FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVE LIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions on your agency/company letterhead and provide maps to illustrate facility locations.

1. Please indicate the name and location of the fire station(s) that serve the project area. Also, indicate, the equipment, personnel and emergency medical services available at each station.

The first due fire station will be Fire Station 1 – An engine, an ambulance, a reserve ambulance, METS (medicine intake room), a Battalion Chief, a Captain, an Engineer, and two firefighter paramedics.

The second in will be Fire Station 2 – An engine with Strike Team capabilities, a reserve engine, a captain, an engineer, and two firefighter paramedics.

The third in will be Fire Station 6 – Fire Truck, USAR (urban search and rescue), a captain, an engineer, and two firefighters.

- 2. What is the approximate response time to the project site from each station?
 - From Station 1 to 3333 Susan is approximately 2 miles.
 - From Station 2 to 3333 Susan is approximately 2.2 miles.
 - From Station 6 to 3333 Susan is approximately 2.5 miles.

The average response time with the calls mentioned in question #6 is 7 minutes and 13 second to 3333 Susan St and 8 minutes and 25 seconds to 3335 Susan St.

The average of the travel time is 7 minutes and 13 second to 3333 Susan St and 8 minutes and 25 seconds to 3335 Susan St. Total response time includes 1:30 minutes added for dispatch processing time and up to 2:00 minutes for crew turnout time (for structure fires when more protective clothing must be donned as compared to an EMS response). Thus, total response time from 9-1-1 call receipt to the development could be upwards of 10:43 – 11:55 minutes.

3. Are there any current plans for expansion of fire protection facilities, services, or staff or to construct a new facility that would serve the City?

There is a plot of land on the Segerstrom Farmland for a proposal of either a 7th station or relocation of an existing station.

The Costa Mesa Fire & Rescue Department (CMFR) indicated that, although there are no current plans to increase the number of personnel to service the project area, additional staffing, apparatus, and facilities need to be considered. As specified above, CMFR is currently conducting a comprehensive Citywide Standards of Coverage Assessment and deployment analysis that is independent of this project. The City is also concurrently conducting a Development Impact Fee Study to account for similar changes of use that result in net increases to call volume. It is CMFR's goal to maintain current response service levels to the community, and meet response performance objectives of the City Council. At the conclusion of the assessment and fee study, it

is anticipated that a development impact fee will be adopted to mitigate similar projects to The Hive.

4. Would the proposed project substantially increase response times or create a substantial increase in demand for fire protection staff, facilities, equipment, etc.?

See answer 6 for now.

The existing site averages two calls per year. It is anticipated that the addition of residential units and retail space will result in significant impacts to calls for service volume based on the call history at the site. There has been 10 Fire and EMS calls for service at the 3333 and 3335 Susan St. over the last five years.

5. Please indicate any development impact fees required for new developments.

See excel spreadsheet – EIR Calls for Service.

6. How many calls does the existing structures generate per year? How many projected calls would come from the proposed project in a year?

There were 6 calls for 3333 Susan, 4 calls for 3335 Susan and zero calls for 3331 and 333 Susan St.

Number	Alarm Time	Туре	Aid	Location	Station	Shift
2007126	08/11/2020 11:21	321	Ν	3333 Susan St	S1	С
2008257	09/14/2020 06:02	743	Ν	3333 Susan St	S1	А
2202074	02/20/2022 22:37	321	Ν	3333 Susan St	S1	С
2309775	09/10/2023 20:07	321	N	3333 Susan St	S1	С
2311262	10/19/2024 12:58	321	N	3333 Susan St	S1	В
2404965	05/11/2024 04:13	321	N	3333 Susan St	S1	С
2004428	05/19/2020 08:07	743	Ν	3335 Susan St #B	S1	А
2303881	04/11/2023 04:33	520	N	3335 Susan St	S1	С
2304525	04/28/2023 15:56	735	N	3335 Susan St	S1	С
2309604	09/06/2023 10:19	651	N	3335 Susan St	S1	С

Last 5 years of Fire calls for service history to 3331-3337 Susan St:

Incidents 2007126, 2202074, 2311262, 2404965, and 2309775, with 321 call "Type" were medical aid transports.

Incidents 2008257and 2004428 with 743 call "Type" was a false alarm due to a faulty smoke detector.

Incident 2303881 with 520 call "Type" was a false alarm on the panel, no mutual aid or fire was observed.

Incident 2304525 with 735 call "Type" was a false alarm due to panel malfunction.

Incident 2309604 with 651 call "Type" was a call for smoke coming from the parking lot drains that was investigated and dissipated when ME82 arrived on scene. It was believed that the smoke was related to an OCFA training that was at a different location.

7. Do you anticipate that required fees and taxes provided by new developments associated with the proposed project will adequately mitigate the expected increase in fire and emergency medical service demand?

The fees for the construction permits will only provide cost recovery for the inspection time. The calls for service increase will need to be accounted for through a development agreement. A fiscal impact model is needed to determine the accuracy for the expected increase in emergency medical service demands.

8. Do you anticipate that implementation of the proposed project would result in the need for physical additions to your agency (i.e., construction of new fire stations)?

In the case of The Hive, the proposed mixed-use of residential and commercial/retail occupancies should generate fire or EMS calls in line with similar uses in the City of Costa Mesa and, as such, would impact the Department's response volume and deployment model.

9. Do you have any required or recommended mitigation measures for significant impacts?

Preliminary fire access plan included proposed mitigation measures for hose pull deficiencies. No other alternate means of methods have been reviewed or approved at this time.

Mitigation measures will be required to offset the anticipated increase in call volume.

580 Anton Blvd	250 Units								
Year	Calls for Service	Average Call per Unit	Fire	e Budget	Number of Calls	Cos	st per Call	Cost	for Services
2021	22	0.088	\$	32,377,354.00	11249.00	\$	2,878.24	\$	63,321.34
2022	9	0.036	\$	33,480,396.00	12063.00	\$	2,775.46	\$	24,979.16
2023	33	0.132	\$	35,785,123.00	11815.00	\$	3,028.79	\$	99,949.98
*2024	44	0.176	\$	37,772,922.00	11709.00	\$	3,225.97	\$	141,942.83
* Calls for Service through 8/13/2024	Average per unit	0.085333333		33880957.67	11709	28	394.164027		

The Hive 3333 Susan	1050 Units								
Year	Calls for Service	Average Call per Unit	Fire	Budget	Number of Calls	Cost	per Call	Cost f	or Services
2021	92.4	0.088	\$	32,377,354.00	11249.00	\$	2,878.24	\$	265,949.64
2022	37.8	0.036	\$	33,480,396.00	12063.00	\$	2,775.46	\$	104,912.46
2023	138.6	0.132	\$	35,785,123.00	11815.00	\$	3,028.79	\$	419,789.93
*2024	184.8	0.176	\$	37,772,922.00	11709.00	\$	3,225.97	\$	596,159.88
* Calls for Service through 8/13/2024	Average per unit	0.085333333		33880957.67	11709	289	94.164027	\$	346,702.98

Existing Site Calls for Service									
Year	Calls for Service		Fire Bu	dget	Number of Calls	Cost per	Call	Cost	t for Services
2021		2	\$	32,377,354.00	11249.00	\$	2,878.24	\$	5,756.49
2022		2	\$	33,480,396.00	12063.00	\$	2,775.46	\$	5,550.92
2023		2	\$	35,785,123.00	11815.00	\$	3,028.79	\$	6,057.57
*2024		2	\$	37,772,922.00	11709.00	\$	3,225.97	\$	6,451.95
* Calls for Service through 8/13/2024	Average per unit			33880957.67	11709	28	94.164027	\$	5,954.23

POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVE LIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions on agency letterhead and provide a map if necessary. In your response, provide as much information as possible (necessary to evaluate potential impacts).

- 1. Please indicate the location of the police or sheriff station that serves the project area. *The Costa Mesa Police Department (CMPD) at 99 Fair Drive, serves the project area.*
- 2. What is the geographical area and total population which is served by the station? *CMPD* serves the City of Costa Mesa which is 16 square miles and serves a population of 112,780 residents. However the number of people who work, visit, and pass through our city is much greater.
- 3. How many law enforcement officers and patrol cars presently serve the project area vicinity? Does your agency have an established target staffing level (i.e. personnel/population)? *CMPD is currently budgeted for 142 full-time sworn police officers. However, we are facing a staffing shortage and our current filled positions are only 119. We do not utilize a target ratio for staffing.*

CMPD has 39 patrol cars presently.

4. What is the City's target response time? Is the City currently meeting these times? What is the approximate response time to the project site? There is no target response time or actual response time to the project area. Response times are based on when the call is received, the assigned priority rating of the call, when the call can be dispatched to an available unit, and when the unit arrives after dispatch.

The impact of this project will change the characteristics of the area, which is now an industrial park, to a mixed use residential and retail.

5. How many calls are generated from the existing structures per year? How many projected calls would result from the proposed project per year? *The existing structures average nine calls per year (2023 & 2024).*

Based upon a similar development in the South Coast Metro area I would anticipate 500-600 calls for service per year.

The location of comparison is The Enclave Apartment Homes, 400 Enclave Circle (Irvine Company). This property is all residential, unlike the proposed mixed use, but was used based on size and location.

- 6. Are there any plans for facility expansion or new facilities, please provide as much detail as possible? Where does your agency acquire funding for new facilities? We are currently establishing a Capital Improvement Plan and funding for a Westside Substation. This would potentially involve a full demolition of the current building, design and construction. However, this location is the southwest corner of the city and would not serve this development. All funding is established through the general budget.
- 7. Please indicate any development impact fees required for new developments. *CMPD does not have development impact fees.*
- 8. Do you anticipate any significant impacts associated with the proposed project on current service within the City, such as increasing service calls, increasing response times, or the need for additional personnel or patrol cars? Please provide generation factors if it is determined that additional personnel or patrol cars are required.

The project would impact police services based on the location and the change to the characteristics of the area with the proposed mixed use (residential, retail, etc.). As indicated, I would anticipate the number of calls for police services to increase from 9 to 600 per year, a 6,600% increase.

The area is currently industrial and the project would increase calls for service, traffic flow, PD community policing and crime prevention outreach for both residential and businesses. Additionally, it would require a shift in patrol strategies based on the new diverse use, which can ultimately affect patrol response times.

9. Do you have any required or recommended mitigation measures for significant impacts?

CMPD has established an Automated License Plate Reader program to assist in deterring crime and investigating it after the fact. This program has been very impactful and assisted in many investigations. It is also a force multiplier and uses technology to monitor 24/7. CMPD has deployed 46 cameras city wide and 10 additional cameras have been funded privately that we have access to. In an effort to prevent and investigate crime for this project, I recommend cameras that CMPD would be able have access (Flock Safety) to be funded and placed at all entrances to the property. Funding for these cameras is per camera/year. The development would be responsible for initial and future funding.

- 10. Do you anticipate that implementation of the proposed project would result in the need for physical additions to your agency (i.e., construction of new police *No*
- 11. Please include any additional information you feel is pertinent to the environmental analysis of the proposed project. *None*

SCHOOL SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVELIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions on your agency/company letterhead and provide maps to illustrate facility locations.

- 1. Please indicate the name and location of schools which are available to serve the project site.
 - a. Home Schools
 - i. Primary:
 - 1. Killybroooke Elementary School
 - ii. Middle & High School:
 - 1. Costa Mesa Middle & High School
 - b. Other School serving this Area
 - i. Primary
 - 1. Paularino Elementary School
 - 2. College Park Elementary School
 - 3. Davis Magnet Elementary School
 - ii. High School
 - 1. Monte Vista High School
 - 2. Early College High School
- 2. What is the current enrollment and capacity of each school in the vicinity of the project, and what is the distance of the school from the project site?

Costa Mesa Middle & High School	Capacity: 2170	Enrollment: 1758
College Park Elementary	Capacity: 690	Enrollment: 452
Killybrooke Elementary	Capacity: 545	Enrollment: 463
Paularino Elementary	Capacity: 640	Enrollment: 377
Sonora Elementary	Capacity: 675	Enrollment: 366

3. What are the current student generation rates used to project enrollment based on residential (single- and multi-family units) and non-residential development?

Single Unit Attached E: .23 M: .05 H: .09

Multi Family E: .15 M: .05 H: .1

4. Does the District charge developer fees for residential and non-residential development. If so, what are these fees? Are there any other required or recommended mitigation measures for the project?

The developer fee rates are \$1.84 per square foot of qualifying residential construction and \$0.30 for qualifying commercial/industrial.

- 5.Does the District have any current plans for new school facilities that would serve the project?
 - a. No.
- 6. Please include any additional information you feel is pertinent to the environmental analysis of the proposed project.

RECREATION QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVE LIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions, on your agency letterhead, providing as much information as possible (necessary to evaluate potential impacts).

- 1. What is the current total acreage of parkland within the City? The city categorizes parks into three categories: Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, and Special Use Parks.
 - Neighborhood Parks 82.93 acres
 - Community Parks 102.51 acres
 - Special Use Parks 230.61 acres Total 416.05 acres

The golf course adds an additional 237.20 acres for grand total of 653.25 acres.

2. Does the City have an adopted parkland-to-population standard?

Park Level of Service and Accessibility by Planning Area An estimate of population to park ratios has been conducted by "Planning Areas" to evaluate deficiencies in the City's allocation of parkland. Table OSR4, 2015 Park /Population Ratios, indicates these estimated ratios. Planning Area 2 exceeds the park-to-population standard of parkland but includes some areas that lacks park accessibility. Planning Area 3 is the area with the most deficient neighborhood parkland with a ratio of 0.62 acres of parkland, for every 1,000 persons.

Planning Existing Park Estimated Park/ Population¹ Land (2015) Area **Population Ratio** 23,244 54.43 2.34/1,000 1 2 24,122 248.39 10.30/1,000 3 22,874 14.09 0.62/1,000 4 26,574 75.10 2.83/1,000 5 8,176 13.62 1.67/1,000 6 5,534 9.56 1.73/1,000 Total 110,524 415.19 3.76/1,000

Table OSR-4: 2015 Park /Population

Notes: 1) Population based on U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates for 2014 by Census Tract and by Table LU-2: Established Land Uses (2015).

Ratios

3. Please indicate the location of the facilities which serve the project site. (Please include the distance from the site and size of the facility).

The development site is on the far northeast side of the City. The closest community center is Balearic Community Center and is approximately 3.0 miles away. The Costa Mesa Golf Course is approximately 1.5 miles away. Wakeham park is approximately 1 mile away.

