Appendix 8 Hazardous Materials Investigations

SOUTH MILLIKEN DISTRIBUTION CENTER

Project No. PLN17-20013

INITIAL STUDY



Revised Draft

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

15.8-Acre Lot Milliken Avenue & 60 Freeway Eastvale, California 91752

July 3, 2017

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

15.8-Acre Lot Milliken Avenue & 60 Freeway Eastvale, California 91752

Holley

Janet Holtz

Principal Environmental Scientist

Prepared for:

Newcastle Partners

4740 Green River Road, Suite 118

Corona, CA 92880

Prepared by:

Arcadis U.S., Inc.

320 Commerce

Suite 200

Irvine

California 92602

Tel 714 730 9052

Fax 714 730 9345

Our Ref.:

CM011935.0000

Date:

July 3, 2017

This document is intended only for the use of the individual or entity for which it was prepared and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited.

CONTENTS

Ac	ronyn	ns and Abbreviations	iv
Ex	ecutiv	ve Summary	1
1	Intro	oduction	1
	1.1	Purpose	1
	1.2	Detailed Scope of Services	1
	1.3	Significant Assumptions	2
	1.4	Limitations and Exceptions	2
	1.5	Special Terms and Conditions	3
	1.6	Reliance	3
	1.7	Deviations	3
	1.8	Additional Services	3
2	Site	Location / Land Use	4
	2.1	Site Location	4
	2.2	Site and Vicinity Characteristics	4
	2.3	Current Use of the Property	4
	2.4	Description of Structures, Roads, and Other Improvements on the Site	4
	2.5	Current Uses of the Adjoining Properties	4
3	Use	r-Provided Information	6
	3.1	Environmental Liens	6
	3.2	Activity and Use Limitations	6
	3.3	Specialized Knowledge	6
	3.4	Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues	6
	3.5	Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information	6
	3.6	Obvious Contamination Presence or Likely Presence	7
	3.7	Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information	7
	3.8	Reason for Performing Phase I ESA	7
4	Site	History	8
	4.1	Previous Environmental Investigations	10
5	Rec	ords Review	11

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

	5.1	Regula	atory Database Research	11
	5	5.1.1	Site	12
	5	5.1.2	Off-Site Properties	12
	5.2	Agenc	y Research	13
6	Envir	onmer	ntal Setting	14
	6.1	Topog	raphy	14
	6.2	Geolo	gy	14
	6.3	Surfac	e Water	14
	6.4	Hydro	geology	14
	6.5	Flood	Zones	14
7	Site F	Reconr	naissance	15
	7.1	Metho	dology and Limiting Conditions	15
	7.2	Genera	al Site Conditions	15
	7	'.2.1	Site Observations	15
	7	.2.2	Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products in Connection with Identified Uses	15
	7	'.2.3	Storage Tanks	15
	7	.2.4	Odors	15
	7	.2.5	Pools of Liquid	16
	7	.2.6	Drums	16
		7.2.7 Connec	Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Product Containers (Not Necessarily in stion with Identified Uses)	16
		'.2.8	Unidentified Substance Containers	
	7	'.2.9	PCBs	16
	7	'.2.10	Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons	16
	7	'.2.11	Stained Soil or Pavement	16
	7	.2.12	Stressed Vegetation	17
	7	.2.13	Solid Waste	17
	7	.2.14	Wastewater	17
	7	'.2.15	Wells	17
	7	'.2.16	Septic Systems	17
	7	.2.17	Heating / Cooling	17

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

		7.2.18	Stains or Corrosion	17
		7.2.19	Drains or Sumps	17
8	Inter	rviews.		18
	8.1	Intervi	iew with Site Contacts	18
9	Find	lings ar	nd Conclusions	19
	9.1	Recog	gnized Environmental Conditions	19
	9.2	Contro	olled Recognized Environmental Conditions	19
	9.3	Histor	rical Recognized Environmental Conditions	19
	9.4	De Mi	inimis Conditions	19
	9.5	Concl	usions	19
10	Data	a Gaps		20
11	Envi	ironme	ntal Professionals Statement	21
12	Refe	erences	s	22
T/	ABI	LES	(EMBEDDED IN TEXT)	
Tab	ole 1	His	storical Information Reviewed	8
Tab	ole 2	Re	gulatory Agency Databases/Lists Reviewed	11

FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location Map

Figure 2 Site Plan

APPENDICES

- A Site Photographs
- B Historical Research Documentation
- C EDR Radius Map Report
- D <u>ASTM User Questionnaire</u>

arcadis.com iii

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Arcadis U.S., Inc.

