INITIAL STUDY

FOR

SWC 8TH STREET AND HIGHLAND SPRINGS AVE.

Prepared for:

City of Beaumont
Carole Kendrick, Senior Planner
550 East 6th Street Beaumont, California 92223

Prepared by:

Lilburn Corporation
1905 Business Center Drive
San Bernardino, CA 92408
(909) 890-1818

June 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Independently reviewed, analyzed and exercised judgment in making the determination, by the Development Review Committee on _____, pursuant to Section 21082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

CEQA requires the preparation of an Initial Study when a proposal must obtain discretionary approval from a governmental agency and is not exempt from CEQA. The purpose of the Initial Study is to determine whether or not a proposal, not except from CEQA, qualifies for a Negative Declaration (ND) or whether or not an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared.

Section 1.0 of this Initial Study (IS) describes the purpose, environmental authorization, the intended uses of the IS, documents incorporated by reference, and the processes and procedures governing the preparation of the environmental document. Pursuant to Section 15367 of the State of California *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA Guidelines), the City of Beaumont (City) is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City has primary responsibility for compliance with CEQA and consideration of the Proposed Project.

1. Project Title: SWC 8th Street & North Highland Springs Ave

2. Lead Agency Name: City of Beaumont
Planning Division
550 E. 6th Street
Beaumont, CA 92223

3. Contact Person: Carole Kendrick, Senior Planner
Phone Number: 951-769-8518

4. Project Location: Southwest corner of the Highland Springs Ave. and 8th Street

5. Geographic Coordinates of Project Site: 33° 55'56.47" N, 116° 56' 51.24" W

6: USGS Topographic Map: Beaumont 7.5-minute USGS Topographic Quadrangle

7: Public Land Survey System: Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Section 11

8. Thomas Guide Location: Page 721, Grid C2, San Bernardino & Riverside Counties (2013)

9. Assessor Parcel Number: 419-150-034

10. General Plan Designation: Community Commercial

11. Zoning: Commercial Community

12. Description of Project: Evergreen Devco, Inc. ("Project Applicant") is proposing the development of a 3,500 square-foot quick service restaurant (QSR), a gas station with six fuel pumps with 12 dispensers, and a 4,088 square-foot convenience store on a 2.08-acre parcel in the City of Beaumont, Riverside County. The Project Site is located on the southwest corner of Highland Springs Avenue and East 8th Street (see Figure 1-Regional Location and Figure 2-Project Vicinity). The existing vacant parcel is described as Assessor's Parcel No. 419-150-034.

The Project Site is currently vacant and will be split into two lots as shown on Figure 3, via a Tentative Parcel Map. Lot A will be in Parcel 2 and consist of a QSR with an attached drive-thru and thirty-nine (39) parking spaces, 2 of which will be handicap-accessible parking spaces; Lot B will in Parcel 1 and consist of a gas station with six fuel pumps with twelve (12) fueling dispensers, and a convenience store with 49 parking spaces, 2 of which will be handicap-accessible parking spaces. The site design also includes two (2) 20K-gallon underground storage tanks (USTs) and one (1) Healy Tank(s) (clean air separator). One of the USTs will hold 20K-gallons of Regular Unleaded Gasoline. The other UST is a Split Tank, which will hold 8K-gallons of Premium Unleaded Gasoline and 12K-gallons of Diesel. An underground detention system with a minimum storage volume of 4,700 cubic feet is proposed for peak attenuation of storm flows.

The City of Beaumont requires a Conditional Use Permit for fast food restaurants with a drive-thru use, a Gas/Service Station, as well as for the operation of an off-sale alcohol license. Access to the Project Site would be provided by a 35-foot driveway at 8th Street and a 35-foot driveway at Highland Springs Ave. The Proposed Project includes the installation of two (2) monuments illuminated signs, one in each frontage. Landscaping will be provided on the northern and eastern boundaries. Structure heights will be a maximum of 18.5 feet for the fueling station canopy and 22 feet for the building.

The Project Site has a current zoning of Commercial Community and General Plan land use designation of Community Commercial. The Community Commercial land use designation is characterized by commercial shopping centers that serve adjacent neighborhoods. The Project Site is surrounded by commercial development (medical and dental offices), ongoing development (Sundance Corporate Center), and public facilities (hospital and nursing facility).

13. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The Project Site has a current zoning of Commercial Community and a General Plan land use designation of Community Commercial. The Community Commercial land use designation is characterized by commercial shopping centers that serve adjacent neighborhoods. The Project Site is surrounded by commercial development (medical and dental offices), ongoing development (Sundance Corporate Center), and public facilities (hospital and nursing facility).

Location	Existing Use	Land Use Designation	Zoning
Site	Vacant	Community Commercial	Commercial Community
North	Vacant, Ongoing development	Single-Family Residential	Specific Plan Area
South	Medical and Dental offices	General Commercial	Commercial General
East	San Gorgonio Memorial Hospital (City of Banning)	Public Facilities	Public Facilities
West	Palmgrove Healthcare center	Multi-Family Residential	Residential-Multiple Family

14. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, finance approval, or participation agreement):

- **Fueling Dispensing Facility -** South Coast Air Quality Management District

15. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

McKenna et Al. submitted a written request to the Native American Heritage Commission for a records search in the commission's Sacred Lands File. The NAHC provided a list dated November 21, 2019 of 21 tribes recommended for contact. The City of Beaumont initiated the AB 52 consultation process on May 8, 2020.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

1.1 EVALUATION FORMAT

This Initial Study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on eighteen (18) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact

Substantiation is then provided to justify each determination. One of the four following conclusions is then provided as a summary of the analysis for each of the major environmental factors.

1. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
2. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
3. Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List mitigation measures)
4. Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are: (List the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self- monitoring or as requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklists on the following pages. For each of the potentially affected factors, mitigation measures are recommended that would reduce the impacts to less than significant levels.

☐ *Aesthetics*	☐ *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*	☐ *Air Quality*
☐ *Biological Resources*	☐ *Cultural Resources*	☐ *Energy*
☐ *Geology /Soils*	☐ *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*	☐ *Hazards & Hazardous Materials*
☐ *Hydrology/Water Quality*	☐ *Land Use / Planning*	☐ *Mineral Resources*
☐ *Noise*	☐ *Population / Housing*	☐ *Public Services*
☐ *Recreation*	☐ *Transportation*	☐ *Tribal Cultural Resources*
☐ *Utilities/Service Systems*	☐ *Wildfire*	☐ *Mandatory Findings of Significance*

1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study, the City of Beaumont Environmental Review Committee finds:

☐ I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the Proposed Project would have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date
Name	Title

1.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if substantial evidence exists that an effect may be significant. If one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries are marked when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. *Note: Instructions may be omitted from final document.

SECTION 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The City formally initiated the environmental process for the project with the preparation of this Initial Study (IS). The IS screens out those impacts that would be less than significant and do not warrant mitigation, while identifying those issues that require further mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As identified in the following analyses, project impacts related to various environmental issues either do not occur, are less than significant (when measured against established significance thresholds) or have been rendered less than significant through implementation of mitigation measures. Based on these analytical conclusions, this IS supports adoption of an MND for the Proposed Project. This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines.

CEQA permits the incorporation by reference of all or portions of other documents that are generally available to the public. The IS has been prepared utilizing information from City planning and environmental documents, technical studies specifically prepared for the project, and other publicly available data. The documents utilized in the IS are identified in Section 3.0 and are hereby incorporated by reference. These documents are available for review at the City of Beaumont, Community Development Department.

Pursuant to Section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Beaumont is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this Initial Study. The City has primary responsibility for approval or denial of this project. The intended use of this Initial Study is to provide adequate environmental analysis related to project construction and operation activities of the Proposed Project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site is an undeveloped parcel in the City of Beaumont, located approximately 1.71 miles northeast of the I-10 freeway and SR-79 highway intersection (refer to Figure 1 - Regional Map). It is adjacent to the City of Banning, in the southwestern corner of the Highland Springs Avenue and 8th Street intersection (refer to Figure 2-Vicinity Map). The property has a current General Plan land use designation of Community Commercial. It is surrounded by medical and dental offices to the south, a hospital to the east, ongoing commercial development to the north and a nursing facility to the west. The Project Site and its immediate vicinity is within the 6th Street Corridor Planning Area of the City General Plan, approved March 2007. Development in this area is largely commercial and industrial in character with many single-family and multiple-family residences located between commercial parcels. The area surrounding the Project Site and in Banning are a mix of general commercial development, high density residences and professional offices.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project Applicant is requesting the approval of Conditional Use Permit and Tentative Parcel Map to develop a QSR with an attached drive-thru use, gas station and convenience store. The Project Site is currently vacant. The Proposed Project would divide the square-shaped approximately 2.08-acre property into two commercial lots. Lot A in Parcel 2 is the western portion of the site and is proposed to consist of a QSR. Lot B in Parcel 1 is the eastern portion and is proposed to consist of a convenience store and gas station (refer to Figure 3-Site Plan). The gas station would consist of 6 fuel pumps with 12 dispensers and two USTs. Access to and egress from the Project Site would be provided by a 35-foot driveway on 8th Street and another one on Highland Springs Avenue. The Proposed Project would provide 88 parking spaces, 4 of which are handicap accessible. An illuminated monument sign would be installed on each frontage.

SECTION 3.0 – CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

3.1 AESTHETICS

1.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Beaumont is located in north-central Riverside County, at the summit of the San Gorgonio Pass. Beaumont is bounded on the west by the City of Calimesa, on the north by the unincorporated community of Cherry Valley; on the south by the I-10 Freeway; and on the east by the City of Banning. Beaumont is located approximately 70 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 21 miles northeast of the City of Riverside; and 21 miles southeast of the City of San Bernardino. The Project Site is surrounded by commercial development, public facilities and undeveloped lands.

