Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan
CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
SCH No. 2021090378

1.0 STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("**CEQA**") requires that a Lead Agency issue two sets of findings prior to approving a project that will generate a significant impact on the environment. The Statement of Facts and Findings is the first set of findings where the Lead Agency identifies the significant impacts, presents facts supporting those conclusions reached in the analysis, makes one or more findings supporting the conclusions reached in the analysis, makes one or more findings for each impact, and explains the reasoning behind the agency's findings.

The following statement of facts and findings has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21081. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) provides that:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding.

There are three possible finding categories available for the Statement of Facts and Findings pursuant to Section 1509(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations is the second set of findings. Where a project will cause unavoidable significant impacts, the Lead Agency may still approve a project where its benefits outweigh the adverse impacts. Further, as provided in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Lead Agency sets forth specific reasoning by which benefits are balanced against effects, and approves the project.

Based upon its review of the Environmental Impact Report ("**EIR**"), the Lead Agency finds that the EIR is an adequate assessment of the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project, represents the independent judgment of the City, and sets forth an adequate range of alternatives to this project.

The Final EIR is composed of the following elements:

- The Beaumont Summit Station project Draft Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No. 2021090378 (April 2022);
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Response to Comments; and
- Corrections and Changes from the Draft EIR to the Final EIR

2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL

The Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan ("**Project**") is located in the City of Beaumont ("**City**"). The Project site is in the northwestern portion of the City within the County of Riverside (County) and regional access to the site is provided by Interstate (I-10) 10 via the Cherry Valley Boulevard exit approximately 3,000 feet west of the Project site.

The approximately 188-acres site is located south of Cherry Valley Boulevard, north of Brookside Avenue, and northeast of I-10. All proposed changes associated with the Project are located within areas previously annexed to the City by the Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission. The following Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) are associated with the Project site: 407-230-22, -23, -24, -25, -26, -27, -28; 407-190-016; and 407-190-017.

The Project includes the adoption of the new Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan (Specific Plan). In addition to the Specific Plan, other related Project entitlements include a General Plan Amendment, Tentative Parcel Map, approval of a Plot Plan/Site Plan, and a Development Agreement. The Specific Plan entails the development of an approximately 188-acre site with e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility (not a high-cube fulfillment center (sort) facility), commercial development, and open space components. The Project would also include 6.7 acres of public and private roads.

2.2 PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The fundamental purpose and goal of the Project is to implement the vision laid out in the Project objectives by providing development standards, and design guidelines to direct future development within the Project area. In order to promote a high-quality development, as well as the functional integrity, economic viability, environmental sensitivity, and positive aesthetic impact of the Project, specific planning and development objectives for the Project were identified:

1. Provide a comprehensive land use plan that designates the distribution, location, and extent of land uses.
2. Provide a land use plan that is sensitive to the environment through avoidance of sensitive resources, aesthetically pleasing through application of design guidelines, and places compatible land uses and facilities in an appropriate location.

3. Develop a state-of-the-art logistics/e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility with complimentary commercial uses that take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, is feasible to construct, is economically competitive with, and in the general vicinity of, similar logistics/e-commerce center uses.

4. Develop and operate a large format logistics center that is in close proximity to the I-10 freeway to support the distribution of goods throughout the region and that also limits truck traffic disruption to sensitive receptors within the surrounding region.

5. Facilitate the development of underutilized land currently planned for residential uses with uses that maximize the use of the site as a large format e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility consisting of one or more buildings with total e-commerce building space in excess of 2,557,465 square feet in size and approximately 150,000 square feet of mixed commercial uses responding to market demand.

6. Provide a system of infrastructure that includes public and private transportation, sewer, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, and other essential facilities to serve the needs of the Project.

7. Provide access patterns that minimize traffic conflicts.

8. Develop project identity through the identification of project design elements such as architecture, landscaping, walls, fencing, signage, and entry treatments

9. Facilitate the establishment of design guidelines and development standards that create a unique, well-defined identity for the proposed Project.

10. Positively contribute to the economy of the region through new capital investment, creation of new employment opportunities, and expansion of the tax base.

11. Establish landscape guidelines that emphasize the use of drought-tolerant and water-efficient plant materials.

12. Provide and plan that incorporates appropriate buffers with the surrounding development through the use of landscaped setbacks and expanded parkways along Cherry Valley Boulevard and Brookside Avenue.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City has conducted an extensive review of this Project which included a Draft EIR and a Final EIR, including technical reports, along with a public review and comment period. The following is a summary of the City's environmental review of the Project:

- Pursuant to the provisions of Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City published a Notice of Preparation ("**NOP**") and filed a copy with the California Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse to inform the general public, trustee and responsible agencies and other interested parties that an EIR would be prepared for this Project. The NOP was distributed for a 30-day public review period, which began on September 21, 2021. In addition, the City held a public-noticed EIR scoping meeting on October 7, 2021. The scope of the Draft EIR was determined

through the NOP and scoping meeting process, whereby it was concluded that the Project would have the *potential* to result in significant environmental impacts under the following 18 environmental subject areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology & Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards & Hazardous Materials, Hydrology & Water Quality, Land Use & Planning, Noise, Population & Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities & Service Systems and Wildfire.

- The City circulated the Draft EIR for the Project from April 21, 2022 to June 6, 2022. The City received a total of 144 comment letters from responsible agencies and other interested parties. The City prepared responses to all written comments received during the public review period. The comments and responses are contained in Section 2 of the Final EIR.

- In accordance with the provisions of the Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, the City of Beaumont has provided a written proposed response to each commenting public agency no less than 10 days prior to the proposed certification date of the Final EIR.

4.0 INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT AND FINDING

The project applicant, Exeter Cherry Valley Land, LLC ("**Project Applicant**"), retained the independent consulting firm of Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. ("**Kimley-Horn**") to prepare the EIR for the Project. Kimley-Horn has prepared the EIR under the supervision, direction and review of the City. The City is the Lead Agency for the preparation of the EIR, as defined by CEQA CPRC Section 21067, as amended. The Beaumont City Council ("**City Council**") has received and reviewed the EIR prior to certifying the EIR and prior to making any decision to approve or disapprove the Project. All findings set forth herein are based on substantial evidence in the record as indicated with respect to each specific finding.

FINDING:

The EIR for the Project reflects the City's independent judgment. The City has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3) in retaining its own environmental consultant to review the EIR, and directing the consultant in preparation of the EIR. The City has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR and accompanying studies and finds that the report reflects the independent judgment of the City.

The City Council has considered all the evidence presented in its consideration of the all the evidence presented in its consideration of the project and the EIR, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR and its supporting studies, written and oral evidence presented at hearings on the project, and written evidence submitted to the City by individuals, organizations, regulatory agencies, and other entities. On the basis of such evidence the City Council finds that with respect to each environmental impact identified in the review process (except those described in the following paragraph), the impact is: (1) less than significant and would not require mitigation; (2) potentially significant but would be avoided or reduced to less than a significant level by implementation of identified mitigation measures; or (3) would be significant and

not fully mitigatable but would be, to the extent feasible, lessened by implementation of identified mitigation measures.

The EIR also identifies certain significant adverse environmental effects of the project which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened. Prior to approving this project the City Council also adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations which finds, based on specific reasons and substantial evidence in the record (as specified in Section 6.0), that certain identified economic, social or other benefits of the project outweigh such unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND FINDINGS

5.1 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT/NO IMPACT IN THE EIR

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project are less than significant or would not result in any impact and therefore do not require the imposition of mitigation measures.

AESTHETICS

Impact 4.1-1: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The City does not contain any designated scenic vistas. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.1-9)**. Because there are no scenic vistas on the Project site or in the vicinity of the Project site and the implementation of the Project would not obstruct views of the scenic vistas provided by the San Bernardino Mountains and the San Jacinto Mountains from any publicly accessible point outside of the Project site, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10)**.

Impact 4.1-2: Would the Project substantially damage scene resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No State Designated Scenic Highway traverses the Project site nor is the Project site in the vicinity of a State Designated Scenic Highway. The nearest State Designated Scenic Highway is SR-243, located approximately nine miles southeast of the Project site, south of the Banning city limits. Due to distance and topography, the Project is not visible from the State Designated Scenic Highway portion of SR-243. Additionally, no structures exist on-site; the Project site is not near a State Designated Scenic Highway, or scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Thus, impacts to scenic resources within a State Designated Scenic Highway would not occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.1-10)**.

Impact 4.1-3: Will the Project in a non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

Although construction activities and long-term development are anticipated to change the existing conditions of the site, the Project would not degrade the visual character of the site as much of the site's view from the public right-of-way is limited and those areas that are currently visible contain remnants of the former eggs and poultry farm. As such, the proposed Project development is anticipated to enhance

the Project site in the long-term through the incorporation of aesthetically pleasing building, landscaping, ornamental trees, lighting, among other features. (**Draft EIR, p. 4.1-11)**.

Project implementation and operation would allow for new development within a currently undeveloped vacant space, which would result in permanent alteration of the existing landforms and visual quality in the area. The Project would involve grading, landform alteration, and the development of several buildings involving commercial and e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility uses. The Project development would be consistent with the high-cube warehouse buildings planned north of Cherry Valley Boulevard, San Gorgonio Crossing. Further, high quality development with visually appealing elements including landscaping and natural-like building materials would create cohesive designs with other similar facilities in the general vicinity. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.1-11)**.

The Project site would transition from a former egg and poultry farm currently containing building pads which are remnant of previous buildings among other debris from the previous use. The Project site has been previously graded to serve the previous use. The site is anticipated to change from its existing condition to a fully developed site containing the proposed uses. The development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or public views. To further reduce changes in the visual environment, the Project would incorporate perimeter landscaping, trees, and ground covers to visually buffer the structures. For this reason, it is anticipated that implementation of the commercial and e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility uses would not degrade the visual characteristics that are already considered low. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-11 – 4.1-12)**.

> **Impact 4.1-4: Will the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?**

Implementation of the Project will introduce new lighting elements on-site to primarily illuminate the parking areas, truck docking areas, and building entrances. All lighting elements will need to comply with the lighting requirements set forth in the City's Municipal Code. In addition, the majority of the Project's building materials will consist of painted tilt-up concrete panels that will contain a matte finish. The remaining areas will contain low-reflect blue glass, which will not adversely affect daytime views of surrounding properties or motorists along the adjacent roadways. Therefore, Project-related development will not create substantial light or glare. Compliance with the City's Municipal Code requirements for lighting will ensure less-than-significant impacts associated with light and glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area from on-site lighting elements. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-12 to 4.1-13)**.

Cumulative Effects. Although the Project would change the current visual quality of the Project site, the changes would not result in degradation of the site. As noted in Section 4.0 Design Guidelines of the Specific Plan, the architectural design guidelines describe the intended architectural themes and styles for buildings permitted within the Specific Plan area and are intended to provide a basis for decisions regarding the built environment that contributes significantly to the visual order and consistency of the entire Specific Plan area and provide a high-quality development. specific planning and development objectives for the Project are identified in **Draft EIR Section 3.8**, Project Purpose and Objectives. These

objectives specifically have some bearing on the aesthetic design of the development within the Specific Plan. As such, the Project would not adversely affect any protected public viewsheds or destroy any scenic vistas, nor would it impede views of the San Jacinto Mountains or the San Bernardino Mountains. Therefore, the Project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution. The cumulative impact related to scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-13 to 4.1-14)**.

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.2-4: Will the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

During construction, emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust, and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate odors. However, these odors would be temporary, are not expected to affect a substantial number of people and would disperse rapidly. The South Coast Air Quality Management District ("**SCAQMD**") CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies certain land uses as sources of odors. These land uses include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project would not include any of the land uses that have been identified by the SCAQMD as odor sources. Therefore, impacts related to odors associated with the Project's construction-related and operational activities would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-56)**.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.3-3: Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Three separate field visits were conducted on April 22, June 3, and June 7, 2021. Field staff examined the potential for wetland waters of the U.S. and State and California Department of Fish and Wildlife ("**CDFW**")-jurisdictional wetlands. Data was collected at three representative Wetland Data Form Points within the Project site, one within NWW-2, one within NWW-3, and one within Basin-4, to determine the presence or absence of jurisdictional wetlands. The delineated aquatic features on-site did not meet the appropriate wetland parameters to qualify as wetland waters of the U.S./State or CDFW-jurisdictional wetlands based on the data collected during the field visits. No areas within the Project site meet the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan ("**MSHCP**") definition of a vernal pool. Because no State or federally protected wetlands were identified on the Project site, no impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-24)**.

Impact 4.3-4: Will the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The Project site is situated at the northern end of the City of Beaumont and occurs immediately north of a developed residential area. Land located north of the site, north of Cherry Valley Boulevard, has been graded in preparation for planned industrial development, and nearby areas to the west and immediately south are highly developed. The site is not identified as a wildlife corridor or criteria area under the MSHCP, and does not serve as a regional wildlife corridor. The drainages in the southwest portion of the site likely serve as minor local wildlife corridors and avian 'stepping stone' corridors. The largest drainage (Planning Area 3) would not be developed as part of the Project so it would continue to function as a local wildlife corridor. Significant impacts on wildlife corridors are not anticipated with Project implementation. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-25)**.

Impact 4.3-5: Will the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Implementation of the Project would be subject to all applicable Federal, State, regional, and local policies and regulations related to the protection of biological resources. The Project would be constructed in compliance with the requirements of the Beaumont General Plan and the Beaumont Municipal Code. The City does not have a tree preservation policy or ordinance. An application and approval from the City is required for any removal of front yard/street tree or trees. No street trees occur on-site and no residential structures and associated front yards occur on site. There are occasional trees near the outbuildings at the east of the site; however, these do not appear to meet the definition of street or yard trees. As such, the Project would comply with City of Beaumont requirements and no street tree approvals would be required, as no impacts to such resources would occur with project implementation. Based on compliance with all local policies and ordinances, impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-25 to 4.3-26)**.

Cumulative Effects. There is a related project located directly north (across Cherry Valley Boulevard) of the Project site that has recently been graded in preparation of the development of industrial land uses. In addition, areas to the west and south of the Project site are developed. Development of the Project site and the surrounding existing and future development precludes the area as a wildlife corridor and eliminates the potential for impacts to go beyond the Project site.

The Project site is relatively disturbed and does not support significant stands of native vegetation, with the possible exception of the riparian habitat in the southwestern portion of the site which would remain undeveloped. Further, the Project would be fully compliant with the regional MSHCP which protects biological resources regionally such that cumulative impacts within the plan area are avoided. As such, the Project would not result in significant cumulative effects. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-29)**.

CULTURAL IMPACTS

Impact 4.4-1: Will the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 150645?

There are no historic-age resources present on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5. No impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.4-14)**.

Impact 4.4-3: Will the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Past land uses of the Project site include residential and poultry farming. The Project site is currently vacant. No cemeteries exist onsite. The closest cemetery, Desert Lawn Funeral Home and Memorial Park, is located approximately 1,200 feet to the south of the Project site, across Brookside Avenue and Interstate 10. An intensive pedestrian survey of the Project site was conducted June 8 – 11, 2021, during which time no human remains were identified. It is unlikely that any human remains would be encountered during ground disturbing activities given that the Project site is already partially disturbed, and the onsite drainages are ephemeral (i.e., flows only in direct response to precipitation). If human remains are found, those remains would be properly treated in accordance with applicable laws. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-16 to 4.4-17)**.

Cumulative Effects.

No historic resources are present on the Project site. Therefore, no historic resources could be altered or destroyed by construction or operation of the Project. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.4-17)**. The Project will be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 *et seq.* As concluded above, previously undiscovered human remains could be encountered during Project construction activities; however, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard following compliance with the established state regulatory framework. Cumulative development could impact previously undiscovered human remains during construction. However, all cumulative development would undergo environmental review on a project-by-project basis to evaluate the site-specific archaeological sensitivity. Additionally, cumulative development would be subject to compliance with the established state regulatory framework concerning the discovery of human remains on a project-by-project basis. The Project's cumulative impacts concerning the potential to disturb human remains would be less than significant given compliance with the established regulatory framework would be required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.4-18)**.

ENERGY

Impact 4.5-1: Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Energy Use During Construction. Energy use during the construction phases of the Project is discussed and quantified in detail at Draft EIR pages 4.5-22 to 4.5-26. The equipment and vehicles used for Project construction would conform to CARB regulations and State emissions, and the Project's fuel from the

entire construction period would increase fuel use in the County by less than one percent. There is no evidence that the Project construction will require the use of equipment that will be more energy intensive than is used for comparable activities elsewhere in the region. Accordingly, the amount of energy and fuel consumed by construction will not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Impacts will be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.5-22 – 4.5-26)**.

Energy Use During Operation. The Project's operational energy use is discussed and quantified in detail at Draft EIR pages 4.5-26 to 4.5-31. The Project building incorporates contemporary, energy-efficient/energy-conserving design and operational programs and will be subject to compliance with the latest Energy Code and CalGreen standards, which are more stringent than prior versions of the respective codes. Due to mandatory compliance with Energy Code and CalGreen standards will ensure that Project building operations will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy. In addition, MM GHG-1 requires the Project to install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation that would provide 100 percent of the expected on-site energy demands for the warehouses in Phase 1. None of the Project energy uses exceed one percent of their corresponding County use. The Project does not propose uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips, nor associated excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption. Project operations would not substantially affect existing energy or fuel supplies or resources. The Project would comply with applicable energy standards and new capacity would not be required. Impacts will be less than significant and no mitigation is required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.5-26 to 4.5-31)**.

Impact 4.5-2: Will the Project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

As discussed under Impact 4.5-1 above, the energy conservation policies and plans relevant to the Project include the California Title 24 energy standards and the 2019 CALGreen building code. The Project would be required to comply with these existing energy standards. Compliance with state and local energy efficiency standards would ensure that the Project meets all applicable energy conservation policies and regulations. As such, the Project would not conflict with applicable plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Southern California Association of Government's ("**SCAG's**") 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Connect SoCal) ("**RTP/SCS**"), adopted in September 2020, integrates transportation, land use, and housing to meet GHG reduction targets set by CARB. The document establishes GHG emissions goals for automobiles and light-duty trucks, as well as an overall GHG target for the region consistent with both the target date of AB 32 and the post-2020 GHG reduction goals of SB 375. The Project would not conflict with the stated goals of the RTP/SCS. Potential impacts are considered less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.5-31)**.

Cumulative Effects. The Project and new development projects located within the cumulative study area would also be required to comply with all the same applicable federal, state, and local measures aimed at reducing fossil fuel consumption and the conservation of energy. The anticipated Project impacts, in conjunction with cumulative development in the vicinity, would increase urbanization and result in increased energy use. Potential land use impacts are site-specific and require evaluation on a case-by-case basis. The Project would not result in significant impacts to state or local plans for renewable energy

or energy efficiency. Therefore, the Project and identified cumulative projects are not anticipated to result in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.5-32)**.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impacts 4.6-1 to 4.6-4: Will the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving: (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?; (ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?; (iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?; and/or (iv) Landslides?

Rupture of Known Earthquake Fault. The Geotechnical Investigation determined that none of the Project components are located on any known active earthquake faults as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and on Figure 9.5, Seismic Zones, of the Beaumont 2040 General Plan. Regardless, the Project site is within a seismically active region and therefore, subject to seismic activity. The nearest active faults are the Cherry Valley Fault, located within a mile of the Project site to the east, and the Beaumont Plain Fault Zone, located approximately two miles further east of the Project site. All Project components would be designed accordingly to the latest California Building Code ("**CBC**") seismic standards and in conformance with all applicable standards set in the Beaumont Municipal Code to resist structural collapse from strong seismic activity as stated in Title 15, Chapter 15.42 Earthquake Hazards Reduction, § 15.42.060 – General Requirements of the Beaumont Municipal Code. The Project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault zone. Furthermore, the Project's operational activity would adhere to all applicable City regulations and engineering standards and specifications. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR at p. 4.6-15 to 4.6-16)**.

