June 3, 2025

Ms. Konnie Dobreva
EPD Solutions, Inc.
2355 Main Street, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92614

SUBJECT: BAKER LAKE ELSINORE ENERGY TABLES

The following Energy Tables were prepared for the proposed Baker Lake Elsinore development (referred to as "Project") which is located southeast of Pierce and Baker Street in the City of Lake Elsinore.

CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT ELECTRICITY USAGE ESTIMATES

Based on the *2024 National Construction Estimator* (1), the typical power cost per 1,000 square feet of building construction per month is estimated to be $2.66. The Project will consist of two new warehouse buildings totaling a combined 1,000,451 SF[1]. Building 1 will be 212,028 SF, inclusive of 5,000 SF of ground floor office, 5,000 SF of mezzanine, and include 23 dock doors along the southwest side of the building. Building 2 will be 788,423 SF inclusive of 10,000 SF of ground floor office, 10,000 SF of mezzanine, and include 110 dock doors along the northeast side of the building. Building 1 will be located at the northwestern end of the site and Building 2 will be located at the southeastern end of the site. The proposed Project is anticipated to have an Opening Year of 2027.

To support the Project development, off-site improvements will be limited to Baker Street and Nichols Street, the Baker Street realignment to Nichols Street, and include improvements from Pierce Street to Hoff Ave southwest of the site. There will be lift station improvements to the temporary lift station at the intersection of Pierce Street and Nichols Street. Additionally, installation of approximately 7,650 feet of 16-inch force main is anticipated at Nichols Road and Collier Avenue to a discharge manhole at the intersection of Collier Avenue and Riverside Drive. Construction of the off-site/lift station and roadway improvements is anticipated to have an Opening Year of 2027.

Table 1 estimates the total power cost of the on-site electricity usage during the construction of the proposed Project to be approximately $248,635.11.

[1] It should be noted that the TIA report analyzed 90% (900,4059 SF) high-cube cold storage and 10% (100,045 SF) manufacturing. However, for purposes of this analysis, the building was analyzed as 80% high cube (800,361), 10% manufacturing (100,045 SF), and 10% cold storage (100,451 SF) utilizing the trips disclosed in the TIA report.

TABLE 1: PROJECT CONSTRUCTION POWER COST

Phase	Land Use	Power Cost (per 1,000 SF)	Size (1,000 SF)	Construction Duration (months)	Project Construction Power Cost
Project Buildout	High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	$2.66	100.451	16	$4,275.19
	Manufacturing	$2.66	100.045	16	$4,257.92
	High-Cube Fulfilment Warehouse	$2.66	800.361	16	$34,063.36
	Parking Lot	$2.66	319.730	16	$13,607.73
	Other Asphalt Surfaces	$2.66	1,546.816	16	$65,832.47
	Landscape	$2.66	889.300	16	$37,848.61
Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements	Other Asphalt Surfaces	$2.66	19.000	20	$1,010.80
	Road Construction	$2.66	1,649.230	20	$87,739.04
				CONSTRUCTION POWER COST	***$248,635.11***

Electricity would be provided to the Project by Southern California Edison (SCE). The SCE general service rate schedule was used to determine the Project's electrical usage. As of March 28, 2024, SCE's general service rate is $0.15 per kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity for industrial services (2). The total electricity usage from on-site Project construction related activities is estimated to be approximately 1,657,567 kWh.

TABLE 2: PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ELECTRICITY USAGE

Phase	Land Use	Cost per kWh	Project Construction Electricity Usage (kWh)
Project Buildout	High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	$0.15	28,501
	Manufacturing	$0.15	28,386
	High-Cube Fulfilment Warehouse	$0.15	227,089
	Parking Lot	$0.15	90,718
	Other Asphalt Surfaces	$0.15	438,883
	Landscape	$0.15	252,324
Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements	Other Asphalt Surfaces	$0.15	6,739
	Road Construction	$0.15	584,927
	CONSTRUCTION ELECTRICITY USAGE		***1,657,567***

CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT FUEL ESTIMATES

Fuel consumption estimates are presented in Table 3. The aggregate fuel consumption rate for all equipment is estimated at 18.5 hp-hr-gal., obtained from California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2018 Emissions Factors Tables and cited fuel consumption rate factors presented in Table D-24 of the Moyer guidelines (3). For the purposes of this analysis, the calculations are based on all construction equipment being diesel-powered which is standard practice consistent with industry standards. Diesel fuel would be supplied by existing industrial fuel providers serving the City and region. As presented in Table 3, Project construction activities would consume an estimated 123,494 gallons of diesel fuel over the course of the Project buildout construction period, approximately 16 months, and Off-Site/Lift Station and Roadway Improvements, approximately 20 months.