AST aboveground storage tank

ASTM ASTM International

bgs below ground surface

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

CRECs controlled recognized environmental conditions

DTSC Department of Toxic Substances Control

EDR Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

ESA Environmental Site Assessment

HRECs historical recognized environmental conditions

kV kilovolt

LUST Leaking Underground Storage Tank

NWC northwest corner

PCBs polychlorinated biphenyls

RECs recognized environmental conditions

RWQCB Regional Water Quality Control Board

TCE trichloroethene

U.S. EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency

UST underground storage tank

arcadis.com iv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Arcadis U.S., Inc. (Arcadis) was retained by Newcastle Partners (Newcastle) to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for 15.8-acres of undeveloped land located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Milliken Avenue and the 60 Freeway in Eastvale, Riverside County, California (the Site). The Site is proposed to be developed with a commercial use.

As directed by Newcastle, the Phase I ESA was performed in accordance with the ASTM International (ASTM) Standard E1527-13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*. The goal of the Phase I ESA was to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), and historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) associated with the property in conformance with ASTM E1527-13.

The Phase I ESA included a visual inspection of the property completed on March 15, 2017; observation of adjacent properties; reviews of environmental regulatory agency records, historical documents, and facility records that were available on site; and interviews with personnel represented to be familiar with the Site as indicated elsewhere in the report.

The findings identified by Arcadis are summarized below and discussed in greater detail in the body of the report.

Historical Findings

Based on review of historical sources, the Site was in agricultural use (vineyard) from as early as 1938 until at least 2012. The owners of the Site state that the Site has been planted only with grape vines and that no pesticides were used onsite. Nevertheless, the past agricultural use of the Site indicates the potential for residual pesticides to be present in site soil. However, Arcadis does not consider the use of pesticides, fertilizers or herbicides, when used in accordance with manufacturer specifications and for approved agricultural uses, by default to be defined as a REC under a commercial use scenario without facts showing that there was a release or potential release of a petroleum product or hazardous substance that would constitute a REC under the ASTM definition. Additionally, the Site is proposed to be developed commercially and will be covered by the building footprint and pavement, thereby eliminating an exposure pathway to underlying soil.

The Site owner also stated that the vineyard was irrigated by surface water flows and that no underground irrigation pipes are present onsite. Additionally, the owner stated that no smudge pots or windmills were used onsite.

On-Site Findings

The approximate 15.8-acre, irregular-shaped site consists of former agricultural land. The Site is not currently being used. Arcadis observed grape vine stumps throughout the Site indicative of a former vineyard. The Site's surface is covered by low-lying vegetation, and where exposed, the ground surface is sandy. A Southern California Edison 220-kV electrical transmission tower is present near the southeast

arcadis.com ES-1

corner of the Site. A debris pile is present near the tower and contained non-hazardous trash as well as a couple of apparently empty 5-gallon oil containers and one open container with rain water that exhibited an oily sheen. There were also smaller debris piles and a pile of abandoned tires in proximity to the tower. Minor amounts of windblown trash were also observed onsite, mostly confined to the southern boundary. A pile of granite rocks was observed on the west side of the Site adjacent to Milliken Avenue. Two billboards are present along the southern boundary. No areas of surface staining and no evidence of water wells or irrigation piping were observed onsite. Sewer manhole covers were observed onsite and water utility equipment was observed along Milliken Avenue

Regulatory Findings

An environmental database report prepared by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) was reviewed for local, state, and federal listings for the Site and properties within the site vicinity. Regulatory database lists were reviewed for cases pertaining to leaking underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), hazardous waste sites, and abandoned sites within the specified radii of standards established by ASTM guidelines. The location of the Site was not listed in any of the databases searched, and as the Site is not addressed, no records for the Site were available at local regulatory agencies. In addition, no off-site properties were listed in the EDR database report that are likely to represent a concern of environmental impairment or a vapor encroachment condition to the Site.

Conclusions

Arcadis has performed a Phase I ESA of the Site in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-13 for Phase I ESAs. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the Site, and no further investigation is recommended.

The following de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the Site:

- The debris piles and abandoned tires onsite should be removed and properly disposed of offsite.
- The Site owner stated that irrigation piping was not used onsite. However, if remnant irrigation
 piping or other agricultural features are uncovered during future development activities, they
 should be assessed for Transite[™] asbestos prior to removal and disposal.

arcadis.com ES-2

1 INTRODUCTION

Arcadis U.S., Inc. (Arcadis) was retained by Newcastle Partners (Newcastle) to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for 15.8-acres of undeveloped land located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Milliken Avenue and the 60 Freeway in Eastvale, Riverside County, California (the Site). The Site is proposed to be developed with a commercial use.

1.1 Purpose

Arcadis understands that the purpose for conducting this Phase I ESA is to assess and document the current status of environmental conditions at the Site.

1.2 Detailed Scope of Services

As directed by Newcastle, the Phase I ESA was conducted in accordance with the ASTM International (ASTM) E1527-13 Standard Practice for Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. The goal of the Phase I ESA was to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), and historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) associated with the property in conformance with ASTM E1527-13.

