TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT PAGE

1. INTRODUCTION 1
   1.1 Purpose and Objectives 1
   1.2 Scope of Services 2
   1.3 Report Limitations 2
   1.4 Data Gaps 3

2. SITE DESCRIPTION 3
   2.1 Location and Legal Description 3
   2.2 Site and Vicinity General Characteristics 3
      2.2.1 Topography 3
      2.2.2 Geologic Conditions 4
      2.2.3 Hydrologic and Hydrogeologic Conditions 4
   2.3 Current and Planned Uses of the Site 4
   2.4 Descriptions of Structures, Roads, Other Improvements on the Site 4
   2.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties 5

3. USER–PROVIDED INFORMATION 5
   3.1 Title, Appraisal and Sale Agreement Records 5
   3.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations 5
   3.3 Specialized Knowledge 5
   3.4 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information 5
   3.5 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information 5
   3.6 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues 5
   3.7 Reason for Performing Phase I ESA 5

4. RECORDS REVIEW 6
   4.1 Standard Environmental Record Sources 6
      4.1.1 Site 6
      4.1.2 Nearby Properties 6
   4.2 Vapor Encroachment Screening/Conditions 7
   4.3 Additional Environmental Record Sources 7
      4.3.1 GeoTracker and EnviroStor Websites 8
      4.3.2 State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) 8
      4.3.3 County of Riverside Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures 8
      4.3.4 County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health 8

5. HISTORICAL USE 8
   5.1 Sanborn, Inc. Fire Insurance Maps 8
   5.2 Aerial Photographs 9
   5.3 Topographic Maps 10
   5.4 City Directory 11

6. SITE RECONNAISSANCE 11
   6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions 11
   6.2 General Site Setting 11
   6.3 Onsite Survey 11
   6.4 Offsite Survey 11

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

7. INTERVIEWS 12

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

9. REFERENCES 13

10. QUALIFICATIONS 14

FIGURES
1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan

PHOTOGRAPHS (1 through 10)

APPENDICES
A. Client and Site Owner Questionnaires
B. EDR Radius Map™ Report with GeoCheck®
C. EDR Vapor Encroachment Screening/Conditions
D. EDR Historical Aerial Photographs
E. EDR Historical Topographic Maps
F. EDR City Directory Abstract

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of approximately 2.17 acres of vacant land (the Site) located immediately east of Highway 79 and west of Briggs Road in Murrieta, California (Figure 1). The Site is identified by the County of Riverside APNs 963-070-002 to -004. No addresses are associated with the Site. The Phase I ESA was requested by FVIP, LLC (the Client) to provide information regarding the potential for existing hazardous substances or petroleum product impacts at the Site as required by the Riverside County Environmental Health Department for the proposed development.

1.1 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the Phase I ESA was to identify evidence or indications of 'recognized environmental conditions' (REC) as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) *Designation E 1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*. Section 1.1.1 of ASTM Designation E 1527-13 defines an REC as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De minimis conditions are not recognized environmental conditions." De minimis conditions are those that generally do not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of the enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies.

ASTM *Designation E 1527-13* also defines 'Historical' and 'Controlled' RECs. They define an 'Historical REC' as "A past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls)." ASTM defines a 'Controlled REC' as "a recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority (for example, as evidenced by the issuance of a no further action letter or equivalent, or meeting risk-based criteria established by regulatory authority), with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls)." An HREC is not a REC if the release meets current standards for unrestricted residential use. A CREC remains a REC by definition because it does not meet the unrestricted residential use requirement unconditionally.

We also conducted the Phase I ESA in general accordance with the requirements of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 312 titled *Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries*, as required under Sections 101(35)(B)(ii) and (iii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The purpose of conducting an all appropriate inquiries investigation into the previous ownership and uses of a property is to meet the provisions necessary for the landowner, contiguous property owner, and/or bona fide prospective purchaser to qualify for certain landowner liability protections under CERCLA.