3.1.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less than Significant Impact. The City General Plan does not contain any designated scenic vistas that would be affected by the implementation of the Proposed Project. The San Timoteo Badlands area is considered a scenic vista, therefore development proposals within the Badlands area will be given special attention.[1] The Project Site is 16 miles southeast of the San Timoteo Badlands and implementation of the Proposed Project would not have an effect on this scenic resource. The Project Site has a General Plan designation of Community Commercial.[2] The Proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan designation. The Project Site is surrounded by vacant land undergoing development to the north, public facility to the east (hospital), nursing facility to the west, and General Commercial development to the south. The Proposed Project's building structures will not exceed 50 feet, as is required

[1] City General Plan. https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/63/General-Plan?bidId=. Page 161
[2] City General Plan. https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/63/General-Plan?bidId=. Page 26

by the City's municipal code standards for the Community Commercial zone. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to change the general aesthetics of the area or obstruct natural scenic views or vistas. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause damage to any scenic resources or historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway. The Project Site is currently vacant and consists of grass and tumbleweeds. The Project Site is not adjacent to or near any State-eligible or State-designated Scenic Highway.[3] The nearest State Scenic Highway is Route 243, which is approximately 3.5 miles east of the Project Site. According to the City General Plan, proposed projects that are either within the San Timoteo Badlands or that could affect views of or alter ridgelines will be given special consideration to reduce aesthetic/visual resource impacts to a less-than-significant level.[4] The Proposed Project is 16 miles southeast of the San Timoteo Badlands and will not affect views of or alter ridgelines. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would the project in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

Less than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project would not cause damage to the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site or its surroundings. The Proposed development would be consistent with the City General Plan designation and would enhance the surrounding community with commercial uses. The surrounding properties are either vacant, developed for residential or commercial uses, or a public facility. The Proposed Project would maintain similar aesthetics and building design as the surrounding establishments. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Less than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project would take place on a site that is currently vacant. The Proposed Project includes two LED-illuminated monument signs adjacent to the driveways, three LED-illuminated canopy signs at the gas station and an LED-illuminated wall sign outside the convenience store. Lights installed for the Proposed Project will be directed away from sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity include hospital patients and staff on the east side of Highland Springs Avenue, and staff and patients in the nursing facility to the west. These facilities and commercial development south of the Project Site already include lighting on the outside of buildings and in parking lots

[3] County General Plan. Circulation Element Figure C-8 Scenic Highways
[4] City General Plan. https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/63/General-Plan?bidId=. Page 161

primarily for safety. Additionally, both 8th St. and Highland Springs Avenue have streetlights in the area of the project as well as traffic lights at intersections. Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit, the Project Applicant is required to install public streetlights along the frontage of perimeter streets. Streetlight installation shall be in accordance to the City's Approved Street Lighting Specifications. In addition, trees would be planted throughout the Project Site and along the perimeter, which would minimize light exposure. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

2.	**AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES. (In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.) In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.) Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
(a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

The Project Site is in the northeastern portion of the City of Beaumont. As shown on the City General Plan Land Use Designations Map, it has a current zoning of Community Commercial. The Project Site is neither considered useful for agriculture nor is it within an existing zone for forest land. The Project Site is vacant with only non-native grasses and tumbleweeds present on-site. SALEM conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Proposed Project in January 2020 (see Appendix A). According to their review of historical aerial photographs, the Project Site and adjacent properties appear to have been undeveloped or agricultural lands since the 1930s.

3.2.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?*

No impact. According to the City General Plan, properties within the General Plan Area are not designated as prime farmlands, unique farmlands, or farmlands of statewide importance.[5] The Project Site is identified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" in the Riverside County Important Farmland 2016 Sheet 1 of 3 maps.[6] Urban and Built-Up Land is occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Examples of this category are residential, industrial commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures. No prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance occur on the Project Site. The Proposed Project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. The Project Site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, as confirmed by the Assessor's Agriculture Division. According to the City General Plan, no agricultural properties within the General Plan Area are currently covered under the provisions of a Williamson Act Contract.[7] Additionally, as shown on the Riverside County Information Technology (RCIT) Geographic Information Systems (GIS), the Project Site is not under Williamson Contract. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

[5] City General Plan. Page 138
[6] California Department of Conservation. Important Farmland 2016 Sheet 1 of 3.
[7] City General Plan. Page 138.

No Impact. Beaumont does not have a zoning designation for, nor does it contain forestry-related timberland or timberland production sites within city limits.[8] Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Site is currently vacant and does not support forest land. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The City General Plan does not include any lands designated as forest land within the General Plan area. Therefore, no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use will result from the implementation of the Proposed Project. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Site does not support agricultural or forest land use. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use on-site or off-site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

3.	**AIR QUALITY. (Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.) Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
(a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.3.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Beaumont is located in the eastern portion of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB is bounded by the San Jacinto, San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountain Ranges. The primary source of air pollution affecting the City are pollutants transported by wind from urbanized

[8] City General Plan. Page 26.

areas located west towards Los Angeles. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB.

3.3.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the basin establishes a program of rules and regulations administered by SCAQMD to obtain attainment of the state and federal air quality standards. The most recent AQMP (AQMP 2016) was adopted by the SCAQMD on March 2017. The 2016 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including transportation control measures developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) using the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

The Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Beaumont's Community Commercial land use designation. The General Plan was adopted before the 2016 AQMP was adopted. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Proposed Project have already been accounted for in the AQMP and approval of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Would 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?

Less than Significant Impact. On March 2020, an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment was prepared for the Proposed Project by Lilburn Corporation (see Appendix B for report). The Proposed Project's construction and operational emissions were screened using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 prepared by the SCAQMD (see Appendix B for model output). CalEEMod was utilized to estimate the on-site and off-site construction emissions. The emissions incorporate Rule 402 and 403 by default as required during construction. The criteria pollutants screened for include reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). Two of the analyzed pollutants, ROG and NO_x, are ozone precursors. Both summer and winter season emission levels were estimated.

Construction Emissions

Construction emissions are considered short-term, temporary emissions and were modeled with the following construction parameters: site preparation, site grading (fine and mass grading), building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2021 and be completed in late 2021. The resulting emissions generated by construction of the Proposed Project are shown in Table 1 and Table 2, which represent summer and winter construction emissions, respectively.

Table 1
Summer Construction Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source/Phase	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Site Preparation	1.9	17.5	8.0	0.0	3.5	2.1
Grading	1.6	24.6	7.9	0.0	3.8	2.0
Building Construction	2.0	15.0	14.4	0.0	1.1	0.8
Paving	1.2	7.8	9.3	0.0	0.5	0.5
Architectural Coating	9.5	1.5	2.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Highest Value (lbs./day)	**9.5**	**24.6**	**14.4**	**0.0**	**3.8**	**2.1**
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Summer Emissions
Phases do not overlap and represent the highest concentration.

Table 2
Winter Construction Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source/Phase	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Site Preparation	1.6	17.4	7.8	0.0	3.4	2.1
Grading	1.6	24.6	7.9	0.0	3.8	2.0
Building Construction	2.0	15.0	14.2	0.0	1.1	0.8
Paving	1.2	7.8	9.4	0.0	0.5	0.5
Architectural Coating	9.5	1.5	2.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Highest Value (lbs./day)	**9.5**	**24.6**	**14.4**	**0.0**	**3.8**	**2.1**
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Winter Emissions.
Phases do not overlap and represent the highest concentration.

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, construction emissions during either summer or winter seasonal conditions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

Compliance with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403

Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction emissions, the Project Proponent would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as the SCAB is in non-attainment status for ozone and suspended particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$).

The Project Proponent would be required to comply with Rules 402 nuisance, and 403 fugitive dust, which require the implementation of Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) for each fugitive dust source, and the AQMP, which identifies Best Available Control Technologies (BACTs) for area sources and point sources. The BACMs and BACTs would include, but not be limited to the following:

1. The Project Proponent shall ensure that any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered prior to the onset of grading activities.

(a) The Project Proponent shall ensure that watering of the site or other soil stabilization method shall be employed on an on-going basis after the initiation of any grading activity on the site. Portions of the site that are actively being graded shall be watered regularly (2x daily) to ensure that a crust is formed on the ground surface and shall be watered at the end of each workday.

(b) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed upon.

(c) The Project Proponent shall ensure that landscaped areas are installed as soon as possible to reduce the potential for wind erosion.

(d) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all grading activities are suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

During construction, exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and fugitive dust generated by equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, would increase NO_X and PM_{10} levels in the area. Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds during construction, the Applicant/Contractor would be required to implement the following BMPs as required by SCAQMD:

2. To reduce emissions, all equipment used in grading and construction must be tuned and maintained to the manufacturer's specification to maximize efficient burning of vehicle fuel. Site development will be limited to one acre disturbed per day.
3. The contractor shall utilize (as much as possible) pre-coated building materials and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as high volume, low pressure (HVLP) spray method, or manual coatings application such as paint brush, hand roller, trowel, dauber, rag, or sponge.
4. The contractor shall utilize water-based or low VOC coating per SCAQMD Rule 1113. The following measures shall also be implemented:
    - Use Super-Compliant VOC paints whenever possible.
    - If feasible, avoid painting during peak smog season: July, August, and September.
    - Recycle leftover paint. Take any left-over 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 clean-up water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of clean-up water and take it to a hazardous waste center (www.cleanup.org).
    - Recycle the empty paint can.
    - Look for non-solvent containing stripping products.
    - 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.

5. The Project Proponent shall ensure that existing power sources are utilized where feasible via temporary power poles to avoid on-site diesel power generation.6. The operator shall maintain and effectively utilize and schedule on-site equipment in order to minimize exhaust emissions from truck idling.
6. The Project Proponent shall ensure that construction personnel are informed of ride sharing and transit opportunities.
7. All buildings on the project site shall conform to energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code as updated to reduce energy consumption and reduce GHG emissions.
8. The operator shall maintain and effectively utilize and schedule on site equipment and delivery trucks in order to minimize exhaust emissions from truck idling.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions are categorized as energy (generation and distribution of energy to the end use), area (operational use of the project), mobile (vehicle trips), water (generation and distribution of water to the land use), and waste (collecting and hauling waste to the landfill). The Proposed Project will not include the manufacture or production of any products on-site; therefore, no industrial type emissions will be generated. The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads, dated March 2020. The TIA determined that the Proposed Project would generate approximately 1,100 total daily trips. Emissions associated with the Proposed Project's estimated total daily trips were modeled and are listed in Table 3 and Table 4, which represent summer and winter operational emissions, respectively. In accordance with the site plan, CalEEMod operational emissions include the following design features: a) Improve Destination Accessibility with a two-mile distance to a downtown job center, b) Increase Transit Accessibility with a two-mile distance to the nearest transit station, and c) Improve Pedestrian Network by including improvements of the adjacent intersection, curb, gutter, and sidewalks.

Table 3
Summer Operational Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source	ROG	NO_X/ VOC[1]	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1.6	10.1	8.9	0.0	1.9	0.5
Fuel Dispensing	---	1.5	---	---	---	---
Total Value (lbs./day)	**3.3**	**11.9**	**9.1**	**0.0**	**1.9**	**0.5**
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significance	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod 2016.3.2, Summer Emissions

[1] VOC emissions, SCAQMD guidelines (RULE 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing).

Table 4
Winter Operational Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1.3	9.9	8.7	0.0	1.9	0.5
Fuel Dispensing	---	1.5	---	---	---	---
Total Value (lbs./day)	**3.0**	**11.7**	**8.9**	**0.0**	**1.9**	**0.5**
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significance	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod 2016.3.2, Winter Emissions

[1] VOC emissions, SCAQMD guidelines (RULE 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing).