Strong Seismic Ground Shaking. As noted above, the Project is subject to regional seismicity. Therefore, all Project components would be designed in accordance with the requirements of the 2019 edition of the CBC and in compliance with all the provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Act and the adopted policies and criteria of Ordinance No. 547. In addition, all relevant documents would be submitted to the Beaumont Public Works Department as part of the Project's discretionary review process. Furthermore, adherence with Goal 9.7 and Policies 9.7.1 through 9.7.5 of the Beaumont 2040 General Plan would ensure that adverse impacts from strong seismic ground shaking is reduced through the adequate planning and building of structures in seismic prone areas through the implementation of the previously noted policies which seek to enforce the most recent seismic requirements, require that all developments located within Alquist-Priolo zones are accompanied with appropriate geotechnical analysis, properly coordinate with the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("**FEMA**") to identify earthquake risks and or mitigation techniques, and ensuring that Building and Safety agencies are involved throughout the plan checks and inspections of the Project. Therefore, impacts concerning strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-16 to 4.16-17)**.

Seismic-Related Ground Failure (Liquefaction). The Geotechnical Investigation determined that based on underlying soil conditions (which included moderate strength older alluvium), the groundwater table was considered to exist beyond 50 feet. Therefore, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for this Project and ground-moving activities (i.e., excavation, grading, etc.) would not contribute to the susceptibility of the site. Overall impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-17)**.

Landslides. No evidence of previous land sliding or debris flow was observed during review of the CGS landslide inventory maps. Additionally, the risk of landslides impacting the Project site is considered low to negligible since the Project's topography does not contain steep slopes. Furthermore, the Project is not surrounded by steep topography with exposed rock-cropping or boulders. Since ground-moving activities would cease at the end the construction phase, and the Project site is not located adjacently to steep topography, no impacts associated with landslides would occur during Project operations. **(Draft EIR at p. 4.6-18)**.

> **Impact 4.6-8: Will the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Accordingly, no impact will occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-22 to 4.6-23)**.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

> **Impacts 4.8-1 and 4.8-2: Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Consistent with federal, state, and local requirements, transport, removal, and disposal of any hazardous materials from the Project site would be conducted by a permitted and licensed service provider. Any handling, transport, use, or disposal would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("**EPA**"), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("**DTSC**"), the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health ("**CalOSHA**"), Caltrans, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("**RCRA**"), and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch (the Certified Unified Program Agency for Riverside County). Operations of the proposed Project would not represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, any potentially hazardous material handled on the Project site would be limited in both quantity and concentrations, consistent with other similar industrial uses located in the City, and any handling, transport, use, and disposal would comply with applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations. Furthermore, as mandated by the OSHA, all hazardous materials stored on the Project site would be accompanied by a Material Safety Data Sheet, which would inform employees and first

responders as to the necessary remediation procedures in the case of accidental release. In addition, and if applicable, future operations would include a hazardous materials business plan in accordance with §§ 25500–25543.3 of the Health and Safety Code. Compliance with existing regulations would be sufficient to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant. Additionally, the Project would require various outdoor landscape maintenance activities. These demands would include the storage of, and periodic application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers. If equipment needed for landscaping are used and housed on-site, the Project may require the storage and of fuels and solvents on-site. Use of this type of equipment and listed materials are common to such facilities and compliance with existing regulations regarding their use would be sufficient to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-19 – 4.8-20)**.

With regard to foreseeable upset and accident conditions, Project operations would involve the routine transport, use, and storage of materials/chemicals typical of industrial facilities. The routine transport, use, and disposal of these materials during Project operations must adhere to federal, State, and local regulations for transport, handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances. The Project would also be subject to compliance with the regulatory framework which would ensure that Project operations would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-20 – 4.8-21)**.

> **Impact 4.8-3: Will the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site. As such, the Project has no potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, and/or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school to the Project site is the Tournament Hills Elementary located at 36611 Champions Drive, approximately 0.9 miles to the southwest. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-21)**.

> **Impact 4.8-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, will the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?**

The Project site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area. The nearest airstrip is the Banning Municipal Airport in Banning located approximately 9.5 miles east of the Project site. Furthermore, the proposed Project does not include any towers or tall structures that would result in a safety hazard. According to the Specific Plan, Planning Area 1 buildings are subject to a 60 feet maximum height and Planning Area 2 buildings are subject to a 50 feet maximum height. No impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23)**.

> **Impact 4.8-6: Will the Project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The proposed Project shall comply with the City's adopted Multi-Hazard Functional Plan. The developer is required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities to comply with the applicable federal, state, and local requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. The proposed plan will be reviewed and approved by the fire marshal during the plan review. Through compliance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements, a less than significant impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-24)**.

Impact 4.8-7: Will the Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

The majority of surrounding areas have been previously disturbed with residential or industrial developments or other areas that are highly disturbed from off-road activity. Although these areas and the Project site are surrounded by developed areas and undeveloped areas, they are designated as a moderate fire hazard severity zone. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-24)**.

While the Project site is located in an area with vegetation that can be prone to fire, due to the presence of surrounding development, non-contiguous nature of the existing undeveloped areas, presence of area roadways, and concrete construction of development, it is not likely to be affected by a wildfire during construction or operations. In addition, the undeveloped area to the north would be separated from the Project area by parking, the drive isle, and landscaping. This buffer would ensure an appropriate width to reduce the risk of potential fire hazards. Lastly, the Project site would be in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code Chapter 7A which would require the use of fire-resistant building materials and fire sprinklers. It is anticipated that these design elements would reduce exposure of the Project site to wildfire. Therefore, although the surrounding areas could experience a fire, because of the above-listed factors, impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-24 – 4.8-25)**.

Cumulative Effects. The potential for cumulative impacts to occur is limited since the impacts from hazardous materials use on site are site-specific. Although some of the cumulative projects and other future projects associated with buildout of the surrounding communities also have potential impacts associated with hazardous materials, the environmental concerns associated with hazardous materials are typically site specific. As with the proposed Project, future development within the area must comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations applicable to hazardous materials.

Each project is required to address any issues related to hazardous materials or wastes on a project-specific basis. With adherence to applicable federal, State, and local regulations governing hazardous materials, the potential risks associated with hazardous materials would be less than significant. The incremental effects of the proposed Project related to hazards and hazardous materials, if any, are anticipated to be minimal, and any effects would be site-specific. Therefore, considering the above, Project impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through compliance of applicable federal, State, and local requirements, policies, and regulations. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-25)**.

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

Impact 4.9-1: Will the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Construction activities associated with the development of the proposed Project would be typical of those used in comparable warehouse and commercial developments. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-15)**. The Project Applicant will be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("**NPDES**") permit, the City Municipal Code, and the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Program, which includes preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("**SWPPP**") and Water Quality Management Plan ("**WQMP**"). The WQMP (which addresses post-construction water quality) must be approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any grading or building permit.

This Project proposes to treat on-site runoff using a series of treatment control measures including biofiltration and infiltration basins. Where feasible, stormwater will be captured within underground detention basins. While the underground detention basins have limited infiltration ability, the captured stormwater will be pumped to irrigate natural vegetation and infiltrate into native soils. On-site flows would be directed towards the proposed underground corrugated metal pipe ("**CMP**") detention system for increased runoff mitigation for Buildings 1 and 3. On-site flows for Building 2 will be directed to a detention basin that provide both infiltration and mitigation for increased runoff. Flows would ultimately discharge to the existing natural streambed to the west of the Project site. The Project would also include self-treating landscape areas throughout the Project site. Routine inspection and maintenance of the biofiltration and infiltration basins and underground detention system are requirements of the City. **(Draft EIR at p. 4.9-16 to 4.9-17)**.

As identified in Standard Condition (SC) HYD-1, preparation, implementation, and participation with the Construction General Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP containing site-specific best management practices ("**BMPs**"), would reduce Project construction effects on water quality to acceptable levels. Compliance with SC HYD-2 would require the Project provide a Final WQMP specifically identifying BMPs that would be incorporated into the Project to control stormwater and non-stormwater pollutants during and after construction. Compliance with SC HYD-3 would require preparation of an Erosion Control Plan that identifies specific measures to control on-site and off-site erosion. Therefore, SC HYD-1 through SC HYD-3 are proposed to preclude the violation of water quality standards during and after construction. Thus, impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-17)**.

Impact 4.9-2: Will the Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with the groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The Project site is within the service area of the Beaumont Cherry Valley Water District ("**BCVWD**"). BCVWD's potable water system is supplied by wells in Little San Gorgonio Creek (Edgar Canyon) and the Beaumont Basin. Although the proposed Project would result in additional impervious surfaces on-site, the proposed Project would treat on-site runoff with biofiltration, infiltration, and reuse. On-site flows would be directed towards a proposed underground CMP detention system. Flows would then be pumped from the detention system at a reduced rate to mitigate for increased runoff to the biofiltration and

infiltration basins. Flows from the detention system for Building 3 would also be pumped to an area of native vegetation to be reused as irrigation and to promote infiltration within the native soils. Infiltration tests were conducted to determine appropriate infiltration rates for the proposed infiltration systems. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-18)**.

Flows would ultimately discharge to the existing natural streambed to the west of the Project site, to landscaped areas within the built-up portions of the site and to the natural water drainage feature located in Planning Area 3 which would allow for infiltration and groundwater recharge. The Project would also include self-treating landscape areas. The pre-treatment of water would minimize pollutants from entering the basin, thereby minimizing impacts to groundwater management. The site does not contain any active or decommissioned groundwater wells. This, along with the Project's compliance with the recommendations of the Infiltration Report **(Draft EIR Appendix H)** will ensure that the proposed Project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-18 to 4.9-19)**.

> **Impact 4.9-3: Will the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which will: (i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?; (ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in flooding on- or off-site?; (iii) Create or contribute runoff which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?; or (iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Erosion and Siltation. The proposed site plan and building layouts do not allow for the same tributary drainage areas to each of the south and west discharge points. To maintain existing outlet conditions, portions of the site would be required to over-mitigate to ensure the downstream facilities are not adversely impacted. The total flows from both discharge points would drain to the west and would not be in excess of pre-Project flows. As noted under Impact 4.9-1, the Project would be subject to the NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit and would implement a SWPPP, which would help minimize erosion and sedimentation from construction activity. The Project would also implement a WQMP and Final WQMP for each building that would include construction and post-construction BMPs to further minimize erosion and sedimentation. In addition to the SWPPP and WQMP, the Project is also subject to the applicable federal, state, regional, and local regulatory framework concerning water quality listed above. Therefore, with implementation of the SWPPP, WQMP, and applicable regulatory framework, the Project is not anticipated to result in substantial erosion or siltation. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-19 – 4.9-20)**.

On- or Off-Site Flooding. The Drainage Report **(Draft EIR Appendix H)** concluded that the proposed Project's drainage improvements would adequately convey flows to the proposed basins at pre-Project flows and as such would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-21)**.

Stormwater Drainage System Capacity and Polluted Runoff. The proposed underground detention system and the proposed biofiltration basins would provide adequate water pre-treated from Buildings 1

and 3, and water from Building 2 would be treated on-site via the proposed infiltration basins. Because water is being treated on-site, no polluted water runoff would occur and the Project would continue to maintain pre-Project release flows. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant would be required to submit all grading and drainage plans for review to the City, to ensure that the Project would not increase flows on- or off-site or substantially exceed the existing drainage facilities. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-21)**.

Flood Flows. Although drainage flows would be required to be internally redirected through the water collection system, the site ultimately continues to drain southwest into the same streambed, further downstream. The streambed eventually enters an existing concrete ditch along Calimesa Boulevard to the northwest of the Project. As shown in the Drainage Report provided for the Project, the stormwater facilities have been designed to have the capacity for all required Hydrologic Conditions of Concern storm events, including post-development peak flows for 100-year storm events. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-21)**.

Impact 4.9-4: Will the Project result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The Project site is inland and is not at risk for inundation due to a tsunami because it is located more than 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean. The Project site is not within a seiche zone because no large bodies of water border the Project site. The Project site is within FEMA FIRM map panel 06065C0785G (effective 8/28/2008). Based on a review of this map panel, the Project site is located in Zone X, an area noted as having a minimal flood hazard. Therefore, the Project site is located outside the 100-year flood hazard area, and no flood risk is present.

According to Figure 5.9-3 of the City's General Plan EIR, the Project site is not located in a flood hazard zone and according to the Riverside County General Plan Dam Failure Inundation Zones Map, the Project site is not located in a dam hazard zone that is susceptible to flood hazards and inundation due to dam rupture. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Thus, no impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-22)**.

Impact 4.9-5: Will the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The Project site is within the Santa Ana River Watershed and is subject to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan and Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan. As discussed in Impact 4.9-1 and Impact 4.9-4, the Project would meet applicable state, regional and local water quality goals. A less than significant impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-23)**.

Cumulative Effects. Implementation of the Project would result in a less than significant impact concerning hydrology and water quality. The Project would be consistent with applicable federal, state, regional, and local water standards that would ensure that the Project's impacts would be cumulatively less than significant. The Project would also require and prepare a SWPPP and Final WQMP that would outline development standards and BMPs that would aid in reducing water quality impacts for construction and post-construction activity. Prior to construction, the City would review and approve the

final drainage and grading plans and final WQMP to ensure that all applicable flood control and water quality standards are met. Additionally, the Project would maintain pre-Project peak flows. Moreover, according to the Water Supply Assessment provided as **Draft EIR Appendix I**, the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District and the City of Beaumont entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on July 9, 2019, which defined the general terms, roles, and responsibilities of both agencies as they related to the delivery of recycled water from the City's upgraded and expanded treatment facility. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to hydrology and water quality. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.9-23)**.

LAND USE & PLANNING

Impact 4.10-1: Will the Project physically divide an established community?

Although the previously approved Specific Plan included residential uses, the Specific Plan was never implemented. The Project site is characterized by cement pads, several structures, and vacant property. Furthermore, the Project's proposed e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial, and open space components would be consistent with the land use designations upon approval of the General Plan Amendment and approval of the Specific Plan. The Project would not physically divide an established community and therefore, no impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.10-11)**.

Impact 4.10-2: Will the Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Project, as designed would be compatible with the strategies proposed by SCAG in their 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. These strategies were a collaborative effort between SCAG and local agencies with the intention of not only managing regional growth, but also maximizing ecological health. **Draft EIR Table 4.10-2**, Project Compatibility with SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS Strategies, demonstrates the proposed Project's compatibility with the land use strategies proposed in SCAG's 2020-2045 amendment of the RTP/SCS. Due to the Project's consistency with SCAG's Land Use strategies, no significant impact is expected in this regard. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.10-12)**.

City of Beaumont General Plan. The Project site is presently designated as "Single Family Residential" by the General Plan. A new Specific Plan and a General Plan Amendment would change the property's land use designation from Single Family Residential to Industrial, General Commercial, and Open Space. The proposed land use designations would be consistent with the proposed e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial area, and open space uses. The City is located in the northwestern portion of Riverside County (County) and is bounded by the City of Calimesa to the northwest, unincorporated areas of the County to the west, unincorporated County areas (e.g., Cherry Valley) to the north, unincorporated County areas and the City of San Jacinto to the south, and by the City of Banning to the east. The City is committed to working with all surrounding jurisdictions in an effort to deal with cross-border and regional issues. The City of Beaumont General Plan Goal 5.6 and Implementation actions EDF 27, CFI, CFI 9, and CFI 26 address how the City will cooperate and work with other agencies to

development and implement regional plans for groundwater, drainage, and solid waste. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14)**.

City of Beaumont Zoning Ordinance. The Project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map. The Project does require a general plan amendment and adoption of new specific plan changes allowable land uses from residential to industrial/ commercial. However, the Project is consistent with the City Code Section 17.20 which will ensure that development of this Project will result in no net loss of residentially zoned property in the City consistent with State law. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with all goals, policies, within the Beaumont General Plan. As such, the Project would not result in any inconsistency with City land use plans and regulations and impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-14 to 4.10-15)**.

Climate Action Plan. The Project would further avoid creating an environmental effect or would further mitigate it with its participation in the cap-and-trade program. The cap-and-trade program is a system designed to reduce pollution in the atmosphere. The cap on greenhouse gas emissions that drive global warming is a firm limit on pollution. The cap gets stricter over time. The trade part is a market for companies to buy and sell allowances that let them emit only a certain amount, as supply and demand set the price. Trading gives companies a strong incentive to save money by cutting emissions in the most cost-effective ways. The cap-and-trade program is applicable to the Project as it applies to large industrial sources such as power plants, refineries, and cement manufacturers which produce the raw materials utilized for the construction of the Project. The cap-and-trade program covers the greenhouse gas emissions associated with electricity consumed in California, generated in-state or imported. Accordingly, greenhouse gas emissions associated with CEQA projects' electricity usage are covered by the cap-and-trade program. The cap-and-trade program also applies to the fuel suppliers (natural gas and propane fuel providers and transportation fuel providers) to address emissions from such fuels and combustion of other fossil fuels. According to **Draft EIR Table 4.7-9**, the Project is consistent with the Climate Action Plan. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.10-14)**.

Cumulative Effects. Existing as well as future cumulative development within the surrounding area is anticipated to occur in accordance with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code and would be evaluated the same as the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project, in conjunction with these other projects, is not anticipated to introduce incompatible uses and substantially conflict with the operation of surrounding land uses. The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community because it does not block access to any existing neighborhoods or existing uses in the vicinity of the Project site. The proposed Project would provide increased connectivity within the area with improvements to Cherry Valley Boulevard and Brookside Avenue that would connect to regional freeways the I-10. Therefore, the proposed Project would not make a cumulative contribution to impacts associated with conflicts with land use planning documents or related policies and regulations. These impacts are less than cumulatively considerable and less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.10-15)**.

NOISE

The City of Beaumont does not specifically provide noise and land use compatibility standards (i.e., noise standards using a 24-hour metric such as Ldn or CNEL and with Normally Acceptable, Conditionally Acceptable, Normally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable designations). In these cases, Riverside County's noise and land use compatibility standards (as recommended by the State Office of Planning and Research) are relied upon for analysis of the following impacts. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-17)**.

> **Impact 4.11-1: Will the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts. Exterior construction noise levels would not exceed the Federal Transportation Authority's ("**FTA's**") 80 dBA threshold at the property line. Additionally, as noise levels would not exceed 70 dBA, interior noise levels would attenuate to 55 dBA or less (conservatively assuming 15 dBA outdoor to indoor noise reduction with windows open). Therefore, noise levels when measured in the interior of the nearest occupied residence would not exceed the City's threshold of 55 dBA at any time. In addition, as required by the City Municipal Code, construction activities may only occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. during the months of October through May. Construction noise would therefore have a less than significant impact. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-20)**.

Construction Traffic Noise. **Draft EIR Table 4.11-11** shows that roadway noise levels would range from 62.5 dBA to 65.1 dBA under existing conditions and from 62.5 dBA to 66.8 dBA under existing conditions plus Project construction. The greatest change in noise levels would occur along Cherry Valley Boulevard from the Project access to Hannon Road. Construction traffic would result in an increase in ambient noise levels of up to 2.1 dBA. This increase in ambient noise levels is below the perceptible range (3.0 dBA). Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(Draft EIR at p. 4.11-20)**.

Operational Noise Impact Analysis – Stationary. Based on current site plans, the nearest Project structure would be a retail building located approximately 230 feet west of the nearest residential and non-residential property lines. At a minimum distance of 230 feet, mechanical equipment noise levels would attenuate to 39 dBA, which is below the City's noise ambient noise standards of 45 dBA for nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.) and 55 dBA for daytime (7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.) for residential receptors (refer to Draft EIR Table 4.11-7). Noise from mechanical equipment would also be below the City's non-residential 50 dBA nighttime standard and 75 dBA daytime standard. Noise impacts associated with HVAC equipment would be less than significant. Operation of mechanical equipment would not increase ambient noise levels beyond the acceptable compatible land use noise levels. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to stationary noise levels. Further, the Project would be required to comply with the General Plan and Municipal Code noise standards. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-21)**.