The following principles are an integral part of ASTM Designation E1527-13:

- **"Uncertainty Not Eliminated -** No environmental site assessment can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property. Performance of this practice is intended to reduce, but not eliminate, uncertainty regarding the potential for recognized environmental conditions in connection with a property, and this practice recognizes reasonable limits of time and cost."
- **"Not Exhaustive -** All Appropriate Inquiries does not mean an exhaustive assessment of a property. There is a point at which the cost of information obtained or the time required to gather it outweighs the usefulness of the information and, in fact, may be a material detriment to the orderly completion of transactions. One of the purposes of this practice is to identify a balance between the competing goals of limiting the costs and time demands inherent in performing an environmental site assessment and the reduction of uncertainty about unknown conditions resulting from additional information."
- **"Level of Inquiry is Variable** – Not every property will warrant the same level of assessment. Consistent with good commercial and customary practice, the appropriate level of environmental site assessment will be guided by the type of property subject to assessment, the expertise and risk tolerance of the user, and the information developed in the course of the inquiry."

1.2 Scope of Services

Our Proposal No. IE-1644, dated April 5, 2016, describes the scope of services for this Phase I ESA. We performed the scope of services outlined in the proposal with the exception that Sanborn Maps were not reviewed. Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) stated that Sanborn Map coverage does not exist for the Site.

1.3 Report Limitations

The main components of the Phase I ESA and their objectives, as specified by the referenced standards, include the following:

- **Physical Setting:** we reviewed physical setting references to obtain information concerning the topographic, geologic, and hydrogeologic characteristics of the Site and vicinity. Such information may be indicative of the direction and/or extent that a contaminant could migrate in the event of a spill or release.
- **Regulatory Agency Records Review:** we reviewed regulatory agency records to obtain information that could potentially help identify RECs at or potentially affecting the Site. We reviewed publicly available Federal, State, and local regulatory agency records for the Site.

- **Site History:** we reviewed historical references to assess the previous uses of the Site and surrounding area to identify those that could have led to RECs on or near the Site. Historical sources reviewed included aerial photographs, topographic maps, and city directories. In addition, we conducted interviews with persons who were expected to be reasonably knowledgeable about historical and/or current conditions at and uses of the Site.
- **Site Reconnaissance:** we performed a site reconnaissance to observe site conditions and activities for indications of evidence of RECs. The site reconnaissance was for the Site only. Offsite properties and features were viewed solely from the vantage of the Site and public thoroughfares.

1.4 Data Gaps

ASTM Designation E 1527-13 defines a data gap as "a lack of or inability to obtain information required by this practice despite good faith efforts by the environmental professional to gather such information." Data gaps could include such things as insufficient historical information, the inability to interview persons with direct site knowledge (e.g., the owner(s), past owner(s), tenants, workers, etc.) or the lack of access to all parts of a site during the site reconnaissance. No significant data gaps were identified during the performance of this Phase I ESA. Sanborn maps were not available for the Site, however, this is not considered a data gap as it did not affect our ability to assess the historical use of the Site.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

This section provides information regarding the location and physical characteristics of the Site including its size, topography, geologic, soil, and hydrogeologic conditions.

2.1 Location and Legal Description

The Site is located adjacent to the east of Highway 79 and west of Briggs Road in Murrieta, California (Figure 1). The Site is identified by County of Riverside APNs 963-070-002 to -004. The Site is depicted in Section 6 of Township 7 South, Range 2 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian on the United States Geological Survey's (USGS) *Murrieta, California, 7.5-minute Topographic Map* (USGS, 2012).

2.2 Site and Vicinity General Characteristics

The Site is vacant land with the surrounding vicinity being primarily vacant land and commercial development. The Site Plan (Figure 2) depicts the site boundaries and features, and surrounding properties.

2.2.1 Topography

The topography of the Site and surrounding vicinity is relatively flat. The *USGS Murrieta, 7.5-minute Topographic Map* (USGS, 2012) shows the site elevation at approximately 1,345 feet above mean sea level, with a general topographic gradient of the site vicinity to the west-southwest.