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, both summer and winter season operational emissions are below SCAQMD thresholds. However, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the following but limited to SCAQMD Rules:

- Rule 201-Permit to Construct: A person shall not build, erect, install, alter or replace any equipment or agricultural permit unit, the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants or the use of which may eliminate, reduce or control the issuance of air contaminants without first obtaining written authorization for such construction from the Executive Officer. A permit to construct shall remain in effect until the permit to operate the equipment or agricultural permit unit for which the application was filed is granted or denied, or the application is canceled.

- Rule 203-Permit to Operate: A person shall not operate or use any equipment or agricultural permit unit, the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants, or the use of which may reduce or control the issuance of air contaminants, without first obtaining a written permit to operate from the Executive Officer or except as provided in Rule 202.

- Rule 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing Facilities: Applicability This rule applies to the transfer of gasoline from any tank truck, trailer, or railroad tank car into any stationary storage tank or mobile fueler, and from any stationary storage tank or mobile fueler into any mobile fueler or motor vehicle fuel tank.

- Rule 1138- Control of Emissions from Restaurants: (a) Applicability This rule applies to owners and operators of commercial cooking operations, preparing food for human consumption. The rule requirements currently apply to chain-driven charbroilers used to cook meat. All other commercial restaurant cooking equipment including, but not limited to, under-fired charbroilers, may be subject to future rule provisions.

- Rule 1401- New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants: This rule specifies limits for maximum individual cancer risk (MICR), cancer burden, and noncancer acute and chronic hazard index (HI) from new permit units, relocations, or modifications to existing permit

units which emit toxic air contaminants listed in Table I. The rule establishes allowable risks for permit units requiring new permits pursuant to Rules 201 or 203.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. SCAQMD has developed a methodology to assess the localized impacts of emissions from a proposed project as outlined within the Final Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Methodology report; completed in June 2003 and revised in July 2008. The use of LSTs is voluntary, to be implemented at the discretion of local public agencies acting as a lead agency pursuant to CEQA. LSTs apply to projects that must undergo CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and are five acres or less. LST methodology is incorporated to represent worst-case scenario emissions thresholds. CalEEMod was used to estimate the on-site and off-site construction emissions. The LSTs were developed to analyze the significance of potential air quality impacts of proposed projects to sensitive receptors (i.e. schools, single family residences, etc.) and provide screening tables for small projects (one, two, or five acres). Projects are evaluated based on geographic location and distance from the sensitive receptor (25, 50, 100, 200, or 500 meters from the site).

For the purposes of a CEQA analysis, the SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a receptor such as a residence, hospital, convalescent facility or anywhere that it is possible for an individual to remain for 24 hours. Additionally, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities can also be considered as sensitive receptors. Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition of sensitive receptor because employees do not typically remain on-site for a full 24 hours, but are usually present for shorter periods of time, such as eight hours.

The Project Site is approximately 2.08 acres, however the "2-acres scenario" was used to represent a worst-case scenario as larger sites are typically granted a larger emission allowance. CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 was used to estimate the on-site and off-site construction emissions. The nearest sensitive receptor land use is an assisted care facility located immediately west of the Project Site and therefore LSTs are based on 25-meter distance. The resulting Proposed Project's construction and operational emissions with the appropriate LST are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Localized Significance Thresholds
(Pounds Per Day)

	NO_x	**CO**	**PM_{10}**		**$PM_{2.5}$**	
Construction Emissions (Max. from Table 6 and Table 7)	9.5	14.4	3.8		2.1	
Operational Emissions (Max. Total from Table 3 and Table 4)[1]	11.9	9.1	0.10		0.025	
Highest Value (lbs./day)	**11.9**	**14.2**	**3.8**	**0.10**	**2.1**	**0.025**
LST Thresholds	149	1,541	10*	3†	6*	2†
Greater Than Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

As shown in Table 5, the Proposed Project's emissions are not anticipated to exceed the LSTs.

Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts

Emissions resulting from gasoline service station operations may include toxic air contaminants (TACs) (e.g., benzene, hexane, MTBE, toluene, xylene) and have the potential to contribute to health risk in the Project vicinity. Standard regulatory controls such as the SCAQMD's Rule 461 (Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing) would apply to the Project in addition to any permits required that demonstrate appropriate operational controls. Gasoline dispensing facilities are required to use Phase I/II EVR (enhanced vapor recovery) systems. Phase I EVR have an average efficiency of 98 percent and Phase II EVR have an average efficiency of 95.1 percent. Therefore, the potential for fugitive VOC or TAC emissions from the gasoline pumps is negligible. Prior to issuance of a Permit to Operate, each individual gasoline dispensing station is required to obtain permits from SCAQMD which identify the maximum annual throughput allowed based on specific fuel storage and dispensing equipment that is proposed by the operator.

The analysis reflects a maximum annual throughput of an estimated 1,000,000 gallons. However, ultimate fuel throughput allowances/requirements would be established by SCAQMD through the fueling station permitting processes. For purposes of this evaluation, cancer risk estimates have been made consistent with the methodology presented in SCAQMD's Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401 & 212 which provide screening-level risk estimates for gasoline dispensing operations. The Project site is located within Source Receptor Area (SRA) 29.

The nearest residential receptor and worker receptor are both less than 25 meters (e.g. 82.02 feet) from the proposed fueling station.

Based on the established SCAQMD procedure outlined in the SCAQMD Permit Application Package "N" it is estimated that the maximum risk attributable to the gasoline dispensing would be 5.46 in one million for the nearest sensitive receptor and the maximum risk to workers would be 0.45 in one million both of which are below the threshold of 10 in one million. SCAQMD Permit Application Package "N" identifies the potential risk per one million gallons of gasoline dispensed at the defined downwind distances. The further the distance from the source the lower the risk. Refer to Table 6 for a linear regression risk estimate with distances of 25 and 50 feet from the source.

Table 6
Linear Regression Risk Estimate

Residential	
Distance	**Risk**
25	**5.46**
50	**2.17**
Worker	
25	**0.45**
50	**0.17**

Source: Risk Tool V1.103

As shown in Table 6, no sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity would be exposed to a cancer risk of greater than 10 in one million. The maximum risk estimate at any sensitive land use in the vicinity of the Project would be 5.46 in one million. The Project gas station operations would therefore not generate emissions that would cause or result in an exceedance of the applicable SCAQMD cancer threshold of 10 in one million. As such, the Project would not have a significant impact with respect to health risks from the gasoline dispensing stations.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project does not contain land uses typically associated with the emission of objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the Proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities; and the temporary storage of domestic solid waste (refuse) associated with the Proposed Project's (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It should be noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City of Beaumont solid waste regulations. The Project would be also required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(b)	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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project consists of a QSR, convenience store and gas station in a 2.08-acre parcel. General Biological Resources Assessment, dated February 14, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) (see Appendix C for report). The assessment was conducted consistent with the requirement of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSCHP), which is intended to balance the growth of western Riverside County with the preservation of open space and protection for species. The MSHCP identifies vernal pools, fairy shrimp habitat and riparian/riverine as resources of concern for all the parcels within the MSHCP Conservation Area.

NRAI requested a report from the MSHCP website for the Project Site. NRAI completed a data search for information on plants and wildlife species known occurrences within the vicinity of the Project Site. The review included biological texts on general and specific biological resources, and those resources considered to be sensitive by various wildlife agencies, local government agencies and interest groups. NRAI used the data to focus their survey efforts in the field.

3.4.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Wildlife Observations
Mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*) and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) were either seen or heard during the field survey. California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*) and Botta's gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) burrows were observed. No other sign of native mammal species was observed.

Riparian Birds

No riverine/riparian bird species are present or will use the site, and no impacts to these species or their habitat will occur. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Fairy Shrimp
For the Proposed Project, the MSHCP requires an assessment for fairy shrimp habitat. Fairy shrimps are confined to temporary pools that fill in spring and evaporate by late spring to early summer. There are no pools on the Project Site and no potential for pools to form based on the soils and site conditions. Therefore, no shrimp species would be impacted by the Proposed Project.

Narrow Endemic Plant Species
The MSHCP did not identify any Narrow Endemic Plant Species as potentially present on the Project Site. The Proposed Project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.1.3.

Criteria Area Plant Species
The MSHCP did not identify any Criteria Area Species as potentially present on the Project Site. The Proposed Project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

Amphibians
The MSHCP did not identify any amphibian species as potentially present on the Project Site.

Burrowing Owl
The MSHCP does not identify burrowing owl as potentially present on the Project Site and it is not in the mapped survey area for burrowing owl. The Proposed Project is consistent with MSHCP Section 6.3.2.

Mammals
The MSHCP does not identify mammal species as potentially present on the Project Site and it is not in the mapped survey area for protected mammals.

Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly
The MSHCP did not identify Delhi sands flower-loving fly as potentially present on the Project Site. The property is not in the mapped survey area for Delhi sands flower-loving fly.

Raptors and Migratory Birds
Raptors and all migratory bird species are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). In addition, bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BEPA). Based on their field survey, NRAI found that the Project Site had very limited marginal nesting habitat for ground-nesting bird species. To ensure the Proposed Project complies with the MBTA and BEPA, NRAI recommends the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: If construction is scheduled to occur between February 1 and August 31, a breeding bird survey following the recommended guidelines of the MBTA may be required to determine if nesting is occurring. A qualified biologist shall conduct a breeding bird survey no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction to determine if nesting is occurring. If occupied nests are found, they shall not be disturbed unless the qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that either (a) the adult birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (b) the juveniles from the occupied nests are capable of independent

survival. If the biologist is not able to verify one of the above conditions, then no disturbance shall occur within a distance specified by the qualified biologist for each nest or nesting site. The qualified biologist will determine the appropriate distance in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. For the Proposed Project, the MSHCP requires an assessment for riverine and riparian habitats. According to the BRA, there are no riparian/riverine habitats on site. No riparian/riverine species will be impacted by Proposed Project.

Riparian Birds

No riverine/riparian bird species are present or will use the site, and no impacts to these species or their habitat will occur. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. NRAI assessed any bodies of water that may be under the jurisdiction of Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. NRAI found no jurisdictional waters on site. Additionally, there is no wetland or riparian habitat on site. For the Proposed Project, the MSHCP requires an assessment for vernal pools. There are no vernal pools on the property and therefore, no vernal pools or vernal pools species will be impacted by Proposed Project. (see Appendix C). Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Would 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is currently surrounded by residential and commercial development, public facilities, ongoing development, a designated arterial highway, and a proposed arterial highway. It is in a developed area where habitat fragmentation has already occurred. It would not be suitable as a native resident or migratory wildlife corridor or for facilitating the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species. The Urban/Wildland Interface guidelines of the MSHCP address indirect effects associated with locating development in the MSHCP Conservation Area near wildlands or other open space areas. The Project Site is not near or in the vicinity of the MSHCP Conservation Area, and no impacts to Urban/Wildland Interface would result from implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e,f) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservancy Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The MSHCP will provide for the protection and preservation of important and significant biological resources consistent with local, State and Federal regulations.[9] As a local permittee, the City of Beaumont has adopted the MSHCP and will comply with all applicable requirements when considering actions associated with the General Plan's implementation.