Warehouse Truck and Loading Dock Noise. Based on the Project plot plans, the elevation of the site would be approximately 48 feet lower than the grade at the property line of the receptors. The retaining wall and terrain would block the line of sight between the loading docks and the receptors, providing a

minimum 5 dBA reduction. Truck and loading dock noise is typically 64.4 dBA Leq at 50 feet. Based on distance attenuation, noise levels due to loading/unloading would be reduced to 45 dBA at the closest residential property line located 675 feet to the northeast of the loading areas. Note that this noise level conservatively assumes activity would occur at the three closest loading docks simultaneously. Loading dock operations would occur throughout the Project site and would be at average distances further away. As noted above, the Project would be grade separated by approximately 48 feet and would include a retaining wall that would attenuate noise between the loading docks and receptors to the east. Due to the grade differences and intervening wall, noise levels would be attenuated by 5 to 8 dB to at least 40 dBA at the closest residential property line. At the closest non-residential property line, noise levels would be 49 dBA. Therefore, loading/unloading noise levels would be below the City's 45 dBA nighttime residential standard and below the 50 dBA non-residential standard. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-22)**.

Parking Noise. Based on the peak hour trip generation rates in the Traffic Study **(Draft EIR Appendix K)**, approximately 585 trips during the worst-case peak hour (Phase 1 and Phase 2 combined) would be made to the Project site each day. Using the FTA's reference noise level of 92 dBA SEL at 50 feet from the noise source, the Project's highest peak hour vehicle trips would generate noise levels of approximately 54 dBA Leq at 50 feet from the parking lot. The nearest property line is 160 feet east of the closest parking area. Based strictly on distance attenuation, parking lot noise at the nearest receptor would be 44 dBA which is below the City's nighttime residential and non-residential noise standards of 45 dBA and 50 dBA, respectively. Therefore, noise impacts from parking lots would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-23)**.

Drive-Thru Noise. Phase 2 of the proposed Project would include two drive-thru restaurants. Project noise sources from drive-thru operations include amplified speech from the intercom, idling vehicles, vehicles circulating along the drive-thru lanes. The measured noise level associated with active drive-thru operations is 64 dBA at a distance of 20 feet. The restaurants would be located approximately 560 feet and 700 feet from the eastern property line and based on distance attenuation, drive-thru noise levels would be 35.1 and 33.1 dBA, respectively. The combined noise levels from these two drive-thru restaurants operating simultaneously would be 37.2 dBA, which is below the City's nighttime residential and non-residential noise standards of 45 dBA and 50 dBA, respectively. (**Draft EIR, p. 4.11-23**).

Off-Site Traffic Noise Impact Analysis.

Opening Year Conditions. The Phase 1 Opening Year "2024 Without Project" and "2024 With Project" scenarios are compared in **Draft EIR Table 4.11-12**, Phase 1 Traffic Noise Levels. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.11-12, roadway noise levels without the Project would range from 46.2 dBA CNEL to 68.5 dBA CNEL and with the Project between 48.6 dBA CNEL and 69.6 dBA CNEL. Project generated traffic would result in a maximum increase of 2.4 dBA. In general, a 3-dBA increase in traffic noise is barely perceptible to people, while a 5-dBA increase is readily noticeable. Table 4.11-12 shows that none of the roadway segments would exceed both 3.0 dBA and the County's 60 CNEL land use compatibility standard for residential uses (refer to Table 4.11-8). Therefore, Phase 1 Opening Year traffic noise would result in a less than significant impact. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-24)**.

Off-Site Phase 1 Plus Phase 2 Traffic Noise. The Project Buildout Opening Year "2027 Without Project" and "2027 With Project" scenarios are compared in **Draft EIR Table 4.11-13**, Project Buildout (Phase 1 Plus Phase 2) Traffic Noise Levels. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.11-13, roadway noise levels without the Project would range from 48.6 dBA CNEL to 69.6 dBA CNEL and with the Project between 52.0 dBA CNEL and 69.9 dBA CNEL. Project generated traffic would result in a maximum increase of 5.7 dBA. In general, a 3-dBA increase in traffic noise is barely perceptible to people, while a 5-dBA increase is readily noticeable. **Draft EIR Table 4.11-13** shows that an increase in traffic noise levels along the following roadway segments would exceed 3.0 dBA:

- Brookside Avenue from Nancy Avenue to Oak View Drive
- Union Street from Cherry Valley Boulevard to Brookside Avenue
- Nancy Avenue from Cherry Valley Boulevard to Brookside Avenue

However, although the "2027 With Project" traffic noise along these roadway segments may be noticeably louder, the traffic noise would remain below 60 CNEL, the County's normally acceptable land use compatibility standard for residential uses **(Draft EIR Table 4.11-8)**, except for Brookside Avenue from Nancy Avenue to Oak View Drive. However, 61.5 dBA is the noise level at 100 feet from the roadway centerline. There is one residence along this segment, and it is 150 feet from the roadway centerline. At 150 feet, the noise level attenuates to 58.8 dBA, which is within the 60 dBA Normally Acceptable standard. Additionally, the primary outdoor space for this receptor appears to be in the back yards and not along the roadway (i.e., further than 150 feet away). Additionally, a golf course is located along the south side of this segment. The golf course would be within the 75 dBA normally acceptable standard. Therefore, traffic noise at Project Buildout would result in a less than significant impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-24 – 4.11-25)**.

Off-Site Horizon Year (Phase 1 Plus Phase 2) Traffic Noise. The Horizon Year "2040 Without Project" and "2040 Plus Project" scenarios were also compared. As shown in **Draft EIR Table 4.11-14**, Horizon Year (Phase 1 Plus Phase 2) Traffic Noise Levels, roadway noise levels would range between 48.8 dBA CNEL and 68.6 dBA CNEL at 100 feet from the centerline and between 52.9 dBA CNEL and 69.9 dBA CNEL with the Project. The Project would result in a maximum increase of 4.0 dBA CNEL. Table 4.11-14 shows that an increase in traffic noise levels along the following roadway segments would exceed 3.0 dBA:

- Union Street from Cherry Valley Boulevard to Brookside Avenue
- Nancy Avenue from Cherry Valley Boulevard to Brookside Avenue

However, although the "2040 With Project" traffic noise along these roadway segments may be noticeably louder, the traffic noise would remain below 60 CNEL, the County's normally acceptable land use compatibility standard for residential uses **(Draft EIR Table 4.11-8)**. Therefore, the Horizon Year "2040 Plus Project" scenario would result in a less than significant traffic noise impact.

Impact 4.11-2: Will the Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Construction Analysis. The nearest structure to the Project construction site is approximately 67 feet away. **Draft EIR Table 4.11-15** shows that at 67 feet the vibration velocities from construction equipment would not exceed 0.0203 in/sec PPV, which is below the FTA's 0.20 in/sec PPV threshold for building damage and below the 0.04 in/sec PPV annoyance threshold. It is also acknowledged that construction activities would occur throughout the Project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to the nearest structure. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with Project construction would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-31)**.

Operational Analysis. The Project would include truck movement activity at the Project site. These movements would generally be low-speed (i.e., less than 15 miles per hour) and would occur over new, smooth surfaces. For perspective, Caltrans has studied the effects of propagation of vehicle vibration on sensitive land uses and notes that "heavy trucks, and quite frequently buses, generate the highest earthborn vibrations of normal traffic." Caltrans further notes that the highest traffic-generated vibrations are along freeways and state routes. Their study finds that "vibrations measured on freeway shoulders (five meters from the centerline of the nearest lane) have never exceeded 0.08 inches per second, with the worst combinations of heavy trucks and poor roadway conditions (while such trucks were moving at freeway speeds). This level coincides with the maximum recommended safe level for ruins and ancient monuments (and historic buildings)". Since the Project's truck movements would be at low speed (not at freeway speeds) and would be over smooth surfaces (not under poor roadway conditions), Project-related vibration associated with truck activity would not result in excessive groundborne vibrations; no vehicle-generated vibration impacts would occur. In addition, there are no sources of substantial groundborne vibration associated with the Project, such as rail or subways. The Project would not create or cause any vibration impacts due to operations. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-28)**.

> **Impact 4.11-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, will the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?**

The closest airport to the Project site is the Banning Municipal Airport located approximately 9 miles to the southeast. The Project is not within 2.0 miles of a public airport or within an airport land use plan. Additionally, there are no private airstrips located within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the Project would not expose people working in the Project area to excessive airport- or airstrip-related noise levels and no mitigation is required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-28)**.

Cumulative Effects.

Construction. The Project's construction activities would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Construction noise would be periodic and temporary noise impacts that would cease upon completion of construction activities. The Project would contribute to other proximate construction project noise impacts if construction activities were conducted concurrently. However, based on the noise analysis, the Project's construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant following the City of Beaumont Municipal Code. Construction activities at other planned and approved

projects near the Project site would be required to comply with applicable City rules related to noise and would take place during daytime hours on the days permitted by the applicable Municipal Code, and projects requiring discretionary City approvals would be required to evaluate construction noise impacts, comply with the City's standard conditions of approval, and implement mitigation, if necessary, to minimize noise impacts. Construction noise impacts are by nature localized. Based on the fact that noise dissipates as it travels away from its source, noise impacts would be limited to the Project site and vicinity. Therefore, Project construction would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts, assuming such a cumulative impact existed, and impacts in this regard are not cumulatively considerable. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-29)**.

Stationary Noise. No known past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would combine with the operational noise levels generated by the Project to increase noise levels above acceptable standards because each project must comply with applicable City regulations that limit operational noise. Therefore, the Project, together with other projects, would not create a significant cumulative impact, and even if there was such a significant cumulative impact, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative operational noises. Given that noise dissipates as it travels away from its source, operational noise impacts from on-site activities and other stationary sources would be limited to the Project site and vicinity. Thus, cumulative operational noise impacts from related projects, in conjunction with Project specific noise impacts, would not be cumulatively significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-33)**.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact 4.12-1 Would the Project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Although the Project does not include residential uses, the Project would indirectly induce population growth since the Project includes commercial uses, which would result in jobs for City residents. The Project's construction and operations would result in the development of commercial, e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, and open space land uses on approximately 188 acres. The construction phase of the Project would generate employment opportunities, including construction management, engineering, and labor. Construction related jobs are not considered significantly growth inducing because they are temporary in nature and are anticipated to be filled by persons in the surrounding area. As noted in **Draft EIR Table 4.12-3**: Housing Units – City of Beaumont and County of Riverside, the City is housing-rich and has a 4.8 percent vacancy rate. Additionally, the City is considered "jobs poor" as it has a high 10.5 percent unemployment rate. This suggests that the Project's employment opportunities would be adequately filled by local residents or the surrounding community. Therefore, the Project's employment opportunities for the construction phase would not induce substantial unplanned population growth. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.12-10)**.

The Project has the potential to generate approximately 4,010 new jobs. Although the Project would generate approximately half of SCAG's forecasted employment for the City, the forecasted increase in

Project employment is well within the City's total future employment of 19,910 by 2045 and well within the County's forecasted employment of 1,103,000 by 2045. According to the Beaumont 2040 General Plan Draft EIR, most of the City's residents commute to other cities for work. Thus, the Project's related employment growth impacts are not anticipated to be significant since the City is housing-rich and would be adequately served by the regional and local workforce, thereby resulting in an improved jobs-housing-balance for the City and the County by 2045. It is expected that jobs at the Project site would be drawn from the local and regional labor force. The Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial population growth, and impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.12-11 to 4.12-12)**.

Impact 4.12-2 Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The Project site is comprised of cement pads, several structures, and vacant property. The approved 2007 Sunny-Cal Specific Plan included approximately 158.65 acres of Low Density Residential. This Project, which would amend the previously approved specific plan includes 1) a General Plan Amendment to change the current "Single Family Residential" land use to "Industrial, General Commercial, and Open Space" land use, consistent with the proposed e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial area, and open space uses; and 2) approval of a Specific Plan that establishes the zoning, land use designations, development standards, and design guidelines for the entire Project area. While the Sunny-Cal Specific Plan project was approved, no development occurred since the Project approval. There are no homes in the Project site, as such, no displacement of homes would occur. A less than significant impact would occur. (**Draft EIR, p. 4.12-12 to 4.12-13)**.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Impact 4.13-1 Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

***Fire Protection*.** The Project buildings would be constructed from non-flammable concrete and would be equipped with automatic ceiling-mounted fire sprinkler systems. All other fire-related safety features would be in accordance with the applicable provisions of the adopted California Fire Code and the City's Municipal Code, ordinances, and standard conditions regarding fire prevention and suppression measures related to water improvement plans, fire hydrants, fire access, and water availability. Additionally, prior to the approval of the Project, the City's Building Department and Riverside County Fire Department ("**RCFD**") would review building plans in order to ensure that all applicable fire safety features are incorporated as part of the Project. Prior to the approval of occupancy permits for the new buildings, it would be required that the RCFD would inspect all new structures in order to ensure that all fire safety features have been implemented and installed correctly. Furthermore, Fire Protection Impact Fees would also be collected in order to build and supply necessary infrastructure for fire protection services, as necessary. The fire station closest to the Project area is RCFD Station 22, the Cherry Valley Station, located

in the County approximately 2.8 roadway miles northeast of the Project area. RCFD has reviewed the Project design to ensure conformance to RCFD requirements and would thereby reduce demands on fire protection services. Additionally, payment of the Fire Protection impact fees, property taxes, and other revenues generated by development within the Project area would be available to the City to offset any increased costs for fire protection services with little or no net effect on the City's budget. Implementation of the Project would be required to be consistent with the City's General Plan for e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial, and open space uses as well as permitted floor area ratio ("**FAR**"). Lastly, Project development would be subject to compliance with RCFD requirements for emergency access, fire-flow, fire protection standards, fire lanes, and other site design/building standards. Therefore, impacts are less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.13-10)**.

***Police Protection*.** Project development would be subject to Beaumont Police Department ("**BPD**") review. BPD has previously reviewed the Project for consistency with crime prevention design and BPD requirements. BPD review would act to ensure that development would conform to BPD emergency access and site/facility security requirements and recommendations, and thereby reduce demands on law enforcement services. Additionally, the Project applicant would pay the required Police Facilities Impact fees, property taxes, and other revenues generated by development and would be available to the City to offset any increased costs for law enforcement services with little or no net effect on the City's budget. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-10 to 4.13-11)**.

Upon development, BPD located at 660 Orange Avenue, approximately 4.4 roadway miles southeast, would provide law enforcement services to the Project site. The City has a target ratio of 1.0 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents, which is reviewed annually. Currently, the ratio is approximately 0.93 officers per 1,000 residents. Further, the City response times in the City is 2.9 minutes for in progress calls and 5.9 minutes for past calls. The Project consists of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial, and open space uses. The Project would not directly increase population and the officer to population ratio would remain the same. Based upon BPD Project comments at various Project Development Review Committee meetings, the Project does not include or require construction of any new or physically altered police protection facilities. Prior to commencement of construction activities, Project plans would be reviewed by applicable local agencies to ensure compliance with the City's Municipal Code as well as all applicable regulations to ensure adequate site signage, lighting and other crime safety preventative measures are implemented. Construction of the Project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project would not substantially affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives such that new facilities are required. The Project also would include design elements such as lighting of streets, walkways, and bikeways; visibility of doors and windows from the street; and fencing of the property. These measures would help reduce demands for law enforcement services and impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.13-11)**.

Cumulative Effects. The Project is not anticipated to substantially increase the need for public services in the City. The Project would not result in an overall net increase in City population. Anticipated increase demands for public services within the City was accounted for in the General Plan and analyzed in the

General Plan EIR, which accounts for cumulative growth in the City. In addition, related to all public services, the Project would pay the required development fees that would be appropriately allocated for police, fire, schools, parks, and other public facilities. The Project would also generate additional revenue for the City which would provide General Fund revenues to offset the Project's contribution toward additional public service demand. Similar to the Project, other cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate their level of impact on public services including paying the appropriate development fees; therefore, the past, present, and future projects would not result in a cumulative impact related to the provision of public services. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-11 to 4.13-12)**.

RECREATION

Impact 4.14-1 Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The Project does not propose any on-site or off-site park or recreational facilities, nor does it propose any residential developments or any other uses that would contribute population growth requiring the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The Project proposes e commerce and commercial uses, as well as 30.6 acres of open space within Planning Area 3 of the Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts to existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities are anticipated. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.14-5)**.

Impact 4.14-2 Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The Project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities as the Project is composed of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, office, and future hotel and general retail uses. The Project does not involve uses that would induce population growth requiring the use of recreational facilities. No impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.14-6)**.

Cumulative Effects. The Project would not result in an overall net increase in City population that exceeds either City and/or regional growth plans. Anticipated increased demands for recreation within the City was accounted for in the City's General Plan and analyzed in the City's General Plan EIR, which accounts for cumulative growth in the City. In addition, the Project would pay the required development fees that would be appropriately allocated for parks and other recreational facilities. Similar to the Project, other cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate their level of impact on recreational facilities including paying the appropriate development fees; therefore, the past, present, and future projects would not result in a cumulative impact related to the provision of recreation. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.14-6)**.

TRANSPORTATION

Impact 4.15-1: Will the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

The Project does not propose elements or aspects that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. On a long-term basis, the Project may result in increased demand for public transportation as increased employment opportunities become available on-site; however, transit agencies routinely review and adjust their ridership schedules to accommodate public demand. There are no existing public transit stops in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area. Community Services may require a future transit stop if warranted by a traffic study. The Pass Transit System provided by the City includes Routes 3, 4, 7, and 9 which are within approximately two miles of the Specific Plan area. As the Project develops, the Pass Transit System may assess the potential demand for these facilities in the area and may establish new or extended routes in the area. Coordination with the Pass Transit System would be required as the Project builds out to determine the need for future bus turnouts along Cherry Valley Boulevard. Accordingly, the Project has no potential to conflict with local public transit service. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-16)**.

The proposed Project has been designed and would be constructed to be responsive to the goals and policies from the Land Use and Community Design and Mobility elements of the City of Beaumont General Plan that pertain to the circulation system. The Project's land use and circulation elements would be consistent with the requirements pertaining to the overall transportation and circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, elements that are included as part of the proposed roadway improvements. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-16 to 4.15-17)**.

The Beaumont General Plan Policy 4.1.2 calls for the maintenance of LOS D on all auto-priority streets in Beaumont. LOS E is considered acceptable on non-auto-priority streets. The Traffic Study conducted for the Project (**Draft EIR Appendix K**) evaluated level of service (LOS) and found that under various scenarios, LOS at 19 intersections/driveways under several scenarios would operate at an unacceptable LOS and therefore not be compliant with General Plan Policy 4.1.2. However, the recommended improvements contained at **Draft EIR pages 4.15-17 to 4.15-18**, in addition to the site-adjacent and site access improvements listed at **Draft EIR pages 4.15-18 to 4.15-19** would ensure that all intersections operate at an acceptable LOS. Recommended improvements may include a combination of fee payments to established programs, construction of specific improvements, payment of a fair share contribution toward future improvements, or a combination of these approaches. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-18)**. The proposed improvements would adhere to all relevant circulation regulations and be consistent with policy and planning document guidance related to needed improvements. Adherence to these planning directives and incorporation of the associated improvements would have a less than significant impact on the environment. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-19)**.

Impact 4.15-3: Will the Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The Project would not create a significant traffic-related safety hazard. The Project roadways, ingress and egress, and interior circulation elements have been designed and would be constructed consistent with the City's Department of Public Works Department standard drawings. There are no incompatible land uses proposed or in the vicinity of the Project Site, such as those utilizing farm equipment, that would result in a potential significant traffic safety hazard. Although construction would involve the use of large

heavy-duty equipment such as rollers, graders, and dump trucks, all staging and construction areas would have appropriate signage and standard safety protocols as implemented by the Project Applicant through standard construction practices. Therefore, potential impacts associated with design hazards would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-22 – 4.15- 23).**

Impact 4.15-4: Will the Project result in in adequate access?