2.2.2 Geologic Conditions

The Site is located within the Perris Block of the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province. The Perris Block is characterized by granitic highlands which display three elevated erosional surfaces surrounded by alluviated valleys. The Peninsular Ranges are bound by the Transverse Ranges (San Gabrielle and San Bernardino Mountains) to the north, the Colorado Desert Geomorphic Province to the east. The Peninsular Ranges extend westward into the Pacific Ocean and southward to the tip of Baja California. Overall the Peninsular Ranges are characterized by Cretaceous-age granitic rock and a lesser amount of Mesozoic-age metamorphic rock overlain buy terrestrial and marine sediments. Faulting within the province is typically northwest trending and includes the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Elsinore, and Newport-Inglewood faults. Locally, the Site is within the northern portion of the Temecula Valley, southeast of the intersection of the Wildomar and Murrieta Hot Springs faults. Older alluvium overlies granitic bedrock in the vicinity of the Site.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Soil Conservation Service (SCS), which leads the National Cooperative Soil Survey (NCSS), soil at the Site is generally well-drained sandy loam. The soil has slow infiltration rates.

2.2.3 Hydrologic and Hydrogeologic Conditions

During our Geotechnical Investigation of the Site in December, 2015, we did not encounter groundwater within our excavations to the maximum depths explored of 16 feet. There are no publicly available well records for wells in the vicinity of the Site. We anticipate groundwater is deeper than 50 feet in the vicinity of the Site. Based on our experience in the vicinity of the Site, it is common for perched water or seepage of infiltrated surface water to occur above less permeable units (granitic bedrock). During the rainy season, localized perched water conditions may develop above less permeable units that may require special consideration during grading operations. Groundwater elevations are dependent on seasonal precipitation, irrigation, and land use, among other factors, and vary as a result.

2.3 Current and Planned Uses of the Site

The Site is currently vacant land not under any use. The planned use of the Site is a commercial brew pub facility.

2.4 Descriptions of Structures, Roads, Other Improvements on the Site

There are no structures on the Site. Various utilities including water and light poles are located along the sidewalk along Briggs Road. Natural gas pipelines (The Gas Company) bisect the northern portion of the Site in a southeast to northwest direction. Further description of the Site is presented in Section 6.0.

2.5 Current Uses of Adjoining Properties

The Site is bound by Highway 79 to the west, beyond which are vacant land and a Moose Lodge a nursery to the south; vacant land with high-tension power lines to the north; and Briggs Road to the east, beyond which are vacant land and II-VI Optical Systems.

3. USER–PROVIDED INFORMATION

This section provides responses to inquiries made to the Client for site information. The Client was asked if they know of previous environmental reports or documents that may exist and, if so, whether copies could be provided. They were also asked if they have knowledge of legal or administrative proceedings involving the Site. Mr. Dan Long of The Rancon Group, representing the Client, completed a Client Questionnaire (Appendix A).

3.1 Title, Appraisal and Sale Agreement Records

The Client did not provide any title, appraisal, or sale agreement records.

3.2 Environmental Liens or Activity and Use Limitations

Mr. Long stated that he is unaware of any environmental liens on, or use limitations for, the Site.

3.3 Specialized Knowledge

Mr. Long indicated that he has specialized knowledge regarding nearby properties and the Site, though he did not elaborate on that information.

3.4 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

Mr. Long provided no commonly known information or reasonably ascertainable information unique to the Site.

3.5 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information

Mr. Long stated that FIVP, LLC currently owns the Site and that the Rancon Group manages it. Interview information provided by the site owner is summarized in Section 7.0.

3.6 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

Mr. Long indicated that he was not aware of any environmental conditions on the Site which could lead to a potential valuation reduction of the Site.

3.7 Reason for Performing Phase I ESA

The Client requested the Phase I ESA to obtain information regarding the potential for existing hazardous substances or petroleum product impacts at the Site as required by the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health for the proposed development.

4. RECORDS REVIEW

This section summarizes our review of readily available agency records for the Site and properties in the surrounding vicinity.

4.1 Standard Environmental Record Sources

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) performed a search of Federal, State, and local databases for the Site and surrounding area. The search distance for the review extended one mile from the site boundaries. A copy of the report entitled *The EDR Radius Map™ Report with GeoCheck*, dated April 8, 2016, is in Appendix B.

4.1.1 Site

The Site is not listed in any of the databases searched by EDR.