Through the MSHCP Consistency Analysis, NRAI assessed the Proposed Project's relationship to Reserve Assembly. Reserve Assembly is concerned with the identification of specific areas that are necessary to assemble a sufficiently large and diverse parcel to protect the resources of concern for the reserve. Each Area has a designated conservation plan and is referred to as an Area Plan. A Criteria Cell is defined as "A unit within the Criteria Area generally 260 acres in size."

The Project Site is located within the MSHCP Plan Area but not located within or adjacent to any Criteria Cells or MSCHP Conservation Area (see Appendix C). Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation dated November 29, 2019 was prepared by McKenna et al. for the Project Site (see Appendix D for report). The purpose of the assessment was to identify and document any cultural resources that may occur within the Project Site and to evaluate resources pursuant to §15064.5. The cultural remains of the Native American Cahuilla peoples and the early Euro-American peoples have been found in multiple locations throughout the City of Beaumont. As such, the Project Site is considered sensitive for buried cultural resources.

[9] City General Plan. Page 61.

3.5.2 Impact Analysis

a/b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. McKenna et al. completed a standard archaeological records search for the Project Site through the University of California, Riverside, Eastern Information Center, Riverside, California. This search included the following reviews: previously completed projects within one mile of the project area; recorded cultural resources within one mile of the project area; and listings for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, California Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest; and historic maps.

Historic background research was done through a review of the Bureau of Land Management, General Land Office Records; San Bernardino County Archives; Riverside County Archives, Riverside County Assessor data; local research; and research through the McKenna et al. in-house library. The staff also searched through the University of California, Riverside, Historic Map Library and on-line aerial photographs.

McKenna et al. identified 29 studies done within one miles of the Project Site. Six cultural resources, both historic and prehistoric, were identified from those studies. Resources identified included properties found in the Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Data File. The Project Site has not been previously surveyed for cultural resources. No recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are associated with the Project Site.

Additionally, McKenna completed a field survey for the site. The Project Site was subjected to an intensive level of survey with paralleling swaths averaging 15 meters apart. The surveyor recorded any identified resource using a Garmin GPS unit. A portion of a semi-buried concrete pad determined to be modern was found on the site. Based primarily on visual examination of the native soils, there is no evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the Project Site. However, the Project Site is considered moderately sensitive for archaeological resources because the City of Beaumont has been associated with historic land uses. According to the City General Plan, prehistoric cultural remains may be present within the City because of the nature of alluvial deposits throughout the City. There is a potential for buried resources that were not evident during a surface survey.

The Project Site and the surrounding area are associated with the San Gorgonio Pass, a narrow valley located between the San Bernardino Mountains and San Jacinto Mountains. The area of San Gorgonio Pass is associated with early Beaumont and Banning development and has the potential to yield historic archaeological resources in a relatively shallow context. Therefore, possible significant impacts have been identified or anticipated, and McKenna et al. recommends the following mitigation measure be implemented to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant:

Mitigation Measure CR-1: A qualified archaeologist shall oversee excavations in the younger alluvial deposits during the first two days of ground disturbance. If the archaeologist determines it necessary, an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented. The monitoring program should be in accordance with current professional guidelines and

protocols. The program should be flexible and account for changes in findings by treating resources in a professional manner and evaluated in accordance with current CEQA criteria.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. McKenna et al. did not encounter any evidence of human remains during the field survey. However, construction activities, particularly grading, could potentially disturb unknown buried human remains. To ensure potential impacts are reduced to less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Ad If any bones are uncovered during the course of project-related ground disturbance and the archaeologist determines that it is likely human, all appropriate cultural resources and health and safety laws will be followed and the developer will work with the NAHC-appointed Most Likely Descendent to determine appropriate measures for avoidance and preservation or other suitable treatment.

3.6 ENERGY

6.	ENERGY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

Energy efficiency can reduce the demand for electricity generation. California has implemented energy efficiency standards and programs, resulting in annual increases of conservation savings for electricity. In 2017, the cumulative annual efficiency and conservation savings for electricity surpassed 70,000 gigawatt hours in California (California Energy Commission, 2018). Energy conservation state laws, like Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and Uniform Building Code, will be enforced by the City of Beaumont. Furthermore, the City encourages measures to reduce energy consumption during construction and operation of proposed projects.

Building Energy Conservation Standards
The California Energy Commission (CEC) adopted Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations: Energy Conservation Standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings in June 1977 and standards are updated every three years. In addition to reducing California's energy consumption, Title 24 also decreases GHG emissions. Title 24 ensures that building designs conserve energy. The requirements allow for opportunities to incorporate new energy efficiency technologies and methods into proposed developments. In June 2015, the CEC updated the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The 2016 Standards improved upon the

previous 2013 Standards for new construction of and additions and alterations to residential and nonresidential buildings. The CEC updated the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards in May 2018. The 2019 Title 24 standards state that nonresidential buildings will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. The updated Standards enable the use of highly efficient air filters to trap hazardous particulates from both outdoor air and cooking and improve kitchen ventilation systems.

Senate Bill 350
Senate Bill (SB) 350 (de Leon) was signed into law in October 2015. SB 350 establishes new clean energy, clean air and greenhouse gas reduction goals for 2030. SB 350 also establishes periodic increases to the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS): 40 percent by 2024, 45 percent by 2027, and 50 percent by 2030. It requires California to double statewide energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas end uses by 2030, thereby increasing the use of RPS eligible resources.

Senate Bill 100
Senate Bill 100 (SB 100) was signed into law September 2018 and increased the required Renewable Portfolio Standards. SB 100 requires that the total kilowatt-hours of energy sold by electricity retailers to their end-use customers must consist of at least 50 percent renewable resources by 2026, 60 percent renewable resources by 2030, and 100 percent renewable resources by 2045. SB 100 also includes a State policy that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all State agencies by December 31, 2045. Under the bill, the State cannot increase carbon emissions elsewhere in the western grid or allow resource shuffling to achieve the 100 percent carbon-free electricity target.

3.6.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact.

Electricity

The Proposed Project consists of a gas station, convenience store and restaurant. Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electricity to the City of Beaumont. The commercial building sector of the Southern California Edison planning area consumed 37260.897803 Gigawatt Hour (GWh) of electricity in 2018.[10] Gigawatt hour is a unit of energy representing one billion watt hours. The Project Site is currently vacant and does not use electricity. The implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in electricity demand. The estimated electricity demand for the Proposed Project 0.2178114 GWh per year. The existing SCE electrical facilities will meet this increased demand. Total electricity demand in SCE's service area is estimated to increase by approximately 12,000 GWh between the years 2015 and 2026. The increase in electricity demand from the Proposed Project is insignificant compared to the projected electricity demand for SCE's entire service area and SCE's 2018

[10] California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

commercial building sector's demand. Therefore, projected electrical demand would not significantly impact SCE's level of service.

The Proposed Project shall comply with the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. During the design phase, the architect, mechanical engineer, and lighting designer must determine whether the building or system design complies with the Energy Standards. The Proposed Project would also be required to adhere to CALGreen, which outlines planning and design standards for sustainable developments and energy efficiency. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Natural Gas

The Project Site would be serviced by Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). The Project Site is currently vacant and has no demand for natural gas. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would create a permanent increase in demand for natural gas. Despite the ever-growing demand for electric power, the overall gas demand for electric generation is expected to decline at 1.4 percent per year for the next 17 years due to more efficient power plants, statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, and use of power generation resources that produce little to no carbon emissions. According to the California Energy Commission, the natural gas consumption of the SoCalGas planning area commercial building sector was 937.882107 therms in 2018.[11] The Proposed Project's estimated natural gas demand is 0.00096611 therms per year; it would represent an insignificant percentage to the overall natural gas demand in SoCalGas's commercial building sector. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Fuel

During construction of the Proposed Project, transportation energy consumption is dependent on the type of vehicles used, number of vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Temporary transportation fuel use such as gasoline and diesel during construction would result from the use of delivery vehicles and trucks, construction equipment, and construction employee vehicles. Additionally, most construction equipment during grading would be powered by gas or diesel. Based on output from CalEEMod version 2016.3 for (see Appendix E for fuel calculations), the Proposed Project construction activities would consume an estimated 20,954 gallons of diesel fuel for operation of heavy-duty equipment. Assuming all construction worker trips are from light duty autos, it is estimated 4,780 gallons of fuel will be consumed and fuel consumption from construction vendor (material deliver) trips is 2,649 gallons. Construction worker and vendor fuel consumption are based on CalEEMod's default data for vehicles miles traveled (VMT). Construction would represent a "single-event" diesel and gasoline fuel demand and would not require continuous or permanent commitment of these fuel resources. Impacts related to transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require the use of additional use of energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure.

[11] California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

During operations of the Proposed Project, fuel consumption would be from customer visits, trips by maintenance staffs, employee vehicle trips and delivery trucks. The Proposed Project is the development of a convenience store, gas station, drive-thru and car wash. The Proposed Project would result in an estimated 83,049 gallons of fuel consumption per year based on 900,150 miles driven. As a worst case analysis, half the miles were modeled with an automobile fuel efficiency of 24 miles per gallon and half were modeled at 7 miles per gallon.[12] Trip generation and VMT generated by the Proposed Project are consistent with other uses of similar scale and configuration. The Proposed Project does not include uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, or associated wasteful vehicle energy consumption. It is not expected to result in a substantial demand for energy that would require expanded supplies or the construction of other infrastructure or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Beaumont has prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP) with the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the building energy sector. The City has partnered with Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SCG) to form the Energy Leader Partnership (ELP). ELP's goal is to reduce the City's municipal and community-wide energy footprint. CAP also involves implementing a variety of retrofits in municipal lighting and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems and conducting various forms of outreach in the community to encourage adoption of energy efficiency and renewable energy programs offered by SCE and SCG. Under CAP, commercial buildings will be held to net-zero energy performance standards by 2030.

Under Resource Management Element Policy 8 of the City General Plan, the City encourages incorporation of energy conservation features in new developments. In addition, the City shall continue to enforce the energy conservation standards in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and other state laws on energy conservation design, insulation and appliances.[13] Project design and operation would comply with Beaumont's CAP, UBC and 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). Project development is not anticipated to cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

[12] United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2018. National Transportation Statistics 2018. Available at: https://www.bts.gov/sites/bts.dot.gov/files/docs/browse-statistical-products-and-data/national-transportation-statistics/223001/ntentire2018q4.pdf.
[13] City General Plan. Page 76.