Adequate emergency access will be provided to the Project site during construction and long-term operation. The City will also require the Project Applicant to provide adequate paved access to-and-from the site as a condition of Project approval. Lastly, the City will review all future Project construction drawings to ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained along abutting pubic streets during construction activities. Based on the Project design and with required adherence to City requirements for emergency vehicle access, no impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-23).**

Cumulative Effects. Construction activities associated with the Project and nearby cumulative projects may overlap and result in temporary traffic impacts to local roadways. However, the Project would not result in significant traffic related impacts resulting from conflicts with transportation plans or policies and is consistent with all applicable Beaumont General Plan policies such as working with Caltrans, making needed roadway improvements, etc. Cumulative development projects would also be required to reduce construction traffic impacts on the local circulation system and implement any required mitigation measures that may be prescribed pursuant to CEQA provisions. Therefore, the Project contribution to cumulative impacts during construction would be less than significant. The Project will not cause or exacerbate existing transportation design safety concerns or adversely affect emergency access. As such, the Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact in these areas. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.15-22 to 4.15-24)**.

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

Impact 4.17-1: Will the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Water Use. The Water Supply Assessment ("**WSA**") prepared for the Project estimated the proposed Project's water demands to be 183 AFY, or approximately 66 percent less water demand than was anticipated for the previously approved Sunny-Cal Specific Plan on the same property footprint of 531 acre-feet per year ("**AFY**") with 560 dwelling units ("**DUs**"), and this is commensurate with the number of EDUs that the BCVWD assumed for buildout of the property and its water demands projections in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan ("**UWMP**"). Although the Project site currently uses little to no water, the proposed Project would have a planned water use of approximately 183 AFY which is a reduction of approximately 66 percent compared to the previously approved Sunny-Cal Specific Plan development which as previously stated would have generated a need of 531 AFY of water use. Because

the water supplier's water demand projections assumed a higher development density based on a previously approved project, than that which is proposed by the Project for the same property, it can be deduced that the water demand for the Project would result in a net decrease in potable water demand. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-24 to 4.17-25)**. According to the WSA, it is anticipated that the new water demand created by the Project would not exceed the City's anticipated water supply. Furthermore, the Project will demonstrate consistency with the City Landscaping Standards located in the Beaumont Municipal Code Chapter 17.06, which require efficient systems and plants with low-water demands. The water demand for each planning area is discussed at **Draft EIR p. 4.17-25**. Based on these figures and based on the evaluation of water demand from the previously approved Specific Plan, water demand from the proposed Project would not result or require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities which could cause significant environmental effects beyond the scope and scale of those already evaluated. These impacts would be less than significant.

Wastewater. Sewer service would be provided by the City of Beaumont, with treatment provided by the Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant ("**WWTP**") No. 1. The WWTP is located within BCVWD's service area and has been upgraded and expanded to include the ability to produce recycled water for distribution. Based on the relatively low wastewater generation rates of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility and commercial uses that would be implemented within the Project area, development would result in nominally increased wastewater treatment demands compared to the two mgd of increased treatment capacity. The County of Riverside uses an average wastewater generation rate of 1,200 gpd per acre for commercial uses. The approximately 150-acre building area of the e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility and commercial planning areas (Pas) would therefore generate 180,000 gpd. This total would comprise less than one percent of the two mgd increased treatment capacity. The WWTP would have sufficient wastewater treatment capacity to serve the proposed Project as the undergoing upgrades would allow for an increase in treatment capacity. Therefore, the Project would not trigger the need for new or expanded regional wastewater treatment facilities and/or exceed capacity. In addition, the Project applicant would be required to pay standard BCVWD sewer connection fees, which are used to fund wastewater treatment and regional wastewater conveyance improvements associated with new development. As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR at 4.17-26)**. Regarding the wastewater collection systems and proposed connections to the municipal wastewater collection system, Project facilities would be designed and installed in conformance with the City stipulated wastewater system design, construction, and operational requirements. This would ensure wastewater collection facilities are properly designed, implemented, operated, and maintained; thereby furthering efficiency and adequacy of facilities while reducing facilities lifecycle costs. The Project applicant also would pay fees pursuant to the incumbent City of Beaumont Fee Schedule. These fees would cover the City's cost to fund plan review, coordination, and inspection of proposed wastewater collection system improvements. The Project applicant would be responsible for any capital costs to extend the existing sewer lines, as well as applicable sewer connection and service fees, which. act to fund future improvement plans, operations, and maintenance of existing wastewater collection facilities. As previously discussed, the Project sewer infrastructure would be a gravity system placed in drive aisles and the central private drive and connecting with a proposed sewer line in Brookside Avenue (**see Draft EIR Exhibit 3.0-10 in Section 3.0, Project Description**). An approximately 488 feet long proposed sewer line is

to be installed just southeast of the site along Brookside Avenue to an existing sewer line located at Morgan Avenue. Therefore, the Project would have little or no net effect on the operation of wastewater collection facilities or wastewater treatment capacity. Impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required. **(Draft EIR at 4.17-26)**.

Stormwater. The Project's drainage plan will collect stormwater through catch basins placed throughout the Specific Plan area. Stormwater will be discharged into a series of above and below-ground detention basins to reduce flows and to provide treatment prior to being discharged into the existing stream course in PA 3. On-site runoff will be conveyed through the site via proposed curb and gutters, and ribbon gutters. Runoff would be collected via a network of inlets provided at low point throughout the Project site and conveyed via underground storm drain towards the proposed water quality treatment facilities. Conveyance of stormwater from Buildings 1, 2 and 3 is discussed in detail at **Draft EIR p. 4.17-27**. Due to the lack of downstream storm drain facilities, the Project site would be required to mitigate for increases in runoff. The proposed mitigation systems for each Building project site have been sized to mitigate for increased runoff for the 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year storm events with a duration of 24 hours. The proposed site plan and building layouts do not allow for the same tributary drainage areas to each of the south and west discharge points. To maintain existing outlet conditions, portions of the site would be required to over mitigate to ensure the downstream facilities are not adversely impacted. The total flows from both discharge points will drain to the west and would not be in excess of pre-Project flows. As such, less than significant impacts would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-27)**.

Electric Power. SCE provides basic electrical service for all residential and nonresidential customers within the City and would provide electricity to the proposed Project. There are no under-served areas within the City and are no significant constraints that would make it infeasible to provide electric service needed for the proposed Project. Underground power is available to most service areas, with lines situated along several of the major streets. As part of the Project development, electricity lines and other junctions (as needed) would be extended into the Project site in areas already proposed for disturbance. The proposed Project would tie into existing utility lines in existing roadways or other easements that have already experienced disturbances or that were anticipated for such use. The proposed Project would not require the construction or unanticipated relocation of electric power facilities resulting in unanticipated environmental effects. Additionally, the Project would not require a substation for electrical power, per SCE. Impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-27 to 4.17-28)**.

Natural Gas. SoCalGas provides basic residential and business gas services. There are no underserved areas, and SoCalGas does not foresee any constraints to substantial future development within the City. Natural gas services for the Project will be provided by underground pipes to distribute the gas within the Project area. These pipes are not existing and would therefore require trenching to place them. However, this can be done in conjunction with the construction of roads or other ground disturbing activities such as laying foundations or sewer systems. Therefore, the installation of natural gas infrastructure would not create an increased impact on the environment. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-28)**.

Telecommunication. Verizon provides home and business phone service, as well as offering fiber optics capabilities. Video and data lines are also possible for each residence via an existing network. There are currently no under-served areas. Telecommunication facilities would be provided to the Project site by Verizon. Verizon would connect the Project site to existing telecommunication facilities, which are in the vicinity of the Project site. Less than significant impacts would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-28)**.

Impact 4.17-2: Will sufficient water supplies be available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Through 2045, BCVWD is anticipated to have adequate water supply to meet current demand, the increased demands for the proposed Project, and water needed for other anticipated growth. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-28)**. Water demand and supply under normal year, dry year and multiple dry year conditions are discussed in detail at **Draft EIR p. 4.17-28 to 4.17-31**. The BVCWD estimates that sufficient water supplies will be available to serve the project during any normal year occurring between 2020 and 2040; during a single dry year occurring anytime from 2025 to 2045; and, with the use of banked groundwater supplies, during each year of a five-year drought that could occur anytime from 2025 to 2045. **(Draft EIR Tables 4.17-3 to 4.17-5)**. In addition, the WSA concluded that the San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency ("**SGPWA**") has projected in its 2020 UWMP to have reliable water supplies through the 2045 planning horizon year to meet SGPWA's current and 2045 future water demands in its service area during normal and average rainfall years, during a five-year drought from 2021 to 2025, as well as a five-consecutive year drought between 2025 and 2045. SGPWA's water reliability assessment for a drought lasting five consecutive years shows sufficient available supplies assuming the retail agencies in SGPWA service area use stored water and regionally managed supplies to offset fluctuations in its State Water Project ("**SWP**") supplies. According to the WSA, BCVWD can rely on the SGPWA to secure and deliver the imported water needed to meet BCVWD's current and future demands. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-31)**.

While it is anticipated sufficient water supply will be available, it should be noted that not all of those water supplies are firm with agreements in place. Beyond 2025, SGPWA and BCVWD would rely on the reliability of SWP water, the availability of Article 21 and Turnback Pool Water, short term water transfers which are not yet agreed to, and the Delta Conveyance Project ("**DCP**") and Sites Reservoir. Both DCP and Sites Reservoir are moving forward, and there is more than reasonable probability these projects will come to fruition. While there is some risk, which BCVWD believes is low, that the projects would not continue, the risk will decrease over time as design and permitting progress. Further, SGPWA is anticipated to be able to obtain sufficient imported water supply to supplement local supplies to meet regional needs including BCVWD's needs, and those of the proposed Project. The proposed Project was planned for in BCVWD's 2020 UWMP which demonstrated adequate water supplies up to the year 2045. BCVWD also identified recycled water from the City for non-potable water irrigation with a plan for the recharge of surplus recycled water with appropriate treatment and permits, which would reduce demands for potable water. This also would assist lowering water demands during critical and multiple dry year reliability analysis demonstrated that BCVWD will be able to meet BCVWD's existing demands during those times and also would supplement the existing supply sources during these dry periods with banked

water in BCVWD's Beaumont Basin Groundwater Storage Account. Therefore, pursuant to the CGC § 66473.7, (SB 221) and § 10910 of the California Water Code (SB 610), BCVWD would have sufficient currently available and planned supplies exist to meet the water demands of the proposed Project in addition to the existing and other projected demands during normal, single dry and multiple dry years over the next 20 years. Accordingly, BCVWD has determined that it has sufficient and adequate water supply available to serve long-term needs of the Project in addition to the existing and other projected demands during normal, single dry and multiple dry years over the next 20 years. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-32)**.

Impact 4.17-3: Will the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Sewer infrastructure for the Project will consist of a gravity system placed in drive aisles and the central private drive and connecting with a proposed sewer line in Brookside Avenue, as depicted in **Draft EIR Exhibit 3.0-10, Conceptual Sewer Plan**). Wastewater from the Project site would then flow to be treated at the City's Treatment Plant No. 1. Currently, the City's WWTP No. 1 is undergoing upgrades that would expand the current permitted capacity from 4 mgd to 6 mgd, as well as construction of advanced treatment, lift station modifications, and the addition of on-site recycled water storage facilities. The treatment upgrades include a new fine screen system, conversion to activated sludge, a new activated sludge pump for secondary clarification, and a new membrane bio-reactor, with a reverse osmosis system to remove dissolved solids. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-32)**. Additionally, new dewatering equipment and optimization of the existing ultraviolet disinfection system. Based on the wastewater generation rates of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility and commercial uses that would be implemented within the Project area, development would result in nominally increased wastewater treatment demands compared to the 2 mgd of increased treatment capacity. The City's Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 1 would have sufficient wastewater treatment capacity to serve the proposed Project as the undergoing upgrades would allow for an increase in capacity. Therefore, the Project would not trigger the need for new or expanded regional wastewater treatment facilities and/or exceed capacity. In addition, the Project applicant would be required to pay standard BCVWD sewer connection fees, which are used to fund wastewater treatment and regional wastewater conveyance improvements associated with new development. As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. Furthermore, wastewater collection systems and proposed connections to the municipal wastewater collection system would be designed and installed in conformance with the City stipulated wastewater system design standards, construction, and operational requirements. This ensures wastewater collection facilities are properly designed, implemented, operated, and maintained; thereby furthering efficiency and adequacy of facilities while reducing facilities lifecycle costs. The applicant also would pay fees pursuant to the incumbent City Fee Schedule. These fees would cover the City's cost to fund plan review, coordination, and inspection of proposed wastewater collection system improvements. The applicant would be responsible for any capital costs to extend the existing sewer lines, as well as applicable sewer connection and service fees, which act to fund future improvement plans, operations, and maintenance of existing wastewater collection facilities. Therefore, the Project would have little or no net effect on the operation

of wastewater collection facilities or wastewater treatment capacity. Impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-32 to 4.17-33)**.

Impact 4.17-4: Will the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

The City is in the service area of the Lamb Canyon Landfill, located just south of the City and operated by the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources. Therefore, the City will provide solid waste management services for the Project. Solid waste services within the City are contracted by WM for weekly trash, green waste and recycling curbside service. The City's agreement with WM includes a tipping fee for the County's costs to operate the Lamb Canyon landfill. The Project will also be served by WM. Solid waste generated from the Project would be collected by WM, with the bulk of recyclable waste and green waste delivered to the Moreno Valley Solid Waste Recycling and Transfer Facility ("**MVTS**") for processing. The MVTS is located at 17700 Indian Street in Moreno Valley. It is permitted for a 2,500-tpd operation. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-33 to 4.17-34)**. The proposed Project site is vacant and solid waste would initially be generated as construction debris. At the end of Project buildout, construction debris would stop being generated. Remnant construction debris including wood products, metals, and concrete and paving would be recycled or reused when possible. Operational waste would be generated from business operations and green waste from landscaping. Based on the listed generation rate, the approximately 2,707,465 square feet mixed commercial, e commerce, and office uses is anticipated to generate approximately 13,537 lbs. (2,707,465/1,000*5) of waste per day or 7 tons per day (tpd). The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. The proposed Project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Solid waste would likely be primarily disposed of at the Lamb Canyon Land Fill facility. Green waste can also be transported to this facility where it is sorted and then transferred for disposal. Based on the anticipated tonnage generated, the proposed Project would contribute a negligible volume of waste, approximately 0.03 percent of existing daily disposal. In addition, the other two landfills available for use, the Badlands Landfill and Sobrante Landfill, can accept up to 4,800 tpd and up to 7,000 tpd, respectively. If these facilities are used, the proposed Project would make a similarly slight contributions. Solid waste created by the Project would be collected and handled in compliance with all applicable regulation including those in Beaumont Municipal Code § 8.12.100 – Disposal of Solid Waste Required. To help reduce the waste stream, the Beaumont Municipal Code Chapter 8.12 details the City's waste management policy which includes requirements and strategies to reduce solid waste and increase the amount of material that is recycled. The proposed Project also would follow the state requirements related to reducing and recycling of the waste stream and comply with ABs 341 and 1826 by implementing a recycling program to separate recyclable, and recyclable organic materials, from non-recyclable solid waste and coordinating with the respective waste hauler(s) to have it disposed of at a proper facility. This also would satisfy other state requirement related to large scale businesses such as the proposed Project to maintain recycling and organics recycling programs. These requirements are designed to move California to its statewide goal of a 75 percent recycling rate, including a reduction in the level of organic waste disposal by 50 percent from its current levels. To help ensure businesses comply with the City's ordinance and state laws, the City's franchise waste hauler, WM, offers

source separated recyclables, green waste, and food waste collection services. Therefore, the proposed Project would implement all required waste reduction strategies and the existing landfills have adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant and mitigation is not required. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-34 to 4.17-35)**.

Impact 4.17-5: Will the Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Project development would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The Project does not propose any activities that would conflict with the applicable programmatic requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-32)**.

Cumulative Effects.

Future projects in the area would incrementally increase water demand, wastewater generation, solid waste generation and decrease available capacity of the landfills in the area. However, as with the Project, these projects have been, or would be, required to conduct environmental review. The BCVWD and SGPWA UWMP's account for growth in the City and Region and have found adequate water supplies exist. Similarly, the Project would be served by existing and planned wastewater and stormwater facilities. Additionally, based on BCVWD's focus on groundwater recharge and the placement of the retention basins on the Project site, it is anticipated that at least some of the wastewater generated from the Project and much of the stormwater would be used for this purpose. Furthermore, as of 2015, the Lamb Canyon Land Fill facility was processing an average of 5,000 tpd and has a remaining capacity of 19,242,950 cubic yards. Therefore, while the Project would incrementally increase demands on public utilities, the increases are within the anticipated growth patterns and within the capacity of existing and planned resources. The Project would not combine with other cumulative projects to result in significant impacts to utilities and service systems. The Project's contribution is not considered cumulatively considerable. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.17-35 to 4.17-36)**.

WILDFIRE

Impact 4.18-1: If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The City's planning process for the proposed Project follows methodologies consistent with FEMA and Cal-EMA guidance. This process includes conducting meetings with the Operational Area Planning Committee coordinated with the RCFD, Office of Emergency Services, and ensuring compliance with all other applicable regulations set forth by federal, state, and local jurisdictions agencies related to evacuation and safety from fire hazards. It should be noted that the City also recognizes other potential hazards and threats that could occur from earthquakes, flooding, and hazardous materials. Because of this, the City is prepared on numerous fronts to implement an evacuation should it be needed, in accordance with the local hazard mitigation program ("**LHMP**"). The City's LHMP has identified routes

near the Project that would serve as emergency evacuation routes: State Route 60 (SR-60), Interstate 10 (I-10), Beaumont Avenue (Highway 79), and 4th Street. Additionally, the City uses a Reverse 911 Emergency Notification System which is managed by the City's Police Department Dispatch Center. This system allows the City to get information to residents if any emergency event that may happen in the area. An evacuation, should it be necessary, would be coordinated by the Beaumont Police Department, California Highway Patrol, and other cooperating law enforcement agencies have primary responsibility for evacuations. These agencies work closely within the with responding fire department personnel who assess fire behavior and spread, which ultimately influence evacuation decisions. Therefore, while construction and operation of the Project would occur within proximity to SR-60 and I 10, neither construction nor operation of the proposed Project would impede the use of either of the freeways or local roadways needed to access them. Impacts would be less than significant. (**Draft EIR, p. 4.18-10 to 4.18-11**).

> **Impact 4.18-2: If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

The Project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone ("**FHSZ**") nor is it located in an SRA. The Project site is within an LRA zone. Since the Project is with a local responsibility area ("**LRA**") zone, provision of fire protection services would continue under contract to the RCFD. Fire protection services provided to Project site would not substantially differ from services available through the County; only the service funding mechanism would change. Furthermore, development from the Project site would be subject to Fire Department review. Department review ensures that the design of proposed developments conform to the RCFD requirements and thereby reduce demands on fire protection services. Additionally, payment of the Fire Protection impact fees, property taxes, and other revenues generated by development within the Project area would be available to the City to offset any increased costs for fire protection services with little or no net effect on the City's budget. Therefore, no impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.18-11)**.

> **Impact 4.18-3: If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

As noted in Draft EIR Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Wildland Hazards), the Project site is not located within a moderate, high, or very high FHSZ. Additionally, the Project site is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area ("**SRA**"). The Project includes development consisting of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility, commercial, and open space land uses, on vacant and previously developed lots. Improvements to both adjacent roadways would be made as part of the Project in accordance with all City and design standards as part of planned improvements for the area. All improvements would occur within areas already planned for disturbance as part of the Project or within existing or planned roadways or within easements that have been previously disturbed. None of the

Project improvements, including landscaping or installation of interior circulation driveways or emergency access lanes, would result in impacts to the environment not analyzed in the respective chapters of this Draft EIR. Because the Project is not located within a VHFHSZ and is not in or near an SRA the Project would also be consistent with General Plan Policy 9.6.3 which seeks to ensure that developments in VHFHSZ minimize the risks of wildfires. For these reasons, impacts in this regard would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.18-11 to 4.18-12)**.