4.1.2 Nearby Properties

The facility on the adjacent property east of the Site is identified on two databases searched by EDR. Exotic Materials, Inc. (also listed as Lightworks Optical Systems) at 36570 Briggs Road is listed on the RCRA-SQG and RCRA-LQG databases. The facility is listed as having handled halogenated solvents, non-halogenated solvents, ignitable waste, corrosive waste, various metals, and benzene. The facility has received minor violations, which were deemed to have been rectified in a compliance evaluation inspection in November 2009. This facility is not expected to have negatively impacted the Site due to its regulatory status.

Seven other properties within ¼-mile of the Site are listed on various databases searched by EDR. The information in the EDR report with respect to these properties/facilities does not suggest that activities associated with them are likely to have negatively impacted the environmental condition of the Site based on:

- the status of the facilities – i.e., closed regulatory cases or historical cases. Release was remediated or monitored and not impacting other offsite properties including the Site;
- types of listings – i.e., non-release-based listings. Listings for possible use or storage of chemicals, but no reported releases;
- distance from the Site, – i.e., likely too far for a possible release of hazardous substances or petroleum products to have been transported in groundwater; and
- direction with respect to the direction of groundwater flow – i.e., Site is not downgradient of a possible release therefore hazardous substances or petroleum products would not be transported toward or to the Site.

4.1.3 Orphan Summary

The Orphan Summary in EDR's report identifies properties that have incomplete address information and could not be specifically plotted. There are no listings in the Orphan Summary.

4.2 Vapor Encroachment Screening/Conditions

The VEC application provided by EDR is a Tier 1 screening process that follows ASTM *Designation E 2600-10*. The VEC application screens known or suspected contaminated properties with volatile or semi-volatile chemicals of concern (COCs) within an area of concern (AOC) around the Site to determine if COCs in vapor from those properties could encroach upon the Site. If the length and width of a contaminant plume from a property are known, then the AOC for a VEC extends 100 feet beyond the known plume dimensions. If the plume dimensions are not known, then ASTM *Designation E 2600-10* specifies AOC dimensions based on each type of COC plume (non-petroleum or petroleum).

The AOC for volatile, non-petroleum hydrocarbon COCs (i.e., COCs from dry cleaner sites, industrial sites, manufactured gas plants, hazardous waste disposal sites, and landfills) extends 1,760 feet (1/3 mile) from the site boundary. The AOC for volatile petroleum hydrocarbon COCs (i.e., COCs from gasoline stations or bulk distribution facilities) extends 528 feet (1/10 mile) from the site boundary. However, the AOC around the Site for both types of COCs can be reduced based on known groundwater flow direction, as summarized in the following table:

Location of COC Release Relative to Groundwater Flow Direction	**AOC Distance**	
	Volatile Non-Petroleum Hydrocarbon COCs	**Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbon COCs**
Upgradient of the Site	1,760 feet or 1/3 mile	528 feet or 1/10 mile
Cross-gradient from the Site	365 feet	165 feet
Downgradient of the Site	100 feet	100 feet

If a known release of volatile COCs is within the AOC, there is a potential that a VEC exists on the Site unless it can be ruled out based on the presence of a hydraulic or physical barrier. A river can act as a hydraulic barrier or a clay layer in soil can act as a physical barrier that would impede the migration of volatile COCs in vapor onto the Site. Manmade or natural features or conditions such as utility corridors or fractured bedrock, can also create preferential vapor pathways that enable vapor to encroach onto the Site.

Based on information in *The EDR Vapor Encroachment Screen Report*, dated April 19, 2016, provided by EDR (Appendix C), no properties within the AOC were identified as having releases of either volatile non-petroleum hydrocarbon COCs or volatile petroleum hydrocarbon COCs.

4.3 Additional Environmental Record Sources

We searched additional readily available environmental record sources. The search distance for the review extended approximately 1/4-mile from the Site. This section summarizes our findings.

4.3.1 GeoTracker and EnviroStor Websites

We reviewed additional environmental records sources including the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker webpage (http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor webpage (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/) for information regarding nearby properties/facilities of concern. The EnviroStor and GeoTracker website databases did not have listings for any properties/facilities within approximately ¼-mile of the Site.