- 4. What are the generation factors for the proposed land use? N/A
- Please indicate if there will be any required fees or parkland dedication to help mitigate potential impacts to park and recreation facilities.
 Parkland Impact Fees are required based on the number of units. Apartments are required to provide \$5,000 per unit.
- Do you anticipate that project implementation would result in the need for physical additions to your facilities (i.e., construction of new park and recreational facilities)? Perhaps at Wakeham Park. The replacement of outdated playground equipment and shade structures.
- 7. Do you have any required or recommended mitigation measures for significant impacts?
- 8. Please include any additional information you feel is pertinent to the environmental analysis of the proposed project.

LIBRARY SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVE LIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions on agency letterhead and provide a map if necessary. In your response, provide as much information as possible (necessary to evaluate potential impacts).

1. Please list and describe existing library facilities serving the proposed project site/area (i.e., square footage of facility, number of volumes, number of employees and volunteers, etc.). Are these facilities currently adequate?

The closest Library is Mesa Verde located 1.8 miles away from the proposed site:

- 2696 Mesa Verde Dr. Costs Mesa, CA 92626.
- Square Footage 6,458
- Number of volumes/Collection size 39,250
- Circulation for 2023-2024 was 172,745
- Number of employees 8.5 FTE
- Built in 1965 the building is not ideal, has ADA challenges, is split level and needs major improvements. City owned, OCPL operated.

The second closet Library is Donald Dungan located 6 miles away from the proposed site:

- 1855 Park Ave, Costa Mesa, Ca 92627.
- Square Footage 23,335
- Number of volumes/Collection size 60,454
- Circulation 211,715
- Number of employees 12.5 FTE
- Built in 2019 this building is state of the art and does not need additional improvements outside of routine maintenance. City owned, OCPL operated.
- 2. What services/programs does the library system currently offer?

Programs and services are for all ages beginning with toddlers, children, tweens, teens, adults and seniors. Age-appropriate activities include but are not limited to book clubs, storytimes, author events, crafts, music and other specialty topics. Online resources are also available.

3. Are there any planned additions to existing library resources or facilities? No immediate plans for Mesa Verde are scheduled although OCPL is in the process of replacing some furniture.

Donald Dungan has some planned maintenance in the works with the City of Costa Mesa.

- 4. How are library service needs/standards determined (i.e., volumes/population)? Services, staffing, resources and number of days open are based on a systemwide Library Advisory Board Resource Deployment Formula which is adjusted as needed.
- 5. What are the current sources of revenue or funds for the library? Are there any new developments assessed fees and if so, what are the amounts? OCPL's main source of funding is through a dedicated property tax. Additional funds come through grants and donations.
- 6. Do you anticipate any significant impacts from the project on current services and capacity at the library? If so, please describe how this determination came to be in as much detail as possible. The impact to the Mesa Verde Library could be significant. The location will bring a large number of new residents to the area. Estimating approximately 2,306 new residents (one person per studio; 2 persons per 1 BR unit; 3 persons per 2 BR unit). The library is 1.8 miles away, well within driving and walking distance. Local residents normally use their neighborhood libraries, and the library customizes its service to the needs of the local community. OCPL would expect a large influx of new users based on historical experience.
- 7. Do you anticipate that the project implementation would result in the need for physical additions to the library?

For Donald Dungan no, for Mesa Verde – A study and the interest of the City would need to be determined as they own the building. There is room for expansion on the property but bringing the current building up to code and reimagining current spaces could be beneficial if developer fees or another source of revenue were available.

WASTEWATER SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

COSTA MESA HIVE LIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3333 Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Please respond to the following questions on agency letterhead and provide a map if necessary. In your response, provide as much information as possible (necessary to evaluate potential impacts).

1. Please list and describe existing wastewater facilities serving the proposed project site/area (i.e., square footage of facility, number of volumes, etc.). Are these facilities currently adequate?

The Current facilities are adequate. Currently the property is serviced by the 15" sewer main on Susan St. via two laterals. A 12" main runs through the west side of the property, the district maintains a 20' wide easement along the length of sewer main to access the two manholes located along that main.

2. Are there any planned additions to existing facilities?

No.

3. How are wastewater service needs/standards determined (i.e., volumes/population)?

Wastewater needs are based on gpd/acre by zoning. Capacity is determined based on D/d of the sewer main(s) impacted by the development. D/d must be less than 0.5. A flow study is conducted to determine current D/d then estimated flow generation from the project is added to the current plus any capacity already reserved for future projects to verify if capacity is available.

4. Do you anticipate any significant impacts from the project on current services and capacity? If so, please describe how this determination came to be in as much detail as possible.

The project is not to exceed 656,250 gpd. This project is expected to utilize approximately **31%** of the available capacity. The usage varies from segment to segment of sewer lateral with the minimum of 24% to a maximum of 50% available capacity utilized. This was determined based on a flow study conducted by FUSCOE engineering. The relevant pages from the flow study are attached.

5. Do you anticipate that the project implementation would result in the need for physical additions to the existing infrastructure (i.e., pipeline increases)?

No.









HIVE LIVE

3333 SUSAN STREET, COSTA MESA, CA 92626

SEWER CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Prepared for:

LEGACY PARTNER

5141 CALIFORNIA AVENUE, SUITE 100

IRVINE, CA 92617

Prepared by:

SHELBY SHIRLOCK, P.E.

Date Issued: November, 2024

Project Number: [424-028-02]

NO. C75912

EXP 06/30/26

OF CA

11/05/2024

FUSCOE ENGINEERING, INC.

600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017

fuscoe.com



HIVE LIVE 3333 Susan St, Costa Mesa, CA 92626 Sewer Capacity Analysis Memorandum

Date: November, 2024

Attention: Mark Esquer, P.E, Costa Mesa Sanitary District

From: Shelby Shirlock, P.E. & Jason Castro

Subject: 3333 Susan Street Development Sewer Capacity Analysis

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The Hive Live residential apartment project proposes 3 apartment structures with 1,050 total residential units and retail space within 14.3 Ac site in the city of Costa Mesa, California. The project is bounded by South Coast Drive to the south, Susan Street to the east, Sunflower Avenue to the north, and railroad tracks to the west. There are 3 existing offices and commercial buildings which will be replaced by the proposed apartment project.

There are 4 existing 8-inch onsite sewer laterals and stubs that currently serve the existing site that the project could potentially reuse and connect to. The onsite sewer laterals connect to a 15" public sewer main along Susan Street that flows north towards Sunflower Avenue. The 15" sewer along Sunflower eventually connects to an 84-inch OCSD trunk sewer along Sunflower.

The 15" public sewer main in Susan Street also collects sewage from the tract housing development to the east at the manhole located at the intersection of Via Luca and Susan St. Per Costa Mesa Sanitary District (CMSD, the existing 15" sewer main will need to consider for the development of the existing 9.7-acre parking lot east of Susan Street.

For the estimated sewer generation, CMSD has allowed to use the LA County sewer generation peak factors per development types and has advised a 5,000 gpd/Ac generation rate for the existing 9.7-acre parking lot east of Susan.

From these sewer generation estimates, the peak flows (cfs) are then calculated into the existing sewer segments using Kutter's hydraulic formula, to compare the depths with the sewer capacities (d/D).

A 14-day field flow monitoring has been conducted on the sewer study limits to understand and compare the existing field flows with the estimated flows at 2 manhole locations (MH#103869 & MH#119797).



CALCULATION SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

(See Appendix 2 for reference)

ESTIMATED FLOWS AND PIPE CAPACITIES							
	EXISTING PROPOSED						
SEGMENT	FLOWS (cfs)	CAPACITY (d/D)	FLOWS (CFS)	CAPACITY (d/D)			
8-inch Onsite to MH #103755	0.00	0.000	0.31	0.313			
8-inch Onsite to MH #103781	0.21	0.263	0.34	0.325			
8-inch Onsite to MH#103774	0.21	0.263	0.38	0.338			
MH #119775to MH #103713 (15")	0.00	0.000	0.08	0.120			
MH #103713 to MH #103755 (15")	0.00	0.000	0.08	0.120			
MH #103755 to MH #103781 (15")	0.00	0.000	0.38	0.253			
MH #103781 to MH #119801 (15")	0.21	0.193	0.72	0.347			
MH #119801 to MH #103774 (15")	0.38	0.253	0.88	0.389			
MH #103774 to MH #103773 (15")	0.59	0.320	1.26	0.473			
MH #103773 to MH #103869 (15")	0.59	0.320	1.26	0.473			

From these calculated estimates, the proposed flows to the existing sewer segments that the Hive Live apartment project will be tributary to, will convey less than the design capacities (d/D) per the Costa Mesa Sanitary District Sewer (CMSD) design requirements shown on Appendix 3. Based on this sewer capacity analysis, it is our conclusion that the existing CMSD sewer infrastructures downstream of development all the way to the connection at the existing 84-inch trunk sewer line could have capacity to accommodate the proposed development sewage generation.

CMSD has required the development to provide an actual flow monitoring at the manhole at the existing tract (TR16416-1325) terminus (MH #119797) and the manhole downstream of the development (MH#103869) to compare the actual flows with the estimates. The existing field measured flows on MH #119797 is determined to be 0.147 cfs (0.095 mgd), while the existing estimated flow at the same manhole is **0.167 cfs**. The existing field measured flows on MH #103869 is determined to be 0.213 cfs (0.138 mgd), while the estimated existing flow at the same manhole is **0.591 cfs**.



Since the flow monitoring results demonstrate lesser flows than estimated flows, it is our conclusion that the methodology used in the analysis generates more and is more conservative to apply in the study than the actual field monitored results. Even with this approach, the sewer reaches in the study appears to have capacity to handle the ultimate development flows.

There is about 640 linear feet of 15-inch CMSD pipe from MH#103774 to MH #103869 that are close to the capacity under the proposed conditions (**0.473**<0.5). These sewer segments in close capacity could potentially be subjected to be upsized as deemed by CMSD upon review of the estimated flows and the flow monitoring results.



ESTIMATED SEWAGE GENERATION

(See Appendix 1 for Unit counts)

(See Appendix 2 for Sewer Analysis Exhibit)

(See Appendix 3 for Building Summary & Sewage Generation Factors) *-Per LA County Estimated Average Daily Sewage Flows for Various Occupancies (2018) Peak Flows

2 bedroom dwelling units – 250 gal/D.U. (avg daily flow)

3 bedroom dwelling units – 300 gal/D.U. (avg daily flow)

Multiply the average daily flow by 2.5 to obtain peak flow

1. Existing Sewage Generation

Existing Sewage Generation Tributary to MH #103869 (SUNFLOWER)

Existing Sewage Generatio	n Tributary to MH #103869	= 0.591 cfs
(Parcel 2/ PMB 287/7-10; API Existing Parking Lot	<u>N # 140-041-59)</u> = 9.7 Ac x 0 gpd	= 0 gpd(0 cfs)
<u>(Tract 16416-1325 of Via Luca</u> Existing SFR Buildings = 143 (Lateral East of Ex 15" VCP P) Units x 300 gpd/DU*x2.5 ublic Sewer on Susan St)	= 107,250 gpd(0.167cfs)
<u>Offsite</u>		
		= 190 gpm(0.424 cfs)
Building "C"		= 95 gpm (0.212cfs)
Buildings "A" & "B"	-	= 95 gpm (0.212 cfs)
Onsite (per C301/G02-00016)	



2. Proposed Sewage Generation

Proposed Sewage Generation Tributary to MH#103869 (SUNFLOWER)

Proposed Sewage	Generation Tributary to MH #103869	=812,925gpd
<u>(Parcel 2/ PMB 287/</u> Commercial Zoned	<u>7-10; APN # 140-041-59)</u> = 9.7 Ac x 5,000 gpd/Ac	= 48,500 gpd(0.075 cfs)
<u>(Tract 16416-1325 of V</u> Existing SFR Buildir (Lateral East of Ex 15	<u>Via Luca)</u> ngs = 143 Units x 300 gpd/DU*x2.5 5" VCP Public Sewer on Susan St)	= 107,250 gpd (0.167cfs)
<u>Offsite</u>		= 657,175 gpd (1.017 cfs)
Prop Building C	= 346 DU x 250 gpd/DU* x2.5 = 389 DU x 250 gpd/DU* x2.5	= 216,250 gpd (0.355 cfs) = 243,125 gpd (0.376 cfs)
Drop Building B	+ 3,700 sf x 100gpd/1,000sf x 2.5	= 197,800 gpd (0.306 cfs)
<u>Onsite</u> Prop Building A	= 315 DU x 250 gpd/DU* x2.5	

=(1.258cfs)



IRVINE SAN DIEGO ONTARIO LOS ANGELES

SEWER CAPACITY STUDY

(See Appendix 2 for Sewer Analysis Exhibit)

3. 3333 Susan Street - Onsite Sewer Capacity Study

Pipe Capacity per CMSD requirements

18" or smaller – flowing $\frac{1}{2}$ full – d/D max = 0.5

21" or larger – flowing 3/4 full – d/D max = 0.75

Ex Onsite 8" Sewer Lateral to MH #103755

8" Sewer @ S=0.020 Design d/D = 0.50

Existing Lateral Existing Flows = 0.000 cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 0.0 in Existing (8") 0/8 = 0.000

<u>Proposed Building A</u> Proposed Project Flows = 0.306 cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 2.5 in Proposed (8") d/D = 2.5/8= 0.313 < 0.5 (ok)

Ex Onsite 8" Sewer to MH #103781

8" Sewer @ S=0.020 Design d/D = 0.50

Existing Building "C" Existing Flows = 0.212 cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 2.1 in Existing (8") d/D = 2.1/8 = 0.263

<u>Proposed Building B</u> Proposed Project Flows = 0.335cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 2.6 in Proposed (8") d/D = 2.6/8 = 0.325 < 0.5 (ok)

Ex Onsite 8" Sewer to MH #103774

8" Sewer @ S=0.020 Design d/D = 0.5

<u>Existing Buildings: "A" & "B"</u> Existing Flows = 0.212 cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 2.1 in Existing (8") d/D = 2.1/8 = 0.263

<u>Proposed Building C</u> Proposed Project Flows = 0.376cfs; d in 8" per flowmaster = 2.7 in Proposed (8") d/D = 2.7/8 = 0.338 < 0.5 (ok)



4. Offsite Sewer Capacity Study (CMSD - 15")

MH #119775 to MH #103713 (15")

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Flows = 0.075cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 1.8/15 = 0.120 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #103713 to MH #103755 (15")

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Project Flows = 0.075cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 1.8/15 = 0.120 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #103755 to MH #103781

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Project Flows = 0.381 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 3.8/15 = 0.253< 0.5 (ok)

MH #103781 to MH #119801

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.212 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 2.9/15 = 0.193

Proposed Project Flows = 0.716 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 5.2/15 = 0.347 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #119801 to MH #103774

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.379 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 3.8/15 = 0.253

Proposed Project Flows = 0.883 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 5.8/15 = 0.389 < 0.5 (ok)



<u>Segments MH #103774 to MH #103773 and MH #103773 to MH#103869</u>

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.591 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 4.8/15 = 0.320

Proposed Project Flows = 1.259 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 7.1/15 = 0.473 < 0.5 (ok)

FIELD MONITORING RESULTS COMPARISON WITH ESTIMATES

5. Actual Field Flow Monitoring Results (Per Appendix 5)

<u>MH #119797</u>

Existing maximum flow (monitored) = 0.147 cfs (0.095 mgd) Calculated existing flow = 143 DU x 300 gpd x 2.5 = 107,250 gpd or 0.167 cfs (see Appendix 2) Use conservative **0.167 cfs** in analysis

MH #103869

Existing maximum flow (monitored) = 0.213 cfs (0.138 mgd) Calculated existing flow = 0.591 cfs (see Offsite Sewer Capacity Study above) Use conservative **0.591 cfs** in analysis

Summary: Field Monitored flows are less than conservative estimates, therefore consider the more conservative flow values shown on the estimated sewer generation & sewer capacity study.