A REC is defined 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 RECs.

A CREC is defined as a REC resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority and that subjects the property to activity and/or use limitations.

A HREC is defined as a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed in a manner accepted by the applicable regulatory authority (for example, as evidenced by the issuance of a no further action letter or equivalent), without subjecting the property to any activity and use limitations.

The ASTM practice requires environmental professionals to identify data gaps following reasonable inquiry of site and Newcastle personnel and Arcadis' search for "reasonably ascertainable" resources. ASTM E1527-13 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."

Arcadis' scope of work included:

- On-site inspection of the Site to identify environmental conditions issues as defined above;
- Review of available environmental documents for the Site, including previous site assessments and investigations;
- Interviews with persons represented to be familiar with the operation and history of the Site;

- Review of property history through interviews, aerial photographs, on-line planning portals, and historical mapping (as available);
- Observation of adjacent properties and the local area to evaluate the potential for adverse environmental impact to the Site; and
- Contracting of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) to identify sites of concern as required in the regulatory records review section of the ASTM practice for a Phase I ESA.

The Phase I ESA did not include the collection or analysis of soil, air, water, groundwater, transformer/ electrical fluids, hazardous building materials, or other samples, nor did it include a title search or search for environmental liens. This ESA did not include an assessment of the environmental (or health and safety) compliance status of the site operations.

1.3 Significant Assumptions

Arcadis has assumed that the information sources used for this assessment provided accurate information. Evaluations presented in this report are based exclusively on information provided by Newcastle and site personnel and observations made during the site visit. No invasive field activities were conducted and no laboratory analyses were performed.

The boundaries of the Site were described in documents provided by Newcastle and by interviews with Newcastle personnel. Arcadis assumed this information was accurate.

1.4 Limitations and Exceptions

The services performed and any opinions expressed by Arcadis in this report are based upon the limits of the assessment described herein. Arcadis has relied upon the accuracy of documents, information, data, and other materials provided or made available by Newcastle and others. Arcadis has not independently verified such information and assumes no liability for the accuracy or completeness of such information. Arcadis makes no guarantee that site conditions do not exist, or will not exist in the future, that were undetected or that could lead to liability in connection with the Site. Similarly, past and present activities on the Site indicating the potential for the existence of environmental concerns may not have been discovered by Arcadis. Such activities may include those that would indicate the potential for regulated hazardous substances at the Site. Likewise, site conditions or site activities that were outside the scope of the services described above, or changes to site conditions or regulatory requirements may lead to liabilities in connection with the Site that are not identified in this report. Arcadis has reviewed the information obtained in connection with the performance of the services described above, in keeping with existing applicable environmental consulting standards and enforcement practices, but cannot predict what actions any given agency may take or what standards and practices may apply in the future.

Where access to portions of the Site or to structures on the Site was unavailable or limited, Arcadis renders no opinion and accepts no responsibility for assessment of the condition of these portions of the Site, including specifically, but not limited to, the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products at these locations. In addition, Arcadis renders no opinion concerning the presence or absence of hazardous substances or petroleum products where direct observation of any part of the Site, or structure on the Site, is limited by physical obstructions.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

The conclusions and observations are based upon limited data and professional opinions, and the assessment is performed on a particular date. Site conditions and activities may change after that date. Therefore, the risk of undiscovered environmental impairment of the Site cannot be ruled out. Arcadis does not make any representations or warranties regarding the condition or value of the Site, regardless of the results of the assessment presented in this report.

Arcadis makes no guarantees, certifications, warranties, or representations of any kind whatsoever, whether expressed or implied, regarding this Phase I ESA, the condition of the Site, or the liabilities associated with the Site.

1.5 Special Terms and Conditions

No special terms and conditions were imposed on this Phase I ESA.

1.6 Reliance

It is understood that this report will be prepared for the sole use of Newcastle, and the contents thereof may not be used or relied upon by any other person without the express written consent and authorization of Arcadis. Use of this report by any other party shall be at such party's sole risk and liability.

1.7 Deviations

No deviations from the referenced ASTM Standard occurred.

1.8 Additional Services

No additional services beyond those outlined in ASTM E1527-13 were conducted as part of the assessment.

2 SITE LOCATION / LAND USE

2.1 Site Location

The irregular-shaped, approximate 15.8-acre site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of the 60 Freeway and Milliken Avenue in Eastvale, California. The Site is located approximately 0.25-mile west of the 15 Freeway. The Site does not currently have a street address. The Site Location Map and Site Plan are presented as **Figures 1 and 2**.