4.3.2 State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR)

We reviewed information available from the DOGGR website (http://www.conservation.ca.gov) for existing/former oil, gas, or geothermal wells on or within the site vicinity. According to the website, no oil and gas wells are listed on or adjacent to the Site.

4.3.3 County of Riverside Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures

The County of Riverside, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures maintains records regarding restricted pesticide use at the Site. The County of Riverside, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures requires an address in order to perform a records search. No addresses are associated with the parcels on the Site.

4.3.4 County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health

The County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health (DEH) maintains records of UST releases and hazardous materials releases and cleanups for properties and facilities in Riverside County. The DEH requires an address in order to perform a records search. No addresses are associated with the parcels on the Site.

5. HISTORICAL USE

This section summarizes information we obtained from a variety of sources regarding the historical uses of the Site and identifies historical uses that could have led to RECs. The sources of information included historical aerial photographs, historical topographic maps, and city directories provided by EDR.

5.1 Sanborn, Inc. Fire Insurance Maps

According to EDR's Sanborn Map Report dated April 8, 2016, Sanborn maps do not exist for the Site or site vicinity.

5.2 Aerial Photographs

We reviewed historical aerial photographs provided by EDR for the years 1938, 1949, 1953, 1961, 1967, 1978, 1985, 1989, 1996, 2002, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010 and 2012 (Appendix D) for indications of past land uses that had the potential to have impacted the Site through the use, storage or disposal of hazardous substances and/or petroleum. The following table summarizes the observations of the Site and adjacent properties on the aerial photographs.

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH REVIEW SUMMARY

Year	Observations	
	Site	**Adjacent Properties**
1938 (1" = 500")	The Site appears to have been vacant land.	Adjacent properties appear to have been vacant land, with the exception of an improved road adjacent west of the southern portion of the Site.
1949 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
1953 (1" = 500')	The Site appears to have been agricultural land.	Adjacent properties appear to have been agricultural land in all directions.
1961 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
1967 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
1978 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph, with the exception of an improved road to the east and vacant land to the north.
1985 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
1989 (1" = 500')	The Site appears to have been vacant land.	All adjacent properties appear to have been vacant land.
1996 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	Adjacent properties were vacant land and a commercial-type structure to the west (beyond Highway 79); vacant land to the north; Briggs Road, beyond which were vacant land and a rectangular commercial facility to the east; and a nursery to the south.
2002 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
2005 (1' = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
2006 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.

Year	Observations	
	Site	Adjacent Properties
2009 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
2010 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.
2012 (1" = 500')	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.	We observed no significant changes from the previous photograph.

We observed no site or vicinity conditions on the aerial photographs that would suggest the potential presence of RECs on the Site or adjoining or nearby properties Agricultural use was present on the Site from at least 1953 until sometime prior to 1996 and represents a potential environmental concern because of the possible use of pesticides. However, the Site has since been graded and tilled and the potential presence of pesticides in soil from past agricultural use is not expected to be of concern due the disturbance/grading of the soil, likely diminishing pesticides, if present.

5.3 Topographic Maps

We reviewed historical topographic maps for the years 1901, 1942, 1943, 1953, 1973, 1979, and 2012 provided by EDR (Appendix E). The following summarizes observations of the Site and adjacent properties on the historical topographic maps.

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP REVIEW SUMMARY

Year	Observations	
	Site	Adjacent Properties
1901 (1: 125,000)	No land use is depicted.	No land use is depicted, with the exception of a street to the west.
1942 (1: 62,500)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.
1943 (1:62,500)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.
1953 (1:24,000)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map, with the exception of a "pipeline" traversing the northern portion.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.
1973 (1:24,000)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.
1979 (1:24,000)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.
2012 (1:24,000)	No significant changes are depicted on the Site from the previous topographic map.	No significant changes are depicted from the previous topographic map.

The historical topographic maps depict nothing that would suggest the presence of RECs on the Site or adjacent properties.

5.4 City Directories

EDR prepared a city directory image report of cross-referenced directories reviewed at approximately five-year intervals from 1975 through 2013. The Site is not listed (no addresses). Various commercial properties, including a nursery, are listed for addresses in the immediate site vicinity. A copy of the EDR city directory image report including information regarding offsite facilities is in Appendix F.