TABLE 3: CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT FUEL CONSUMPTION ESTIMATES

Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Usage Hours	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
Project Buildout								
Demolition	18	Concrete/Industrial Saws	33	1	8	0.73	193	188
		Excavators	36	3	8	0.38	328	319
		Rubber Tired Dozers	367	2	8	0.4	2,349	2,285
Site Preparation	11	Rubber Tired Dozers	367	3	8	0.4	3,523	2,095
		Crawler Tractors	87	4	8	0.43	1,197	712
Grading	30	Excavators	36	2	8	0.38	219	355
		Graders	148	1	8	0.41	485	787
		Rubber Tired Dozers	367	1	8	0.4	1,174	1,904
		Scrapers	423	2	8	0.48	3,249	5,268
		Crawler Tractors	87	2	8	0.43	599	971
Building Construction	290	Cranes	367	1	8	0.29	851	13,347
		Forklifts	82	3	8	0.2	394	6,170
		Generator Sets	14	1	8	0.74	83	1,299
		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	3	8	0.37	746	11,693
		Welders	46	1	8	0.45	166	2,596
Paving	30	Pavers	81	2	8	0.42	544	883
		Paving Equipment	89	2	8	0.36	513	831
		Rollers	36	2	8	0.38	219	355
Architectural Coating	90	Air Compressors	37	1	8	0.48	142	691

Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Usage Hours	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements								
Grading	2	Graders	148	1	8	0.41	485	52
		Rubber Tired Dozers	367	1	8	0.4	1,174	127
		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	2	8	0.37	497	54
		Excavators	36	2	8	0.38	219	24
		Scrapers	423	2	8	0.48	3,249	351
Building Construction	218	Cranes	367	1	8	0.29	851	10,033
		Forklifts	82	2	8	0.2	262	3,092
		Generator Sets	14	1	8	0.74	83	977
		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	1	8	0.37	249	2,930
		Welders	46	3	8	0.45	497	5,854
Paving	5	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	1	8	0.37	249	67
		Pavers	81	1	8	0.42	272	74
		Paving Equipment	89	1	8	0.36	256	69
		Rollers	36	2	8	0.38	219	59
		Cement and Mortar Mixers	10	1	8	0.56	45	12
Architectural Coating	5	Air Compressors	37	1	8	0.48	142	38
Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	21	Signal Boards	6	2	8	0.82	79	89
		Crawler Tractors	87	1	8	0.43	299	340
		Excavators	36	1	8	0.38	109	124
Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	Excavators	36	3	8	0.38	328	1,455
		Crawler Tractors	87	1	8	0.43	299	1,327
		Graders	148	1	8	0.41	485	2,152

Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Usage Hours	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
		Rollers	36	2	8	0.38	219	970
		Scrapers	423	2	8	0.48	3,249	14,399
		Rubber Tired Loaders	150	1	8	0.36	432	1,915
		Signal Boards	6	2	8	0.82	79	349
		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	2	8	0.37	497	2,204
Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	72	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	2	8	0.37	497	1,935
		Signal Boards	6	2	8	0.82	79	306
		Scrapers	423	2	8	0.48	3,249	12,643
		Rough Terrain Forklifts	96	1	8	0.4	307	1,196
		Graders	148	1	8	0.41	485	1,889
		Plate Compactors	8	1	8	0.43	28	107
		Pumps	11	1	8	0.74	65	253
		Air Compressors	37	1	8	0.48	142	553
		Generator Sets	14	1	8	0.74	83	323
Linear, Paving	31	Rollers	36	3	8	0.38	328	550
		Paving Equipment	89	1	8	0.36	256	430
		Pavers	81	1	8	0.42	272	456
		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84	2	8	0.37	497	833
		Signal Boards	6	2	8	0.82	79	132
CONSTRUCTION FUEL DEMAND (GALLONS DIESEL FUEL)								***123,494***

CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL ESTIMATES

It is assumed that all construction worker trips are from light duty autos (LDA) along area roadways. Data regarding Project related construction worker trips were based on CalEEMod 2022.1.1.25 defaults utilized within the AQIA. Vehicle fuel efficiencies for LDAs were estimated using information generated within the 2021 version of the EMFAC developed by the CARB.