Supporting Documents

APPENDIX 1

SUPPORTING MAPS AND PLANS

- ASSESSOR MAP
- CMSD SEWER SYSTEM MAPS
- EXISTING SEWER IMPROVEMENT PLANS
- PROPOSED SITE PLAN & UNIT MIX

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED FOR ORANGE COUNTY ASSESSOR DEPT. PURPOSES ONLY. THE ASSESSOR MAKES NO GUARANTEE AS TO ITS ACCURACY NOR ASSUMES ANY LIABILITY FOR OTHER USES. NOT TO BE REPRODUCED. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. © COPYRIGHT ORANGE COUNTY ASSESSOR 2022

2

BL

RBOR

DETAIL "B"

S

SUSAN

7.228

1 " = 200'

1.862

(96)

15.493m (50.83')~

2.134m (7')---

12.125m (39.78')

0.232 AC. (95

2.134m (7')

6.065m (19.90')

4.539m (14.89')

(92)



PARCEL MAP P.M. 125-5, 127-13, 139-21, 149-29 P.M. 194-13, 284-7, 305-6 PARCEL MAP

NOTE - ASSESSOR'S BLOCK & PARCEL NUMBERS SHOWN IN CIRCLES

ASSESSOR'S MAP BOOK 140 PAGE 04 COUNTY OF ORANGE

MARCH 1962

Costa Mesa Sanitary District Sewer System



Costa Mesa Sanitary District Sewer System

f y 🗞











						PA-	02-	34
E	GRADING	CHECK	NO.	G	02-	000	16	

C202





Project: EMULEX

3333 Susan Street Costa Mesa, California

Prepared for: Emulex 3535 Harbor Blvd. Costa Mesa, CA 92626

42 HELLMUTH, OBATA + KASSAB UM, INC lo hŧk CHITECTURE, ENGINEERING, PLANNING 9530 Jefferson Boulevard Volce: 310 838 9555 Fax: 310 838 9586 All reproduction & intellectual property rights reserved a 2003 In association with: RBF CONSULTING 14725 Alton Parkeray Irvine, CA 92618 T 949.472.3493 F 949.472.8122 Landscape Melendrsz Design Partners The Ovict Building 617 South Olive Street - \$1110 Los Angeles, CA 90014 T 213.673.4400 F 213.673.4410 Structural Engineer Bradow & Johnston Associates 2001 S.W. Brink Street, §100 Neeport Beach, CA 82860 Mechanical & Plumbing Engineers Tsuchymo & Kalna 17877 Ven Karmon Awnus, Suite 100 hvine, CA 92814 T 949.476.8319 F 949.955.0794 T 949.756.0565 F 949.756.0927 Electrical Engineer FBA Engineering Concuting Engin 3420 Irvine Avenue, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92680-3189 T 949.852.9995 F 949.852.1657 Specifications Bob Cloud, AM/CSI 1048 Pine Street Santa Monico, CA 90405 T 310.314.7540 F 310.314.7540

7/16/02 SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVISED 7/18/02 PLANNING SUBMITTAL 8/30/02 0/11/02 et11/13/0 Plancheck Resubmittal #2 12/4/02 Drawn by: TJ Reviewed by: BK Project No: 02-0193-00 Sheet Titles: SEWER AND WATER PLAN

riginal drawing is 36° x 48°. Scale	entities accordingly if reduced
LANCHECK SUBMITTAL	- SHELL PACKAGE
Sheet Number:	C301

PRECISE GRADING CHECK NO. G 02- 00016

- - COSTA MESA SANITARY DISTRICT APP'D FOR CONNECTION TO EXISTING SEWER IN SUSAN STREET PA- 02- 34

	CONSTRUCTION NOTES AND ESTIMATED QUANTITIES
×	NOTE: QUANTITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE FOR PERMIT PURPOSES ONLY. EACH CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS OWN CALCULATIONS AND BID A COMPLETE JOB.
	SEWER (50) INSTALL 8" VCP SEWER MAIN (TYP.) WITH BEDDING PER CMSD STD DWG S-112 3825 L.F.
	(51) CONSTRUCT 48" MANHOLE PER CMSD STD DWG S-100 17 EA.
	53 INSTALL 6" VCP SEWER LATERAL PER CMSD STD DWG S-104-A 3046 L.F.
	(54) INSTALL CLEANOUT PER CMSD STD DWG S-107 9 EA.
	WATER
	(60) INSTALL 8" PVC CL 150 C900 AWWA WATER LINE (WHITE) 5042 L.F. [1]
	MCWD STD DWGS. NO 1, 3 & 7METERS 83 EA.
	62 INSTALL STANDARD FIRE HYDRANT PER MCWD STD DWG NO 4 (CLOW W/BREAK-OFF
	(63) INSTALL 1" COPPER SERVICE ASSEMBLY PER MESA CONSOLIDATED WATER DISTRICT
	STD DWGS. NO 1,3 & 23 WITH 5/8" METER & BOX (FOR POOL AREA BATHROOM) 1 EA.
	65 INSTALL 8" FLG. D.I. TEE 9 EA.
	(66) INSTALL 8" PUSH-ON D.I. 45 DEGREE BEND
	68 CONSTRUCT 2" COPPER SERVICE ASSEMBLY & 2"METER PER MESA CONSOLIDATED WATER DISTRICT
	69 INSTALL 8" x 8" x 6" PUSH-ON x FLG. D.I. TEE 15 EA.
	70 INSTALL 8" PUSH-ON D.I. 11¼ DEGREE BEND 1 EA. (71) INSTALL 6" PUSH-ON D.I. 45 DEGREE BEND 1 EA.
	(2) CONSTRUCT 2 " COPPER SERVICE ASSEMBLY WITH 2" METER PER MCWD
	(74) INSTALL 8" PUSH-ON D.I. COUPLING
	76 INSTALL 6" PVC CL 150 C900 AWWA WATER LINE (WHITE) 230 L.F. 77 INSTALL 6" FLO
	79 PROTECT EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT IN PLACE N/A
	84 INSTALL 6" LATERAL PER MCWD STD DWG 6 45 L.F.
	(87) INSTALL 3" COPPER SERVICE ASSEMBLY PER MESA CONSOLIDATED WATER
	DISTRICT STD DWG NO 1&3 WITH 1" METER & BOX (38 GPM) 60 EA.
	(89) INSTALL 5 PVC CL 150 C900 AWWA WATER LINE (WHITE) 2859 LF 2859 LF 1 EA.
	OFFSITE WATER
	B CONSTRUCT THRUST BLOCK PER MCWD STD. 12 1 EA.
	C RELOCATE EXISTING 12" WATERLINE PER MCWD STD. 25 40 L.F.
	P.L. LATERAL LENGTH
	FER SEWER LATERAL TABLE
	No la
: 7	FL ELEV
	NO. 2 SLOPE
	6" LATERAL
	CASE C 8" SEWER MAIN
	VARIES
	H H
	FL ELEV
	(0.08 ABOVE MAIN INV.)
	L (FOR CASE B)
	P PER SEWER LATERAL TABLE
	1.41'
	CASE A 1/8" BEND
	SLOPE 6" LATERAL
	-8" SEWER MAIN
	FL ELEV FL ELEV
	NO. 1
	FOR DEEP
	SEWER MAIN (10-12 FT, DEEP)
	OR CROSSING OVER STORM DRAIN
	SEWER LATERAL F.L. DETAIL
	N.I.S. I SEE CMSD STD. DWG S-104-A AND
	TABLE ON THIS SHEET FOR COMPLETE DETAILS
	NO. DATE DESCRIPTION APP. 1/2 4/3/03 REVISED STREET NAMES, REVISED CASE, SEWER LATERALS LOTS 23 & 24

5-2003



LOT NO.	SEWER LA	T. TION	SEWER FLOWLINE ON TI	LATERAL SEE DETAIL HIS SHEET	SLOPE	LAT. LENGTH	BEARING IF NOT RADIAL OR PERP.	LOT NO.	SEWER SEWER S
		CASE	ELEV. I	ELEV. Z				-	<u> </u>
UNIT	65 1+54.25	CASE C	21.86	27.50	.9400	6.00		UNIT	46 2+58.5
UNIT	66 1+74.67	CASE C	22.51	27.30	.7983	6.00		UNIT	47 1+56.2
UNIT	67 1+95.58	CASE C	23.18	27.20	.6700	6.00		UNIT	48 1+76.7
UNIT	68 2+16.33	CASE C	23.84	27.00	.5267	6.00		UNIT	49 1+97.6
UNIT	69 2+37.17	CASE C	24.51	26.90	.3983	6.00		UNIT	50 2+18.2
UNIT	70 2+57.58	CASE C	25.16	26.80	.2733	6.00		UNIT	51 2+39.1
UNIT	71 1+56.25	CASE A	25.86	27.40	.0928	18.00		UNIT	52 2+59.5
UNIT	72 1+76.67	CASE A	25.97	27.50	.0922	18.00		UNIT	53 1+54.2
UNIT	73 1+97.58	CASE A	26.08	27.40	.0796	18.00		UNIT	54 1+74.6
UNIT	74 2+18.25	CASE A	26.18	27.30	.0675	18.00		UNIT	55 1+95.5
UNIT	75 2+39.17	CASE A	26.29	27.20	.0549	18.00		UNIT	56 2+16.3
UNIT	76 2+59.58	CASE A	26.40	27.10	.0422	18.00		UNIT	57 2+37.1
UNIT	77 1+54.25	CASE C	25.06	27.40	.3900	6.00		UNIT	58 2+57.5
UNIT	78 1+74.67	CASE C	25.17	27.60	.4067	6.00		UNIT	59 1+56.2
UNIT	79 1+95.54	CASE C	25.28	27.40	.3533	6.00		UNIT	60 1+76.7
UNIT	80 2+16.33	CASE C	25.39	27.30	.3183	6.00		UNIT	61 1+97.6
UNIT	81 2+37.17	CASE C	25.49	27.30	.3017	6.00		UNIT	62 2+18.2
UNIT	82 2+57.58	CASE C	25.60	27.20	.2667	6.00		UNIT	63 2+39.1
UNIT	83 2+78.34	CASE C	25.71	27.10	.2333	6.00		UNIT	64 2+59.5
									T





.







NORRIS-REPKE, INC. Consulting Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors			7-27-95 7-31-95 8-9-99	ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION ITEMS AND CONS REVISED PIPE CURVE DATA ELIMINATE RIGHT TURN POCKET INCREAGE
600 N. TUSTIN AVENUE SUITE 250 SANTA ANA CA. 92705-3736 TEL. (714) 973-2230	PROFESSION AND SNOS			35' & JOIN EX. E.P.
FAX. (714) 973-2263	No. C44642 men 3/31/98 ★			
RANDALL G. BERRY, RCE 44642 DATE	COF CALLS	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION




NORRIS-REPKE, INC. Consulting Civil Engineers and Lond Surveyors			7-27-95	BEDDING AND BACKFILL NOTE
SANTA ANA CA. 92705-3736	S			
FAX. (714) 973-2253	HEVIS			
MANPALL Q. BENTY, NGE 11912 PATE		NQ.	DATE	



			1				
25.00'	3 9.61'	25.35'					
2.00'	6.28'			STREE	T_CURVE		
25.00'	38.87'	24.61'	CURVE	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH	TANGENT
815.00'	411.21'	210.08'	C9	06"16'08"	847.00'	92.67'	46.38'
853.00'	113.31'	56.74'	C10	87'17'30"	25.00'	38.09'	23.85'
857.00'	281.41'	141.99'	C11	93'07'13"	25.00'	40.63'	26.40'
885.00'	451.04'	230.53'	C12	32'09'03"	850.00'	477.00'	245.00'
843.00'	257.07'	129.54'	C13	01'01'38"	850.00'	15.2 4 '	7.62'
84	3.00 ¹	431.04 13.00' 257.07'	431.04 230.53 13.00' 257.07' 129.54'	33.00 431.04 230.53 C12 13.00' 257.07' 129.54' C13	33.00 431.04 230.53 C12 32'09'03" 13.00' 257.07' 129.54' C13 01'01'38"	33.00 451.04 230.53 C12 32'09'03" 850.00' 13.00' 257.07' 129.54' C13 01'01'38" 850.00'	33.00 451.04 230.53' C12 32'09'03'' 850.00' 477.00' 13.00' 257.07' 129.54' C13 01'01'38'' 850.00' 15.24'