2.2 Site and Vicinity Characteristics

At the time of Arcadis' site reconnaissance, the Site was undeveloped land with evidence of a former vineyard. The Site is comprised of two parcels; the majority of the Site (12.56 acres) is owned by Anthony DiTommaso, and the southeast corner of the Site (3.31 acres) is owned by the City of Norco.

The site vicinity is comprised of a church, commercial warehouse properties and vacant land. Photographs of the Site and surrounding areas were taken to document current conditions and are included in **Appendix A**.

2.3 Current Use of the Property

There are no current uses of the Site.

2.4 Description of Structures, Roads, and Other Improvements on the Site

There are no structures onsite. An unpaved road is present along the southern boundary of the Site that provides access to a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical transmission tower. An SCE easement transects the southeastern corner of the Site in a southwest/northeast direction. The unpaved road also provides access to two billboards on the southern end of the Site. An unpaved road also runs along the western boundary of the Site and provides access to a SCE transmission tower located just beyond the northwest corner of the Site.

2.5 Current Uses of the Adjoining Properties

Land uses surrounding the Site predominately consist of commercial properties and undeveloped land. The adjoining properties and land uses include:

- North: Undeveloped land that supports a SCE transmission tower and a water retention basin followed by a large commercial warehouse building at 3100 Milliken Avenue.
- East: A church at 3100 Cornerstone Drive.
- South: Buffer land owned by the State of California and used as a laydown yard for construction materials followed by the Milliken Avenue off-ramp from the 60 Freeway.

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

• West: Milliken Avenue followed by a vacant lot.

Based on visual observations, current activities at the adjacent properties do not appear to be of environmental concern to the Site.

3 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION

Arcadis was provided with an ASTM User Questionnaire completed by Mr. Jackson Smith, Partner with Newcastle Partners. See **Appendix D** for a copy of the questionnaire.

3.1 Environmental Liens

According to Mr. Smith, there are no environmental liens recorded for the Site. In addition, Arcadis' review of regulatory records did not identify environmental liens recorded for the Site.

3.2 Activity and Use Limitations

According to Mr. Smith, there are no activity and use limitations recorded for the Site. In addition, Arcadis' review of regulatory records did not identify activity and use limitations, such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls, that are in place at the Site and/or have been filed or recorded in a registry.

3.3 Specialized Knowledge

Mr. Smith does not have specialized knowledge or experience related to the property. Specialized knowledge regarding the Site was provided by a representative of the DiTommaso family, which has owned the Site for approximately 50 years. The representative provided the following information via e-mail:

- The Site has historically been planted as a vineyard. No fruit trees were planted onsite.
- The vineyard was irrigated from surface water flows. There were never any underground irrigation pipes.
- No smudge pots or windmills were used onsite.
- No pesticides were used onsite.
- The owners are not aware of any environmental concerns or potential environmental concerns associated with the Site.

3.4 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues

Mr. Smith stated that the purchase price reasonably reflects the fair market value of the property.

3.5 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

Mr. Smith is not aware of:

- The past use of the property other than agriculture;
- Specific chemicals that once were present at the property;
- Spills or other chemical releases that may have taken place at the property; or

• Environmental cleanups that may have taken place at the property.

3.6 Obvious Contamination Presence or Likely Presence

According to Mr. Smith and a Site owner representative, there are no obvious indicators that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property.

3.7 Owner, Property Manager, and Occupant Information

The majority of the Site is owned and managed by The Anthony and Beverly DiTommaso Living Trust. According to the Riverside County Assessor's office, this portion of the Site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 156-030-001. A small portion of the southeast end of the Site is owned by the City of Norco and is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 156-030-002. There are no site occupants.

3.8 Reason for Performing Phase I ESA

The reason for performing the Phase I ESA was to evaluate current environmental conditions at the Site.

4 SITE HISTORY

Historical information obtained by Arcadis from EDR during this Phase I ESA is summarized in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Historical Information Reviewed

Source	Date	Information Obtained
Sanborn® Fire Insurance Maps	Not Applicable	According to EDR, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps are not available for the Site or site vicinity ("No Coverage" letter is presented in Appendix B.)

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Topographic	1897, 1900,
Maps	1903, 1941,
(copies	1944,1953,
provided in	1954, 1966,
Appendix B)	1973, 1976,
,	1981, and
	2012