> **Impact 4.18-4: If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

The Project site is not located in an SRA or in an area classified as very high FHSZ. The Project site's topography to the northwestern area of the site possesses several east-west and southeast-northwest trending drainage courses. The drainage features possess gradual to steep sidewalls with elevation differences of up to 15± feet below the surrounding topography. To the south of the leech pits, the site slopes towards the south to southwest at a gradient of 10± percent. The topography descends by 50± feet in this area. Another significant east-west trending drainage is located at the base of the descending slope, located in the southern-most region of the site. The drainage possesses gradual to steep sidewalls with an elevation difference up 10± feet below the surrounding topography. A hill, located to the southeast of this drainage, is approximately 20 to 30 feet higher than the surrounding topography. The hill possesses slope gradients ranging from 14 to 40± percent.

Slope is important relative to wildfire because steeper slopes typically facilitate more rapid-fire spread upslope. The portion of the Project where the highest variations of topography elevations exist is in the portion of the site planned for Open Space with no planned development. Additionally, no significant amounts of below-grade construction, such as basements or crawl spaces, are expected to be included in the proposed Project. Based on the assumed topography, cuts of 45± feet and fills of up to 65± feet are expected to be necessary to achieve the proposed site grades. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.18-12)**.

As discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, landslide risks from the Project are less than significant with compliance with existing codes and regulations, including the CBC (as adopted by the Beaumont Municipal Code). Project flooding and drainage is discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality; runoff, flooding, and drainage impacts are less than significant with implementation of relevant Beaumont General Plan policies and existing regulations, such as compliance with the Beaumont Municipal Code. Specifically, Beaumont General Plan Goal 8.5 and its supporting policies, and Beaumont General Plan Policies 3.1.6, 3.1.9, 3.1.12, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 7.4.1, 7.4.3, all help to address and maintain open areas, preserve or discourage development in hillside areas, or drainages that can lead to flooding or downstream risk after fire events. Through compliance with existing regulations and Beaumont General Plan goals and policies there are no significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. The Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes since the Project site is not located in an SRA nor is it located within a very high FHSZ and no development is planned in Planning Area 3 which is where the greatest topography height variation

occurs. Additionally, total flows from the discharge points would drain to the west and would not be in excess of pre-Project flows. Impacts would be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.18-13)**.

Cumulative Effects

Similar to the Project, cumulative development occurring within the vicinity and similar FHSZs would be subject to risk of wildfire hazards. Cumulative projects also would be subject to compliance with the CBC and California Fire Code, as well as local regulations and all proposed construction would be required to meet minimum standards for fire safety. Development occurring within the City, or those future projects annexed from the County lands adjacent to and near the Project site would be subject to review by the City to ensure cumulative development is designed to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities. This would include compliance with state and local fire codes, inclusion of fire sprinklers if required, proper fire hydrant system, paved access, and secondary emergency access routes. Implementation of these plans and policies, in conjunction with compliance with the Fire Code and City standards, would ensure cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire hazards are less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.18-13)**.

5.2 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

The City of Beaumont having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, the Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(1) that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project, which would avoid or substantially lessen to below a level of significance the following potentially significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR in the following categories:

- Air Quality (exposure sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations);
- Biological Resources (special status species, riparian habitat; conflict with HCP/NCCP);
- Cultural Resources (archaeological resources);
- Geology & Soils (erosion or loss of topsoil; unstable geologic unit; expansive soil; paleontological resources);
- Hazards (list of hazardous materials Project sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (significant tribal cultural resources).

The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that can be mitigated are listed below. The City finds that these potentially significant adverse impacts can be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR.

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.2-3 Would the proposed project, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Without mitigation, Phase 2 construction would result in a maximum cancer risk of approximately 22.6 in one million for residents, and the maximum unmitigated combined construction and operational emissions (from overlap of Phase 1 and Phase 2) is 63 per million, each of which exceeds the SCAQMD excess cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-52; 4.2-54)**. The combined unmitigated worker cancer risk would also exceed SCAQMD's 10 in one million threshold without mitigation, at 60.9 per million. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-55)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: **Draft EIR Tables 4.2-16 and 4.2-17** show that that pollutant emissions on the peak days of Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction, respectively would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-42 to 4.2-43)**. Likewise, **Draft EIR Tables 4.2-18 and 4.2-19** show that the maximum daily emissions of these pollutants during Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations, respectively, would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-44)**. At Project buildout (Phase 1 and Phase 2 emissions combined), **Draft EIR Table 4.2-20** shows that emissions generated onsite by the Project would not exceed the local significance thresholds ("**LSTs**") at the sensitive receptor located approximately 67 feet (20 meters) to the east of the site. Therefore, significant impacts would not occur concerning LSTs during operational activities under Project buildout conditions. In addition, SCAQMD's Rule 2305 will require the Project to directly reduce NO_X and particulate matter emissions, or to otherwise facilitate emissions and exposure reductions of these pollutants in nearby communities. The Project operator may be required to implement additional emission reduction strategies. Compliance with Rule 2305 would further reduce emissions below what was analyzed in the Draft EIR. In addition, a preliminary WAIRE calculation has been conducted for the proposed Project and the Project would more than fulfill its Warehouse Points Compliance Obligation and would bank 8,161 points with implementation of MM GHG-1 requiring rooftop solar and PDF AQ-2 requiring ZE yard trucks, which would further reduce emissions. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-44 to 4.2-46)**.

Projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD's LSTs and mass emissions thresholds would not violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and do not result in criteria pollutant health impacts. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-46)**. In addition, the Project's emissions are not sufficiently high enough to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a air basin-wide level. While the Project is expected to exceed the SCAQMD's numeric regional mass daily thresholds for ROG and NOX, this does not in itself constitute a significant health impact to the population adjacent to the Project and within the SCAB. The reason for this is that the mass daily thresholds are in pounds per day emitted into the air whereas health effects are determined based on the concentration of emissions in the air at particular receptor (e.g., parts per million by volume of air, or micrograms per cubic meter of air). **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-48 to 4.2-49)**. The Project will not generate enough vehicle trips to result in a CO

hotspot. Compliance with regulatory requirements and the fact that construction activities are temporary and intermittent will ensure that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial concentrations of construction-related toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-50)**.

A construction and operational Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared for the Project **(Draft EIR Appendix B)**. Results of the HRA indicate that without implementation of MM AQ-1, Phase 1 construction would result in a cancer risk of approximately 1.75 in one million for residents and 0.21 in one million for workers, which is well below SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Non-cancer hazards for diesel particulate matter ("**DPM**") would also be below the SCAQMD threshold of 1.0, with a chronic hazard index computed at 0.001 and an acute hazard index of 0.12 for residents and with a chronic hazard index computed at 0.002 and an acute hazard index of 0.16 for offsite workers. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-52)**. Phase 2 construction would be located closer to sensitive receptors than Phase 1. The Project HRA indicates that the ***unmitigated*** concentrations of DPM during Phase 2 construction would result in a maximum cancer risk of approximately 22.6 in one million for residents, which exceeds the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in a million, and 0.11 in one million for workers which is below the threshold. Non-cancer hazards for DPM would be below the SCAQMD threshold of 1.0, with a chronic hazard index computed at 0.01 and an acute hazard index of 0.85 for residents and with a chronic hazard index computed at 0.001 and an acute hazard index of 0.55 for workers. MM AQ-1 would require construction equipment to meet CARB Tier 4 Final emissions standards, which would reduce DPM emissions. With the implementation of MM AQ-1, the maximum cancer risk from Project construction would decrease to 1.21 per million for residents and 0.006 per million for workers. Additionally, chronic and acute hazards would be lowered to 0.0007 and 0.05 for residents and 0.0001 and 0.03 for workers respectively. Therefore, construction risk levels would be less than SCAQMD thresholds and impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM AQ-1. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-52)**.

For operational health risks from DPM, the HRA concluded that implementation of PDF AQ-2 would reduce the maximum cancer risk at a residence to 1.41 in one million and 0.82 in one million for workers, both of which are below the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in one million. Therefore, operational impacts related to cancer risk would be less than significant at nearby sensitive receptors with the implementation of PDF AQ-2. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-54)**. Since Phase 1 operational emissions may combine with Phase 2 construction, the HRA also concluded that while unmitigated emissions would exceed SCAQMD's excess cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million, with MM AQ-1 and PDF AQ-2 incorporated the cancer risk would be reduced from 63 in one million to 0.98 in one million, which is well below the SCAQMD threshold and would result in a less than significant impact. The excess cancer risk for workers would also be reduced from 60.9 per million to 0.77 per million. Likewise, implementation of MM AQ-1 and PDF AQ-2 would ensure that the chronic and acute hazard index would be further reduced to 0.0009 and 0.08 for residents and 0.0007 and 0.07 for workers, respectively. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-55)**.

Mitigation Measure

MM AQ-1 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Beaumont to demonstrate the following:

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards. Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All construction equipment and delivery vehicles shall be turned off when not in use, or limit on-site idling for no more than 5 minutes in any 1 hour.
- On-site electrical hook ups to a power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills, and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.3-1: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Least Bell's vireo was detected within the mulefat scrub in the western portion of the Project site during early protocol-level surveys. This species shas moderate to high potential to occur within the Project site due to the presence of suitable habitat. This Project would result in the removal of suitable mulefat scrub habitat (1.14 acres) which could result in significant impacts to least Bell's vireo. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-19)**. The Project site also has moderate potential to support burrowing owl which is a California Species of Special Concern. The Project has the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation is removed or ground disturbing activities are initiated during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). All habitat and land cover within the Project site has the potential to support nesting birds. The tree and shrub communities have the potential to support a variety of sensitive and non-sensitive avian species. The non-native grassland and disturbed habitats have the potential to support ground nesting species, such as western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*) and California horned lark. Even the developed portions of the Project still have the potential to support non-sensitive species such as house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*). **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-20)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: Project-specific Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-1 details the strategy to avoid vegetation removal during the bird breeding season, which would reduce potential impacts to least Bell's vireo to less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-19)**. In addition to the payment of MSHCP Local Development Mitigation Fees, the MSHCP also requires a pre-construction survey (MM BIO-2) to avoid impacts to burrowing owl. MM BIO-3 would avoid impacts to nesting birds that could occur during vegetation clearing and ground disturbing activities. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-20)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 Project activities shall not be initiated within 100 feet of any least Bell's vireo suitable habitat area(s) during the species' breeding season (March 15-August 31) unless a negative USFWS protocol survey has been conducted within one year of construction kickoff and findings were negative.

If groundbreaking activities occur outside the least Bell's vireo nesting season (i.e., September 16-March 14), a qualified biologist shall perform a presence/absence survey within suitable habitat on-site, and shall continue these surveys on a monthly basis, especially as breeding season commences.

If least Bell's vireo nesting is discovered, either during protocol surveys, monthly presence/absence surveys, or incidentally, no Project activities shall occur within 300 feet of any least Bell's vireo nest site until it has been confirmed that the young have fledged, and the nest is no longer active. A qualified biologist shall always be present when construction crews are working within 1/8 mile surrounding an identified least Bell's vireo nest site to ensure that the birds do not react unfavorably to Project activities. If the qualified biologist observes signs of agitation stemming from Project activities, the activities shall cease and not resume until the birds' behavior normalizes. If the birds continue to exhibit signs of agitation, Project activities shall be adjusted to avoid impacts on nesting least Bell's vireo. Additionally, in the presence of least Bell's vireo nests, noise level from Project activities shall not to exceed 65 dBA at the edge of occupied habitat. If this is not possible, a noise barrier shall be constructed to keep noise at or below 65 dBA to avoid adverse impacts to any least Bell's vireo nest/s.

During the least Bell's vireo breeding season, artificial light shall not be cast into suitable habitat.

A qualified biologist shall conduct a training session for Project personnel prior to grading in conformance with MSCHP best management practices requirements. The

training shall include a description of least Bell's vireo and its habitats, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act (Act) and the MSHCP, the need to adhere to the provisions of the Act and the MSHCP, the penalties associated with violating the provisions of the Act, the general measures that are being implemented to conserve the species of concern as they relate to the Project, and the access routes to and Project site boundaries within which the Project activities must be accomplished.

MM BIO-2 A qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction presence/absence survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If burrowing owls are documented on-site, the owls will be relocated/excluded from the site outside of the breeding season following accepted protocols, as specified in the MSHCP.

MM BIO-3 Vegetation clearing and ground disturbing activities should be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1 through August 31). If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to any disturbance of the site, including disking, demolition activities, and grading. If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests depending on the level of activity within the buffer and species observed, and the buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied, and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

Impact 4.3-2: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The Project would primarily result in permanent impacts on upland vegetation communities and land uses, including 103.8 acres of non-native grassland and 48.37 acres of developed land. Additional habitats that would be directly affected by the Project include impacts on >0.01 acre of chamise chaparral, 1.5 acres of disturbed land, 0.1 acre of eucalyptus woodland, 1.14 acres of mulefat scrub, 0.23 acre of Riversidean sage scrub, and 1.09 acres of Torrey's scrub oak (*Quercus acutidens*) stands. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-22)**. The Project would permanently impact approximately 0.25 acre (3,072 linear feet) of non-wetland waters of the U.S./State that are potentially jurisdictional by the USACE and Regional Water Quality Control Board ("**RWQCB**"), and 2.17 acres (3,072 linear feet) of vegetated streambed and 0.24 acre of associated riparian habitat that are potentially jurisdictional by the CDFW. MSHCP riparian/riverine areas also occur on the Project site. According to the Project DBESP Report **(Draft EIR Appendix C3)**, the Project site contains approximately 8.48 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, as defined by Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, of which, 2.41 acres (0.24 acre of MSHCP riparian habitat and 2.17 acres of MSCHP riverine habitat) would be directly impacted by construction. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-23)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: Permitting through the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW would be required for impacts on non-wetland waters of the U.S. jurisdictional by the USACE, non-wetland waters of the State jurisdictional by the RWQCB, and vegetated streambed and associated riparian habitat jurisdictional by the CDFW. The Project applicant would be responsible for acquiring the necessary authorizations required by the regulatory agencies and associated compensatory mitigation requirements, pursuant to MM BIO-4. The on-site MSHCP riparian/riverine areas coincide with CDFW-jurisdictional vegetated streambed and associated riparian habitat. To address impacts to riparian/riverine areas, MM BIO-4 would mitigate direct impacts at a 2:1 ratio. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-23)**.

Mitigation

MM BIO-4 Prior to any ground-disturbing activity near jurisdictional features, applicable permits shall be obtained through the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW for impacts on jurisdictional features. Based on the results of the aquatic resources delineation for the proposed Project, the proposed Project would permanently impact 0.25 acre of USACE-jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S. and RWQCB-jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the State (i.e., NWW-1, NWW-1A, NWW-2, NWW-2A, NWW-2B, NWW-2C, NWW-3A, NWW-3B, and NWW-3B1). Additionally, the proposed Project would permanently impact 2.17 acres of CDFW-jurisdictional vegetated streambed (i.e., NWW-1, NWW-1A, NWW-2, NWW-2A, NWW-2B, NWW-2C, NWW-3A, NWW-3B, and NWW-3B1) and 0.24 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional riparian habitat (i.e., NWW-2A and NWW-3B). The Project applicant shall be obligated to implement/comply with the permit conditions and mitigation measures required by the resource agencies regarding impacts on their respective jurisdictions.

A minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio (0.25 acre USACE/0.25 acre RWQCB/2.41 acres CDFW) is typically required, though ratios may be higher. Compensatory mitigation to offset impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources may be implemented through off-site, permittee-responsible mitigation, in-lieu fee program or mitigation bank credit purchase (e.g., Riverpark Mitigation Bank), or a combination of these options depending on availability. The proposed mitigation strategy is the purchase of 4.82 re-establishment and/or rehabilitation credits (2:1 mitigation ratio) from the Riverpark Mitigation Bank. The regulatory agencies will make the final determination of the final compensatory mitigation requirements during the permit evaluation process. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant will provide the City of Beaumont with purchase confirmation.

Impact 4.3-6: Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

Features within the Project site which are described as CDFW-jurisdictional riparian habitat also meet the definition of MSHCP riparian habitat. Additionally, the mulefat scrub within and adjacent to NWW-3 and NWW-3B provide suitable habitat for least Bell's vireo, an MSHCP riparian/riverine wildlife species. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-26)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: The Project would result in permanent, direct impacts on NWW-1, NWW-1A, NWW-2, NWW-2A, NWW-2B, NWW-2C, NWW-3B, NWW-3B1, and a small portion of NWW-3A. However, the Project applicant designed the proposed Project to avoid impacts on NWW-3, the primary and highest quality riparian/riverine resource within the project boundary, as well as a majority of NWW-3A (a tributary of NWW-3). The 2.41 acres of on-site MSHCP riparian/riverine resources within the Project impact area provide minimal aquatic resource functions due to the highly disturbed nature of the property (e.g., regularly mowed, grazed, and farmed land) and historic degradation and runoff into the on-site aquatic features from previous on-site farming operations. The purchase of re-establishment and/or rehabilitation credits and preservation of 4.82 acres of high-quality sensitive resources at the Riverpark Mitigation Bank to offset impacts to 2.41 acres of highly disturbed MSHCP riparian/riverine resources (as required under MM BIO-4) meet the criteria of a biologically equivalent or superior alternative. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-27)**. Pre-construction burrowing owl surveys would be required to comply with MSHCP Objective 6 for burrowing owls. With the implementation of this measure (MM BIO-2), the Project would be consistent with Volume I, Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP. The Project would be consistent with the biological requirements of Section 6.1.2 (Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools), Section 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species), Section 6.1.4 (Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface), Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures), and MSHCP Reserve assembly requirements. The Project would be consistent with the goals/objectives of the MSHCP with the implementation of the proposed mitigation and avoidance measures described in this analysis.

In addition, implementation of the Project would require payment of MSHCP Local Development Mitigation Fees. Based on the local development mitigation fee schedule for fiscal year 2022 (effective July 1, 2021 – December 31, 2021), fees would be $11,982/acre for commercial and industrial development and $2,935/acre for low-density residential. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.3-28)**.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to MM BIO-2 and BIO-4 above.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.4-2: Will the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

As a result of the cultural resource records search and intensive pedestrian survey, three historic period archaeological sites were documented on the property (21-0281-EH-001H, -002H, and -004H). These resources consist of the remnants of two residential structures and the remnants of a large poultry farming facility, all of which were constructed in the late 1940s and early 1950s. These resources were previously evaluated and did not meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR. No further cultural resource management is recommended for these resources. Nonetheless, if any prehistoric cultural resources are unearthed during Project construction and are disturbed or damaged by the Project construction activities, impacts to those prehistoric cultural resources would be significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.4-15).**

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any significant archaeological resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with Project construction. With implementation of the required mitigation, the Project's potential impacts to important archaeological resources will be reduced to less than significant. Cumulatively-considerable impacts would likewise be reduced to less than significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-16 to 4.4-18)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 A qualified archaeological monitor will be present during Project-related ground-disturbing activities in undisturbed native sediments.