•

		-
33 SEWE 90 CONSTRUC JOINTS. 02 CONSTRUC JOINTS. 03 CONSTRUC JOINTS. 03 CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC JOINTS. CONSTRUC DISTRICT BEDDING BEDDING BEDDING BEDDING BEDDING BEDDING BEDDING CONSTRUC CONST	R CONSTRUCTION N CT 15" VCP EXTRA STRENGTH SEWER CT 8" VCP EXTRA STRENGTH SEWER W CT MANHOLE PER CMSD STD. NO. S-1 & BACKFILL SHALL BE PER COSTA MI STD. DRAWING NO. S-112 A: STANDARD REQUIREMENT B: 3/4" CRUSHED GRAVEL COSTA MESA STD. DRAWING NO.	OTES WITH COMPRESSION TH COMPRESSION 00 ESA SANITARY 813.
28 J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J		
MATCHLINE 9+		
	·	
PLAN AND PROFILE FOR THE SEWER IMPRO SUSAN STREET FROM STA 15452.79 TO STA 20450.00	AS-BUILT: 1/ ISSUE DATE: 8/14	9/96 4/95 SHEET 12
CITY OF COSTA ME DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING SER	ESA VICES	OF 21 SHEETS PLAN NUMBER

S	US	-S	T5	.DW	1
S	US	-S	T5	.D₩	1



SUS-SHT4.DWG

	HIVE LIVE		
PROJECT INFORMATION	A 1,050-UNIT PROJECT CONSIS SEPARATE 5-STORY MULTIFAMI BUILDINGS WITH ONE BUIDLING DECK AND A MIXED-USE COMPO AN ART GALLERY, RETAIL, AND	TING OF THREE LY RESIDENTIAL G CONTAINING A ROOF DNENT, INCLUDING A PUBLIC PLAZA.	
PROJECT ADDRESS	3333 S SUSAN ST., COSTA MESA, CA 92626		
ZONING DISTRICT			
EXISTING	PDI - PLANNED DEVELOPM	IENT INDUSTRIAL	
PROPOSED	PLANNED DEVELOPMENT COMMERCIAL		
LAND USE			
EXISTING	INDUSTRIAL P	ARK	
PROPOSED	URBAN CENTRAL CO	MMERCIAL	
GROSS LOT AREA	620,804 SQ.FT.	14.3 AC	
GROSS BUILDING AREA	1,874,917 SQ.FT.		
SITE COVERAGE	336,579 SQ.FT.		
FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR)*	2.3		
TOTAL UNITS	1,050 DU		
DENSITY	73.7 DU/AC		

	П	F
	J	

TOTAL UNITS	315 UNITS
TOTAL ACRES	4.68 AC
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DENSITY	67.3 DU/AC
RESIDENTIAL GFA	382,617 SF
NON-RESIDENTIAL GFA	3,692 SF
PARKING GFA	210,020 SF
FAR	1.89

BUILDING A UNIT SUMMARY

2 BR	1,078	99	31%
J 2 BR	938	21	7%
1 BR	772	128	41%
J 1 BR	633	26	8%
STUDIO	778	41	13%
UNITS	AREA (SQ. FT.)	NO. OF UNITS	%

*EXCLUDES PARKING STRUCTURES

RESIDENTIAL SUMMARY					
UNITS	AREA (SQ. FT.)	NO. OF UNITS	%		
STUDIO	778	141	13%		
J 1 BR	633	115	11%		
1 BR	772	447	43%		
J 2 BR	938	21	2%		
2 BR	1,078	326	31%		
TOTAL	AVG. 856	1,050	100%		

RETAIL SUMMAR	RY
RETAIL	3,692 SF
BLDG A RETAIL	3,692 SF

UNITS	NO. OF UNITS	PARKING RATIO	TOTAL PARKING
STUDIO	41	1.65	68
J 1 BR	26	1.65	43
1 BR	128	1.65	211
J 2 BR	21	1.65	35
2 BR	99	1.65	163
USPS STALL	N/A	N/A	1
TOTAL	315	RATIO: 1.65	521

BUILDING A RETAIL SUMMARY

RETAIL	AREA

PARKING PROVIDED (1 STAL

DING A SUMMARY

BUILDING A PARKING SUMMARY

	3,692 SQ.FT.
LL PER 250 SQ.FT.)	15 STALLS

BUILDING B SUMMARY			
TOTAL UNITS	346 UNITS		
TOTAL ACRES	4.44 AC		
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DENSITY	77.9 DU/AC		
RESIDENTIAL GFA	388,293 SF		
PARKING GFA	216,794 SF		
FAR	2.01		

BUILDING B UNIT SUMMARY				
UNITS	AREA (SQ. FT.)	NO. OF UNITS	%	
STUDIO	778	57	16%	
J 1 BR	633	51	15%	
1 BR	772	135	39%	
J 2 BR	938	0	0%	
2 BR	1,078	103	30%	
TOTAL	AVG. 844	346	100%	

BUILDING B PARKING SUMMARY			BUILI	DING C PAR	KING SUM	<i>I</i> ARY	
UNITS	NO. OF UNITS	PARKING RATIO	TOTAL PARKING	UNITS	NO. OF UNITS	PARKING RATIO	TOTAL PARKING
STUDIO	57	1.65	94	STUDIO	43	1.65	71
J 1 BR	51	1.65	84	J 1 BR	38	1.65	63
1 BR	135	1.65	223	1 BR	184	1.65	304
J 2 BR	0	1.65	0	J 2 BR	0	1.65	0
2 BR	103	1.65	170	2 BR	124	1.65	205
USPS STALL	N/A	N/A	1	USPS STALL	N/A	N/A	1
TOTAL	346	RATIO: 1.65	572	TOTAL	389	RATIO: 1.65	643

BUIL	DING	C	SUN	/MARY

TOTAL UNITS	389 UNITS
TOTAL ACRES	5.13 AC
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING DENSITY	75.8 DU/AC
RESIDENTIAL GFA	441,005 SF
PARKING GFA	232,496 SF
FAR	1.97

	BUILDING C UNIT SUMMARY			
%	UNITS	AREA (SQ. FT.)	NO. OF UNITS	%
16%	STUDIO	778	43	11%
15%	J 1 BR	633	38	10%
39%	1 BR	772	184	47%
0%	J 2 BR	938	0	0%
30%	2 BR	1,078	124	32%
100%	TOTAL	AVG. 857	389	100%

PROJECT SUMMARY

- LEASING & AMENITIES
- RESIDENTIAL
- PARKING
- PROPERTY LINE
- — EASEMENT
- ---- SETBACK

- ------ SITE CURB
- TRANSFORMERS

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

|

|

| 150′

APPENDIX 2

SEWER ANALYSIS EXHIBITS (EXISTING AND PROPOSED)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL 3 OF PARCEL MAP 94–120, IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP FILED IN THE BOOK 284, PAGES 7 TO 10 INCLUSIVE OF PARCEL MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO GRANTOR, ITS SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT TO GRANT AND TRANSFER ALL OR A PORTION OF THE SAME, ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND WATER, WATER RIGHTS, OIL, OIL RIGHTS, MINERALS, MINERAL RIGHTS, NATURAL GAS, NATURAL GAS RIGHTS AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS BY WHATSOEVER NAME KNOWN AND ALL RIGHTS THEREIN, GEOTHERMAL STEAM, AND ALL PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM ANY OF THE FOREGOING, THAT MAY BE WITHIN OR UNDER THE PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH THE PERPETUAL RIGHT OF DRILLING, PUMPING, MINING, EXTRACTING, EXPLORING AND OPERATING THEREFOR AND STORING IN AND REMOVING THE SAME FROM THE PROPERTY OR ANY OTHER PROPERTY, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO WHIPSTOCK OR DIRECTIONALLY DRILL, PUMP AND MINE FROM PROPERTY OTHER THAN THE PROPERTY, WATER, OIL OR GAS WELLS, TUNNELS AND SHAFTS INTO, THROUGH OR ACROSS THE SUBSURFACE OF THE PROPERTY, AND TO BOTTOM SUCH WHIPSTOCKED OR DIRECTIONALLY DRILLED WELLS, TUNNELS AND SHAFTS UNDER AND BENEATH OR BEYOND THE EXTERIOR LIMITS THEREOF, AND TO REDRILL, RETUNNEL, EQUIP, MAINTAIN, REPAIR, DEEPEN AND OPERATE ANY SUCH WELLS, TUNNELS OR SHAFTS; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT IN NO EVENT SHALL GRANTOR OR ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS HAVE THE RIGHT TO DRILL, PUMP, MINE OR EXCAVATE THROUGH THE SURFACE OR UPPER 200 FEET OF THE SUBSURFACE OF THE PROPERTY, AS RESERVED IN THE GRANT DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 5, 2004 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2004000089551 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

APN: 140-041-81

<u>GENERAL NOTES</u>

RECORDS.

RECORDS.

20020341461 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

1.) THE BASIS OF THE MAP IS THE AMENDED PRELIMINARY REPORT PREPARED BY FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE COMPANY. ORDER NO. 997–23059368–A–JV1, REPORT DATE: AUGUST 6, 2015, AMENDED: AUGUST 18, 2015.

TITLE TO SAID ESTATE OR INTEREST AT THE DATE HEREOF VESTED IN: - EMULEX DESIGN & MANUFACTURING CORPORATION, A DELAWARE CORPORATION

THE ESTATE OF INTEREST IN THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO COVERED BY THIS REPORT IS: - FEE

NO RESPONSIBILITY AS TO THE ACCURACY OF THE TITLE INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT IS ASSUMED BY THIS MAP.

2.) GEOGRAPHICALLY LOCATABLE ITEMS FROM SAID REPORT (SUCH AS EASEMENTS) WHICH AFFECT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ARE SHOWN ON THIS MAP WITH A $\langle \#
angle$ AND ARE NUMERICALLY KEYED TO SAID REPORT.

AT THE DATE HEREOF EXCEPTIONS TO COVERAGE IN ADDITION TO THE PRINTED EXCEPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS IN SAID REPORT WOULD BE AS FOLLOWS: ITEMS A THROUGH C REFER TO TAXES.

ITEM 1 REFERS TO WATER RIGHTS, CLAIMS OR TITLE TO WATER, WHETHER OR NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS. ITEM $\langle 2 \rangle$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR SEWER PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 7 OF ORANGE COUNTY, RECORDED NOVEMBER 10, 1966 IN BOOK 8101, PAGE 439 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM $\overline{3}$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR RAILROAD PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, RECORDED OCTOBER 24, 1967 IN BOOK 8414, PAGE 129 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. ITEM $\overline{4}$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR RAILROAD PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, RECORDED OCTOBER 11, 1973 IN BOOK 10940, PAGE 559 OF OFFICIAL

ITEM $\langle 5 \rangle$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED AUGUST 2, 1999 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 19990561798 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 6 REFERS A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR HOME RANCH, DATED MARCH 20, 2002 BY AND BETWEEN CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C. J. SEGERSTROM & SONS, SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES LLC AND HENRY T. SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES LLC, FOR THE TERM AND UPON THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS THEREIN PROVIDED, RECORDED MARCH 20, 2002 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 20020229863, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

SAID MATTER WAS PARTIALLY ASSIGNED TO EMULEX CORPORATION, A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, BY PARTIAL ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, RECORDED FEBRUARY 05, 2004 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2004000089554, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 7 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY SERVICE AND IRREVOCABLE CONSENT TO ANNEXATION" EXECUTED BY AND BETWEEN COSTA MESA SANITARY DISTRICT AND SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES, LLC, RECORDED APRIL 24, 2002 AS INSTRUMENT NO.

ITEM $\langle 8 \rangle$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR STREET AND HIGHWAY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, RECORDED APRIL 3, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000368842 OF OFFICIAL

ITEM 9 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT FOR PRIVATE STORM DRAIN LATERAL CONNECTION" EXECUTED BY THE CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C.J. SEGERSTROM &

SONS, RECORDED MAY 16, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000564591.

ITEM 10 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "MAINTENANCE AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT FOR PRIVATE STORM DRAIN" EXECUTED BY THE CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C.J. SEGERSTROM & SONS, RECORDED MAY 16, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000564592 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. ITEM (1) REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED SEPTEMBER 24, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001171879 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

(1A) REFERS TO THE ALTERNATE LOCATION OF THE ELECTRICAL EASEMENT IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001171879 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS BASED UPON THE APPARENT INTENT OF THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION IN THE RECORDED DOCUMENT WHICH ALSO MORE CLOSELY AGREES WITH THE EXISTING ELECTRICAL FACILITIES.

ITEM (12) REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PIPELINE PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF MESA CONSOLIDATED WATER DISTRICT, RECORDED DECEMBER 12, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001476872 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 13 MATTERS WHICH MAY BE DISCLOSED BY AN INSPECTION AND/OR BY A CORRECT ALTA/ACSM LAND TITLE SURVEY OF SAID LAND THAT IS SATISFACTORY TO THE COMPANY, AND/OR BY INQUIRY OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION THEREOF. ITEM 14 REFERS TO RIGHTS OF PARTIES IN POSSESSION.

ITEM 15 REFERS TO A NOTE THAT THE TITLE COMPANY'S SEARCH DID NOT DISCLOSE ANY OPEN DEEDS OF TRUST OF RECORD.

3) THE LOCATION OF THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE OBTAINED FROM THE ALTA SURVEY DATED JANUARY 26, 2004.
4) THERE IS NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF CURRENT EARTH MOVING WORK, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OR BUILDING ADDITIONS

5) THERE IS NO OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE OF SITE USE AS A SOLID WASTE DUMP, SUMP OR SANITARY LANDFILL.

6) PER EMAIL (RECEIVED ON 9/1/2015) FROM CRISTINA OQUENDO, CITY OF COSTA MESA ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN II, THERE ARE NO RIGHT-OF-WAY CHANGES ANTICIPATED BY PUBLIC SERVICES. AS OF THE DATE OF THIS SURVEY, THERE IS NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF RECENT STREET OR SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION. FOR MORE INFORMATION: CONTACT: CRISTINA OQUENDO (714) 754 - 5015

CRISTINA.OQUENDO@COSTAMESACA.GOV CITY OF COSTA MESA 77 FAIR DRIVE, COSTA MESA, CA 92626

7) THE DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON RELATIVE TO EACH OBJECT OF CULTURE (I.E. MANHOLE, STREET LIGHT, ETC.) ARE BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE AND THE EDGE OF THAT OBJECT CLOSEST TO THE PROPERTY LINE. VARIOUS LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION FEATURES EXIST IN THE VICINITY OF THE NORTHERLY, EASTERLY, AND SOUTHERLY PROPERTY BOUNDARIES. SPECIFIC LOCATIONS FOR THESE INCIDENTAL FEATURES ARE OMITTED HEREON.