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

7.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(a)	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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	ii)Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iii)Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iv)Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(c)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(e)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

Beaumont is located along the northern boundary of the Peninsular Ranges in the San Gorgonio Pass.[14] The City is located within a seismically active region at the junction of the Transverse Ranges and the Peninsular Ranges. The City could be affected by the San Jacinto Fault, the San Andreas Fault Zone in the San Gorgonio pass area, the Banning Fault, and Beaumont Plains Fault Zone. The City and its designated spheres of influence are mostly undeveloped; nearly one-half of the City's land area consists of vacant land.

A Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated January 31, 2020, was prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc. for the Project Site (see Appendix F for report). The Project Site is suitable for the Proposed Project given that SALEM's recommendations are incorporated into the

[14] City General Plan. Page 60.

Project design and construction. The Project Applicant is required to comply with the recommendations in the Report and as approved by the City. SALEM shall review the project grading and foundation plans prior to final design submittal to assess whether recommendations have been properly implemented and evaluate is additional analysis or recommendations are required.

3.7.2 Impact Analysis

a)i) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less than Significant Impact. The San Jacinto Fault, considered to be one of the most active faults in southern California, crosses the southern portion of the City and sphere of influence.[15] The San Andreas Fault is approximately six miles northeast of the City. The branch of the Banning Fault closest to Beaumont is inactive. The Project Site is not within a state designated Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.[16] Furthermore, according to the Riverside County General Plan: Safety Element, the Project Site is also not within a Riverside County Fault Zone.[17] The nearest fault zone is the Beaumont Plain Fault Zone, which is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Project Site. The likelihood for on-site rupture is considered low due to the absence of known faults and fault zones within the vicinity. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

a)ii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City General Plan, the Beaumont Plains Fault Zone consists of a series of parallel faults in the northern portion of the City that were found to be inactive and are not considered ground rupture hazards. The Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology found that unconsolidated soils, which can settle as a result of ground shaking and cause damage to structures, do not exist within the City limits. The County of Riverside adopted the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which requires that the construction of structures be in compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) to reduce the hazard risks posed by earthquakes. Adhering to these codes would ensure that potential ground-shaking impacts are reduced to less than significant level. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

a)iii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

[15] City General Plan. Page 60.
[16] California Department of Conservation. Fault Activity Map of California 2010.
[17] County General Plan. Safety Element. Figure S-2.

Less than Significant Impact. Areas overlying groundwater within 30 to 50 feet of the surface are considered susceptible to liquefaction hazards. According to the United States Geological Survey's (USGS) Professional Paper 1360 highlighted in the City General Plan, the City of Beaumont is considered to have a moderate potential for liquefaction based on depth to groundwater in the area. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures are not anticipated to occur with the excavation, grading and paving necessary for future development. Ground shaking may cause unconsolidated soils to settle, which can result in significant damage to structures. According to geologic investigations performed by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology for the City General Plan Draft EIR, studies indicate that no such soils exist within City limits. The Project Site and its immediate vicinity have low susceptibility to liquefaction.[18]

Although the post-liquefaction settlement of liquefied sands could cause damage to the Proposed Project during seismic shaking, the Project Site is considered to have low liquefaction potential due to the absence of shallow groundwater (see Appendix F). According to regional groundwater well data reported by SALEM, the historically highest groundwater is estimated to be at a depth of more than 50 feet below ground surface. However, it should be acknowledged that water table elevation is dependent upon seasonal precipitation, irrigation, land use, localized pumping, and climatic conditions. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

a)iv)Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

No Impact. Landslides and slope failure can result from ground motion generated by earthquakes. The slopes within the San Timoteo Badlands are the most susceptible to landslides in the City. These slopes are approximately 16 miles northwest of the Project Site. The Project Site and its surrounding areas are relatively flat. The Project Site is not on or close to areas with existing landslides or with high susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls.[19] Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. According to the City General Plan, future development under the General Plan will not result in any additional soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Soils within City limits are classified as Ramona-Placentia, Hanford, and Yolo Soils Association.[20] These soils are generally well drained, have low soil permeability, and have relatively low inherent fertility. Moreover, the Project Applicant is required to design temporary drainage facilities and erosion control measures to minimize erosion and silt deposition during the grading operation.

Underground buried structures and/or utility lines encountered during demolition and construction should be properly removed and the resulting excavations backfilled with Engineered Fill (see Appendix F). Demolition activities of the existing structures may disturb

[18] County General Plan: Safety Element. Figure S-3 Generalized Liquefaction.
[19] County General Plan: Safety Element. Figure S-4 Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map.
[20] City General Plan. Page 105.

the upper soils. The upper soils are moisture-sensitive and moderately collapsible under saturated conditions. Soils of this type possess moderate risk to construction in terms of possible post-construction movement of the foundations and floor systems. To reduce soil movement, the collapsible soil would need to be over-excavated and recompacted, as is required under Mitigation Measures GEO-1 to GEO-3 below. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

c) *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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is relatively flat with a 2 to 5 percent slope. Ramona sandy loam (RaB2) is the only soil type found within the Project Site.[21] RaB2 is well-drained, has low permeability and occurs on alluvial fans and terraces. According to the City General Plan, "soils that underlie the City include the Romona-Placentia, Hanford, and Yolo Soils Associations. All of these soils are generally well drained, have low soil permeability, and their inherent fertility is relatively low. Thus, no unusual soil constraints to future development in the City are anticipated." As stated above, the Project Site is not located within or near a Liquefaction Zone and is in an area with low susceptibility to liquefaction. SALEM considers the Project Site to have a low likelihood of lateral spreading due to its relatively flat topography and low liquefaction potential. Moreover, it is concluded that a landslide is not a potential hazard to the Proposed Project because there are no known landslides at the Project Site, and nor is it in the path of any known or potential landslides. The Project Site is neither located in an area with documented subsidence nor in an area susceptible to subsidence.[22] State and City Building Codes establish engineering and construction criteria designed to mitigate potential impacts associated with unstable soils, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, soils collapse and expansive soils. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *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?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Expansive soils are fine grained clay soils that swell in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry. This change in volume causes stress on buildings and other loads placed on expansive soils. The upper soils of the Project Site are moisture-sensitive and moderately collapsible under saturated conditions (refer to Appendix A of the attached Appendix F). These soils, in their present condition, possess moderate risk to construction in terms of possible post-construction movement of the foundations and floor systems if no mitigation measures are employed. Accordingly, measures are considered necessary to reduce anticipated expansion and collapse potential. Mitigation measures will not eliminate post-construction soil movement but will reduce the soil movement. Success of the mitigation measures will depend on the thoroughness of the contractor in dealing with the soil conditions. The near surface soils identified as part of the investigation are, generally, slightly moist to moist due to the absorption characteristics of the soil. Earthwork operations may encounter very moist unstable soils which may require removal to a stable bottom. Native soils exposed as part of

[21] United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey.
[22] County General Plan: Safety Element. Figure S-7 Documented Subsidence.

site grading operations shall not be allowed to dry out and should be kept continuously moist prior to placement of subsequent fill. To reduce anticipated expansion and collapse potential, the recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Report as approved by the City shall be followed including the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Overexcavation and recompaction within the proposed building areas should be performed to a minimum depth of **four (4) feet** below existing grade or **two (2) feet** below proposed shallow footing bottom, whichever is deeper. The overexcavation and recompaction should also extend laterally to a minimum of 5 feet beyond the outer edges of the proposed footings.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Within pavement and canopy areas, it is recommended that the overexcavation and recompaction be performed to a minimum depth of **one (1) foot** below existing grade or proposed grade, whichever is deeper. The overexcavation and recompaction should also extend laterally to a minimum of 2 feet beyond the pavement area.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Prior to placement of fill soils, the upper 10 to 12 inches of native subgrade soils should be scarified, moisture-conditioned to no less than the optimum moisture content and recompacted to a minimum of 95% (90% for fine grained, cohesive soils) of the maximum dry density based on ASTM D1557 Test Method.

e) *Would 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project does not include the installation of a new septic tank or any other alternative wastewater disposal system. The Proposed Project will construct sewer laterals from each structure to an existing sewer line in Highland Springs Avenue. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site is located in an area of undetermined potential for paleontological resources.[23] The majority of level areas throughout the City contain very few significant paleontological sites.[24] The extreme southern areas of the Beaumont planning area have a higher potential for paleontological findings since it remains less disturbed by agricultural cultivation and is subject to less human disturbance. The Project Site is in the northern part of the planning area.

The Project Site is currently vacant with only insignificant rocks, and a mix of native and nonnative vegetation occurring on the site (see Appendix D). No unique geologic feature is present on the site. The Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County completed a paleontological overview for the Project Site. This information along with the data from the

[23] Riverside County Information Technology GIS. Map My County.
[24] City General Plan. Page 119.

Riverside County GIS system were used to assess the potential for the Project Site to yield evidence of fossil specimens.

According to McKenna et al., no recorded paleontological resources are associated with the Project Site. In addition, the field survey concluded no evidence of paleontological resources within the Project Site. The Project Site is considered moderately sensitive for paleontological resources and consists of Quaternary Alluvium, derived from the San Jacinto Mountains. In a letter appended to McKenna's report, the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County confirmed that the shallow deposits of Quaternary Alluvium in the vicinity are not considered sensitive for paleontological specimens. Shallow excavations will not likely impact fossil bearing deposits, but deeper excavations may. To ensure that potential impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to less than a significant level, the following mitigation measure should be implemented:

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: Deep excavations for utilities and underground storage tanks shall be monitored to detect and professionally collect any fossils uncovered without impeding development. If required a paleontological monitoring program shall be prepared and filed with the City.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

8.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.8.1 Environmental Setting

The environmental efforts in California emphasized the need to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. According to the City's Climate Action Plan, Beaumont is committed to planning sustainably to reduce GHG emissions among other things. Executive Order S-3-05, which was passed in 2005, established GHG emissions targets for California for the subsequent decades: 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. According to the California Air Resources Board, as of 2017, California has emitted 7 MMTCO2e below the 2020 GHG Limit.

3.8.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, when making a determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions, the "lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to (1) use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use." In addition, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7(c)

provides that "a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts" on the condition that "the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence."

The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires that by the year 2020, the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions generated in California be reduced to the levels of 1990. The City of Beaumont has not adopted its own thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. However, the City finds persuasive and reasonable the approach to determining significance of greenhouse gas emissions established by SCAQMD.

Emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 (see Appendix B for model output). Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2021 and completed in late 2021. Other parameters which are used to estimate construction emissions such as those associated with worker and vendor trips, and trip lengths were based on the CalEEMod defaults. The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads, which determined that the Proposed Project would generate 1,100 total daily trips.