MM CUL-2 In the event that potentially significant cultural materials are encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, all work will be halted in the vicinity of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the archaeological resource.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact 4.6-5 Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Construction activities such as grading, site stripping, excavation, and demolition would potentially result in soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-19)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: The grading proposed by the Project would cut/remove approximately 2,230,40 cubic yards (CY) of all the existing undocumented fill soils and most of the near-surface compressible/collapsible younger alluvial soils and replace these materials as compacted fill soils and approximately 1,869,300 CY would be used to fill the site. The difference of approximately 360,840 CY of cut soil material will be compacted on-site. The underlying moderate strength older alluvium which would remain in-place are not expected to be susceptible to settlement from the foundations of the proposed structures. Grading would also include cut/fills of up to 65 feet within the building pads. Grading activities would include newly constructed fill slopes (both cut and fill), comprised of properly compacted engineered fill. Initial site stripping would include the removal of any surficial vegetation and topsoil. This would also include any weeds, grasses, shrubs, and trees. The Project would also include the demolition of minor existing improvements such as buildings, retaining walls, concrete slabs and foundations which would subject both top and subsurface soils to erosion. Therefore, the Project would adhere to the construction design features and Mitigation Measure (MM) GEO-1, which requires that a settlement monitoring program be implemented. Construction activities would also be required to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit and be subject to BMPs set forth in the Project-specific SWPPP and WQMP to reduce impacts from runoff associated with soil erosion. Construction activities would also be required to comply with the erosion control measures stipulated through the CBC, and other applicable ordinances; federal, state, and local permits; and other applicable requirements. Therefore, implementation of MM GEO-1 and permitting requirements and erosion control measures would ensure that construction impacts related to soil erosion are mitigated to less than significant levels. The Project's operational activity is not anticipated to damage or result in the loss of topsoil/sedimentation into local drainage facilities and water bodies. Operation activities (i.e., landscape maintenance) would be subject to the BMPs set in the Project's SWPPP and WQMP that would prevent soil erosion or loss of topsoil. A network of storm drains and gutters would be maintained and upgraded as necessary and provided throughout the developed site as needed. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with operation of the Project. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-19)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 **Settlement Monitoring Program.** A Settlement Monitoring Program would be implemented, consisting of the surveying of surface monuments to monitor settlement of alluvial soils left in-place and/or proposed fills deeper than 30 feet

(design plus remedial grading). Survey monument readings for both deep fill areas and for fill over compressible natural ground (Qal) should be conducted following the completion of fill placement. Survey monument locations should be selected by the geotechnical consultant. Survey readings should be taken weekly for the first month and on a weekly basis thereafter until vertical movement of the fill mass achieve 90 percent of primary compression, begin secondary compression or the estimated remaining settlement is less than one inch. Construction of proposed structures would not commence until approved by the geotechnical consultant based on the results of the settlement monitoring. Survey benchmarks used for the monitoring would be confirmed with the geotechnical consultant prior to initial readings being performed.

Foundation and Grading Plan Review. New retaining walls with maximum heights of up to 50± feet would be constructed as part of the new development. Additional review of the global stability of the proposed site grading be performed by SCG once more detailed rough grading plans become available. An additional subsurface exploration may be required to evaluate the geotechnical design considerations of the retaining wall and new slope configurations.

Over excavation. Benching of the sidewalls would be required during fill placement. The horizontal extent of the benching should be sufficient to reduce the inclination of the native fill contact to 3h:1v or flatter. Following completion of the over excavations, the subgrade would be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify its suitability to serve as the structural fill subgrade. Some localized areas of deeper excavation may be required if loose, porous, or low-density materials are encountered at the base of the over excavation. Materials suitable to serve as the structural fill subgrade within the building area should consist of moderate strength alluvial soils which possess an in-situ density equal to at least 85 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. These materials would be moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum moisture content prior to placement of any new fill soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.

Impact 4.6-6: Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The Project site is not included within an Earthquake Fault Zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. However, the Project site is in a seismically active area and located near an active fault zone. Cut slopes excavated within the existing granular alluvial soils may be subject to surficial instability due to the lack of cohesion within these materials. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-21)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: The Project would be designed in accordance with applicable state and local design standards to withstand effects from strong seismic ground-shaking and would implement geotechnical design considerations pursuant to the Geotechnical Investigation including MM GEO-1 to ensure that the Project is not subject to collapse. The Project is an area of low to moderate liquefaction susceptibility, but the groundwater table has been shown to exist beyond 50 feet and therefore not a concern for this Project. Subsequent to grading, the proposed development areas would be underlain by engineered fill soils (design plus remedial), extending to depths of 50 to 85+ feet. The primary settlement associated with these fill soils is expected to occur relatively quickly due to the generally granular nature of the on-site soils. Minor amounts of additional settlement may occur due to secondary consolidation effects. The extent of secondary consolidation is difficult to assess precisely and would be reduced by MM GEO-1 but may be in the range of 0.1 to 0.3 percent of the fill thickness. Based on the differential fill thickness that would exist across the building footprints, the structural design would account for distortions that could be caused by the secondary consolidation of the fill soils. Provided that the grading and foundation design recommendations presented in the Geotechnical Investigation are implemented, the settlements are expected to be within the structural tolerances of the proposed buildings. The Project grading plan indicates that the new slopes (both cut and fill) would occur at inclinations of 2h:1v or flatter. Newly constructed fill slopes, comprised of properly compacted engineered fill, at inclinations of 2h:1v would possess adequate gross and surficial stability. Project construction would be temporary and therefore would not be susceptible to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence. Project designs would be subject to compliance with applicable state and local design standards. Implementation of the Project design features discussed, and implementation of MM GEO-1 would ensure that operation of the Project would not result in substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure (liquefaction/lateral spreading), and seismically-induced landslides. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-21)**.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to MM GEO-1, above.

Impact 4.6-7: Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

The near-surface soils consist of silty sands and sandy silts with no appreciable clay content. However, some isolated strata of sandy clays and clayey sands were encountered. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-22)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: On-site grading is expected to blend the on-site soils, resulting in a very low to low expansion index (Expansion Index > 50 per ASTM D-4829). Additional expansion index testing would also be performed at the time of rough grading in order to confirm the expansion potential of the near-surface soils. Although the expansive soil potential was considered to be low, the Project would implement various project design measures/controls to reduce the exposure of people and structures to the effects of expansive soils by complying with requirements set forth in the latest CBC. Project construction associated with expansive soils would result in a less than significant impact. Likewise, the Project would be subject to compliance with requirements set forth in the CBC that is current at the time of construction and would implement settlement considerations, foundation design and earthwork considerations related to soil removal and compaction via MM GEO-1. Project operations would result in a less than significant impact related to risks to life or property associated with expansive soils. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-22)**.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to MM GEO-1, above.

Impact 4.6-9: Will the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Although the Project site does not contain any known unique geologic features and no paleontological resources or sites were observed during field investigation, the site does contain older alluvium soils with a high potential sensitivity for paleontological resources. Accordingly, construction activities on the Project site have the potential to unearth and adversely impact paleontological resource that may be buried beneath the ground surface. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-23)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Mitigation Measure GEO-2 will ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any paleontological resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of the Project. Therefore, with implementation of GEO-2, the Project's potential impact to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-25)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-2 **Paleontological Construction Monitoring and Compliance Program.** The following measures would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant:

Retain a Qualified Paleontologist. Prior to initial ground disturbance, the Applicant shall retain a Project paleontologist, defined as a paleontologist who meets the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards for Qualified Professional Paleontologist, to direct all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources.

Paleontological Monitoring. Ground disturbing construction activities (including grading, trenching, foundation work, and other excavations) in areas mapped as high paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored on a full-time basis by a qualified paleontological monitor during initial ground disturbance. Areas mapped as low to high paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored when ground-disturbing activities exceed five feet in depth, because underlying sensitive sediments could be impacted. Areas considered to have an undetermined paleontological sensitivity shall be inspected and further assessed if construction activities bring potentially sensitive geologic deposits to the surface. The Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall be supervised by the Project paleontologist. Monitoring must be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, who is defined as an individual who has experience with collection and salvage of paleontological resources. The duration and timing of the monitoring would be determined by City based on recommendation from the Project paleontologist. If the Project paleontologist determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, they may recommend to the City that monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely. Monitoring would be reinstated if any new or unforeseen deeper ground disturbances are required and reduction or suspension would need to be reconsidered by the Supervising Paleontologist. Ground disturbing activity that does not exceed five feet in depth would not require paleontological monitoring.

Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program. After Project design has been finalized to determine the precise extent and location of planned ground disturbances, and prior to construction activity, a qualified paleontologist would prepare a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program to be implemented during ground disturbance activity for the Project. This program would outline the procedures for construction staff Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, paleontological monitoring extent and duration, salvage and preparation of fossils, the final mitigation and monitoring report, and paleontological staff qualifications. The program would be prepared in accordance with the standards set forth by current Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines (2010) and with proper implementation, would reduce or eliminate potential impacts to paleontological resources.

Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program. Prior to the start of construction, the Project paleontologist or his/her designee shall conduct training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. The WEAP shall be presented at a preconstruction meeting that a qualified paleontologist shall attend. In the event of a fossil discovery by construction personnel, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find before restarting work in the area. If it is determined that the fossil(s) is (are) scientifically significant, the qualified paleontologist shall complete the following conditions to mitigate impacts to significant fossil resources.

Salvage of Fossils. If fossils are discovered, the Project paleontologist or paleontological monitor should recover them. Typically, fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases, larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case, the paleontologist would have the authority to temporarily direct, divert, or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner.

Preparation and Curation of Recovered Fossils. Once salvaged, the City would ensure that significant fossils would be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the Western Science Center), along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the Project paleontologist. Field collection and preparation of fossil specimens would be performed by the Project paleontologist with further preparation as needed by an accredited museum repository institution at the time of curation.

Final Paleontological Mitigation Report. Upon completion of ground-disturbing activity (and curation of fossils, if necessary) the qualified paleontologist should prepare a final mitigation and monitoring report outlining the results of the mitigation and monitoring program. The report should include discussion of the location, duration, and methods of the monitoring, stratigraphic sections, any recovered fossils, and the scientific significance of those fossils, and where fossils were curated.

Cumulative Effects

Southern California is a seismically active region with a range of geologic and soil conditions. These conditions can vary widely within a limited geographical area due to factors, including differences in landforms and proximity to fault zones, among others. Therefore, while geotechnical impacts may be associated with the cumulative development, by the very nature of the impacts (i.e., landslides and expansive and compressible soils), impacts are typically site-specific and there is little, if any, cumulative relationship between the development of Project and development within a larger cumulative area, such

as citywide development. Impacts associated with seismic events and hazards would be considered significant if the effects of an earthquake on a property could not be mitigated by an engineered solution. The significance criteria do not require elimination of the potential for structural damage from seismic hazards. Instead, the criteria require an evaluation of whether the seismic conditions on a site can be overcome through engineering design solutions that would reduce to less than significant the substantial risk of exposing people or structures to loss, injury, or death. As stated throughout this section, the Project's compliance with applicable state and local design standards and regulations including implementation of MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 would ensure that impacts related to geology and soils are reduced to less than significant levels. Consequently, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative geotechnical and seismic impacts would be less than significant. None of the Project characteristics would affect or influence the geotechnical hazards for off-site development and any cumulative development would be required to comply with the same applicable state and local design standards, regulations, goals, and policies. For these reasons, no significant cumulative geotechnical impacts would occur for the Project. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.6-25 to 4.6-26)**.

HAZARDS

Impact 4.8-4: Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials Project sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Although the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese" list), the Project site was identified on the Historical Underground Storage Tank ("**UST**") (HIST UST) and Statewide Evaluation and Planning System UST (SWEEPS UST) databases at the site address 37251 Cherry Valley Boulevard under Sunny-Cal Egg & Poultry Co. for having one 550-gallon diesel UST, one 8,000-gallon diesel UST and one 1,000-gallon unleaded gasoline UST, installed between 1978 and 1979. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-22)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Facts in Support of Findings: The above-referenced USTs were removed from the site in January 1994. Confirmation sampling indicated relatively low concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel, as gasoline, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes were detected below the USTs. On September 20, 1994, the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health granted ***"no further action"*** for the removed USTs which included the following statement: "Additionally, be advised that changes in the present or proposed use of the site may require further site characterization and mitigation activity. It is the property owner's responsibility to notify this agency of any changes in report content, future contamination findings, or site usage." Findings revealed that available materials did not indicate if excavated soil was disposed off-site or re-used to backfill the UST excavations. Based on this information

and the conditions indicated in the "no further action letter," the former USTs represent a controlled recognized environmental condition ("**CREC**") in connection with the Project site. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-22)**. The levels of petroleum hydrocarbons that were detected in a 1994 Phase II environmental site assessment are well below the current 2019 RWQCB Residential Environmental Screening Level (ESL) for petroleum hydrocarbons. With preparation of a Soil Management Plan prior to the redevelopment of the site, impacts will be less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.8-23)**.

Mitigation Measure

MM HAZ-1 The Applicant shall prepare a Soil Management Plan prior to the redevelopment of the site.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.16-1: Will the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site feature place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: (i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or (ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California Native American tribe.

The Project site does not contain any recorded, significant tribal cultural resource sites; therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal culture resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register of historical resources. Nevertheless, there is always the possibility that tribal cultural resources could be encountered during ground-disturbing construction activities. If a tribal cultural resource be found on the Project site during construction and not protected, a significant impact would occur. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.16-11)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM TCR-1 The Serrano Nation, (currently Mr. Mark Cochrane and/or Mr. Wayne Walker, but the representative could change depending on when a finding may occur), shall be notified if any cultural material is encountered during Project construction.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any significant tribal cultural resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project development. With implementation of the required mitigation, the Project's potential impact to significant tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.16-11)**.

5.3 EFFECTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE AFTER MITIGATION AND FINDINGS

The City of Beaumont having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, makes infeasible the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, and therefore, the Project would cause significant and unavoidable impacts to the categories of:

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.2-1: Will the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Section 4.2 of the EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of the Project's potential to result in significant air quality impacts due to a conflict with, or an obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD air quality management plan. The Project will emit air pollutants (NOx and ROG) that will contribute to a delay in the attainment of federal and state ozone standards. Additionally, because the Project requires a general plan amendment, the Project will generate emissions not reflected in the current air quality management plan and is considered inconsistent with the Air Quality Management Plan ("**AQMP**"). This would be a significant and unavoidable direct impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-25 - 4.2-27).** No additional feasible mitigation measures are available that can reduce impacts to less than significant.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with conflicts with the SCAQMD air quality management plan will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Although MM AQ-1 through AQ-6 would reduce the Project's operational-related emissions of NOx and ROG, the mitigation measures will not reduce NOx and ROG emissions to below the applicable SCAQMD regional emissions threshold. Additionally, because of the proposed change in land use for the Project site from residential to industrial/commercial, the Project will generate emissions not reflected within the current AQMP, and thus the Project is not consistent therewith. Therefore, Project impacts are considered

to be significant and unavoidable on both a project level and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.2-26; 4.2-36)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-1 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Beaumont to demonstrate the following:

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards. Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All construction equipment and delivery vehicles shall be turned off when not in use, or limit on-site idling for no more than 5 minutes in any 1 hour.
- On-site electrical hook ups to a power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills, and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.

MM AQ-2 The Project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits (i.e., have a lower VOC content than what is required) put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113 for all architectural coatings. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 building permits, the Beaumont Building and Safety Department shall confirm the plans include the following specifications:

- All architectural coatings will be super-compliant low VOC paints.
- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.
- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of cleanup water and take it to the hazardous waste center (www.cleanup.org).
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.

- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

MM AQ-3 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 occupancy permits (unless otherwise specified), the Project operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities within 200 yards of a building entrance (Phase 1 only).
- Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day.
- Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service.
- Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.
- Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.
- Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.

MM AQ-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 building permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:

- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.
- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed in the future to supply power to trailers with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) during the loading/unloading of refrigerated goods. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to the loading docks determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check as the logical location(s) to receive trailers with TRUs.

MM AQ-5 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Phase 1, the Planning Department shall confirm that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that states:

- Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.
- For non-essential idling, truck drivers shall shut down the engine after five minutes of continuous idling operation (pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485). Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged.
- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.
- Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.

MM AQ-6 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements require the Project Applicant to provide $1.00 per square foot in funding for fleet upgrade financing to be used over the term of their lease on Zero Emissions (ZE) and Near Zero Emissions (NZE) delivery vans or trucks. This requirement shall apply to new leases only (not renewals) and for the first 10 years of the Project's life. The funding shall be provided in the form of lease allowance/concession. The allowance shall be a reimbursement once ZE or NZE medium/heavy duty vehicles are purchased and can be used at any time during the lease term (i.e., the landlord shall reimburse the tenant once the tenant provides

receipt of paid invoice for the order). If a tenant leases their fleet, this allowance shall also cover the cost to lease ZE or NZE trucks. This measure would also facilitate compliance with SCAQMD Rule 2305.

Impact 4.2-2: Will the Project result in a cumulatively-considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Section 4.2 of the EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of the Project's potential to result in significant air quality impacts including the potential for the Project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Based on the analysis in the EIR, Project operational emissions will exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for NOx and ROG on both a project-related and cumulative basis. This impact is significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-27 – 4.2-35)**. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available that can reduce operational emission impacts to less than significant.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with operational-related emissions of NOx and ROG will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Project-generated emissions would be primarily associated with motor vehicle use and area sources, such as the use of landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings. Long-term operational emissions attributable to Phase 1 of the Project are summarized in **Draft EIR Table 4.2-10, Unmitigated Phase 1 Operational Emissions**. **Table 4.2-10** shows that Project emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG and NO_X. Therefore, regional operations emissions would result in a potentially significant long-term regional air quality impact. Similar to Phase 1, operational emissions from Phase 2 of the Project would be associated with area sources, energy sources, and mobile sources (i.e., motor vehicle use), and off-road emissions. Emissions from these categories are described above. Phase 2 Project-generated vehicle emissions are based on the trip generation within the Project Traffic Impact Study and incorporated into CalEEMod as recommended by the SCAQMD. Per the Project Trip Generation and Vehicle Miles Traveled Analyses, the Phase 2 of the Project would generate 485 daily trips, which include employee commutes to work, retail customers, and delivery trips. CalEEMod default trips lengths and vehicle fleet mix for projects in Riverside County were used in the analysis of Phase 2 mobile source emissions. As the Project would be constructed in phases, Phase 1 has the potential to be operational during Phase 2 construction. The overlapping emissions of Phase 1 operations and Phase 2 construction are shown in **Draft EIR Table 4.2-13, Project Overlapping Emissions**. **Table 4.2-13** shows that total

overlapping emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG and NO_X. As indicated in **Table 4.2-14**, total operational emissions for the Project at buildout would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG and NO_X. The majority of the Project's emission exceedances are from mobile sources that cannot feasibly be reduced below the SCAQMD threshold.

Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-6 will reduce the Project's operational emissions of NOx and ROG, but not to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-1 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Beaumont to demonstrate the following:

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards. Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All construction equipment and delivery vehicles shall be turned off when not in use, or limit on-site idling for no more than 5 minutes in any 1 hour.
- On-site electrical hook ups to a power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills, and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.

MM AQ-2 The Project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits (i.e., have a lower VOC content than what is required) put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113 for all architectural coatings. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 building permits, the Beaumont Building and Safety Department shall confirm the plans include the following specifications:

- All architectural coatings will be super-compliant low VOC paints.
- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.

- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of cleanup water and take it to the hazardous waste center (www.cleanup.org).
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

MM AQ-3 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 occupancy permits (unless otherwise specified), the Project operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities within 200 yards of a building entrance (Phase 1 only).
- Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day.
- Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service.
- Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.

- Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.
- Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.

MM AQ-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 building permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:

- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.
- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed in the future to supply power to trailers with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) during the loading/unloading of refrigerated goods. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to the loading docks determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check as the logical location(s) to receive trailers with TRUs.

MM AQ-5 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Phase 1, the Planning Department shall confirm that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that states:

- Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.
- For non-essential idling, truck drivers shall shut down the engine after five minutes of continuous idling operation (pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485). Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged.
- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.
- Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.