6. SITE RECONNAISSANCE

This section summarizes observations of the Site and surrounding properties made during the site reconnaissance.

6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions

Mr. Scott Nunes with Geocon performed the site reconnaissance on April 18, 2016, by walking the Site. Mr. Nunes performed the offsite survey by making observations of adjacent properties from the Site and adjacent roads and thoroughfares. Vegetation growth limited the observation of various areas on the Site. Weather on the day of the site reconnaissance was sunny with temperatures in the mid-80s. Photographs of various site features and offsite properties are appended. Figure 2 illustrates selected site features.

6.2 General Site Setting

The Site is located in an area of mainly vacant land and commercial facilities.

6.3 Onsite Survey

The Site consists of relatively flat vacant land (Photo #s 1-3). The ground appears to have been tilled, with dry brush/grass covering some areas. Sign markers for natural gas pipelines (Photo #s 4 and 5) were observed on the northern portion, traversing the Site in a southeast to northwest direction. We observed various utilities, including water and underground light poles along the sidewalk along Briggs Road.

6.4 Offsite Survey

Properties within the site vicinity include:

- **North –** High-tension power lines (Photo #6) and vacant land (Photo #7).
- **East –** Briggs Road, beyond which is II-VI Optical Systems (Photo #8, a commercial warehouse structure)
- **South –** Moon Valley Nurseries (Photo #9).
- **West** – Highway 79, beyond which is vacant land and a Moose Lodge (Photo #10).

7. INTERVIEWS

We interviewed Mr. Dan Long, representing the Site owner, via a site owner questionnaire regarding the current and past uses of the Site. Mr. Long stated that the Site was historically used for farming until March 1990, when it was subdivided to its current configuration. Mr. Long stated that since then, the Site has been graded and improved with curb, gutter, sidewalks, street lights, and a paved street. Mr. Long stated that there is annual and seasonal weed abatement on the Site. In addition, he stated a high-pressure natural gas line bisects the Site. Mr. Long is unaware of any environmental concerns for the Site.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We have performed a Phase I ESA, in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM *Designation E 1527-13*, for the Site in Murrieta, California. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1.4 of this report.

The assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs on the Site.

Prior to any construction activities near the natural gas pipelines on the northeastern portion of the Site, the owners of those lines should be notified so they can confirm their locations and observe construction activities at their discretion.

9. REFERENCES

American Society for Testing and Materials, *Designation E 1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*, 2013.

American Society for Testing and Materials, *Designation E 2600-10 Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions*, 2010.

California Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources, 2016. Website database, District 1, http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doms/index.html.

California State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker website, 2016, https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov.

Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor website, 2016, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov.

Norris, R. M. and Webb, R. W., 1990. Geology of California (2nd edn). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

United States Geological Survey, *Murrieta, California, Quadrangle Topographic Map (7.5', 1:24,000)*, 2012.

10. QUALIFICATIONS

This Phase I ESA report was prepared by Mr. Scott Nunes and reviewed by Mr. Jim Brake. We declare that, to the best of our professional knowledge and belief, we meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in Section 312.10 of 40 CFR Part 312. We have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience, to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. We have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries investigation in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Mr. Brake has an MS degree in Geological Science and 29 years of experience in environmental investigation and remediation, including implementation of Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study programs and soil and groundwater remedial actions for private industrial and government clients. He has managed a wide variety of projects for clients in the manufacturing, transportation, mining, automobile and real estate industries including Environmental Protection Agency and DTSC Superfund sites. Mr. Brake has extensive experience in the performance of Phase I and II ESAs of commercial, industrial, and agricultural properties throughout Northern California.

Mr. Nunes is a Senior Environmental Scientist for Geocon. He has over 28 years conducting and managing environmental investigations. Mr. Nunes has completed numerous Phase I and II ESAs, Preliminary Endangerment Assessments, underground storage tank removals, and asbestos and lead-based paint survey and abatement activities for a variety of residential, commercial, school, hospital, industrial, agricultural, and municipal properties. He has a Bachelor's of Arts in Geography-Ecosystems (Environmental Science) and is a Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) in California.