LAND AREA

THE SUBJECT PROPERTY CONTAINS: 14.152 ACRES +/- NET (14.252 ACRES +/- GROSS)

EXISTING CONDITIONS SEWER ANALYSIS EXHIBIT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL 3 OF PARCEL MAP 94–120, IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP FILED IN THE BOOK 284, PAGES 7 TO 10 INCLUSIVE OF PARCEL MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

EXCEPTING AND RESERVING UNTO GRANTOR, ITS SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT TO GRANT AND TRANSFER ALL OR A PORTION OF THE SAME, ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND WATER, WATER RIGHTS, OIL, OIL RIGHTS, MINERALS, MINERAL RIGHTS, NATURAL GAS, NATURAL GAS RIGHTS AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS BY WHATSOEVER NAME KNOWN AND ALL RIGHTS THEREIN, GEOTHERMAL STEAM, AND ALL PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM ANY OF THE FOREGOING, THAT MAY BE WITHIN OR UNDER THE PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH THE PERPETUAL RIGHT OF DRILLING, PUMPING, MINING, EXTRACTING, EXPLORING AND OPERATING THEREFOR AND STORING IN AND REMOVING THE SAME FROM THE PROPERTY OR ANY OTHER PROPERTY, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO WHIPSTOCK OR DIRECTIONALLY DRILL, PUMP AND MINE FROM PROPERTY OTHER THAN THE PROPERTY, WATER, OIL OR GAS WELLS, TUNNELS AND SHAFTS INTO, THROUGH OR ACROSS THE SUBSURFACE OF THE PROPERTY, AND TO BOTTOM SUCH WHIPSTOCKED OR DIRECTIONALLY DRILLED WELLS, TUNNELS AND SHAFTS UNDER AND BENEATH OR BEYOND THE EXTERIOR LIMITS THEREOF, AND TO REDRILL, RETUNNEL, EQUIP, MAINTAIN, REPAIR, DEEPEN AND OPERATE ANY SUCH WELLS, TUNNELS OR SHAFTS; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT IN NO EVENT SHALL GRANTOR OR ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS HAVE THE RIGHT TO DRILL, PUMP, MINE OR EXCAVATE THROUGH THE SURFACE OR UPPER 200 FEET OF THE SUBSURFACE OF THE PROPERTY, AS RESERVED IN THE GRANT DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 5, 2004 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2004000089551 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

APN: 140-041-81

<u>GENERAL NOTES</u>

RECORDS.

1.) THE BASIS OF THE MAP IS THE AMENDED PRELIMINARY REPORT PREPARED BY FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE COMPANY. ORDER NO. 997–23059368–A–JV1, REPORT DATE: AUGUST 6, 2015, AMENDED: AUGUST 18, 2015.

TITLE TO SAID ESTATE OR INTEREST AT THE DATE HEREOF VESTED IN: - EMULEX DESIGN & MANUFACTURING CORPORATION, A DELAWARE CORPORATION

THE ESTATE OF INTEREST IN THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO COVERED BY THIS REPORT IS: - FEE

NO RESPONSIBILITY AS TO THE ACCURACY OF THE TITLE INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT IS ASSUMED BY THIS MAP.

2.) GEOGRAPHICALLY LOCATABLE ITEMS FROM SAID REPORT (SUCH AS EASEMENTS) WHICH AFFECT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ARE SHOWN ON THIS MAP WITH A $\langle \#
angle$ AND ARE NUMERICALLY KEYED TO SAID REPORT.

AT THE DATE HEREOF EXCEPTIONS TO COVERAGE IN ADDITION TO THE PRINTED EXCEPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS IN SAID REPORT WOULD BE AS FOLLOWS: ITEMS A THROUGH C REFER TO TAXES.

ITEM 1 REFERS TO WATER RIGHTS, CLAIMS OR TITLE TO WATER, WHETHER OR NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS. ITEM $\langle 2 \rangle$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR SEWER PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 7 OF ORANGE COUNTY, RECORDED NOVEMBER 10, 1966 IN BOOK 8101, PAGE 439 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM $\overline{3}$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR RAILROAD PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, RECORDED OCTOBER 24, 1967 IN BOOK 8414, PAGE 129 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. ITEM $\overline{4}$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR RAILROAD PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, RECORDED OCTOBER 11, 1973 IN BOOK 10940, PAGE 559 OF OFFICIAL

RECORDS. ITEM $\langle 5 \rangle$ REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED AUGUST 2, 1999 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 19990561798 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 6 REFERS A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR HOME RANCH, DATED MARCH 20, 2002 BY AND BETWEEN CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C. J. SEGERSTROM & SONS, SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES LLC AND HENRY T. SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES LLC, FOR THE TERM AND UPON THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS THEREIN PROVIDED, RECORDED MARCH 20, 2002 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 20020229863, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

SAID MATTER WAS PARTIALLY ASSIGNED TO EMULEX CORPORATION, A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, BY PARTIAL ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, RECORDED FEBRUARY 05, 2004 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2004000089554, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 7 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY SERVICE AND IRREVOCABLE CONSENT TO ANNEXATION" EXECUTED BY AND BETWEEN COSTA MESA SANITARY DISTRICT AND SEGERSTROM PROPERTIES, LLC, RECORDED APRIL 24, 2002 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 20020341461 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 8 REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR STREET AND HIGHWAY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, RECORDED APRIL 3, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000368842 OF OFFICIAL

ITEM 9 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT FOR PRIVATE STORM DRAIN LATERAL CONNECTION" EXECUTED BY THE CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C.J. SEGERSTROM &

SONS, RECORDED MAY 16, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000564591.

ITEM 10 REFERS TO A DOCUMENT ENTITLED "MAINTENANCE AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT FOR PRIVATE STORM DRAIN" EXECUTED BY THE CITY OF COSTA MESA AND C.J. SEGERSTROM & SONS, RECORDED MAY 16, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003000564592 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. ITEM (11) REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED SEPTEMBER 24, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001171879 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

(1A) REFERS TO THE ALTERNATE LOCATION OF THE ELECTRICAL EASEMENT IN FAVOR OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, RECORDED AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001171879 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS BASED UPON THE APPARENT INTENT OF THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION IN THE RECORDED DOCUMENT WHICH ALSO MORE CLOSELY AGREES WITH THE EXISTING ELECTRICAL FACILITIES.

ITEM (12) REFERS TO AN EASEMENT FOR PIPELINE PURPOSES IN FAVOR OF MESA CONSOLIDATED WATER DISTRICT, RECORDED DECEMBER 12, 2003 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2003001476872 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ITEM 13 MATTERS WHICH MAY BE DISCLOSED BY AN INSPECTION AND/OR BY A CORRECT ALTA/ACSM LAND TITLE SURVEY OF SAID LAND THAT IS SATISFACTORY TO THE COMPANY, AND/OR BY INQUIRY OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION THEREOF. ITEM 14 REFERS TO RIGHTS OF PARTIES IN POSSESSION.

ITEM 15 REFERS TO A NOTE THAT THE TITLE COMPANY'S SEARCH DID NOT DISCLOSE ANY OPEN DEEDS OF TRUST OF RECORD.

3) THE LOCATION OF THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE OBTAINED FROM THE ALTA SURVEY DATED JANUARY 26, 2004.
4) THERE IS NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF CURRENT EARTH MOVING WORK, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OR BUILDING ADDITIONS

5) THERE IS NO OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE OF SITE USE AS A SOLID WASTE DUMP, SUMP OR SANITARY LANDFILL. 6) PER EMAIL(RECEIVED ON 9/1/2015) FROM CRISTINA OQUENDO. CITY OF COSTA MESA ENGINEERING

TÉCHNICIAN II, THERE ARE NO RIGHT-OF-WAY CHANGES ANTICIPATED BY PUBLIC SERVICES. AS OF THE DATE OF THIS SURVEY, THERE IS NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF RECENT STREET OR SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION. FOR MORE INFORMATION: CONTACT: CRISTINA OQUENDO (714) 754 - 5015

CRISTINA.OQUENDO@COSTAMESACA.GOV CITY OF COSTA MESA 77 FAIR DRIVE, COSTA MESA, CA 92626

7) THE DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON RELATIVE TO EACH OBJECT OF CULTURE (I.E. MANHOLE, STREET LIGHT, ETC.) ARE BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE AND THE EDGE OF THAT OBJECT CLOSEST TO THE PROPERTY LINE. VARIOUS LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION FEATURES EXIST IN THE VICINITY OF THE NORTHERLY, EASTERLY, AND SOUTHERLY PROPERTY BOUNDARIES. SPECIFIC LOCATIONS FOR THESE INCIDENTAL FEATURES ARE OMITTED HEREON.

<u>LAND AREA</u>

THE SUBJECT PROPERTY CONTAINS: 14.152 ACRES +/- NET (14.252 ACRES +/- GROSS)

PROPOSED CONDITIONS SEWER ANALYSIS EXHIBIT

APPENDIX 3

DESIGN CRITERIA

- CMSD SEWER DESIGN REQUIREMENTS
- LA COUNTY SEWER GENERATION FACTORS

STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SANITARY SEWERS

COSTA MESA SANITARY DISTRICT ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SECTION 2 - DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

2-1 Design Criteria

- (a) Minimum Size The minimum size for sewer mains shall be 8" and for laterals 6".
- (b) Sewer Slope Minimum pipeline slopes shall be:

Pipe Size (Mains)	Grade
8 inch	0.40%
10 inch	0.28%
12 inch	0.22%
15 inch	0.16%
18 inch	0.12%
6 inch (laterals)	2.0 %

(c) Pipe Capacity - Pipelines shall be designed to carry estimated peak flow as follows:

```
18" or smaller - flowing 1/2 full
21" or larger - flowing 3/4 full
```

- (d) Manholes Manhole construction is required at the following locations:
 - (1) at changes of slope
 - (2) at changes of direction
 - (3) at changes of pipe size
 - (4) at junction of laterals larger than 6 inches
 - (5) at intervals not exceeding 350 feet
 - (6) at termination of sewer mains
 - (7) at special locations as designated by the District Engineer

Elevation drop through manholes shall be 0.10 foot minimum.

2018 LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Estimated Average Daily Sewage Flows for Various Occupancies

Occupancy	Abbreviation		*Average daily flow
Apartment Buildings:			
Bachelor or Single dwelling units	Apt	150	gal/D.U.
1 bedroom dwelling units	Apt	200	gal/D.U.
2 bedroom dwelling units	Apt	250	gal/D.U.
3 bedroom or more dwelling units	Apt	300	gal/D.U.
Auditoriums, churches, etc.	Aud	5	gal/seat
Automobile parking	Р	25	gal/1000 sq ft gross floor area
Bars, cocktails lounges, etc.	Bar	20	gal/seat
Commercial Shops & Stores	CS	100	gal/1000 sq ft gross floor area
Hospitals (surgical)	HS	500	gal/bed
Hospitals (convalescent)	HC	85	gal/bed
Hotels	Н	150	gal/room
Medical Buildings	MB	300	gal/1000 sq ft gross floor area
Motels	MB	150	gal/unit
Office Buildings	Off	200	gal/1000 sq ft gross floor area
Restaurants, cafeterias, etc.	R	50	gal/seat
Schools:			
Elementary or Jr. High	S	10	gal/student
High Schools	HS	15	gal/student
Universities or Colleges	U	20	gal/student
College Dormitories	CD	85	gal/student

*Multiply the average daily flow by 2.5 to obtain the peak flow

Zoning Coefficients

Zone	Coefficient (cfs/Acre)
Agriculture	0.001
Residential*:	
R-1	0.004
R-2	0.008
R-3	0.012
R-4	0.016*
Commercial:	
C-1 through C-4	0.015*
Heavy Industrial:	
M-1 through M-4	0.021*

* Individual building, commercial or industrial plant capacities shall be the determining factor when they exceed the coefficients shown

* Use 0.001 (cfs/unit) for condominiums only

PER 1ST PLAN CHECK COMMENT, USE 5,000 GPD/AC FOR EX 9.7-ACRE PARKING LOT FOR AUTOMOBILE CLUB EAST OF SUSAN STREET

APPENDIX 4

HYDRAULIC CALCULATIONS (FLOWMASTER)

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Diameter	8.0 in	
Discharge	0.31 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	2.5 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.8 ft	
Hvdraulic Radius	1.4 in	
Top Width	0.61 ft	
Critical Depth	3.1 in	
Percent Full	30.7 %	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity	3.36 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.18 ft	
Specific Energy	0.38 ft	
Froude Number	1.542	
Maximum Discharge	1.71 cfs	
Discharge Full	1.57 cfs	
Slope Full	0.001 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Supercritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Denth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 m	
Number Of Steps	0.0 10	
	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	30.7 %	
Downstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Normal Depth	2.5 in	
Critical Depth	3.1 in	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	