Table 4 provides an estimated annual fuel consumption resulting from the Project generated by LDAs related to construction worker trips. Based on Table 4, it is estimated that 86,212 gallons of fuel will be consumed related to construction worker trips over the course of the Project buildout construction period, approximately 16 months, and Off-Site/Lift Station and Roadway Improvements, approximately 20 months.

TABLE 4: CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION ESTIMATES

Year	Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Project Buildout							
2026	LDA						
	Demolition	18	8	18.5	2,664	33.43	80
	Site Preparation	11	9	18.5	1,832	33.43	55
	Grading	30	10	18.5	5,550	33.43	166
	Building Construction	138	210	18.5	536,130	33.43	16,036
	LDT1						
	Demolition	18	4	18.5	1,332	25.70	52
	Site Preparation	11	5	18.5	1,018	25.70	40
	Grading	30	5	18.5	2,775	25.70	108
	Building Construction	138	105	18.5	268,065	25.70	10,430
	LDT2						
	Demolition	18	4	18.5	1,332	26.01	51
	Site Preparation	11	5	18.5	1,018	26.01	39
	Grading	30	5	18.5	2,775	26.01	107
	Building Construction	138	105	18.5	268,065	26.01	10,307
2027	LDA						
	Building Construction	152	210	18.5	590,520	34.29	17,223

Year	Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
	Paving	30	8	18.5	4,440	34.29	129
	Architectural Coating	90	42	18.5	69,930	34.29	2,040
	LDT1						
	Building Construction	152	105	18.5	295,260	26.22	11,262
	Paving	30	4	18.5	2,220	26.22	85
	Architectural Coating	90	21	18.5	34,965	26.22	1,334
	LDT2						
	Building Construction	152	105	18.5	295,260	26.63	11,089
	Paving	30	4	18.5	2,220	26.63	83
	Architectural Coating	90	21	18.5	34,965	26.63	1,313
Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements							
2025	LDA						
	Grading	2	10	18.5	370	32.49	11
	LDT1						
	Grading	2	5	18.5	185	25.14	7
	LDT2						
	Grading	2	5	18.5	185	25.29	7
2026	LDA						
	Paving	5	8	18.5	740	33.43	22
	Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	21	5	18.5	1,943	33.43	58
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	18	18.5	27,306	33.43	817
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	16	15	18.5	4,440	33.43	133
	LDT1						
	Paving	5	4	18.5	370	25.70	14
	Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	21	3	18.5	1,166	25.70	45
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	9	18.5	13,653	25.70	531

Year	Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	16	8	18.5	2,368	25.70	92
	LDT2						
	Paving	5	4	18.5	370	26.01	14
	Linear, Grubbing & Land Clearing	21	3	18.5	1,166	26.01	45
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	9	18.5	13,653	26.01	525
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	16	8	18.5	2,368	26.01	91
2027	LDA						
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	56	15	18.5	15,540	34.29	453
	Linear, Paving	31	18	18.5	10,323	34.29	301
	LDT1						
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	56	8	18.5	8,288	26.22	316
	Linear, Paving	31	9	18.5	5,162	26.22	197
	LDT2						
	Linear, Drainage, Utilities, & Sub-Grade	56	8	18.5	8,288	26.63	311
	Linear, Paving	31	9	18.5	5,162	26.63	194
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION							***86,212***

CONSTRUCTION VENDOR FUEL ESTIMATES

It is assumed that 50% of all vendor trips are from Medium-Heavy-Duty-Trucks (MHDT) and 50% are from Heavy-Heavy-Duty Trucks (HHDT). These assumptions are consistent with the CalEEMod 2022.1.1.25 defaults utilized within the within the AQIA. Vehicle fuel efficiencies for MHDTs and HHDTs were estimated using information generated within EMFAC2021.