The 1897 through 1903 maps depict the Site as undeveloped land immediately east of the Riverside/San Bernardino county line. No features are depicted in the surrounding area other than several roads and scattered residences. The 1941 map depicts the Site and surrounding area as undeveloped except for a railroad line northeast of the Site. The 1944 map depicts the Site as undeveloped. Small structures are shown north of the Site and small plots of orchards are visible in the surrounding area. An electric transmission line has been erected to the northwest of the Site. The 1953 map shows the Site and a large portion of the surrounding area covered in orchards. However, the Site owner stated the Site was a vineyard and was not planted with fruit trees. A second transmission line is now depicted southeast of the Site. Approximately one mile east/northeast of the Site at its closest point is military land labelled Mira Loma Quartermaster (Supply Depot). A gravel pit is shown west of the military land. No significant changes are shown on the 1954 map. On the 1966 map, the Site and surrounding land are vineyards or orchards. Land east/northeast of the Site is now labelled U.S. Military Reservation. On the 1973 map, the Site remains agricultural. Railroad tracks are present north of the Site, transmissions lines are present east and west of the Site, and the newly constructed 60 Freeway is now present south of the Site. On the 1976 map, the Site is shown as undeveloped land. Orchards, gravel pits, water wells, and sewage disposal ponds are shown in the greater surrounding area. The 1981 map again shows the Site as planted with a crop. The 15 Freeway east of the Site is under construction. The 2012 map shows the Site as undeveloped; however, only limited features are shown on the map. The military reservation is no longer shown.

No features were depicted on or off the Site on the maps reviewed that would indicate an environmental concern for the Site. The past agricultural use of the Site indicates the potential for residual pesticides to be present in site soil. However, Arcadis does not consider the use of pesticides, fertilizers or herbicides, when used in accordance with manufacturer specifications and for approved agricultural uses, by default to be defined as a REC without facts showing that there was a release or potential release of a petroleum product or hazardous substance that would constitute a REC under the ASTM definition. Additionally, the Site is proposed to be developed commercially and will be covered by the building footprint and pavement, thereby eliminating an exposure pathway to underlying soil. And according to the Site owner, pesticides were not applied to the Site.

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the land labelled "military reservation" was owned and used by the U.S. Army from 1942 to the mid-1960s. The land was used for "warehouses, an administration building, training building, infirmary, garage, officer's quarters, sewage disposal plant, and other buildings and structures." The DTSC identifies the property, which was originally over 500 acres, as "inactive – needs evaluation as of 7/1/2005." The property is currently owned by private parties. Therefore, as this property is not an active case with a regulatory agency, this former

Source Date		Information Obtained		
		land use within one-mile of the Site does not appear to represent an environmental concern for the Site.		
Aerial Photographs (copies provided in Appendix B)	1938, 1948, 1953, 1959, 1967, 1975, 1985, 1989, 1990, 1994, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010, and 2012. Also Google Earth 2016.	In the 1938 photograph, the Site appears to be agricultural. The surrounding area appears agricultural as well. A road is visible adjacent west of the Site in the location of the present-day Milliken Avenue. Farmhouses are present farther south of the Site. Railroad tracks are visible farther to the north and northeast of the Site. No significant changes are shown on the Site or in the surrounding area on the 1948 photograph. The clarity of the 1953 photograph is poor but there do not appear to be any substantial changes to the Site or surrounding area. The Site and surrounding area appear agricultural on the 1959 and 1967 photographs. On the 1975 photograph, the Site is either agricultural or fallow land as is the surrounding area. However, the 60 Freeway has now been constructed south of the Site. In the 1985 photograph, a transmission tower is visible on the southern end of the Site and the two transmission lines depicted on topographic maps are visible to the northwest and northeast of the Site. The 15 Freeway is under construction east of the Site. In the 1989 and 1990 photographs, the Site is sectioned into five plots, likely agricultural. The majority of the surrounding land is agricultural; however, the 15 Freeway is now visible east of the Site and residential development is visible farther southwest of the Site. No significant changes are shown on the 1994 photograph. In the 2005 and 2006 photographs, the Site is shown as undeveloped land except for the transmission tower. Land west, north and east of the Site is now developed with commercial structures. Commercial development is also visible south of the Site beyond the 60 Freeway. In the 2009 photograph, the Site is again shown to be agricultural with a more developed vineyard on the east half of the Site. No significant changes are shown on the Site or in the surrounding area on the 2010 and 2012 photographs. The 2016 aerial image shows the Site and surrounding area in their present-day configurations.		

4.1 Previous Environmental Investigations

Arcadis was not provided with prior environmental reports for the Site.

5 RECORDS REVIEW

As part of this assessment, Arcadis reviewed regulatory databases and available agency files and records for the Site. Information from these sources is discussed in the following sections.

5.1 Regulatory Database Research

An environmental database report prepared by EDR was reviewed for local, state, and federal listings for properties within the site area. Included in EDR's report are regulatory databases reviewed by EDR for cases pertaining to leaking underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), hazardous waste sites, and abandoned sites within the ASTM-specified radii (Table 2). EDR also reviewed selected databases generated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Explanations of the regulatory agency databases reviewed are presented in EDR's report, which is included as **Appendix C**.

