							Irrigation Efficien	сy
egular Landscape Areas							Drip Irrigation	0.81
otal ETAF x Area	35,869						Overhead Spray	0.75
otal Area	21,947						Rotors	0.75

Regular Landscape Areas	
Total ETAF x Area	35,869
Total Area	21,947
Average ETAF	1.634352
All Landscaep Areas	
<b>All Landscaep Areas</b> Total ETAF x Area	35,869
<b>All Landscaep Areas</b> Total ETAF x Area Total Area	35,869 21,947

VINES					
SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	
•	<u>Pyracantha</u> Firethorn	1 Gal	29	L	

3" layer decomposed granite over filter fabric.

2" layer shredded organic mulch in shrub areas, 1" layer in groundcover areas.

VICNITY MAP





CONTACT: TOM HAYES PHONE NUMBER: 714.986.2400 EMAIL: TOMH@HUNETER LANDSCAPE.NET



Westminister, California