Table 5 shows the estimated fuel economy of MHDTs and HHDTs accessing the Project site. Based on Table 5, fuel consumption from construction trips will total approximately 55,628 gallons over the course of the Project buildout construction period, approximately 16 months, and Off-Site/Lift Station and Roadway Improvements, approximately 20 months.

TABLE 5: CONSTRUCTION VENDOR/HAULING FUEL CONSUMPTION ESTIMATES

Year	Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Vendor Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Project Buildout							
2026	MHDT						
	Demolition	18	4	10.2	734	8.72	84
	Site Preparation	11	3	10.2	337	8.72	39
	Grading	30	7	10.2	2,142	8.72	246
	Building Construction	138	68	10.2	95,717	8.72	10,970
	HHDT (Vendor)						
	Demolition	18	4	10.2	734	6.33	116
	Site Preparation	11	3	10.2	337	6.33	53
	Grading	30	7	10.2	2,142	6.33	339
	Building Construction	138	68	10.2	95,717	6.33	15,131
	HHDT (Hauling)						
	Demolition	18	2	20	720	6.33	114
2027	MHDT						
	Building Construction	152	68	10.2	105,427	8.87	11,881
	HHDT (Vendor)						
	Building Construction	152	68	10.2	105,427	6.45	16,343
Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements							
2026	MHDT						
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	1	10.2	836	8.72	96
	HHDT (Vendor)						
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	31	1	10.2	316	8.87	36
2027	MHDT						
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	82	1	10.2	836	6.33	132
	HHDT (Vendor)						
	Linear, Grading & Excavation	31	1	10.2	316	6.45	49

Year	Construction Activity	Duration (Days)	Vendor Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION VENDOR/HULING FUEL CONSUMPTION							***55,628***

TRANSPORTATION ENERGY DEMANDS

Energy that would be consumed by Project-generated traffic is a function of total VMT and estimated vehicle fuel economies of vehicles accessing the Project site. Table 6 presents the estimated annual fuel consumption from project-generated traffic.

TABLE 6: PROJECT-GENERATED TRAFFIC ANNUAL FUEL CONSUMPTION

Vehicle Type	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Annual VMT	Estimated Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
LDA	34.29	4,989,323	145,520
LDT1	26.22	372,280	14,199
LDT2	26.63	2,098,819	78,822
MDV	21.39	1,580,848	73,906
LHDT1	17.30	1,903,464	110,020
LHDT2	16.30	543,942	33,374
MHDT	8.87	952,764	107,367
HHDT	6.45	4,253,233	659,329
MCY	42.17	229,574	5,444
TRU			44,253
TOTAL (ALL VEHICLES)		***16,924,247***	***1,272,234***

STATIONARY SOURCE ENERGY DEMANDS

Fuel consumption estimates from stationary sources are presented in Table 7. The proposed Project build out was conservatively assumed to include installation of two 300-horsepower diesel-powered emergency generators, which is estimated to operate for up to 1 hour per day, 1 day per week for up to 50 hours per year for maintenance and testing purposes. Additionally, the Off-Site/Lift Station Improvements was conservatively assumed to include installation of one 350-horsepower diesel-powered emergency generator, which is estimated to operate for up to 1 hour per day, 1 day per week for up to 50 hours per year for maintenance and testing purposes. As presented in Table 7, Project stationary sources would consume an estimated 13,683 gallons of diesel fuel.

TABLE 7: STATIONARY SOURCE EQUIPMENT FUEL CONSUMPTION ESTIMATES

Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Usage Hours	Annual Hourly Usage	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
Emergency Generator	300	2	1	50	0.73	438	8,642
Emergency Generator	350	1	1	50	0.73	256	5,041
STATIONARY SOURCE FUEL DEMAND (GALLONS DIESEL FUEL)							***13,683***

ON-SITE CARGO HANDLING EQUIPMENT FUEL DEMANDS

It is common for industrial buildings to require the operation of exterior cargo handling equipment in the building's truck court areas. For this particular Project, on-site modeled operational equipment includes up to four (4) 175 horsepower (hp), natural gas-powered cargo handling equipment – port tractors operating at 4 hours a day[2] for 365 days of the year.