It should be noted that the computerized geocoding technology used in the database search is based on available census data and is only accurate to approximately ±300 feet. Also, elevations were determined from the U.S. Geological Survey Digital Elevation Model and are relative (not absolute). Sites with an elevation equal to or higher than the target property have been differentiated from sites with an elevation lower than the target property.

Sites identified within the study radii were evaluated to determine if they are likely to have adversely impacted the Site. The criteria used to evaluate the potential for adverse impact to the Site include:

- Distance from the Site;
- Expected depth and direction of groundwater and surface water flow;
- Expected storm water flow direction; and
- Presence/absence of documented contaminant releases at the identified sites not identified as remediated.

It is also noted that the Site was plotted from the approximate center, which is approximately 0.1-mile from the Site boundaries. Only certain databases such as NPL and CORRACTS (as identified in the table below) are searched to the 1.0-mile radius. These two databases were searched independently to confirm that NPL and CORRACTS sites are not present within 1.0-mile of the Site boundaries. All other databases' search radiuses are within the guidelines established by ASTM and were also independently confirmed on the RWQCB and Department of Toxic Substances Control on-line websites.

Table 2 Regulatory Agency Databases / Lists Reviewed

Search Radius	Agency	Database	Type of Records in Database
1 mile	U.S. EPA	NPL	Sites designated for Superfund cleanup by the U.S. EPA

Search Radius	Agency	Database	Type of Records in Database		
	U.S. EPA CORRACTS		RCRA facilities undergoing "corrective actions"		
	U.S. EPA	CERCLIS	Sites under review by the U.S. EPA		
	U.S. EPA	TSD	Facilities that treat, store, and/or dispose of hazardous waste		
	RWQCB	LUST	Sites with LUSTs		
0.5 mile	SWRCB	SWLF/SWAT	Sites permitted as solid waste landfills, incinerators, or transfer stations		
	IWMB	WMUDS/SWAT	Tracking and inventory of waste management units		
	U.S. EPA	CERCLIS-NFRAP	CERCLIS sites with no further remedial actions planned.		
Site or	U.S. EPA	RCRA Generator	Sites that generate large or small quantities of hazardous waste		
Adjacent Properties	U.S. EPA	ERNS	Sites with reported accidental releases of oil and hazardous substances		
	RWQCB	UST	Sites with registered USTs		

Notes:

BEP = Bond Expenditure Plan

CERCLIS = Comprehensive Environmental Response

Compensation and Liability Information System

CORRACTS = Corrective Action Report

ERNS = Emergency Response Notification System

DHS = Department of Public Health

IWMB = Integrated Waste Management Board

LUST = Leaking Underground Storage Tank

NFRAP = No Further Remedial Action Planned

NPL= National Priorities List

OES = Office of Emergency Services

SWAT = Solid Waste Assessment Test

SWLF = Solid Waste Landfills

TSD = Transfer, Storage and Disposal

WMUDS = Waste Management Unit Database

5.1.1 Site

According to EDR's report, the Site location is not listed in any of the databases searched. The Site does not currently have a street address.

5.1.2 Off-Site Properties

According to EDR's report, several properties are listed within the ASTM-search radius. However, based on their listing for tracking purposes only, distance from the Site, type of release, groundwater flow pattern, inactivity and no active regulatory involvement, and/or successful remediation with case closure granted by the regulatory oversight agency, none of the off-site properties listed in the EDR database

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT

report are likely to represent a concern of environmental impairment or a vapor encroachment condition to the Site.

Two properties are listed in EDR's Orphan Summary; however, neither appear to be in proximity to the Site.

5.2 Agency Research

Files and records available at the agencies listed in **Table 3** were reviewed for information on the Site.

Table 3 Local Agency Files

Source	Date	Information Obtained
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	March 2017	Available information maintained by the RWQCB at http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov was reviewed for records concerning hazardous spills, USTs, and LUSTs at the Site. There were no records for the Site location.
Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	March 2017	A review of the DTSC website (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/) did not identify any records for the Site location.
Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH)	March 2017	No RCDEH records were identified in the EDR report for the Site location. Based on the Site's location on the County line with San Bernardino County, EDR listed several sites with permits issued by the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Division. No concerns were identified.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

6.1 Topography

According to information obtained from the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Map of the Guasti quadrangle, dated 2012, topography at the Site is approximately 817 feet above mean sea level. The Site is somewhat uneven and lower in elevation on the west side compared to the east side. The general topographic gradient of the surrounding area exhibits a downward slope to the south.

6.2 Geology

The general geology summary provided by EDR specifies that the sediments beneath the Site have been identified as part of the Quaternary Series of the Quaternary System of the Cenozoic Era. According to the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the Site is underlain by the Delhi soil component, which has a soil surface texture of fine sand and exhibits high infiltration rates (EDRa).