Many gases make up the group of pollutants that are believed to contribute to global climate change. However, three gases are currently evaluated and represent the highest concertation of GHG: Carbon dioxide (CO2), Methane (CH4), and Nitrous oxide (N2O). The Proposed Project would not generate Fluorinated gases as defined by AB 32, only the GHGs (CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O) that are emitted by construction equipment. SCAQMD provides guidance methods and/or Emission Factors that are used for evaluating a project's emissions in relation to the thresholds. A threshold of 3,000 MTCO2E per year has been adopted by SCAQMD for non-industrial type projects.

As shown in Table 7 and Table 8, the Proposed Project's emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ threshold of significance. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 7
Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions
(Metric Tons per Year)

Source/Phase	**CO_2**	**CH_4**	**N_20**
Site Preparation	1.6	0.0	0.0
Grading	9.4	0.0	0.0
Building Construction	249.5	0.0	0.0
Paving	6.5	0.0	0.0
Architectural Coating	1.6	0.0	0.0
Total MTCO2e	**268.6**		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
Significant	**No**		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

Table 8
Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions
(Metric Tons per Year)

Source/Phase	**CO_2**	**CH_4**	**N_20**
Area	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	121.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	566.2	0.0	0.0
Waste	8.2	0.5	0.0
Water	5.8	0.0	0.0
Construction Amortized over 30 years	8.9		
Total MTCO2e	**725.3**		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
Significant	**No**		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than Significant Impact. On October 2015, the City adopted a climate action plan known as the "Sustainable Beaumont: The City's Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reduction," which commits the City to a more energy efficient pathway. The Project Site has a current land use designation of Community Commercial under the General Plan. The future emissions estimates of the City's climate action plan therefore account for the implementation of the Proposed Project as it is consistent with the General Plan. The project design incorporates standards such as Title 24 to lower GHG emissions. In addition, approval of the project will bring products and services to consumers that are not currently being met thereby, reducing vehicle miles travelled. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

9.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
(a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(b)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

9.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan had not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.9.1 Environmental Setting

The transportation of hazardous substances through the City poses a threat to public health and safety. Many of Beaumont's businesses produce, use and store hazardous materials. The transport, storage, use and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes is extensively regulated at all levels. The Safety Element under the City General Plan is concerned with identifying ways to reduce the potential for accidents and the health risk posed from hazards and hazardous materials.

3.9.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Components of the Proposed Project that may involve potential impacts from hazardous materials include a fueling station, two USTs, and one healy tank (clean air separator). One of the USTs will hold 20K-gallons of Regular Unleaded Gasoline. The other UST is a Split Tank, which will hold 8K-gallons of Premium Unleaded Gasoline and 12K-gallons of Diesel.

A permit to operate a UST system is required per California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, California Health and Safety Code Section (25280-25299.8) and Riverside County Ordinance 617. These regulations mandate the testing and frequent inspections of the UST facilities. The proposed USTs and healy tank would be located on the northeastern corner of the Project Site. The fuel island would be located south of the USTs.

The Project Applicant would be required to prepare a Spill Contingency Plan with the County of Riverside Hazardous Materials Department, and all operations of the fueling station and related USTs would be required to comply with all federal, state and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts associated with long-term operation would not result in significant impacts.

Development of the Project Site would disturb approximately 2.08 acres and would therefore be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit

requirements. Requirements of the permit include development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

The purpose of the SWPPP is to: 1) identify pollutant sources that may affect the quality of discharges of storm water associated with construction activities and 2) identify, construct, and implement storm water pollution control measures to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges from the construction site during and after construction. The SWPPP must include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control and abate pollutants. Implementation of Mitigation Measure WQ-1 in Section 3.11 would ensure that potential impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials to the public or to the environment are reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. Hazardous or toxic materials transported in association with construction of the Proposed Project may include items such as oils, paints, and fuels. The United States Department of Transportation, California Department of Transportation, and SCAQMD regulate the transportation and delivery of gasoline and diesel fuel. All materials required during construction would be kept in compliance with State and local regulations. With the implementation of BMPs and compliance with all applicable regulations, potential impacts from the use of construction-related hazardous materials is considered less than significant.

AB 3777 was enacted to minimize potential emergencies involving acutely hazardous materials by requiring facilities which handle these materials to submit Risk Management Prevention Plans (RMP). An RMP will list the equipment and procedures that will be used to prevent, mitigate and abate release of hazardous materials. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Breach began implementation of this Program County-wide.

The City of Beaumont will work with County, State and Federal agencies involved in the regulation of hazardous materials' storage, use and disposal. The City will work with the Riverside County Fire Department in requiring hazardous materials users and generators to identify safety procedures for responding to accidental spills and emergencies. Additionally, the Proposed Project is subject to NPDES permit requirements and would therefore include a SWPPP.

The construction, installation, and operation of the USTs and gas station is to adhere to all regulations and requirements set forth in the 'California Code of Regulations; Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16: Underground Storage Tank Regulations.' These regulations provide mandatory product implementation and operational procedures to reduce the risk of accidental release. Some of these required appurtenances include, but are not limited to, primary and secondary containment chambers, installation of 24/7 monitoring devices, monitoring programs and reporting procedures, constant vacuum seal of the fueling system, and vapor sensors. Permitting and design of fueling system must be diligently reviewed and approved by County Programs, including the 'South Coast Air Quality Management District' and 'Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials

Management Branch.' The California Health and Safety Code, Statutes of Chapter 6.7, Underground Storage of Hazardous Materials provides further regulations in regard to permitting the operation of the USTs. Site design and operating procedures are to adhere to California Stormwater Quality Association standard BG-22, which requires implementation of operational BMPs to avoid above ground storm water pollution and discharge into storm drain system. Some of these operational requirements include training employees on proper leak and spill prevention and cleanup practices, and the maintenance and cleaning of the fueling area. Furthermore, an UST permit mut be obtained from the County Hazardous Materials Management Branch, which is responsible for routine inspections of fueling station operations and USTs.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is approximately 0.28 miles from the building structure of Sundance Elementary School, located at 1520 E. 8th Street. Additionally, the Site is approximately 0.21 miles east of the nearest parking lot of the school. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials which would minimize or eliminate potential impacts to schools. The Proposed Project would adhere to all California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Chapter 16 - Chapter 18 requirements and pursue the proper permitting and design approvals. It would comply with all Environmental Protection Agency requirements by adhering to all requirements set forth in the 2015 UST Regulations. The Proposed Project would adhere to all local ordinances with approval from the pertinent Riverside County departments. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Less than Significant Impact. There is no existing toxic or hazardous material being recognized as an environmental concern at the Project Site.[25]

SALEM conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Proposed Project in January 2020 to identify any "Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC)" (see Appendix A for report). REC is defined as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the property. SALEM found no evidence of any REC in connection with the Project Site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

[25] Department of Toxic Substances Control. Envirostor Database: Hazardous Waste and Substances list. Accessed November 25, 2019.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan had not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The Project Site is located approximately 5.2 miles northwest of the Banning Municipal Airport. The Project Site is neither within an airport land use plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial safety hazard related to airports. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. Highland Springs Road is a major roadway identified as an evacuation route.[26] The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan that outlines responsibilities and procedures to be followed in the event of an emergency or Citywide disaster. The City and the Riverside County Fire Department established certain design standards to ensure that site planning and building design consider public safety and fire prevention; these standards include requirements governing emergency access. During construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the City and County. Site access for operations would be subject to approval of the Site Plan by the City. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less than Significant Impact. Proposed development under the General Plan is subject to environmental and building permit review procedures to ensure adequate and appropriate site design and construction methods are implemented to reduce the risk of wildland fires. For new development, the creation of defensible areas around building structures, and use of fire-resistant building materials will provide protection from wildland fires. The Project Site does not lie within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and is not in area considered a wildland fire risk.[27] Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

10.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐

[26] City General Plan. Exhibit 5.3
[27] Calfire. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Local Responsibility Area Map for the Western Riverside County Region.

10.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
	i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
	ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flood on- or off-site;	☐	☒	☐	☐
	iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

According to the City General Plan, the City's water supply has been sourced from groundwater supplies within the Beaumont Groundwater Storage Unit (BSU). The BSU is part of the Beaumont Hydrologic Subarea of the San Timoteo Hydrologic Area and the northern portion of the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit. The City is serviced by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. The District draws groundwater from shallow wells in Little San Gorgonio Canyon. The increase in urban runoff due to increasing urban/suburban growth has resulted in the degradation of the surface water quality. The Project Site is part of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC and WCD) Master Drainage Plan for the Beaumont Area (Zone 5) tributary to the Santa Ana River, which is located approximately 24 miles west of the project site. Under existing conditions, the Project Site is undeveloped and generally sheet flows from northwest to southeast. The site runoff sheet flows to Highland Springs Avenue where flows are conveyed southerly via curb and gutter. Runoff is captured via storm drain curb inlets along Highland Springs Avenue, which connect directly into the Highland Springs Channel, a concrete RCFC and WCD Facility. Runoff is conveyed southerly and discharges into the San Timoteo Creek, which discharges into the Santa Ana River.

Kimley-Horn prepared a Preliminary Drainage Study for the Project Site on February 2020 (see Appendix G for report). The Project Site is part of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC and WCD) Master Drainage Plan for the Beaumont Area (Zone 5) tributary to the Santa Ana River, which is located approximately 24 miles west of the project site. Under existing conditions, the Project Site is undeveloped and generally sheet flows from northwest to southeast. The site runoff sheet flows to Highland Springs

Avenue where flows are conveyed southerly via curb and gutter. Runoff is captured via storm drain curb inlets along Highland Springs Avenue, which connect directly into the Highland Springs Channel, a concrete RCFC and WCD Facility. Runoff is conveyed southerly and discharges into the San Timoteo Creek, which discharges into the Santa Ana River.

3.10.2 Impact Analysis

a,e) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 2.08 acres and is therefore subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES. Construction activities covered under the State's General Construction permit include removal of vegetation, grading excavating, or any other activity that causes the disturbance of at least one acre. The General Construction permit requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a SWPPP.

The NPDES also requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). In February 2020, a Preliminary WQMP was prepared for the Proposed Project by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (on file with City). The WQMP is intended to comply with the requirements of the City of Beaumont, which includes the requirement for the preparation and implementation of a Project-Specific WQMP. The implementation of the WQMP is enforceable under the City of Beaumont Water Quality Ordinance. Review and approval of the WQMP by the City would ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are minimized or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the Project Site. To ensure potential impacts are reduced to less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

Mitigation Measure WQ-1: The Project Proponent shall implement all permanent, structural BMPs and Operations BMPs as listed in the final WQMP to be approved by the City.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City General Plan, the City of Beaumont historically has drawn from groundwater supplies available within the Beaumont Groundwater Storage Unit (BSU), which underlies the City and surrounding areas. The BSU is within Area 4 of the Beaumont and Banning Hydrologic Subarea of the San Timoteo Hydrologic Area, and within the northern portion of the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit.