Project operational activity estimates and associated fuel consumption estimates are based on the annual EMFAC2021 offroad emissions for the 2027 operational year and was used to derive the total annual fuel consumption associated on-site equipment. As presented in Table 8, Project on-site equipment would consume an estimated 18,568 gallons of natural gas.

TABLE 8: ON-SITE CARGO HANDLING EQUIPMENT FUEL CONSUMPTION ESTIMATES

Equipment	Quantity	Usage Hours	Days of Operation	EMFAC2021 Fuel Consumption (gal./yr)	EMFAC2021 Activity (hrs./yr)	Total Fuel Consumption
Cargo Handling Equipment	4	4	365	19,286	6,066	18,568
ON-SITE CARGO HANDLING EQUIPMENT FUEL DEMAND (GALLONS FUEL)						***18,568***

FACILITY ENERGY DEMANDS

Project building operations and Project site maintenance activities would result in the consumption of electricity, which would be supplied to the Project by SCE. Annual electricity demands of the Project are summarized in Table 7.

Based on information provided by the Project Applicant, the Project would not use natural gas for the building envelope. As such, natural gas consumption has not been analyzed in this study.

[2] Based on Table II-3, Port and Rail Cargo Handling Equipment Demographics by Type, from CARB's Technology Assessment: Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment document, a single piece of equipment could operate up to 2 hours per day (Total Average Annual Activity divided by Total Number Pieces of Equipment). As such, the analysis conservatively assumes that the tractor/loader/backhoe would operate up to 4 hours per day.

TABLE 7: PROJECT ANNUAL OPERATIONAL ELECTRICITY DEMAND SUMMARY

Land Use	Electricity Demand (kWh/year)
High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	2,196,818
Manufacturing	957,338
High-Cube Fulfilment Warehouse	3,683,543
Parking Lot	280,084
TOTAL PROJECT ENERGY DEMAND	***7,117,782***

CONCLUSIONS

ENERGY IMPACT 1

Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

For construction, limitations on idling of vehicles and equipment and requirements that equipment be properly maintained would result in fuel savings. California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by the ARB. Additionally, given the cost of fuel, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction. Due to the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for developers and contractors to use energy-consuming resources in an efficient manner, the construction phase of the proposed Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the construction-related impacts related to electricity and fuel consumption would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed Project would consume energy as part of building operations and transportation activities including truck and passenger vehicle traffic from the Project. Building operations would involve energy consumption for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting, and electronics. The proposed Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the California Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building. For example, the Title 24 Lighting Power Density requirements define the maximum wattage of lighting that can be used in a building based on its square footage. Title 24 standards are widely regarded as the most advanced energy efficiency standards and would help reduce the amount of energy required for lighting, water heating, and heating and air conditioning in buildings and promote energy conservation.

Additionally, the Project will also be providing parking and EV infrastructure that would further promote

fuel efficient vehicles. For these reasons, operational-related transportation fuel consumption would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the operational impact related to vehicle fuel consumption would be less than significant.

As supported by the preceding analyses, Project construction and operations would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy. The Project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. The Project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservations goals within the State of California.

ENERGY IMPACT 2

Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The Project's consistency with the applicable state and local plans is discussed below.

CONSISTENCY WITH ISTEA

Transportation and access to the Project site is provided by the local and regional roadway systems. The Project would not interfere with, nor otherwise obstruct intermodal transportation plans or projects that may be realized pursuant to the ISTEA because SCAG is not planning for intermodal facilities on or through the Project site.

Consistency with ISTEA supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption and decreased reliance on fossil fuels, as workers and customers traveling to and from the site can use public transportation which would decrease fuel and overall VMT.

CONSISTENCY WITH TEA-21

The Project site is located in an area with proximate access to the Interstate freeway system. The site selected for the Project facilitates access, acts to reduce vehicle miles traveled, takes advantage of existing infrastructure systems, and promotes land use compatibilities through collocation of similar uses. The Project supports the strong planning processes emphasized under TEA-21. The Project is therefore consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation of TEA-21.

Consistency with TEA-21 supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption and decreased reliance on fossil fuels, as workers and customers traveling to and from the site can use public transportation which would decrease fuel and overall VMT.