According to a report on Geotracker for a property located 1,130 feet south/southeast of the Site at its closest point (Crossroad Classic Mustang at 12421 Riverside Avenue), soil lithology in the area of the Site consists of interbedded fine sands, silts and clay to 80 feet below ground surface (bgs) with a dense, partially cemented gravelly sand layer between 30 to 45 feet bgs (RWQCB 2017).

6.3 Surface Water

Arcadis did not observe surface water features onsite. However, a flood control is present adjacent south of the Site and appears to extend under the Site.

6.4 Hydrogeology

According to information on Geotracker for the Crossroad Classic Mustang property, depth to groundwater in the area of the Site is 180 to 198 feet bgs (RWQCB 2017). A groundwater gradient was not reported; however, based on topography, the overall groundwater gradient is anticipated to be to the south.

6.5 Flood Zones

According to the EDR report, the Site is not located within a flood zone (EDRa).

7 SITE RECONNAISSANCE

On March 15, 2017, Ms. Janet Holtz, a representative of Arcadis, performed a reconnaissance-level assessment of the Site to observe general site conditions and indications of the possible release(s) of chemicals to the subsurface. A walk-over site reconnaissance was conducted to identify visible evidence of RECs. Ms. Holtz was unaccompanied during the site reconnaissance. Photographs taken during the site reconnaissance are included in **Appendix A**.

7.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions

Arcadis' representative was granted full access to the Site. The methodology for the site visit included walking and observing the entire site. There were no limiting conditions.

7.2 General Site Conditions

7.2.1 Site Observations

The approximate 15.8-acre, irregular-shaped site consists of former agricultural land. The Site is not currently being used. Arcadis observed grape vine stumps throughout the Site indicative of a former vineyard. The Site's surface is covered by low-lying vegetation, and where exposed, the ground surface is sandy. A SCE electrical transmission tower is present near the southeast corner of the Site. Identification on the tower base indicates it is part of the Mira Loma Rancho Vista #2 220 kV transmission line. A debris pile is present near the tower and contained non-hazardous trash as well as a couple of apparently empty 5-gallon oil containers and one open container with rain water that exhibited an oily sheen. There were also smaller debris piles and a pile of abandoned tires in proximity to the tower. Minor amounts of windblown trash were also observed onsite, mostly confined to the southern boundary. A pile of granite rocks was observed on the west side of the Site adjacent to Milliken Avenue. Two billboards are present along the southern boundary. No areas of surface staining and no evidence of water wells or irrigation piping were observed onsite. Sewer manhole covers were observed onsite and water utility equipment was observed along Milliken Avenue.

7.2.2 Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Products in Connection with Identified Uses

No hazardous substances or petroleum products were observed onsite.

7.2.3 Storage Tanks

Arcadis did not observe ASTs at the Site. No evidence of USTs, such as dispensers, pipes, or vent lines, was observed on the Site.

7.2.4 Odors

No odors that would indicate an environmental concern were noted on the Site.

7.2.5 Pools of Liquid

No readily visible standing surface water, pools, or sumps containing liquids likely to be hazardous substances or petroleum products were identified during this assessment.

7.2.6 Drums

No drums were observed on site.

7.2.7 Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Product Containers (Not Necessarily in Connection with Identified Uses)

No hazardous substances or petroleum products were observed onsite.

7.2.8 Unidentified Substance Containers

No unidentified substance containers were observed onsite except for several 5-gallon containers observed in the larger debris pile at the southern end of the Site. Most of the containers appeared empty and no ground staining was observed beneath the containers. One of the containers was open and filled with rain water and exhibited an oily sheen on the surface of the water.

7.2.9 PCBs

No electrical or hydraulic equipment known to contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or likely to contain PCBs was identified onsite during this assessment.

One 220 kV transmission line easement passes through the southern end of the Site, and one 500 kV transmission line easement is present just north of the Site. A lower kV transmission line with polemounted transformers runs along the Site's western boundary along Milliken Avenue. The equipment is owned by SCE and any concerns with the transformers are the responsibility of SCE. The transformers appeared to be in good condition and no evidence of seepage or releases was observed.

7.2.10 Pits, Ponds, or Lagoons

During the site visit, Arcadis' representative looked for pits, ponds, or lagoons on the Site. Arcadis' representative also looked for pits, ponds, and lagoons on adjoining properties to the extent that such features could be visually and/ or physically observed from the Site or identified in the interviews or records review. No such features were identified on or near the Site. However, there are at least two quarries within one mile of the Site.

7.2.11 Stained Soil or Pavement

During the site visit, Arcadis' representative did not observe areas of stained soil or pavement.

7.2.12 Stressed Vegetation

During the site visit, Arcadis' representative looked for areas of stressed vegetation (from other than insufficient water). No areas of stressed vegetation were observed during this assessment.