The Project Site would be served by the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD), which draws groundwater from shallow wells in Little San Gorgonio Canyon. The Beaumont

Groundwater Basin has a large storage capacity for banked water.[28] During wet years, BCVWD can bank State Water Program water for dry years.

At the time the UWMP was prepared, the population served by BCVWD is expected to nearly double by 2040-50, based on the City 2007 General Plan projected build-out population. The build-out population estimate will set the ultimate water demand. The Proposed Project is the development of a QSR, gas station and convenience store. It includes 22,700 square-feet of landscaping, which is 25 percent of the total site. The Proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan and would therefore be included in BCVWD's projections for water demands.

Compliance with BCVWD's development conditions, as listed in the Preliminary Review, will ensure that the Proposed Project does not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The Proposed Project is required to conform to the City of Beaumont and County of Riverside Landscaping Ordinances that pertain to water efficient landscape requirements. In addition, as is required by BCVWD, landscaped areas which have turf shall have smart irrigation controllers and systems shall have automatic rain sensors. Landscaping in non-turf areas should be drought-tolerant with drip or bubbler irrigation systems. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*

i) *result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site*

Less than Significant Impact.

The Proposed Project's uses are not anticipated to affect drainage patterns or add substantial on or off-site erosion or siltation. Erosion is the process by which soils are removed from a property most commonly by wind or water. Erosion is more likely to occur if soils are left unprotected. The Proposed Project would be approximately 75% impervious area and 25% landscape.

According to the City General Plan, future development under the General Plan will not result in any additional soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Soils within City limits are classified as Ramona-Placentia, Hanford, and Yolo Soils Association.[29] These soils are generally well drained, have low soil permeability, and have relatively low inherent fertility. The Project Site does not fall within any geological boundary which would contribute to the soil erosion or loss of topsoil to the Project Site or surrounding properties. Moreover, the Project Applicant is required to design temporary drainage facilities and erosion control measures to minimize erosion and silt deposition during site grading activities. In accordance with the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, temporary excavations and slope faces shall be protected from rainfall and erosion; surface runoff shall be directed away from excavations and slopes.

[28] Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District. 2015 Urban water Management Plan.
[29] City General Plan. Page 105.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site is within the Riverside County Flood Control District. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps portions of the City within the 100-year flood plain zones. According to the City General Plan, the General Plan Area is not exposed to significant hazards due to dam or levee failure(s). The majority of the Project Site is within Other Areas Zone X, which is areas outside the 0.2% annual chance of flood hazard. The eastern edge of the Project Site within the Other Flood Areas Zone X, which is areas of 0.2% annual chance flood; areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance flood.[30]

Uncontrolled infiltration of irrigation excess and storm runoff into the soils can adversely affect the performance of the planned improvements (see Appendix F). Saturation of a soil can cause it to lose internal shear strength and increase its compressibility, resulting in a change to important engineering properties. Proper drainage should be maintained at all times. To maintain proper surface drainage at all times to prevent on-site flooding, SALEM recommends the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measure WQ-2: The ground immediately adjacent to the foundation shall be sloped away from the building at a slope of not less than 5 percent for a minimum distance of 10 feet.

Mitigation Measure WQ-3: Impervious surfaces within 10 feet of the building foundation shall be sloped a minimum of 2 percent away from the building and drainage gradients maintained to carry all surface water to collection facilities and off site. These grades should be maintained for the life of the project. Ponding of water should not be allowed adjacent to the structure. Over-irrigation within landscaped areas adjacent to the structure should not be performed.

Mitigation Measure WQ-4: Roof drains should be installed with appropriate downspout extensions out-falling on splash blocks so as to direct water a minimum of 5 feet away from the structures or be connected to the storm drain system for the development.

Implementation of the mitigation measures above would reduce the amount and rate of surface runoff to prevent on and off-site flooding.

iii,iv) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources or polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows

Less than Significant Impact. Design review at the project level will ensure that the Proposed Project will not create nor modify drainage patterns that would impede or redirect flood flows. Implementation of the Proposed Project is anticipated to increased peak volume

[30] Federal Emergency Management Agency. National Flood Hazard Layer.

by 4,696 cubic feet (see Appendix G). As a result, an underground detention system with minimum storage volume of 4,700 cubic feet is proposed for peak attenuation. A detailed detention analysis will be provided to the during final design and approved prior to issuance of grading permits.

Under proposed conditions, storm water runoff would sheet flow on the majority of the QSR into various storm drain inlets via curb and gutter and ribbon gutter. The gutters would ultimately connect to the existing RCFC and WCD curb inlet, which discharges to the Highland Springs Channel. The Proposed Project's uses are not anticipated to affect drainage patterns or add substantial runoff that cannot be supported by existing RCFC and WCD Facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Would the project in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. Due to the Project Site's distance from the Pacific Ocean and any other significant body of water, tsunamis and seiches are not potential hazards in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

11.	LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
(b)	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

3.11.1 Environmental Setting

The City and its spheres of influence contain significant tracts of undeveloped land. Development under the General Plan will largely affect undeveloped and rural areas within the City Sphere of Influence. Future development would result in intensified existing urban uses and convert open space into urban land. The General Plan's Community Development Element establishes the policy statements to preclude or reduce the potential for disruption or division of established communities.

3.11.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No impact. The Citys General Plan Area has been subdivided into smaller Planning areas. The Project Site is part of the 6th Street Corridor Planning Area. Commercial and industrial uses are the predominant land uses within this Planning Area, with residential uses south of 8th street. The Project Site is currently vacant. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan designation and would serve nearby residential development. The physical

division of an established community is typically associated with construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility in an existing community or between a community and an outlying area. The Proposed Project is the development of a convenience store, gas station and quick-service restaurant with an attached drive-thru. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Would 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?

No impact. The Project Site has a current land use designation of Community Commercial (CC). With approval of the CUP, the Proposed Project would comply with applicable requirements for structures in the CC zone. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

12.	MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.12.1 Environmental Setting

The General Plan Area is lacking in any known or identified mineral resources. Development under the General Plan will not restrict access to mineral resources outside of the General Plan Area. There may be accretions of aggregates along watercourses and drainage ways that can be valuable for local construction.

3.12.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Less than Significant Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation, Mineral Land Classification map, the Project Site is located in the San Bernardino Production-Consumption (P-C) region, specifically in Special Report (SR) 143. The Project Site and its immediate vicinity occur within Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3).[31] This zone is defined as

[31] California Department of Conservation. Mineral Land Classification Map SR 143 Plate 7.16.

an area containing mineral deposits with a significance that cannot be evaluated from available data. There are no known or identified mineral resources of regional or Statewide importance within the General Plan Area.[32] Additionally, development under the General Plan will not restrict access to mineral resources outside of the General Plan Area. The Proposed Project's demand for mineral resources will be considered less than significant due to the abundance of available aggregate resources in the Southern California region. Mineral resource mining would not be compatible with the surrounding land uses and the General Plan designation for the Project Site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Less than Significant Impact. Analysis under the City General Plan concludes that development under the General Plan will result in a less than significant loss of available locally important mineral resource recovery site. There are no delineated sites of mineral resources within the General Plan Area. Undeveloped parts of the General Plan Area may yield sand, gravel and aggregate that can be used for local construction activities as long as mineral extraction does not conflict with other policies or land uses. The Project Site has a current zoning of Commercial Community and general land use designation of Community Commercial. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.13 NOISE

13.	NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

Highland Springs Avenue is designated as an Arterial Highway under the General Plan. 8th Street is a designated Major Highway and a proposed Arterial Highway. A Noise Impact Analysis, dated March 26, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Urban Crossroads to determine the

[32] City General Plan. Page 152.

potential noise impacts and the necessary noise mitigation measures, if any, for the Proposed Project (see Appendix H for report).

3.13.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would 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?*

Less than Significant Impact. Noise can be measured in the form of a decibel (dB), which is a unit for describing the amplitude of sound. The predominant rating scales for noise in the State of California are the Equivalent Continuous Sound Level (L_{eq}), and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which are both based on the A-weighted decibel (dBA). The L_{eq} is the average of the sound level energy for a one-hour period and employs an A-weighted decibel correction that corresponds to the optimal frequency response of the human ear. The CNEL is based upon 24 one-hour L_{eq} measurements. The average noise levels for the late evening and early morning hours (the period between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM) are weighted 10 decibels. This is to take into account a person's increased sensitivity to noise during the early morning and late evening periods. A decibel is a unit used for measuring the intensity of sound. Zero on the decibel scale represents the lowest limit of sound that can be heard by humans.

The Noise Impact Analysis was been prepared to satisfy applicable City of Beaumont standards and thresholds of significance based on guidance provided by Appendix H of CEQA guidelines.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Analysis

Traffic generated by the operation of the Project will influence the traffic noise levels in surrounding off-site areas. To quantify the off-site traffic noise increases on the surrounding off-site areas, the changes in traffic noise levels on 16 study-area roadway segments were calculated using the transportation related twenty-four hour community noise equivalent levels (CNEL) based on the change in the average daily traffic (ADT) volumes. The traffic noise levels provided in this analysis are based on the traffic forecasts found in the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads, Inc. To assess the off-site noise level impacts associated with the Proposed Project, noise contour boundaries were developed for Existing 2020, and Opening Year Cumulative (OYC) 2021 conditions (see Tables 9 and 10). The analysis shows that the unmitigated Project-related traffic noise level increases under all with Project traffic scenarios are considered less than significant impacts at receiving land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments. No mitigation measured are required.

Table 9
Existing 2020 with Project Traffic Noise Level Increases

ID	Road	Segment	Noise-sensitive land use?	Project Increase (dBA)[1]	Noise Level Increase Significance Criteria[2]	Exceeded?
1	Pennsylvania Ave.	n/o 8th St.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No
2	Pennsylvania Ave.	s/o 8th St.	Yes	0.0	1.5	No
3	Xenia Ave.	n/o 8th St.	Yes	0.0	1.5	No
4	Allegheny St.	s/o 8th St.	Yes	0.9	5.0	No
5	Highland Springs Ave.	n/o Wilson St.	Yes	0.0	1.5	No
6	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o Wilson St.	No	0.1	5.0	No
7	Highland Springs Ave.	n/o Ramsey St.	No	0.1	5.0	No
8	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o Ramsey St.	No	0.1	3.0	No
9	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o I-10	No	0.0	3.0	No
10	8th St.	w/o Pennsylvania Ave.	Yes	0.1	3.0	No
11	8th St.	e/o Pennsylvania Ave.	Yes	0.3	3.0	No
12	8th St.	e/o Xenia Ave.	Yes	0.3	3.0	No
13	8th St.	e/o Driveway 1	Yes	0.4	1.5	No
14	Wilson St.	e/o Highland Springs Ave.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No
15	6th St.	w/o Highland Springs Ave.	No	0.1	5.0	No
16	Ramsey St.	e/o Highland Springs Ave.	No	0.1	3.0	No

[1] Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) at receiving land use. The CNEL is calculated at the boundary of the right-of-way of each Roadway and the property line of the receiving land use.
[2]Does the Project create an off-site transportation related noise level increase exceeding the significance criteria (Table 4-2 of Appendix H)? "RW" = Location of the respective noise contour falls within the right-of-way of the road. "MFR"= Multi-Family Residential; "SFR"= Single-Family Residential; "GC"= General Commercial; "LDR"= Low Density Residential; "CC"= Community Commercial; "PF"= Public Facilities; "PO"= Professional Office; "PFRI"= Public Facilities- Railroad/Interstate; "HDR"= High Density Residential; "MHP"= Mobile Home Parks.