Prop lateral to MH 103755

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Friction Method Kutter Formula Solve For Normal Depth Input Data Roughness Coefficient Roughness Coefficient 0.013 Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Discharge 0.21 cfs Results Results Normal Depth 2.1 in Flow Area 0.1 ft ² Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.00 ft Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Input Data 0.00 ft Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss<	Project Description		
Formula Solve For Normal Depth Input Data Roughness Coefficient Roughness Coefficient 0.013 Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Discharge 0.21 cfs Results Normal Depth Normal Depth 2.1 in Flow Area 0.1 ft² Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 ft Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.00 ft Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Description N/A Profile Description N/A Profile Description	Friction Method	Kutter	
Solve For Normal Depth Input Data 0.013 Roughness Coefficient 0.013 Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Diameter 8.0 in Discharge 0.21 cfs Results Image: Comparison of the state		Formula	
Input Data Roughness Coefficient 0.013 Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Diameter 8.0 in Discharge 0.21 cfs Results	Solve For	Normal Depth	
Roughness Coefficient 0.013 Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Diameter 8.0 in Discharge 0.21 cfs Results	Input Data		
Channel Slope 0.020 ft/ft Discharge 0.21 cfs Results	Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Diameter 8.0 in Discharge 0.21 cfs Results	Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Discharge 0.21 cfs Results	Diameter	8.0 in	
Results Normal Depth 2.1 in Flow Area 0.1 ft ² Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Stope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Cutput Data Upstream Depth Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.57 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s <t< td=""><td>Discharge</td><td>0.21 cfs</td><td></td></t<>	Discharge	0.21 cfs	
Normal Depth2.1 inFlow Area 0.1 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7% Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input Data 0.0 in Length 0.0 in Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 25.7% Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth Over Rise 25.7% Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth 2.1 in Critical Death 2.5 in	Results		
Flow Area 0.1 ft^2 Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7% Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataDownstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 in Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 25.7% Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth 2.1 in Critical Death 2.5 in	Normal Depth	2.1 in	
Wetted Perimeter 0.7 ft Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 in Length 0.0 in Length 0.0 if Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity	Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Hydraulic Radius 1.2 in Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 ft Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Deeth 2.5 in	Wetted Perimeter	0.7 ft	
Top Width 0.58 ft Critical Depth 2.5 in Percent Full 25.7% Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataDownstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output DataUpstream Depth 0.0 in Profile DescriptionN/AProfile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 25.7% Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.1 in	Hydraulic Radius	1.2 in	
Critical Depth2.5 inPercent Full25.7 %Critical Slope0.008 ft/ftVelocity2.98 ft/sVelocity Head0.14 ftSpecific Energy0.31 ftFroude Number1.507Maximum Discharge1.71 cfsDischarge Full1.57 cfsSlope Full0.000 ft/ftFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input Data0.0 inLength0.0 ftNumber Of Steps0GVF Output Data0.0 inUpstream Depth0.0 inNormal Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise2.5.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Top Width	0.58 ft	
Percent Full 25.7 % Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.57 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.1 in	Critical Depth	2.5 in	
Critical Slope 0.008 ft/ft Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.1 in	Percent Full	25.7 %	
Velocity 2.98 ft/s Velocity Head 0.14 ft Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Death 2.5 in	Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity Head0.14 ftSpecific Energy0.31 ftFroude Number1.507Maximum Discharge1.71 cfsDischarge Full1.57 cfsSlope Full0.000 ft/ftFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataGVF Input DataGVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.0 inLength0.0 inProfile DescriptionN/AProfile Headloss0.00 ftAverage End Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.1 in	Velocity	2.98 ft/s	
Specific Energy 0.31 ft Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s	Velocity Head	0.14 ft	
Froude Number 1.507 Maximum Discharge 1.71 cfs Discharge Full 1.57 cfs Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Opstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Average Ind Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	Specific Energy	0.31 ft	
Maximum Discharge1.71 cfsDischarge Full1.57 cfsSlope Full0.000 ft/ftFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataDownstream Depth0.0 inLength0.0 ftNumber Of Steps0GVF Output DataGVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.0 inProfile DescriptionN/AProfile Headloss0.00 ftAverage End Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Froude Number	1.507	
Discharge Full1.57 cfsSlope Full0.000 ft/ftFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input Data0.0 inLength0.0 ftNumber Of Steps0GVF Output Data00 ftUpstream Depth0.0 inProfile DescriptionN/AProfile Headloss0.00 ftNormal Depth Over Rise0.00 ftNormal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sOwnstream Velocity2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Maximum Discharge	1.71 cfs	
Slope Full 0.000 ft/ft Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s	Discharge Full	1.57 cfs	
Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.0 in Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Ormal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
GVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0 Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Vpstream Velocity 1.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	Flow Type	Supercritical	
Downstream Depth 0.0 in Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Opstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Average Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	GVF Input Data		
Length 0.0 ft Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Ownstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Vesteram Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Denth 2.5 in	Length	0.0 ft	
GVF Output Data Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Ormal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	Number Of Steps	0	
Upstream Depth 0.0 in Profile Description N/A Profile Headloss 0.00 ft Average End Depth Over Rise 0.0 % Normal Depth Over Rise 25.7 % Downstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 2.5 in	GVF Output Data		
OpsitionN/AProfile DescriptionN/AProfile Headloss0.00 ftAverage End Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Linstream Denth	0.0 in	
Profile Headloss0.00 ftAverage End Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Profile Description	0.0 III NI/A	
Average End Depth Over Rise0.0 %Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Profile Headloss		
Normal Depth Over Rise25.7 %Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Average End Depth Over Dise		
Downstream VelocityInfinity ft/sUpstream VelocityInfinity ft/sNormal Depth2.1 inCritical Depth2.5 in	Normal Depth Over Pice	0.0 /0 25 7 %	
Upstream Velocity Infinity ft/s Normal Depth 2.1 in Critical Depth 25 in	Downstream Velocity	Lo.7 70	
Normal Depth 2.1 in	Linstream Velocity	Infinity ft/c	
Critical Denth 2.5 in	Normal Depth	2 1 in	
	Critical Depth	2.1 III 2 5 in	
Channel Slone 0.020 ft/ft	Channel Slone	۲.5 m ۵ ۵۶۵ ۴ /۴	
Critical Slope 0.020 ft/ft	Critical Slope	0.020 ft/ft	

Ex lateral to MH 103781

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Eriction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Diameter	8.0 in	
Discharge	0.34 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	2.6 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.8 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.4 in	
Top Width	0.62 ft	
Critical Depth	3.2 in	
Percent Full	32.1 %	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity	3.46 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.19 ft	
Specific Energy	0.40 ft	
Froude Number	1.546	
Maximum Discharge	1.71 cfs	
Discharge Full	1.57 cfs	
Slope Full	0.001 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Supercritical	
GVE Input Data		
Downstroom Donth	0.0 in	
Longth	0.0 11	
Length Number Of Stops	0.0 10	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	32.1 %	
Downstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Normal Depth	2.6 in	
Critical Depth	3.2 in	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	

Prop lateral to MH 103781

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Diameter	8.0 in	
Discharge	0.21 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	2.1 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.7 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.2 in	
Top Width	0.58 ft	
Critical Depth	2.5 in	
Percent Full	25.7 %	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity	2.98 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.14 ft	
Specific Energy	0.31 ft	
Froude Number	1.507	
Maximum Discharge	1.71 cfs	
Discharge Full	1.57 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Supercritical	
GVE Input Data		
	0.0 ;=	
Downstream Deptn	0.0 lh	
Length	0.0 π	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	25.7 %	
Downstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Normal Depth	2.1 in	
Critical Depth	2.5 in	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	

Ex lateral to MH 103774

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Diameter	8.0 in	
Discharge	0.38 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	2.7 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.8 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.5 in	
Top Width	0.63 ft	
Critical Depth	3.4 in	
Percent Full	34.0 %	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity	3.59 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.20 ft	
Specific Energy	0.43 ft	
Froude Number	1.554	
Maximum Discharge	1.71 cfs	
Discharge Full	1.57 cfs	
Slope Full	0.001 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Supercritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	, 0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	34.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	Infinity ft/s	
Normal Depth	2.7 in	
Critical Depth	3.4 in	
Channel Slope	0.020 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	

Prop lateral to MH 103774

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.08 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	1.8 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.9 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.1 in	
Top Width	0.81 ft	
Critical Depth	1.3 in	
Percent Full	12.1 %	
Critical Slope	0.010 ft/ft	
Velocity	0.89 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.01 ft	
Specific Energy	0.16 ft	
Froude Number	0.488	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVE Input Data		
Devereture are Death	0.0 i=	
Downstream Depth	0.0 IN	
Length	0.0 π	
Number Of Steps	U	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	1.8 in	
Critical Depth	1.3 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.010 ft/ft	

Prop Segment MH119775-103713

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.08 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	1.8 in	
Flow Area	0.1 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	0.9 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.1 in	
Top Width	0.81 ft	
Critical Depth	1.3 in	
Percent Full	12.1 %	
Critical Slope	0.010 ft/ft	
Velocity	0.89 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.01 ft	
Specific Energy	0.16 ft	
Froude Number	0.488	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	1.8 in	
Critical Depth	1.3 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.010 ft/ft	

Prop Segment MH103713-103755

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.38 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	3.8 in	
Flow Area	0.2 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.3 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	2.2 in	
Top Width	1.09 ft	
Critical Depth	2.9 in	
Percent Full	25.6 %	
Critical Slope	0.007 ft/ft	
Velocity	1.54 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.04 ft	
Specific Energy	0.36 ft	
Froude Number	0.568	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	3.8 in	
Critical Depth	2.9 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.007 ft/ft	

Prop Segment MH103755-103781

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
Cabua Far	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depun	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.21 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	2.9 in	
Flow Area	0.2 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.1 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	1.8 in	
Top Width	0.99 ft	
Critical Depth	2.1 in	
Percent Full	19.4 %	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	
Velocity	1.27 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.03 ft	
Specific Energy	0.27 ft	
Froude Number	0.544	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	2.9 in	
Critical Depth	2.1 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.008 ft/ft	

Ex Segment MH103781-119801

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
Calva Far	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.72 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	5.2 in	
Flow Area	0.4 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.6 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	2.9 in	
Top Width	1.19 ft	
Critical Depth	4.0 in	
Percent Full	34.9 %	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	
Velocity	1.87 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.05 ft	
Specific Energy	0.49 ft	
Froude Number	0.584	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	5.2 in	
Critical Depth	4.0 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	

Prop Segment MH103781-119801

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
Cable Far	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.38 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	3.8 in	
Flow Area	0.2 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.3 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	2.2 in	
Top Width	1.09 ft	
Critical Depth	2.9 in	
Percent Full	25.5 %	
Critical Slope	0.007 ft/ft	
Velocity	1.53 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.04 ft	
Specific Energy	0.36 ft	
Froude Number	0.568	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Unstream Denth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	3.8 in	
Critical Depth	2.9 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.007 ft/ft	

Ex Segment MH119801-103774

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.88 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	5.8 in	
Flow Area	0.4 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.7 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	3.1 in	
Top Width	1.22 ft	
Critical Depth	4.4 in	
Percent Full	38.9 %	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	
Velocity	2.00 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.06 ft	
Specific Energy	0.55 ft	
Froude Number	0.584	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
, Normal Depth	5.8 in	
Critical Depth	4.4 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	

Prop Segment MH119801-103774

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	0.59 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	4.8 in	
Flow Area	0.3 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1.5 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	2.7 in	
Top Width	1 16 ft	
Critical Depth	3.6 in	
Percent Full	31.7 %	
Critical Slope	0 006 ft/ft	
Velocity	1 77 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.05 ft	
Specific Eperav	0.05 ft	
Froude Number	0.581	
Maximum Discharge	3 04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	, 0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	4.8 in	
Critical Depth	3.6 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	

Ex Segment MH103774-103773-103869

424-028 Sewer Capacity Flow Calculations.fm8 4/8/2024

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Prop Segment MH103774-103773-103869

Project Description		
Friction Method	Kutter	
	Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Diameter	15.0 in	
Discharge	1.26 cfs	
Results		
Normal Depth	7 1 in	
Flow Area	0.6 ft ²	
Wetted Perimeter	1 9 ft	
Hydraulic Radius	2.5 IL 2.6 in	
Top Width	1 25 ft	
Critical Depth	5.3 in	
Percent Full	47 1 %	
Critical Slope	0,006 ft/ft	
Velocity	2 21 ft/s	
Velocity Head	0.08 ft	
Specific Epergy	0.00 ft	
Froude Number	0.578	
Maximum Discharge	3.04 cfs	
Discharge Full	2.80 cfs	
Slope Full	0.000 ft/ft	
Flow Type	Subcritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.0 in	
Length	0.0 ft	
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.0 in	
Profile Description	N/A	
Profile Headloss	0.00 ft	
Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Normal Depth Over Rise	0.0 %	
Downstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Upstream Velocity	0.00 ft/s	
Normal Depth	7.1 in	
Critical Depth	5.3 in	
Channel Slope	0.002 ft/ft	
Critical Slope	0.006 ft/ft	

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 27 Siemon Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

APPENDIX 5

FIELD SEWER MONITORING RESULTS

Methods & Procedures & Equipment

Methods and Procedures

Utility Systems Science & Software provided Fuscoe Engineering with an off the shelf, nonproprietary flow monitoring solution that included two state of the art Hach Flo-Dar® AV Sensor systems. The project course of action is listed below. The US³ team:

- Assessed permitting and traffic control at the sites in Costa Mesa, CA.
- Prepared the traffic control plan and obtained a City Encroachment Permit.
- Installed and removed traffic control in accord with approved traffic control plans per/site-specific California Temporary Traffic Control Handbook (CATTCH) requirements for the installation, calibration and removal of equipment.
- Validated the sites for suitability for sewer flow monitoring for the Hive Live Project.
 - The Sunflower manhole (MH) 103869 had pipes entering from the east, south and west with slow open channel hydraulics and some turbulence due to inflow from laterals. Monitoring began on the downstream line to obtain total flow.
 - The Via Luca MH 119797 had pipes entering from the north & south with slow to moderate open channel hydraulics and some turbulence due to inflow from lateral. Monitoring began on the downstream line to obtain total flow.
- Installed and calibrated the flow monitoring equipment at the sites per manufacturer recommendations on 02/23/2024.
 - Follow-up on the installations confirmed equipment was reading properly.
 - Collected 15-minute interval depth and velocity data points over the entire monitoring period.
- Removed the equipment on 03/11/2024 and validated the data.
 - All of the equipment went through diagnostic testing before and after the study with less than a 1% deviation between manual and meter level readings and less than a 5% deviation between manual and meter velocity readings.
 - Equipment calibration was verified in accordance with manufacturer specifications.
- Prepared the data reports.
 - The table below contains a summary of the average (Avg) and maximum (Max) velocities (Vel) and levels (Lev) collected during this study as well as the calculated flow rates (Flow) and depth versus diameter ratios (d/D).