MM AQ-6 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements require the Project Applicant to provide $1.00 per square foot in funding for fleet upgrade financing to be used over the term of

their lease on Zero Emissions (ZE) and Near Zero Emissions (NZE) delivery vans or trucks. This requirement shall apply to new leases only (not renewals) and for the first 10 years of the Project's life. The funding shall be provided in the form of lease allowance/concession. The allowance shall be a reimbursement once ZE or NZE medium/heavy duty vehicles are purchased and can be used at any time during the lease term (i.e., the landlord shall reimburse the tenant once the tenant provides receipt of paid invoice for the order). If a tenant leases their fleet, this allowance shall also cover the cost to lease ZE or NZE trucks. This measure would also facilitate compliance with SCAQMD Rule 2305.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact 4.7-1: Will the Project generate greenhouse gas emission, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Section 4.7 of the EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of the potential for the Project to result in a project-specific and cumulative impact due to greenhouse gas emissions. As shown in **Draft EIR Table 4.7-3**, the Project's unmitigated emissions would be approximately 20,646 $MTCO_2e$ annually from both construction and operations. Project-related GHG emissions would exceed the City's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold. Mitigated emissions would be approximately 14,004 $MTCO_2e$, which still exceed the applicable threshold of significance. This impact is significant on both a project-related and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-31 – 4.7-41)**. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available that can reduce operational emission impacts to less than significant.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with GHG emissions will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

GHG emissions associated with Phase 1 of the Project are summarized in **Draft EIR Table 4.7-3, Phase 1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. As shown in **Table 4.7-3**, the Project's unmitigated emissions would be approximately 20,646 $MTCO_2e$ annually from both construction and operations. Project-related GHG emissions would exceed the City's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold. The majority of the GHG emissions (67 percent of unmitigated emissions and 96 percent of mitigated emissions) are associated with non-construction related mobile sources. Emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and Federal standards, and the Project has no control over these standards. GHG emissions associated with Phase 2 of the Project are summarized in **Draft EIR Table 4.7-4: Phase 2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. As shown in **Table 4.7-4**, the Project's unmitigated emissions would be approximately 11,580 MTCO2e annually from

both construction and operations. Project-related GHG emissions would exceed the City's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold. The majority of the GHG emissions (86 percent unmitigated and 90 percent mitigated) are associated with non-construction related mobile sources. Emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and Federal standards, and the Project has no control over these standards. Application of Standard Conditions (SC) GHG-1 through SC GHG-9, as required by the California Building Code, would provide designated parking to promote the use of alternative fuels and clean fleets, facilitate future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment, and limit idling times. As shown in **Table 4.7-3** and **Table 4.7-4**, mitigation and PDFs would individually reduce Phase 1 and Phase 2 stationary emissions to below the City's industrial threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$; however, mobile source emissions would continue to exceed the threshold. Despite application of mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-6 and MM GHG -1 through MM GHG-4, Project emissions of greenhouse gases remains significant on a Project-specific and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-40 to 4.7-41; 4.7-53)**.

Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-1 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Beaumont to demonstrate the following:

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards. Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.
- All construction equipment and delivery vehicles shall be turned off when not in use, or limit on-site idling for no more than 5 minutes in any 1 hour.
- On-site electrical hook ups to a power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills, and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.

MM AQ-2 The Project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits (i.e., have a lower VOC content than what is required) put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113 for all architectural coatings. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 building permits, the Beaumont Building and Safety Department shall confirm the plans include the following specifications:

- All architectural coatings will be super-compliant low VOC paints.

- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.
- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of cleanup water and take it to the hazardous waste center (www.cleanup.org).
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

MM AQ-3 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 occupancy permits (unless otherwise specified), the Project operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities within 200 yards of a building entrance (Phase 1 only).
- Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day.
- Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service.

- Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.
- Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.
- Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.

MM AQ-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 building permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:

- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.
- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed in the future to supply power to trailers with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) during the loading/unloading of refrigerated goods. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to the loading docks determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check as the logical location(s) to receive trailers with TRUs.

MM AQ-5 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Phase 1, the Planning Department shall confirm that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that states:

- Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.
- For non-essential idling, truck drivers shall shut down the engine after five minutes of continuous idling operation (pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485). Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged.
- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.
- Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.

MM AQ-6 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements require the Project Applicant to provide $1.00 per square foot in funding for fleet upgrade financing to be used over the term of their lease on Zero Emissions (ZE) and Near Zero Emissions (NZE) delivery vans or trucks. This requirement shall apply to new leases only (not renewals) and for the first 10 years of the Project's life. The funding shall be provided in the form of lease allowance/concession. The allowance shall be a reimbursement once ZE or NZE medium/heavy duty vehicles are purchased and can be used at any time during the lease term (i.e., the landlord shall reimburse the tenant once the tenant provides receipt of paid invoice for the order). If a tenant leases their fleet, this allowance shall also cover the cost to lease ZE or NZE trucks. This measure would also facilitate compliance with SCAQMD Rule 2305.

MM GHG-1 Phase 1 of the Project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, conservatively anticipated to be approximately 8.87 kilowatt hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot[1,2]).

With expected energy consumption at 8.87 kWh/sf, a PV panel array covering approximately one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size requires approval by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements for any facility connected to SCE's distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export, the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to offset consumption.

Should the energy consumption characteristics of a future tenant differ from this projection, there is sufficient space on the rooftop for the system to roughly triple on-site generation. The building shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage.

MM GHG-2 Prior to the issuance of a Phase 1 or Phase 2 building permit, the Project Applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the City of Beaumont demonstrating that the Project is designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification and meet or exceed CalGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time of building permit application.

MM GHG-3 The development (Phase 1 and Phase 2) shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, a recyclables collection

[1] U.S. Energy Information Administration, Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey. Table PBA4. Electricity consumption totals and conditional intensities by building activity subcategories, 2012. 75th percentile value for Nonrefrigerated Distribution Center = 8.5kWh/year/sf.

[2] Additional consumption of 30 Level 2 EV chargers providing 6 hours of charge time for two employee shifts per day = 0.37kWh/year/sf.

and load area shall be constructed in compliance with Riverside County Waste Management Department's Design Guidelines for Recyclable Collection and Loading Areas.

MM GHG-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 or Phase 2 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This requirement shall be included in the third-party vendor agreements for landscape services for the building owner and tenants, as applicable.

Impact 4.7-2: Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions?

The Project's long-term operational GHG emissions would exceed the City's significance threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year despite the implementation of mitigation and energy conserving PDFs; thus, the Project could impede California's statewide GHG reduction goals for 2030 and 2050. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-52 to 4.7-53)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with the Project's conflict with the City of Beaumont, Sustainable Beaumont Plan (Climate Action Plan) will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Section 4.7 of the EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of the potential for the Project to result in a project-specific and cumulative impact due to greenhouse gas emissions. The City approved Sustain Beaumont (Climate Action Plan) in 2015, which serves as a long-term plan for achieving sustainability by utilizing resources effectively and reducing GHG emissions. By using energy more efficiently, harnessing renewable energy to power buildings, recycling waste, and enhancing access to sustainable transportation modes, the City can keep dollars in the local economy, create new green jobs, and improve community quality of life. The goals outlined in the Climate Action Plan are shown in **Table 4.7-6, City of Beaumont, Sustainable Beaumont Plan (Climate Action Plan) Consistency**. As shown in **Table 4.7-6**, the Project would not conflict with the goals in the Climate Action Plan.

Although the Project does not conflict with the Climate Action Plan, the Project's long-term operational GHG emissions would exceed the City's significance threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year despite the implementation of **MM AQ-3** through **MM AQ-6** and **MM GHG-1** through **MM GHG-4**, and energy conserving PDFs, thus the Project could impede California's statewide GHG reduction goals for 2030 and 2050. As shown in **Draft EIR Table 4.7-3**, the Project's unmitigated emissions would be approximately 20,646 $MTCO_2e$ annually from both construction and operations. Project-related GHG emissions would

exceed the City's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year threshold. Mitigated emissions would be approximately 14,004 $MTCO_2e$, which still exceed the applicable threshold of significance. This impact is significant on both a project-related and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-31 – 4.7-41)**. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available that can reduce operational emission impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-3 Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 occupancy permits (unless otherwise specified), the Project operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided (Phase 1 only).
- Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities within 200 yards of a building entrance (Phase 1 only).
- Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day.
- Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service.
- Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.
- Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.
- Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.

MM AQ-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 building permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:

- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.
- The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed in the future to supply power to trailers with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) during the loading/unloading of refrigerated goods. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to the loading docks determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check as the logical location(s) to receive trailers with TRUs.

MM AQ-5 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Phase 1, the Planning Department shall confirm that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that states:

- Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.
- For non-essential idling, truck drivers shall shut down the engine after five minutes of continuous idling operation (pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485). Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged.
- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.
- Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.

MM AQ-6 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements require the Project Applicant to provide $1.00 per square foot in funding for fleet upgrade financing to be used over the term of their lease on Zero Emissions (ZE) and Near Zero Emissions (NZE) delivery vans or trucks. This requirement shall apply to new leases only (not renewals) and for the first 10 years of the Project's life. The funding shall be provided in the form of lease allowance/concession. The allowance shall be a reimbursement once ZE or NZE medium/heavy duty vehicles are purchased and can be used at any time during the lease term (i.e., the landlord shall reimburse the tenant once the tenant provides receipt of paid invoice for the order). If a tenant leases their fleet, this allowance shall also cover the cost to lease ZE or NZE trucks. This measure would also facilitate compliance with SCAQMD Rule 2305.

MM GHG-1 Phase 1 of the Project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, conservatively anticipated to be approximately 8.87 kilowatt hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot[3,4]).

With expected energy consumption at 8.87 kWh/sf, a PV panel array covering approximately one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size requires approval by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements for any facility connected to SCE's distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export, the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to offset consumption.

Should the energy consumption characteristics of a future tenant differ from this projection, there is sufficient space on the rooftop for the system to roughly triple on-site generation. The building shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage.

MM GHG-2 Prior to the issuance of a Phase 1 or Phase 2 building permit, the Project Applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the City of Beaumont demonstrating that the Project is designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification and meet or exceed CalGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time of building permit application.

MM GHG-3 The development (Phase 1 and Phase 2) shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with Riverside County Waste Management Department's Design Guidelines for Recyclable Collection and Loading Areas.

MM GHG-4 Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 or Phase 2 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This requirement shall be included in the third-party vendor agreements for landscape services for the building owner and tenants, as applicable.

NOISE

(Cumulative Long-Term Traffic Noise)

[3] U.S. Energy Information Administration, Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey. Table PBA4. Electricity consumption totals and conditional intensities by building activity subcategories, 2012. 75th percentile value for Nonrefrigerated Distribution Center = 8.5kWh/year/sf.

[4] Additional consumption of 30 Level 2 EV chargers providing 6 hours of charge time for two employee shifts per day = 0.37kWh/year/sf.

Draft EIR Table 4.11-16 shows that the volume of traffic generated by the Project would potentially meet the criteria for cumulative noise increases along several road segments. Specifically, traffic noise impacts along Cherry Valley Boulevard (from Project access to Hannon Road, from Hannon Road to Union Street, and from Union Street to Nancy Avenue) would be potentially significant. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-30 to 4.11-32)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with the Project's conflict with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings: Feasible mitigation is not available to reduce traffic noise. Typically, feasible mitigation measures for off-site roadway noise impacts include repairing the roads with rubberized asphalt and developing sound walls or attenuation barriers to minimize noise impacts. However, this mitigation can only be imposed on on-site roadways since the Applicant would not have authorization or control to make off-site improvements. As impacts would also occur on off-site roadways and properties, it is usually infeasible for the Applicant to implement these measures. Sound walls would be infeasible due to impacts on right of way, restricted views, and not being proportional to the barely perceptible increase in sound compared with the No Project scenario. Rubberized asphalt could be considered by the City's public works department in the future as part of scheduled maintenance funding, but it would not be roughly proportional to impose paving costs on the Project for a barely perceptible sound level increase. Therefore, mitigation measures to reduce the potentially significant traffic noise impact along Cherry Valley Boulevard are not feasible. Noise levels along this segment of Cherry Valley Boulevard would still be within the Conditionally Acceptable standard. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-32)**. However, as the Normally Acceptable standard would be exceeded, cumulative operational noise impact from related projects, in conjunction with Project-specific noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable along Cherry Valley Boulevard (from Project access to Hannon Road, from Hannon Road to Union Street, and from Union Street to Nancy Avenue) and impacts would be significant and unavoidable. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.11-33)**.

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation measures are available to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impact identified in the EIR.

TRANSPORTATION

Impact 4.15-2: Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Section 4.15 of the EIR includes a comprehensive analysis of potential transportation related impacts resulting from development and operation of the Project including whether the Project would be

consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3. Project vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceed the City of Beaumont threshold of significance of three percent (3%) below city-wide average future year (2040) vehicle miles traveled per employee and service population (SP). The Project's VMT per Employee and VMT per service population (SP) would not meet the three percent below citywide future year threshold. This impact is significant on both a project-related and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-31 – 4.7-41)**.

Findings:

1. **Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan project that avoids or substantially lessens the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.**
2. **Impacts associated with the Project's conflict with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 will constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.**

Facts in Support of Findings:

Project VMT was calculated using the most current version of RivTAM. Adjustments in socio-economic data were made to the appropriate traffic analysis zone within the RivTAM model to reflect the Project's proposed land use. Socio-economic data inputs were derived based on factors developed using Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rates. For purposes of this VMT assessment the Project's HBW VMT per Employee and VMT per service population ("**SP**") has been compared to three percent below citywide average future year (2040) VMT for the City of Beaumont, based on data provided by WRCOG. As shown in **Draft EIR Table 4.15-2**, the Project's home-based work ("**HBW**") VMT per Employee and VMT per SP would not meet the applicable citywide future year threshold. As such, the Project's transportation impact is potentially significant based on City of Beaumont's recommended thresholds. The Project's transportation impact based on VMT is significant based on City of Beaumont's recommended thresholds. As the efficacy of TDM measures and reduction of VMT impacts below thresholds cannot be assured, the Project's VMT impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable on a project-related and cumulative basis. **(Draft EIR, p. 4.15-21 to 4.15-22; 4.15-24)**.

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation measures are available to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impact identified in the EIR.

5.4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR analyzes the following two (2) alternatives to the Project as proposed, and evaluates these alternatives for their ability to meet the Project's goals and objectives. CEQA requires the EIR to include in its evaluation a No Project Alternative. Additionally, CEQA requires the EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project which would feasibly attain the basic Project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant impacts.

Alternatives considered within this analysis include:

- No Project Alternative: No Project/Existing Specific Plan;
- Reduced Building Intensity Alternative

The analysis included in the Draft EIR describes each Alternative, analyzes the impacts of the Alternative as compared to the Project, identifies significant impacts of the Project that would be avoided or lessened by the Alternative, assesses the Alternative's ability to meet most of the Project objectives, and evaluates the comparative merits of the Alternative and the Project. In making the following findings relating to Project alternatives, the City certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information included in the Draft EIR.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact of the Project.

Sections 4.1 through **4.18** of the Draft EIR address the environmental impacts of implementation of the Project. The analyses contained in these sections identified the following significant and unavoidable environmental impacts resulting from the Project:

Air Quality

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable air quality impacts, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, due to operational ROG and NO_x emissions; (2) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment, due to operational ROG and NO_x emissions; and (3) result in cumulative air quality impacts, as a result of operational ROG and NO_x emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) generation of 33,940 $MTCO_2e$ per year (mitigated) of GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment; (2) conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency, adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, as a result of total emissions; and (3) the Project would result in a potentially significant cumulative GHG impact.

Noise (Cumulative)

Noise impacts would be less than significant with the exception of cumulative off-site traffic noise along Cherry Valley Boulevard (from Project access to Hannon Road, from Hannon Road to Union Street, and from Union Street to Nancy Avenue). Cumulative traffic noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to buildout of the proposed Project and other projects in the vicinity. Noise levels along the affected segments of Cherry Valley Boulevard would be Conditionally Acceptable. However, mitigation was determined to be infeasible to reduce mobile traffic noise to Normally Acceptable levels in accordance with the Land Use Compatibility standards.

Transportation

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impact, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) the Project would exceed the City's Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) thresholds of 8.9 VMT per Employee and 30.4 VMT per service population. The former threshold would be exceeded by 6.4 VMT and second by 12.1 VMT. A cumulatively considerable transportation impact would also occur.

Alternative 1. No Project/Development Under Existing Specific Plan Alternative.

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6, the No Project/Existing Specific Plan assumes that the existing land uses and condition of the Project Site at the time the NOP was published (September 2021) would continue to exist without the Project. The setting of the Project site at the time the NOP was published is described as part of the existing conditions within **Section 3.0, Project Description** and throughout **Section 4.0** of the Draft EIR. The discussion within the respective sections provides a description of the environmental conditions in regard to the individual environmental issues.

The No Project/Existing Specific Plan Alternative assumes the Project would not be implemented and proposed land uses, and other improvements would not be constructed related to proposed Project and under this alternative none of the proposed improvements would occur. However, development allowed under the previously approved Sunny-Cal Specific Plan could occur and is analyzed as part of this Alternative.

The previously approved Sunny-Cal Specific Plan allows for the development of 200 acres with approximately 560 Dwelling Units (DU) on approximately 159 acres, over 30 acres of parks, open space, landscaped buffers, and paseos, and approximately 10 acres of circulation improvements.

Under this Alternative, the Sunny-Cal Specific Plan would remain and would not be replaced with the proposed Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan. While the Sunny-Cal Specific Plan allows for a variety of land uses, this Alternative assumed development in accordance with the residential densities allowed under the specific plan which, as noted above, allows for up to 560 DUs, park space, and roads.

The Draft EIR compares in detail the potential impacts of the No Project Alternative to the Project. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-5 – 6-16)**.

Findings: Under the No Project Alternative, development of the Project would not occur; instead, this alternative assumes development of the Project site consistent with the existing Specific Plan designation. Development under the existing Specific Plan would reduce significant transportation impacts to less than significant levels. However, development under the No Project Alternative would result in great impacts with regard to the following CEQA categories: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Energy Consumption, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Water Quality, Population and Housing, Public Services Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, other than transportation impacts, the No Project Alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce identified significant impacts to Air Quality, Noise, or Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Moreover, the No Project Alternative would not meet most of the basic Project objectives. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-5 – 6-16, Table 6-2)**.

Aesthetics. Impacts to aesthetics would be worse with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that implementation of the Specific Plan and related approvals as proposed would result in significant aesthetic impacts by creating a fundamental change in views from a nearby scenic route (I-10 Freeway) and the rural Cherry Valley area to the east. Furthermore, the project could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and could substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Furthermore, the project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings and would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-5, Table 6-2)**.

Air Quality. Impacts to air quality would be worse with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, the project would create significant short-term air quality regional impacts during construction from ROG and NO_x emissions and would create long-term regional impacts during project occupancy from ROG emissions. The Project also has the potential to create similar significant localized impacts during project construction and operation from PM_{10}. Because the Project has the potential to emit air pollutants in excess of the appropriate standards, there is the potential that air emissions of PM_{10} and ROG during construction and operation of the Project could impact the health of nearby residents. Therefore, the Project may result in pollutant concentrations to significantly affect sensitive receptors. In addition, the Project was not compliant with the 2003 AQMP. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-6, Table 6-2).**

Biological Resources. Impacts to biological resources would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that through the Fish and Game § 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement process, direct impacts to riparian habitat would be reduced to below the level of significance. Mitigation measures included in the Sunny Cal EIR determined that impacts would be less than significant. Through implementation of MM BIO-1 to BIO-3, impacts to avian nesting sites would be reduced to below the level of significance. Through the Section 404 permitting process, direct impacts to waters of the U.S. and wetlands would be reduced to below the level of significance. Implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce indirect impacts to jurisdictional waters to below the level of significance. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-7 – 6-8, Table 6-2)**.

Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources. Impacts to cultural resources would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that impacts to potential cultural resources from construction of the proposed Sunny-Cal Specific Plan would be less than significant after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. MMs CUL-1 and CUL-2 would address impacts to undiscovered archaeological resources, human remains, and tribal cultural resources. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-8, Table 6-2)**.

Energy. Impacts from energy consumption would be worse with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR did not evaluate energy impacts. However, the DEIR did analyze impacts to air quality impacts, which are largely related to the consumption (and associated combustion) of energy

resources. As previously mentioned, this Alternative would result in both construction and operational air quality impacts despite implementation of all feasible mitigation. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-9, Table 6-2)**.

Geology and Soils. Impacts to geology and soils would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. Potential impacts from development of the No Project Alternative could similarly be mitigated to less than significant levels. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-9, Table 6-2)**.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Impacts from greenhouse gas emissions resulting from development of the No Project Alternative would be similar to impacts resulting from development of the Project. Although the Sunny-Cal DEIR did not include a greenhouse gas analysis, considering the size of the development envisioned under the specific plan, impacts would have been similarly significant and unavoidable. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-10)**.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the proposed Specific Plan would not have significant impacts relative to hazardous materials, fire hazards, and airports/airfields. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-10, Table 6-2)**.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-11, Table 6-2)**.