CONSISTENCY WITH IEPR

Electricity would be provided to the Project by SCE. SCE's *Clean Power and Electrification Pathway* (CPEP) white paper builds on existing state programs and policies. As such, the Project is consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation the goals presented in the 2023 IEPR.

Additionally, the Project will comply with the applicable Title 24 standards which would ensure that the Project energy demands would not be inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. As such, development of the proposed Project would support the goals presented in the 2023 IEPR.

Consistency with IEPR supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreased reliance on fossil fuels and increased reliance on renewable energy sources.

CONSISTENCY WITH STATE OF CALIFORNIA ENERGY PLAN

The Project site is located in an area with proximate access to the Interstate freeway system. The site selected for the Project facilitates access and takes advantage of existing infrastructure systems. The Project therefore supports urban design and planning processes identified under the State of California Energy Plan, is consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation of the State of California Energy Plan.

Consistency with the State of California Energy Plan IEPR supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption and reliance on fossil fuels, as workers and customers traveling to and from the site can use public transportation which would decrease fuel and overall VMT.

CONSISTENCY WITH CALIFORNIA CODE TITLE 24, PART 6, ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

The 2022 version of Title 24 was adopted by the CEC and became effective on January 1, 2023. As the Project building construction is anticipated in 2027, it is presumed that the Project would be required to comply with the Title 24 standards in place at that time. Therefore, the Project is would not result in a significant impact on energy resources (4). The proposed Project would be subject to Title 24 standards.

Consistency with Title 24 standards supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreased reliance on fossil fuels and increased reliance on renewable energy sources, as the Project would need to incorporate energy efficiency standards as discussed in the 2022 CalGreen Building Code Standards (5).

CONSISTENCY WITH CALIFORNIA CODE TITLE 24, PART 11, CALGREEN

As previously stated, CCR, Title 24, Part 11: CALGreen is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial, and school buildings that went in effect on January 1, 2009, and is administered by the California Building Standards Commission. CALGreen is updated on a regular basis, with the most recent approved update consisting of the 2022 California Green Building Code Standards that were published on July 1, 2022, and became effective on January 1, 2023. The Project would be required to comply with the applicable standards in place at the time plan check submittals are made.

Consistency with Title 24 standards supports decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreased reliance on fossil fuels and increased reliance on renewable energy sources, as the Project would need to incorporate energy efficiency standards as discussed in 2022 CalGreen Building Code Standards (5).

CONSISTENCY WITH AB 1493

AB 1493 is not applicable to the Project as it is a statewide measure establishing vehicle emissions standards. No feature of the Project would interfere with implementation of the requirements under AB 1493.

The project would not interfere with implementation of AB 1493 and would decrease reliance on fossil fuels.

CONSISTENCY WITH RPS

California's RPS is not applicable to the Project as it is a statewide measure that establishes a renewable energy mix. No feature of the Project would interfere with implementation of the requirements under RPS.

The project would not interfere with implementation of the RPS and would increase reliance on renewable energy sources.

CONSISTENCY WITH SB 350 AND SB 100

The proposed Project would use energy from SCE, which have committed to diversify their portfolio of energy sources by increasing energy from wind and solar sources. No feature of the Project would interfere with implementation of SB 350 and SB 100. Additionally, the Project would be designed and constructed to implement the energy efficiency measures for new residential and educational developments and would include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption in accordance with Title 24.

The project would not interfere with implementation of SB350 and would increase reliance on renewable energy sources.

As shown above, the Project would not conflict with any of the state or local plans. As such, a less than significant impact is expected.

REFERENCES

1. **Pray, Richard.** *2024 National Construction Estimator.* Carlsbad : Craftsman Book Company, 2024.
2. **Southern California Edison.** Schedule GS-1 General Service. *Regulatory Information - Rates Pricing.* [Online] https://www.sce.com/regulatory/tariff-books/rates-pricing-choices.
3. **California Air Resources Board.** *Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects For Evaluating Motor Vehicle Registration Fee Projects And Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Projects, Emission Factor Tables.* 2018.
4. **The California Energy Commission.** 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. *California Energy Commission.* [Online] 2022. https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2022-building-energy-efficiency.
5. **California Department of General Services.** 2022 CALGreen Code. *CALGreen.* [Online] https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CAGBC2022P1.