МН	Pipe Size (in)	Avg Vel (fps)	Max Vel (fps)	Avg Lev (in)	Max Lev (in)	Avg Flow (gpm)	Max Flow (gpm)	Avg d/D	Max d/D
103869	15	0.86	1.33	2.69	3.16	57.20	95.91	0.18	0.21
119797	8	2.22	2.81	1.13	1.66	30.42	66.18	0.14	0.21

Equipment

Figure above: Equipment installed for the Sewer Flow Monitoring Study

Figure above: Web-Enabled Flo-Dar® AV Sensor, Radar-Based Velocity/Area Flow Meter

FloDar® AV Sensor Specifications:

- Enclosure
 - IP68 Waterproof rating, Polystyrene
- Dimensions
 - 160.5 W x 432.2 L x 297 D mm (6.32 x 16.66 x 11.7 in.),
 - With SVS, D = 387 mm (15.2 in.)
- Weight
 - 4.8 kg (10.5 lbs.)
- Operating Temperature
 - -10 to 50°C (14 to 122°F)
- Storage Temperature
 - -40 to 60°C (-40 to 140°F)
- Power Requirements
 - Supplied by FL900 Flow Logger, Flo-Logger, or Flo-Station
- Interconnecting Cable
 - o Disconnect available at both sensor and logger or Flo-Station
 - o Polyurethane, 0.400 (±0.015) in. diameter; IP68
 - Standard length 9 m (30 ft), maximum 305 m (1000 ft)
- Cables available in two styles:
 - connectors at both ends
 - connector from sensor with open leads to desiccant hub, desiccant hub with connector to logger. A potting/sealant kit will be included. This can be used to run the cable through conduit.
- Certification
 - o Certified to: FCC Part 15.245: FCC ID: VIC-FLODAR24
 - o Industry Canada Spec. RSS210. v7: IC No.: 6149A-FLODAR24

SURCHARGE DEPTH MEASUREMENT

- \circ Auto zero function maintains zero error below 0.5 cm (0.2 in.)
- Method
 - o Piezo-resistive pressure transducer with stainless steel diaphragm
- Range
 - \circ $\,$ 3.5 m (138 in.), overpressure rating 2.5 x full scale $\,$

VELOCITY MEASUREMENT

- Method
 - o Radar
- Range
 - 0.23 to 6.10 m/s (0.75 to 20 ft/s)

- Frequency Range
 - o 24.075 to 24.175 GHz, 15.2 mW (max.)
- Accuracy
 - ±0.5%; ±0.03 m/s (±0.1 ft/s)

DEPTH MEASUREMENT

- Method
 - o Ultrasonic
- Standard Operating Range from Flo-Dar® Housing to Liquid
 - o 0 to 152.4 cm (0 to 60 in.)
- Optional Extended Level Operating Range from Transducer Face to Liquid
 - o 0 to 6.1 m (0 to 20 ft.) with 43.18 cm (17 in.) dead band, temperature compensated.
- Accuracy
 - ±1%; ±0.25 cm (±0.1 in.)

FLOW MEASUREMENT

- Method
 - Based on Continuity Equation
- Accuracy
 - ±5% of reading typical where flow is in a channel with uniform flow conditions and is not surcharged, ±1% full scale max.

SURCHARGE CONDITIONS DEPTH/VELOCITY DEPTH (Std with Flo-Dar® Sensor)

• Surcharge depth supplied by Flo-Dar® sensor.

VELOCITY (Optional Surcharge Velocity Sensor)

- Method
 - Electromagnetic
- Range
 - ±4.8 m/s (±16 ft/s)
- Accuracy
 - \circ ±0.15 ft/s or 4% of reading, whichever is greater.
- Zero Stability
 - ±0.05 ft/s

The Flo-Dar® Open Channel Flow Meters provide an innovative approach to open channel flow monitoring. Combining digital Doppler radar velocity sensing with ultrasonic pulse echo level sensing Flo-Dar® provides accurate open channel flow monitoring without the fouling problems associated with submerged sensors.

Perfect Solution for Difficult Flow Conditions:

- Flows with High Solids Content
- High Temperature Flows
- Caustic Flows
- Large Man-Made Channel
- High Velocities
- Shallow Flows

Benefits:

- 1. Personnel have no contact with the flow during installation.
- 2. Maintenance caused by sensor fouling is eliminated
- 3. Field Replaceable/Interchangeable Sensors and Monitors

How It Works

Flo-Dar® transmits a digital Doppler radar beam that interacts with the fluid and reflects back signals at a different frequency than that which was transmitted. These reflected signals are compared with the transmitted frequency. The resulting frequency shift provides an accurate measure of the velocity and the direction of the flow. Level is detected by ultrasonic pulse echo. Flow is then calculated based on the Continuity Equation:

$$Q = V \times A$$
, Where $Q = Flow$, $V = Average$ Velocity and $A = Area$

Accurate Flow Measurements

Flo-Dar® provides the user with highly accurate flow measurements under a wide range of flows and site conditions. By measuring the velocity of the fluid from above, Flo-Dar® eliminates accuracy problems inherent with submerged sensors including sensor disturbances, high solids content and distribution of reflectors.

Figure above: US³ utilizes exclusively Hach March-McBirney Flo-Dar® Meters

US³ Company Information

*US*³ is a California Corporation **Federal ID No. 33-0729605** and qualifies as a Minority Business Enterprise. US³ has certified as an MBE with the California Public Utility Commission's authorized clearinghouse, **Verification Number: 97ES0008**.

US³ is a specialty service company for the Water & Waste Water industry, providing monitoring and control for Utilities since 1996. US³ is in the forefront of this industry by taking the proven technological approaches developed in other high-tech industries and applying them to protect one of our most precious natural resources - our water.

US³ engineers and technical personnel have applied advanced instrumentation system technology to water/wastewater open channel flow monitoring, pipeline evaluation, engineering, and data analysis, all coupled to the power of the Internet. This unique integrated systems approach allows the company to bring greater insight and intelligence to gathering information about water/wastewater system performance of our clients, and in turn, to support the fulfillment of their commitments to manage and cost effectively design, operate, and maintain these systems.

Moreover, **US**³ supports Municipalities, Consulting Engineering firms and other water/waste water systems integrators by providing temporary technical services for engineering, software programming and technical site maintenance and calibration site support work, primarily in the Water and Waste Water industries.



Figure at right: All US³ technicians are certified for Confined Space Entry.



Key Personnel Assigned

US³ provided the necessary resources to fully implement this project. Primary in support of this effort were the following personnel:

Mr. Mark Serres: Mr. Serres is a degreed electrical engineer with over 25 years of experience with fresh/wastewater systems, project management, and systems integration in relation to complex industrial systems. This includes experience in industrial automation and water/wastewater industries. Mr. Serres is responsible for assuring client satisfaction and marshalling the required resources to meet the project requirements.

Mr. Thomas Williams: Mr. Williams is an Engineering Manager with over 20 years of experience in complex systems development for wastewater monitoring. This experience includes hydraulic compatibility, instrumentation, communications and analysis. Mr. Williams is responsible for assuring that the required equipment is designed and calibrated to meet the project requirements.

Darlene Szczublewski, PE: Mrs. Szczublewski is a licensed Civil Engineer in multiple states. She has over 15 years of engineering experience with stormwater/wastewater related projects. She assisted in the completion of several Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Surveys and Capacity Analysis projects to meet Consent Decrees as well as completing numerous Infiltration and Inflow (I&I) studies for other clients. Mrs. Szczublewski has developed numerous flow data analysis techniques to present a clear informative picture of flow in a monitored system. Her work also includes the development of training programs for clients describing I&I and capacity analysis methodologies. Mrs. Szczublewski is responsible for analyzing the data as well as the data collection process and assuring that the reports meet the project requirements.

Name, title, address and telephone number of persons to contact regarding this US³ project.

Darlene Szczublewski, PE

Senior Civil Engineer darlene.szczublewski@uscubed.com

> 1300 Hill Street El Cajon, CA 92020 619-546-4281 (work) 619-246-5304 (cell)

Tom Williams

Engineering Manager tom.williams@uscubed.com

> 1300 Hill Street El Cajon, CA 92020 619-546-4281 (work) 619-398-7799 (cell)





3/13/2024

Site Report Confidential Proprietary Information

Fuscoe			MH at	~1313 W. Sunf	lower Ave
				Costa Mesa,	CA 92626
2024.02 Sunflower MH				MH	# 103869
Access:	Sani	System Type	rm	Install Date: 2	/23/2024
WITHINED CUID lane, NW OF address	Garn				
Мар			Flov	/ Meter	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Meter Dept	h: 161.4"		
		MH Coordinates: 33.695646, -117.912475			
		Slow open channel hydraulics with some turbulence due to inflow from laterals & bend in trough.			
W Santhewer Ave W Santhewer Ave	tlower Ave	Avg Velocity	Avg Measured	l Level	Multiplier
N CENTRAL CONTRAL CONT		0.9 fps	2.7"		1.0
	The second	Gas			
Cite Material Cite Matterial Cite Material Cite Material	-	O2	H2S	СО	LEL
	1 1-11	20.9	0	0	0
			N	otes	
		Pipes enter downstrear	ring from eas n line to get	t, south & west total flow.	; monitored
			Traffi	c Safety	
		Used arrowboard, cones & signs in accord w/approved TCP per site-specific CATTCH requirements.			
		Land Use			
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Trunk
		Х			
		Manhole D	epth	183"	
Location		Monitored	Pipe Size	15"	
		Inner Pipe Size (In/Out)		15"/15"	
		Pipe Shape	e	Round	
МН #103869	See.	Pipe Condition		Fair	
		Manhole Material		Lined	
		Silt		None observed	
		Velocity Profile Data		Passed	
		Velocity Profile Taken		0.4 2-D	
Din Mar		Sensor Offset		21.6"	
		Sensor Dist. to Crown 6.6"		6.6"	
		Sensor Dire	ection	Downstream	



Meter Site Document

2024.02 Sunflower MH

MH at ~1313 W. Sunflower Ave

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Site



Manhole Before Install



Installation Process







Upstream







Temporary Flow Study

Fuscoe

2024.02 Sunflower MH

Meter Start D	ate	From	2/23/2024
Meter Stop D	ate	То	3/11/2024
Veloci	ty (fps)	Level (in)	Flow (mgd)
Average	0.864	2.686	0.082
Maximum	1.330	3.160	0.138
Minimum	0.520	2.220	0.043
Pipe Size		15.000	
Estimated Ca	pacity (mgd)	Not Calculated	
Capacity Use	d	Not Calculated	
Sensor Type		Hach - Flodar	

Utility Systems, Science and Software

1300 Hill St El Cajon, CA 92020

601 N. Parkcenter Dr, Suite 209 Santa Ana, CA 92705





3/13/2024

Fuscoe			Ν	/IH at ~3366 Ct	e Levanto	
				Costa Mesa,	CA 92626	
2024.02 Via Luca MH				MH	# 119797	
Access: MH located south of address within intersection in gated community	System Type: Sanitary X Storm		Install Date: 2/23/2024			
Мар			Flow	v Meter		
		Meter Depth: 145.3"				
		MH Coordinates: 33.694411, -117.912664				
		Slow to moderate open channel hydraulics with some turbulence due to inflow from lateral.				
		Avg Velocity	Avg Measured	l Level	Multiplier	
the support of the second s	- L+ - +	2.2 fps	1.1"		1.0	
	and a		(Gas		
Berger Lander Human	A G P LO	O2	H2S	со	LEL	
		20.9	0	0	0	
			N	otes		
		Pipes enter downstream	th & south; mor total flow.	nitored		
	[Traffic Safety				
		Used arrowboard, cones & signs in accord w/site- specific CATTCH requirements.				
		Land Use				
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Trunk	
		X				
		Manhole Depth		161"	161"	
		Monitored Pipe Size		8"		
Sewer Map		Inner Pipe S	Size (In/Out)	8"/8"		
1977 1977		Pipe Shape		Round		
	T	Pipe Condition		Fair		
	pe Line Surge 1007GU	Manhole Material		Concrete		
	andr Pape Linne andr Pape Linne and Rate Linne and Rate Linne and	Silt		None observed		
		Velocity Profile Data		Passed		
		Velocity Profile Taken		0.4 2-D		
		Sensor Offset		15.7"		
		Sensor Dist. to Crown		<u> /./"</u>		
2/ 1/2 Construction of Control Sector and Construction	internation of the	Sensor Direction				
			ny	west		



Meter Site Document

2024.02 Via Luca MH

MH at ~3366 Cte Levanto

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Site



Manhole Before Install



Installation Process

Installed





Upstream





Temporary Flow Study

Fuscoe

2024.02 Via Luca MH

Meter Start D	ate	From	2/23/2024
Meter Stop D	ate	То	3/11/2024
Veloci	ty (fps)	Level (in)	Flow (mgd)
Average	2.225	1.129	0.044
Maximum	2.810	1.660	0.095
Minimum	1.780	0.790	0.023
Pipe Size		8.000	
Estimated Ca	pacity (mgd)	Not Calculated	
Capacity Use	d	Not Calculated	
Sensor Type		Hach - Flodar	

Utility Systems, Science and Software

1300 Hill St El Cajon, CA 92020

601 N. Parkcenter Dr, Suite 209 Santa Ana, CA 92705















2/23/2024 thru 3/11/2024



3/13/2024 11:31:38 AM













2/23/2024 thru 3/11/2024



3/13/2024 11:44:49 AM



IRVINE SAN DIEGO ONTARIO LOS ANGELES

4. Offsite Sewer Capacity Study (CMSD - 15")

MH #119775 to MH #103713 (15")

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Flows = 0.075cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 1.8/15 = 0.120 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #103713 to MH #103755 (15")

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Project Flows = 0.075cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 1.8/15 = 0.120 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #103755 to MH #103781

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.0 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 0/15 = 0.0

Proposed Project Flows = 0.380 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 3.8/15 = 0.253< 0.5 (ok)

MH #103781 to MH #119801

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.212 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 2.9/15 = 0.193

Proposed Project Flows = 0.715 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 5.2/15 = 0.347 < 0.5 (ok)

MH #119801 to MH #103774

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.379 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 3.8/15 = 0.253

Proposed Project Flows = 0.882 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 5.8/15 = 0.389 < 0.5 (ok)



IRVINE SAN DIEGO ONTARIO LOS ANGELES

Segments MH #103774 to MH #103773 and MH #103773 to MH#103869

15" Sewer segment @ S=0.0020

Existing Flows = 0.591 cfs Existing (15") d/D = 4.8/15 = 0.320

Proposed Project Flows = 1.258 cfs Proposed (15") d/D = 7.1/15 = 0.473 < 0.5 (ok)

FIELD MONITORING RESULTS COMPARISON WITH ESTIMATES

5. Actual Field Flow Monitoring Results (Per Appendix 5)

<u>MH #119797</u>

Existing maximum flow (monitored) = 0.147 cfs (0.095 mgd) Calculated existing flow = 143 DU x 300 gpd x 2.5 = 107,250 gpd or 0.167 cfs (see Appendix 2) Use conservative **0.167 cfs** in analysis

<u>MH #103869</u>

Existing maximum flow (monitored) = 0.213 cfs (0.138 mgd) Calculated existing flow = 0.591 cfs (see Offsite Sewer Capacity Study above) Use conservative **0.591 cfs** in analysis

Summary: Field Monitored flows are less than conservative estimates, therefore consider the more conservative flow values shown on the estimated sewer generation & sewer capacity study.



May 15, 2024

Legacy Partner 5141 California Avenue, Suite 100 Irvine, CA 92617

Proposed Hive Live Development at 3333 Susan Street : CMSD Will Serve Sewer Letter

The Costa Mesa Sanitary District (District) is the local sewer agency that provides sanitary sewer service to the subject property. You have requested a Sewer Will Serve letter, from the District, for the proposed development mentioned above. The proposed development consists of 3 apartment structures with 1050 total residential units within the existing 13.8-acre site.