Land Use and Planning. Impacts to land use and planning would be less with development of the No Project Alternative. Unlike the Project, development of the No Project Alternative would not require a general plan amendment or revision to the specific plan. The Sunny-Cal Specific Plan was found to be consistent with surrounding planned land uses and with applicable policies of the General Plans of the County of Riverside, including The Pass Area Plan, and the City of Beaumont. Therefore, it would not create significant impacts related to land use or planning. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-11, Table 6-2)**.

Noise. Impacts to Noise would be similar with development of the No Project Alternative. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, potential noise impacts on and from the project would be reduced to less than significant levels. At project buildout, projected traffic along adjacent roads/highways could generate significant noise impacts on future project residents. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-12, Table 6-2)**.

Population and Housing. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that the amount of new housing and population generated by the project was consistent with regional growth projections and did not represent a significant impact in this regard. Potential population and housing impacts of the project were not expected to be significant over the short- or long-term, based on local and SCAG demographic projections. While both the No-Project Alternative and the proposed Project were found to result in a less than significant impact, this Alternative would result in both direct population and housing growth.

Therefore, based on the above discussion, under the No-Project Alternative, impacts regarding population and housing would be greater when compared to the proposed Project. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-13, Table 6-2)**.

Public Services. The Sunny-Cal DEIR found that with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and payment of applicable development impact fees, potential impacts to public services as a result of the proposed Specific Plan would be less than significant. However, due to the increased residential uses as compared to the Project, the No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts to public services. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-13, Table 6-2)**.

Recreation. Under the No-Project Alternative, impacts regarding recreation would be greater when compared to the proposed Project because the proposed Project would not result in impacts that would require the implementation of mitigation. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-14)**.

Transportation. Development of the No Project Alternative would result in fewer transportation impacts in comparison to the Project. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, development under the current specific plan would not have significant impacts related to traffic, circulation, or parking. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-14 – 6-15, Table 6-2)**.

Utilities and Service Systems. With development of the No-Project Alternative, impacts regarding utilities and service systems would be greater when compared to the proposed Project because the proposed Project would not result in impacts that would require the implementation of mitigation. Development of the No Project Alternative would result in greater water use and impacts to sewage and solid waste generation due to more intense residential development. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-15, Table 6-2)**.

Wildfire. Development of the No Project Alternative would have a similar impact with regard to wildfire impacts to development of the Project. **(Draft EIR, p. 6-16, Table 6-2)**.

Attainment of Project Objectives. The No Project Alternative will not meet most of the basic project objectives. The No Project Alternative will not meet the following objectives:

13. Develop a state-of-the-art logistics/e-commerce center with complimentary commercial uses that take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, is feasible to construct, is economically competitive with, and in the general vicinity of, similar logistics/e-commerce center uses.
14. Develop and operate a large format logistics center that is in close proximity to the I-10 freeway to support the distribution of goods throughout the region and that also limits truck traffic disruption to sensitive receptors within the surrounding region.
15. Facilitate the development of underutilized land currently planned for residential uses with uses that maximize the use of the site as a large format e-commerce center consisting of one or more buildings with total e-commerce building space in excess of 2,557,465 square feet in size and approximately 150,000 square feet of mixed commercial uses responding to market demand.

16. Facilitate the establishment of design guidelines and development standards that create a unique, well-defined identity for the proposed Project.

Alternative 2. Reduced Building Intensity.

Alternative 2 would entail the development of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility and commercial uses, but at a smaller square footage (15 percent less) than what was proposed for the Project. Alternative 2 would involve the development of 2,173,846 square feet of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility space. Additionally, since the Project footprint would be smaller, it is anticipated that the amount of graded area would be smaller as well. Modifications would occur to multiple on-site features such as drainage basins, parking, and landscaping. **Table 6-1, Alternative 2 Design Comparison** summarizes the similarities and differences between the Project design features and Alternative 2's design features.

Table 6-1: Alternative 2 Design Comparison

Feature	Project	Alternative 2
Net Site Area	181.3 ac	181.3 ac
Warehouse Building Area	Bldg. 1: 985,860 sq. ft.	Bldg. 1: 837,981 sq. ft.
	Bldg. 2: 1,213,235 sq. ft.	Bldg. 2: 1,031,250 sq. ft.
	Bldg. 3: 358,370 sq. ft.	Bldg. 3: 304,615 sq. ft.
	Total: 2,557,465 sq. ft.	**Total: 2,173,846 sq. ft.**
Coverage	Bldg. 1: 43.2%	Bldg. 1: 36.7%
	Bldg. 2: 41.8%	Bldg. 2: 35.5%
	Bldg. 3: 39.7%	Bldg. 3: 33.8%
	Total: 32.4%	**Total: 27.5%**
Auto Parking Provided	Bldg. 1: 628 stalls	Bldg. 1: 534 stalls
	Bldg. 2: 610 stalls	Bldg. 2: 519 stalls
	Bldg. 3: 222 stalls	Bldg. 3: 189 stalls
	Total: 1,460 stalls	**Total: 1,242 stalls**
Trailer Parking Provided	Bldg. 1: 246 stalls	Bldg. 1: 209 stalls
	Bldg. 2: 514 stalls	Bldg. 2: 437 stalls
	Bldg. 3: 149 stalls	Bldg. 3: 127 stalls
	Total: 909 stalls	**Total: 773 stalls**
Floor Area Ratio	1.0	0.85

Notes:
ac = acre
sq. ft. = square feet

Off-site improvements to the adjacent roadways of Cherry Valley Boulevard and Brookside Avenue would remain consistent with the Project.

Findings: Alternative 2 would minimize impacts related to the scale of the Project. Therefore, environmental impact areas such as aesthetics, energy, utilities and service systems, and wildfire may see a nominal improvement regarding potential impact significance. However, these resource areas are anticipated to have a less than significant impact under the Project. The Project was able to achieve a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated in all environmental impact areas except air quality,

greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation. These resources were anticipated to create significant and unavoidable impacts. Development of the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would similarly result in significant unavoidable impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation and noise. Therefore, the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce an identified significant environmental impact resulting from the Project. Additionally, the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Building Alternative is rejected. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-17 – 6-22, Table 6-2)**.

Aesthetics. The same general aesthetics impacts would occur with the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative when compared to the proposed Project. Although the building footprint would be reduced with this Alternative, the same general mass and scale of the site would be the same. When compared to the proposed Project, aesthetics impacts associated with the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative 2 would be similar when compared to the proposed Project. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-17, Table 6-2)**.

Air Quality. Development of the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would propose the same e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility land use as the Project although the building space would be reduced by 383,619 square feet for the Alternative. Presumably, this would reduce potential operational emissions through the reduced building area. However, the majority of operational emissions stemmed from mobile sources such as vehicles and construction equipment. The vehicular traffic generated from the Project is not anticipated to be significantly reduced in Alternative 2. Operations of Alternative 2 is expected to be similar to the Project. Because the usage would be similar, the emissions generated from the Alternative 2 would be similar to the Project and would also likely create a significant and unavoidable impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-18, Table 6-2)**.

Biological Resources. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the construction footprint would be smaller due to the 15 percent reduction in e-commerce building space and associated amenities. This would result in a smaller area being graded, thus leading to a reduction in impacts to wildlife habitat and water crossings. As with the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce biological resource impacts to a level of less than significant. However, lesser impacts would occur with implementation of the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative 2 due to the reduced footprint. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-18, Table 6-2)**.

Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the construction footprint would be smaller due to the 15 percent reduction in e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility building space and associated amenities. This would result in a greater area being designated as open space, leading to a reduction in potential impacts to undiscovered archaeological resources. As with the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce cultural resource impacts to a level of less than significant. However, lesser impacts would occur with implementation of the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative 2 due to the reduced footprint. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-18, Table 6-2)**.

Energy. Both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would require energy during both the construction and operations phases of the Project, although the Reduced Building

Intensity Alternative would require approximately 15 percent less energy to build and operate when compared to the proposed Project. When compared to the proposed Project, the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would result in fewer energy-related impacts than the proposed Project. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-19, Table 6-2)**.

Geology and Soils. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the construction footprint would be smaller due to the 15 percent reduction in e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility building space and associated amenities. This would result in a greater area being designated as open space, leading to a reduction in potential impacts to geological and paleontological resources. As with the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce geological and paleontological resource impacts to a level of less than significant. However, lesser impacts would occur with implementation of this Alternative due to the reduced footprint. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-19, Table 6-2)**.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The Project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas impacts were associated with the potential to conflict with GHG emissions regulations through the generation of excess $MTCO_2e$. For this impact, mitigation was proposed to reduce potential impacts, however, the Project was still found to exceed thresholds with mitigation. Like air quality above, the Project's emissions stem largely from mobile source emissions.

The Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would likely reduce emissions impacts through a reduction in energy use in a smaller space. However, the usage rate of the Project site would remain similar. Even with a reduction in energy use emissions, the mobile source emissions associated with vehicular travel would not be largely reduced. Therefore, this Alternative would likely remain in excess of the City's GHG emissions thresholds. The impact would be expected to remain a significant and unavoidable impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-19, Table 6-2)**.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the construction footprint would be smaller due to the 15 percent reduction in e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility building space and associated amenities. This would result in a greater area being designated as open space, leading to a reduction in potential discovery of hazardous materials and decreased generation of hazards and hazardous materials. As with the proposed Project, mitigation measures would not be required to reduce hazards and hazardous materials impacts to a level of less than significant. Lesser impacts would occur with implementation of this Alternative due to the reduced footprint. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-19 – 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the construction footprint would be smaller due to the 15 percent reduction in e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility building space and associated amenities. This would result in a smaller area of disturbance, leading to a reduction in impact to floodplain and hydrological resources, and water quality due to reduced grading, excavation, or construction activities. As with the proposed Project, mitigation measures would not be required to reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to a level of less than significant. Lesser impacts would occur with implementation of this Alternative due to the reduced footprint. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Land Use and Planning. Both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would require a General Plan Amendment. Therefore, impacts between the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the Project would be similar. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Noise. Both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would generate noise during both the construction and operations phases of the Project, although the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would generate approximately 15 percent less noise when compared to the proposed Project given the reduction in size. When compared to the proposed Project, the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would result in fewer noise-related impacts than the proposed Project; however, it is anticipated that both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would require similar mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts. Although the under Alternative 2 traffic noise would be reduced by 15 percent compared to the proposed Project, it was determined that the Project would have a significant impact from cumulative traffic noise and no feasible mitigation would reduce the impact. As such, cumulative off-site traffic noise impacts are anticipated to remain significant and unavoidable for both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Population and Housing. The Project site would be comprised of e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility and commercial uses and therefore would have an indirect impact on population. Because this Alternative would include smaller sized warehouses than the Project, it is anticipated that the demand for employees would be less. It is anticipated that most employees would come from within the City and surrounding areas, resulting in a demand for new workers potentially needing housing within the City. Therefore, this Alternative would have slightly less impacts to population and housing than the Project. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Public Services. Both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would require additional public service needs, although the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would require approximately 15 percent less public service needs when compared to the proposed Project given the reduction in size. When compared to the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in fewer public service impacts related impacts than the proposed Project; however, it is anticipated these reductions would be nominal. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20, Table 6-2)**.

Recreation. Neither the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative nor the proposed Project would increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated nor include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Project would include approximately 30 acres of designated Open Space, allowing for further recreational development within the City. The Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would result in a 383,619-square foot reduction in e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility space which could lead to a proportional increase in open space under Alternative 2. Therefore, the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would result in a reduced impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-20 – 6-21, Table 6-2)**.

Transportation. Development of the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would involve the development of a smaller e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility buildings which would utilize a smaller portion of the Project site for e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility uses. With the smaller size, this Alternative would likely have a lesser usage intensity than the Project. The number of dock doors would be reduced and the number of employees less under this Alternative. The Reduced Building Intensity Alternative e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility uses would be approximately 15 percent less than the Project. It is anticipated that a 15 percent reduction of projected employment would occur with this Alternative. VMT impacts associated with the proposed Project were found to be significant and unavoidable. While the Reduced Building Intensity Alterative e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility buildings would be 15 percent smaller, it is anticipated that this Alternative would still exceed City VMT thresholds and realize a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, development of this Alternative would result in a similar impact. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-21, Table 6-2)**.

Utilities and Service Systems. Both the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative and the proposed Project would require additional utilities and service systems needs, although the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would require approximately 15 percent less utility needs when compared to the proposed Project given the reduction in size. When compared to the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in fewer utility and service system impacts related impacts than the proposed Project; however, it is anticipated these reductions would be nominal. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-15, Table 6-2)**.

Wildfire. Under the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative, the development of the Project site would occur similar to the Project, but e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility use would be reduced 15 percent. Development in the Project area includes roadways, residential, and commercial, and well as planned industrial development to the north. The Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ zone nor is it located in a SRA. The Project site is within a LRA zone. Since the Project is within an LRA zone, provision of fire protection services would continue under contract to the RCFD. The warehouse structures would be predominantly concrete which is not typically susceptible to fire. Specifically, the warehouses would be built consistent with the California Building Code requiring new buildings to use ignition-resistant construction methods and materials as well as have a fire suppression system.

Neither this Alternative nor the Project would interfere with any emergency plan or evacuation plan. This Alternative also would not exacerbate any existing fire hazards associated with slopes or spreading of wildfire. Lastly, neither the Project nor this Alternative would require construction of any infrastructure that could exacerbate fire hazards. Therefore, Alternative 2 would be environmentally equivalent to the Project regarding wildfire. **(Draft EIR, pp. 6-16, Table 6-2)**.

Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Based on the summary of information presented in **Table 6-2, Comparison of Project Alternatives Environmental Impacts with the Project**, the environmentally superior Alternative is Alternative 2: Reduced Building Intensity. Because Alternative 2 would reduce the e-commerce/high cube warehouse facility development footprint by 15 percent, this Alternative has fewer environmental impacts than the proposed Project or any of the other alternatives.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that if the "No Project" alternative is found to be environmentally superior, "the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives". The No Project/Existing Specific Plan Alternative was not found to be environmentally superior. However, while the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, it is not capable of meeting most of the basic objectives of the Project.

6.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines provide in part the following:

(a) CEQA requires that the decision maker balance the benefits of a Project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
(b) Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effect that are identified in the Final EIR but are not mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes the findings under Section 15091(a)(2) or (a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.
(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination (Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines).

The City Council, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR for the Project, Responses to Comments and the public record, adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations that have been balanced against the unavoidable adverse impacts in reaching a decision on this Project.

6.2 OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

To the extent that the significant effects of the Project are not avoided or substantially lessened to below a level of significance, the City Council, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan EIR and the public record, and having balanced the benefits of the Project against the unavoidable effects which remain, finds that such unmitigated effects to be acceptable in view of the following overriding considerations. The City Council finds that any one of these project benefits standing alone would be sufficient to sustain the Statement of Overriding Considerations:

1. All feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to lessen project impacts to less than significant levels; and furthermore, that alternatives to the Project are infeasible because while they have similar or less environmental impacts, they do not provide the benefits of the

Project, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible when compared to the Project, as described in the Statement of Facts and Findings.

2. The Project is consistent with and will contribute to achieving the goals and objectives established by the General Plan. Implementing the City's General Plan as a policy is a legal and social prerogative of the City.
3. Approval of the Project will create maximum employment-generating opportunities for citizens of Beaumont and surrounding communities. Development and construction of the site will create both temporary on-site jobs as well as indirectly support local and regional jobs. Additionally, construction spending will create a one-time stimulus to the local and regional economics.
4. Approval of the Project will contribute towards maximizing employment opportunities within the City to improve the jobs-housing balance and to reduce systemic unemployment within the City. The Project will attract businesses that can expedite the delivery of essential goods to consumers and businesses in Beaumont and beyond the City boundary.
5. Approval of the Project will create approximately 4010 new jobs.
6. Approval of the Project will enhance the fiscal performance of the City and help stabilize the City's fiscal health.
7. Approval of the Project will result in improved infrastructure to keep pace with development, and will enhance the quality of life for the City's residents by linking land use, transportation and infrastructure development.
8. Approval of the Project will ensure a high level of public safety to protect the personal safety and welfare of people who live, work and visit the City from crime, pollution, disasters and other threats and emergencies.

Although significant impacts will remain, the City will mitigate any significant adverse impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, cumulative traffic noise and transportation to the maximum extent practicable. In its decision to approve the Project, the City Council has considered the Project benefits to outweigh the environmental impacts.

7.0 CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

7.1 FINDINGS

The City Council certifies that the Revised Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and that the City Council has complied with CEQA's procedural and substantive requirements.

The City Council further certifies that it has reviewed and considered the EIR in evaluation the Project and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council. The City Council further finds that no new significant information as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, has been received by the City Council after the circulation of the Draft EIR that would require further recirculation.

Accordingly, the City Council certifies the Final EIR for the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan.

As the decision-making body for approval, the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Findings and supporting documentation. The City Council determines that the Findings contain a complete and accurate reporting of the unavoidable impacts and benefits of the Project as detailed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

7.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The Project will have significant adverse impacts even following adoption of all feasible mitigation measures which are required by the City Council. The following significant environmental impacts have been identified in the Final EIR and will require mitigation but cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:

Air Quality

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable air quality impacts, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, due to operational ROG and NO_x emissions; (2) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment, due to operational ROG and NO_x emissions; and (3) result in cumulative air quality impacts, as a result of operational ROG and NO_x emissions.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) generation of 33,940 $MTCO_2e$ per year (mitigated) of GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment; (2) conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency, adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, as a result of total emissions; and (3) the Project would result in a potentially significant cumulative GHG impact.

Noise (Cumulative)

Noise impacts would be less than significant with the exception of cumulative off-site traffic noise along Cherry Valley Boulevard (from Project access to Hannon Road, from Hannon Road to Union Street, and from Union Street to Nancy Avenue). Cumulative traffic noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to buildout of the proposed Project and other projects in the vicinity. Noise levels along the affected segments of Cherry Valley Boulevard would be Conditionally Acceptable. However, mitigation was determined to be infeasible to reduce mobile traffic noise to Normally Acceptable levels in accordance with the Land Use Compatibility standards.

Transportation

The Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impact, despite the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures: (1) the Project would exceed the City's Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) thresholds of 8.9 VMT per Employee and 30.4 VMT per service population. The former threshold would

be exceeded by 6.4 VMT and second by 12.1 VMT. A cumulatively considerable transportation impact would also occur.

Details of these significant unavoidable adverse impacts were discussed in the Final EIR and are summarized, or were otherwise provided in Section 5.3, *Environmental Effects Which Remain Significant and Unavoidable After Mitigation and Findings*, in the Statement of Facts and Findings.

The City Council has eliminated or substantially reduced environmental impacts where feasible as described in the Findings, and the City Council determines that the remaining unavoidable significant adverse impacts are acceptable due to the reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (See Section 6.0).

CONCLUSIONS

1. Except as to those impacts stated above relating to air quality, greenhouse gases and transportation, all other significant environmental impacts from the implementation of the Project have been identified in the EIR and, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified, will be mitigated to a level of insignificance.
2. Alternatives to the Project, which could potentially achieve the basic objectives of the Project, have been considered and rejected in favor of the Project.
3. Environmental, economic, social, and other considerations and benefits derived from the development of the Project override and make infeasible any alternatives to the Project or further mitigation measures beyond those incorporated into the Project.

8.0 ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Pursuant to *Public Resources Code* Section 21081.6, the City Council hereby adopts, as conditions of approval of the Project, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) provided as Resolution Exhibit ___. In the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures set forth herein and the attached MMRP, the MMRP shall control, except to the extent that a mitigation measure contained herein is inadvertently omitted from the MMRP, in which case such mitigation measure shall be deemed as if it were included in the MMRP.