7.2.13 Solid Waste

During the site visit, Arcadis looked for areas that were apparently filled or graded by non-natural causes (or filled with material of unknown origin) that suggest the presence of trash construction debris, demolition debris, or other solid waste disposal, or mounds or depressions suggesting trash or other solid waste disposal. No such areas were observed.

7.2.14 Wastewater

During the site visit, Arcadis looked for wastewater or other liquids (including storm water) or discharges into a drain, ditch, underground injection system, or stream on or adjacent to the Site. There is no process wastewater discharged on site.

7.2.15 Wells

During the site visit, Arcadis looked for wells, including dry wells, irrigation wells, injection wells, monitoring wells, water wells, abandoned wells, oil wells, or other wells. No wells were observed onsite.

7.2.16 Septic Systems

During the site visit, Arcadis looked for indications of on-site septic systems or cesspools. No septic systems or cesspools were observed.

7.2.17 Heating / Cooling

There are no structures onsite; therefore, heating and cooling systems were not evaluated for this assessment.

7.2.18 Stains or Corrosion

Arcadis did not observe areas of staining or corrosion during this site assessment.

7.2.19 Drains or Sumps

Arcadis did not observe drains or sumps onsite during this site assessment. However, a vertical storm water drain from the adjacent flood control channel is present on the southern boundary of the Site.

8 INTERVIEWS

8.1 Interview with Site Contacts

Through e-mail correspondence with the Site broker, Arcadis obtained information on the Site from a representative of the DiTommaso family, Site owner (see Section 3). A site contact was not provided for the City of Norco, which owns the southeast portion of the Site.

9 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Arcadis has performed a Phase I ESA in accordance with the ASTM International E1527-13 Standard Practice for Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. Limitations or deviations from this practice are described in Section 1.4 of this report. The findings identified by Arcadis are summarized below and discussed in greater detail in the body of the report.

9.1 Recognized Environmental Conditions

No RECs were identified in connection with the Site.

9.2 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions

No CRECs were identified in connection with the Site.

9.3 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions

No HRECs were identified in connection with the Site.

9.4 De Minimis Conditions

The following de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the Site:

- The debris piles and abandoned tires onsite should be removed and properly disposed of offsite.
- The Site owner stated that irrigation piping was not used onsite However, if remnant irrigation
 piping or other agricultural features are uncovered during future development activities, they
 should be assessed for Transite™ asbestos prior to removal and disposal.

9.5 Conclusions

Arcadis has performed a Phase I ESA of the Site in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E1527-13 for Phase I ESAs. This assessment has revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the Site, and no further investigation is recommended.

No Phase I ESA can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for RECs in connection with a property. This evaluation was intended to reduce, but not eliminate uncertainty in RECs.

10 DATA GAPS

No significant data gaps were identified during this assessment. Pertinent data, if any, obtained by Newcastle following the issuance of this report should be reviewed by an environmental professional and an addendum should be prepared to present an evaluation of the data and any changes to the conclusions of this report, as warranted by the data.

11 ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONALS STATEMENT

The environmental assessment described herein was conducted by the undersigned employee of Arcadis. Arcadis' assessment consisted solely of the activities described in the Introduction of this Report, and in accordance with the ASTM E1527-13 guidelines for Phase I Environmental Site Assessments signed prior to initiation of the assessment, as applicable.

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of environmental professional as defined in §312.10 of 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 312, and I have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the Subject Property. I have developed and performed all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312. *

Report Prepared By:



July 3, 2017

Janet Holtz Date

Principal Environmental Scientist

^{*}A professional geologist's or environmental professional's certification of conditions comprises a declaration of his or her professional judgment. It does not constitute a warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, nor does it relieve any other party of its responsibility to abide by contract documents, applicable codes, standards, regulations, and ordinances.

12 REFERENCES

ASTM International. 2013. Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, Designation E1527-13.

Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor website, 2017.

http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR)_a. 2017. EDR Radius Map Report with GeoCheck. Inquiry #4874708.2s. March 9.

EDR_b. 2017. EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package. March 10.

EDR_c. 2017. EDR Historical Topographic Map Report. March 9.

EDR_d. 2017. EDR Sanborn Map No Coverage Letter. March 9.

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Geotracker website, 2017.

http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report?global_id=T0606500266

U.S. Geological Survey. 2012. 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Map, Guasti quadrangle.

FIGURES

APPENDIX A

Site Photographs

APPENDIX B Historical Research Documentation

APPENDIX C

EDR Radius Map Report

APPENDIX C

EDR Radius Map Report

APPENDIX D

2015 Sampling Records for the Onsite Well



Arcadis U.S., Inc.

320 Commerce

Suite 200

Irvine, California 92602

Tel 714 730 9052

Fax 714 730 9345

www.arcadis.com