Your consultant, FUSCOE Engineering, conducted a flow analysis and estimates the sewage demand for the proposed development at 656,250 gallons per day (gpd), as provided in the Sewer Capacity Analysis Memorandum, dated April 2024. That Study was transmitted via a FUSCO Engineering email, dated May 8, 2024, from Youngsuk Lim to Mark Esquer, District Engineer. The estimated flows will be 30% from Building A, 33% from Building B, and 37% from Building C.

The District requested architectural drawings and plumbing plans but have been told the designs, plans, and layouts are not currently available because your company is still performing due-diligence before moving forward with design or building project. The District will provide this Sewer Will-Serve letter and accept flows from your proposed development, provided the following conditions and requirements are met:

- 1. Sewer flows from the proposed development do not exceed 656,250 gpd; and
- 2. The proposed development density does not exceed three (3) apartment buildings, comprising not more than 1050 total units; and
- 3. The Developer and/or property owner applies for a permit, submits the required building designs, grading plans, and sewer plans, pays the appropriate sewer fees, and is issued a sewer permit. The sewer permit fees will be based on the final development plans and fixture counts; and

290 Paularino Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92626 • (949) 645-8400 • fax: (714) 540-1392 "Protecting public health and the environment for current and future generations."

Board of Directors Robert Ooten Michael Scheafer Arlene Schafer Arthur Perry Brett Eckles

Staff

Scott C. Carroll General Manager

Harper & Burns, LLP District Counsel

> Davis Farr, LLP District Treasurer

Mark Esquer District Engineer

Noelani Middenway District Clerk & Public Information Officer

> Kaitlin Tran *Finance Manager*

Dyana Bojarski Administrative Services Manager

Steve Cano Wastewater Maintenance Superintendent

www.cmsdca.gov

- 4. Any public sewer and/or sewer connections designed, build, and conveyed to the District are minimum, an 8" SDR 26 PVC or clay pipe, meet District requirements, and connects to the existing public 15-inch sewer in Susan Street at two (2), possibly three (3), existing locations.; and
- 5. Should the Developer or property owner propose public mainline sewer on private property and desire to turn the mainline sewer over to the District for ownership, operations, and maintenance, the proposed public sewer must be built within a 20-foot easement that is conveyed to the District and accessible by the District vacuum trucks or other equipment.; and
- 6. Compliance with California Plumbing Code and District ordinance, regulations, and requirements.
- 7. Should commercial, or other development types be included in your proposed project, such as food service establishments, those developments must be included within the estimated project flows and the appropriate sewer permits acquired for those development types.
- 8. You must obtain a Sewer Will-Serve Letter from Adrian Siew, Engineer, OC Sanitation, at 714.593.7064.

This letter constitutes a CMSD "Will Serve" and commitment to provide sewer service for this project provided all conditions and requirements are met. This "Will Serve" letter will expire three (3) years from the date of this letter. If a sewer permit application hasn't been submitted within the three-year period, a new sewer service request (aka Sewer Will Serve Letter Request with updated information) must be submitted to the District for consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Esquer, P.E. District Engineer

cc. Jason Castro/FUSCOE Engineering Adrian Siew, OC San Planning Div. Engineer Noelani Middenway, CMSD Clerk of the Board District Legal Counsel Mike Benesh, RBH & Associates Permits

> 290 Paularino Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92626 • (949) 645-8400 • fax: (714) 540-1392



Dedicated to Satisfying our Community's Water Needs

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Shawn Dewane President Division V

Marice H. DePasquale Vice President Division III

> **Jim Atkinson** Director Division IV

Fred R. Bockmiller, P.E. Director Division I

> James R. Fisler Director Division II

Paul E. Shoenberger, P.E. General Manager

> **Denise Garcia** District Secretary

Marwan Khalifa, CPA, MBA District Treasurer

> Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo Legal Counsel

1965 Placentia Avenue Costa Mesa, CA 92627 tel 949.631.1200 fax 949.574.1036 info@MesaWater.org MesaWater.org August 13, 2024

Winnie Woo, Environmental Associate Michael Baker International 5 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 500 Santa Ana, CA 92707

Subject: C0510-24-01: 3333 Susan Street (Costa Mesa Hive Live) Water Services Questionnaire

Attn Ms. Woo:

Per the email from August 1, 2024, Michael Baker International (MBI) is supporting the City of Costa Mesa in preparing an environmental impact report for the Costa Mesa Hive Live Project (Development), located at 3333 Susan Street in the City of Costa Mesa. MBI has requested Mesa Water District to respond to the following questions on Mesa Water District letterhead and provide a map, if necessary. It was requested that in our response, provide as much information as possible (necessary to evaluate potential impacts).

1. Please list and describe existing water facilities serving the proposed project site/area (i.e., square footage of facility, number of volumes, etc.). Are these facilities currently adequate?

Response: The water facilities serving the proposed project site/area will be those facilities listed in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, Section 3.2.2. Water Facilities. Due to security concerns the square footage of the facility, volume, location and other specific detail is not shared with the general public. The water supply characterization can be found in Section 6.0 of the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan.

2. Are there any planned additions to existing facilities?

Response: A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) was prepared in July 2024 for the Costa Mesa Hive Live project. Based on the demand methodologies presented in Section 2 of the WSA, the projected Maximum Day Demand (MDD) provided for the proposed Development is approximately 366 AFY. Based on the supply vs demand Tables 20 through 26 in Section 5 of the WSA, Mesa Water can expect to meet future demands for all climate conditions through 2045, including the proposed Development. Based on the WSA conclusion, no planned additions to existing facilities to supply water to the Development are required. During the Plan Check process, Mesa Water District will determine any infrastructure upgrades that would be required.

3. How are water service needs/standards determined (i.e., volumes, population)?

Response: In the WSA, Section 4 discusses Water Demand Projections with and without the Development and in Section 5 discusses Water Supply versus Demand Analysis with and without the Development. In both analyses population is utilized by sectors (single family residential, multi-family residential, Institutional/Governmental, Commercial, Industrial and Landscape Irrigation was utilized.



Dedicated to Satisfying our Community's Water Needs

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Shawn Dewane President Division V

Marice H. DePasquale Vice President Division III

> **Jim Atkinson** Director Division IV

Fred R. Bockmiller, P.E. Director Division I

> James R. Fisler Director Division II

Paul E. Shoenberger, P.E. General Manager

> **Denise Garcia** *District Secretary*

Marwan Khalifa, CPA, MBA District Treasurer

> Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo Legal Counsel

1965 Placentia Avenue Costa Mesa, CA 92627 tel 949.631.1200 fax 949.574.1036 info@MesaWater.org MesaWater.org 4. Do you anticipate any significant impacts from the project on current services and capacity? If so, please describe how this determination came to be in as much detail as possible.

Response: Based on the WSA, Mesa Water District does not anticipate any significant impacts from the Development on current services and capacities.

5. Do you anticipate that the project implementation would result in the need for physical additions to the existing infrastructure (i.e., pipeline increases)?

Response: During the Plan Check process, Mesa Water District will determine the water services improvements required to supply domestic, irrigation and fire protection services to the Development, Mesa Water District does not anticipate that the Development implementation would result in the need for physical additions to the existing infrastructure, owned and operated by Mesa Water District. However this will be reviewed and confirmed during the Plan Check process.

Should you have any questions or comments please do not hesitate to contract me.

Regards,

John/Robinson Plan Check Consultant johnr@mesawater.org 949.207.5460



DATE: 10/9/2024

COMPANY: LEGACY PARTNERS

SUBJECT: Community Development/1,050 Units/W. Sunflower St., Costa Mesa CA

Your project is located in Southern California Edison (SCE) service territory. SCE will serve the above subject project's electrical requirements per the California Public Utilities Commission and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission tariffs.

SCE may need to conduct utility studies, where applicable, to assess whether additions or modifications to the existing electric infrastructure are required to serve this project. Where applicable, SCE has attached Appendix (B) which not only describes the study, and permitting, but includes a Project Information Sheet that will need to be completed by you and submitted to SCE if your project is at a point where SCE has to determine the required electrical utility work. This Will-Serve letter does not imply that either: (i) these studies have been completed, or (ii) that any required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis of project-related electric utility impacts has been conducted.

I am the SCE Design Representative currently assigned to this project. SCE or Applicant will design and construct all required electrical infrastructure to serve this project provided you enter into the applicable contractual agreements with SCE identify scope of electrical utility work required, and supply the following information:

- Site plans as required
- Required contracts and agreements (fully executed)
- Applicable fees
- Local permits
- Required easement documents

Your project will be scheduled for construction once SCE has all the necessary information for your project and you have submitted or agreed to the applicable requirements as stated above, and paid any necessary fees.

If your project will not require SCE services, please notify us so that we can update our records.

SCE appreciates your business. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (951) 751-1970, RJ Popovits.

Sincerely,

SCE Design Representative

Enclosure: Appendix B, where applicable

Rev. 07/09/12

Appendix B



DATE: 10/9/2024

COMPANY: LEGACY PARTNERS

SUBJECT: Community Development/1,050 Units/W. Sunflower St., Costa Mesa CA

As your Southern California Edison (SCE) Design Representative for this project, I am committed to providing you with excellent customer service. The following information is intended to help explain SCE's planning and permitting process for the electric infrastructure needed to serve your Project.

Depending on the scope of work necessary to serve your project (electric facility installation, removal, relocation, rearrangement and/or replacement), it may be necessary for you to submit an Advanced Engineering Fee. This Fee will be applied to certain expenses associated with preliminary design and engineering work required to estimate the cost for SCE to perform the electric work associated with your project. Please note: Depending on factors such as resource constraints, construction or relocation of SCE facilities requirements, the need for environmental review, and so forth, delays in meeting your projected completion date may occur. To help minimize the potential for delays it is imperative that you provide all requested information as early as possible.

If the project results in the need for SCE to perform work on SCE electrical facilities that operate at between 50 and 200 kilovolts (kV), please be advised these facilities are subject to the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC's) General Order 131-D (GO 131-D) Permit to Construct (PTC) requirements. For the CPUC PTC review, the CPUC acts as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Depending on the scope of SCE's work, certain exemptions to the PTC requirements may be available. If no exemptions are available, the PTC application preparation and environmental approval process could take a minimum of 24 - 48 months.

If you anticipate that your project will require work to be performed on SCE electrical facilities operated at between 50 kV and 200 kV, please inform me at your earliest possible convenience for further assistance to determine the potential G.O.131-D permitting requirements and/or permitting exemption(s).

In order for SCE to determine the required electrical utility work necessary to support your project, and to determine any permitting requirements and costs associated with constructing these facilities, project plans and a completed Customer Project Information Sheet will need to be submitted.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to call me at (951) 751-1970.

Sincerely.

SCE Design Representative

Rev. 07/09/12

DS-125-1

1919 S State College Blvd Anaheim, CA 92806



April 19, 2024

Moran Utility Services, Inc. 4168 Avenida De La Plata, Suite 103 Oceanside, CA 92056 Attn: Shannon Lloyd

Subject: Maps & Will Serve - Will Serve and Map Request for the area between Sunflower St and S Coast Dr just West of Susan St; Costa Mesa

Thank you for inquiring about the availability of natural gas service for your project. We are pleased to inform you that Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) has facilities in the area where the above named project is being proposed. The service would be in accordance with SoCalGas' policies and extension rules on file with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) at the time contractual arrangements are made.

This letter should not be considered a contractual commitment to serve the proposed project, and is only provided for informational purposes only. The availability of natural gas service is based upon natural gas supply conditions and is subject to changes in law or regulation. As a public utility, SoCalGas is under the jurisdiction of the Commission and certain federal regulatory agencies, and gas service will be provided in accordance with the rules and regulations in effect at the time service is provided. Natural gas service is also subject to environmental regulations, which could affect the construction of a main or service line extension (for example, if hazardous wastes were encountered in the process of installing the line). Applicable regulations will be determined once a contract with SoCalGas is executed.

If you need assistance choosing the appropriate gas equipment for your project, or would like to discuss the most effective applications of energy efficiency techniques, please contact our area Service Center at 800-427-2200.

Thank you again for choosing clean, reliable, and safe natural gas, your best energy value.

Sincerely,

J.Sum

Jason Sum Pipeline Planning Associate SoCalGas - Anaheim HQ



Will Serve Letter

4/22/2024

Shannon Lloyd Moran Utility Services Inc 4168 Avenida de la Plata, Suite 103 Oceanside, CA 92675

Project Name: LOCATION: W. Sunflower Ave and Susan Street, Costa Mesa W. Sunflower Ave and Susan Street, Costa Mesa

Re: May Serve Letter by Charter Communications or an affiliate authorized to provide service ("Charter")

Thank you for your interest in receiving Charter service. The purpose of this letter is to confirm that the Property is within an area that Charter may lawfully serve. However, it is not a commitment to provide service to the Property. Prior to any determination as to whether service can or will be provided to the Property, Charter will conduct a survey of the Property and will need the following information from you:

- Exact site address and legal description
- Is this an existing building or new construction?
- Site plans, blue prints, plat maps or any similar data
- The location of any existing utilities or utility easements

Please forward this information to the construction manager listed below. Upon receipt, a Charter representative will be assigned to you to work through the process. Ultimately, a mutually acceptable service agreement for the Property will be required and your cooperation in the process is appreciated.

Construction Manager Contact:

Lilly, Larry Construction Manager - Zone 8 7142 Chapman Ave Garden Grove, CA 92841 714-591-4883 Larry.Lilly@charter.com

Sincerely,

Lawrence C Lilly



1452 Edinger Ave, 3rd Floor Tustin, CA 92780

Apr 23, 2024

Moran Utility Services Shannon Lloyd 27121 Calle Arroyo, Ste 2220 San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

RE: Will Serve Letter; W. Sunflower Avenue and Susan Street, Costa Mesa, CA

Dear Ms. Lloyd,

This letter acknowledges that the project at W. Sunflower Avenue and Susan Street, Costa Mesa, CA is located in an area served by AT&T. Any service arrangements at this location will be subject to later discussions and agreements between the developer and AT&T. While AT&T has the capacity to serve the project, please be advised that this letter is not a commitment by AT&T to provide service to W. Sunflower Avenue and Susan Street, Costa Mesa, CA.

Please contact me at the phone number included in this letter with any questions.

Thank you for contacting AT&T.

Sincerely,

Ernest Estacio

Ernest Estacio Manager (OSP) Planning and Engineering 714-325-2110 Ee9318@att.com