Table 10
Opening Year 2021 with Project Traffic Noise Increases

ID	Road	Segment	Noise-sensitive land use?	Project Increase (dBA)[1]	Noise Level Increase Significance Criteria[2]	Exceeded?
1	Pennsylvania Ave.	n/o 8th St.	Yes	0.0	1.5	No
2	Pennsylvania Ave.	s/o 8th St.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No
3	Xenia Ave.	n/o 8th St.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No
4	Allegheny St.	s/o 8th St.	Yes	0.8	5.0	No
5	Highland Springs Ave.	n/o Wilson St.	Yes	0.0	1.5	No
6	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o Wilson St.	No	0.1	3.0	No
7	Highland Springs Ave.	n/o Ramsey St.	No	0.1	5.0	No
8	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o Ramsey St.	No	0.1	3.0	No
9	Highland Springs Ave.	s/o I-10	No	0.0	3.0	No
10	8th St.	w/o Pennsylvania Ave.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No

ID	Road	Segment	Noise-sensitive land use?	Project Increase (dBA)[1]	Noise Level Increase Significance Criteria[2]	Exceeded?
11	8th St.	e/o Pennsylvania Ave.	Yes	0.2	1.5	No
12	8th St.	e/o Xenia Ave.	Yes	0.2	1.5	No
13	8th St.	e/o Driveway 1	Yes	0.2	1.5	No
14	Wilson St.	e/o Highland Springs Ave.	Yes	0.1	1.5	No
15	6th St.	w/o Highland Springs Ave.	No	0.0	5.0	No
16	Ramsey St.	e/o Highland Springs Ave.	No	0.1	3.0	No

[1] Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) at receiving land use. The CNEL is calculated at the boundary of the right-of-way of each Roadway and the property line of the receiving land use.
[2]Does the Project create an off-site transportation related noise level increase exceeding the significance criteria (Table 4-2 of Appendix H)? "RW" = Location of the respective noise contour falls within the right-of-way of the road. "MFR"= Multi-Family Residential; "SFR"= Single-Family Residential; "GC"= General Commercial; "LDR"= Low Density Residential; "CC"= Community Commercial; "PF"= Public Facilities; "PO"= Professional Office; "PFRI"= Public Facilities- Railroad/Interstate; "HDR"= High Density Residential; "MHP"= Mobile Home Parks.

Operational Noise Analysis

For noise-sensitive residential properties, the City of Beaumont Municipal Code, Section 9.02.050, identifies base ambient noise level (BANL) stationary-source noise level limits for the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) hours of 55 dBA L_{eq} and 45 dBA L_{eq} during the nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. For industrial and commercial land uses, the BANL is 75 dBA L_{eq} for the daytime hours and of 50 dBA L_{eq} during the nighttime hours. Section 9.40.050 states that actual decibel measurements exceeding the levels set forth hereinabove at the times and within the zones corresponding thereto shall be employed as the "base ambient noise level. In effect, when the ambient noise levels exceed the base exterior noise level limits, the noise level standard shall be adjusted as appropriate to encompass or reflect the ambient noise level.

Using reference noise levels to represent the expected noise sources from the Project Site, the operational analysis estimates the Project-related stationary-source noise hourly average L_{eq} levels at nearby sensitive receiver locations. Receiver locations are located in outdoor living areas (e.g., backyards) at 10 feet from any existing or proposed barriers or at the building façade, whichever is closer to the Project site. Distance is measured in a straight line from the project boundary to each receiver location.

R1: Located approximately 114 feet north of the Project site, R1 represents vacant land. Traffic noise from 8th Street represents the primary noise source at this location.

R2: Location R2 represents the existing San Gorgonio Memorial Hospital located approximately 196 feet east of the Project site and Highland Springs Avenue.

R3: Location R3 represents the existing Westco Medical Supplies office use. The medical office use is located approximately 103 feet south of the Project site.

R4: Location R4 represents the existing single-family residence located at 720 Allegheny Street approximately 296 feet south west of the Project site.

R5: Location R5 represents the existing Palm Grove Health Care Center skilled nursing facility located at 1665 E 8th Street approximately 71 feet south west of the Project site.

The typical activities associated with the Proposed Project are anticipated to include roof-top air conditioning units, trash enclosure activity, drive-thru speakerphone and gas station activity. The operational noise analysis shows that the Project will satisfy the City of Beaumont stationary-source exterior hourly average L_{eq} noise levels of 55 dBA L_{eq} daytime and 45 dBA L_{eq} nighttime noise level standards at all nearby receiver locations (see Table 11). Therefore, the Project-related operational noise level impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 11
Operational Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location[1]	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)[2]		Noise Level Standards (dBA Leq)[3]		Noise Level Standards Exceeded?[4]	
	Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
R1	45.9	44.3	55	45	No	No
R2	43.3	40.7	55	45	No	No
R3	47.0	42.1	55	45	No	No
R3	42.3	38.2	55	45	No	No
R4	48.5	43.6	55	45	No	No

[1] See Exhibit 9-A of Appendix H for the receiver locations.
[2] Proposed Project operational noise levels as shown on Tables 9-2 and 9-3 of Appendix H.
[3] Exterior noise level standards for noise sensitive residential land use, as shown on Table 4-2 of Appendix H.
[4] Do the estimated Project operational noise source activities exceed the noise level standards?
"Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Construction Noise Analysis

Project construction noise level standards are typically described as exterior noise level limits in order to assess the potential impacts. Therefore, to describe the Project construction noise levels at off-site sensitive receiver locations, an exterior construction-related noise level threshold of 75 dBA L_{eq} is used. Since typical building construction will provide a Noise Reduction (NR) of approximately 20 dBA with "windows closed", an unmitigated exterior noise level standard of 75 dBA L_{eq} when measured at the building façade is used to describe the for noise sensitive residential uses. This exterior construction noise level standard represents the combination of the City of Beaumont 55 dBA L_{eq} interior noise level limit and the 20 dBA noise reduction associated with typical building construction.

Using sample reference noise levels to represent the planned construction activities of the Proposed Project, this analysis estimates the Project-related construction noise levels at nearby sensitive receiver locations. The Project-related short-term construction noise levels are expected to range from 53.2 to 70.8 dBA L_{eq} and will satisfy the acceptable 75 dBA L_{eq} threshold at all receiver locations (see Table 12). Therefore, based on the results of this analysis, all nearby sensitive receiver locations will experience less than significant impacts due to Project construction noise levels, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 12
Construction Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location[1]	Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})		
	Highest Construction Noise Levels[2]	Threshold[3]	Threshold Exceeded?[4]
R1	69.2	75	No
R2	65.9	75	No
R3	69.3	75	No
R4	63.3	75	No
R5	70.8	75	No

[1] Noise receiver locations are shown on Exhibit 10-A of Appendix H.
[2] Highest construction noise level calculations based on distance from the construction noise source activity to nearby receiver locations as shown on Table 10-2 of Appendix H.
[3] Exterior construction noise level standard represents the combination of the City of Beaumont 55 dBA Leq interior noise level limit and the 20 dBA noise reduction associated with typical building construction.[4] Do the estimated Project construction noise levels exceed the construction noise level threshold?

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact. There are several different methods that are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings but is not always suitable for evaluating human response (annoyance) because it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. Instead, the human body responds to average vibration amplitude often described as the root mean square (RMS). The RMS amplitude is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal and is most frequently used to describe the effect of vibration on the human body. Decibel notation (VdB) is commonly used to measure RMS. Decibel notation (VdB) serves to reduce the range of numbers used to describe human response to vibration. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Sensitive receivers for vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly, and sick), and vibration-sensitive equipment and/or activities

Ground-borne vibration levels from automobile traffic are generally overshadowed by vibration generated by heavy trucks that roll over the same uneven roadway surfaces. However, due to the rapid drop-off rate of ground-borne vibration and the short duration of the associated events, vehicular traffic-induced ground-borne vibration is rarely perceptible beyond the roadway right-of-way, and rarely results in vibration levels that cause damage to buildings in the vicinity. However, while vehicular traffic is rarely perceptible, construction has the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction activities and equipment used.

Ground-borne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring within the Project site were estimated by data published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Construction activities that would have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne

vibration within the Project site include grading. At distances ranging from 71 feet (at location R5) to 296 feet (at location R4) from Project construction activities (at the Project Site boundary), construction vibration levels are estimated to range from 54.8 to 73.4 VdB and will remain below the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment maximum acceptable vibration criteria of 78 VdB for daytime residential uses at all receiver locations (see Table 13). Moreover, the vibration levels reported at the sensitive receiver locations are unlikely to be sustained during the entire construction period but will occur rather only during the times that heavy construction equipment is operating adjacent to the Project site perimeter. Therefore, the Project-related vibration impacts are considered less than significant during the construction activities at the Project Site, and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 13
Project Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver Location[1]	Distance to Construction Activity (Feet)	Receiver Vibration Levels (VdB)[2]					Threshold VdB[3]	Threshold Exceeded?[4]
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Highest Vibration Levels		
R1	114'	38.2	59.2	66.2	67.2	67.2	78	No
R2	196'	31.2	52.2	59.2	60.2	60.2	78	No
R3	103'	39.6	60.6	67.6	68.6	68.6	78	No
R4	296'	25.8	46.8	53.8	54.8	54.8	78	No
R5	71'	44.4	65.4	72.4	73.4	73.4	78	No

[1] Noise receiver locations are shown on Exhibit 10-A of Appendix H.
[2] Based on the Vibration Source Levels of Construction Equipment included on Table 6-5 of Appendix H.
[3] Source: FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment maximum acceptable vibration criteria.
4 Does the vibration level exceed the maximum acceptable vibration threshold?

c) *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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located approximately 5.2 miles southeast of the Banning Municipal Airport. The Project Site is neither within an airport land use plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.[33] The Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

[33] Riverside County Information Technology GIS. Map My County.

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

14.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

According to the 2010 United States Census Bureau, the City of Beaumont had a population of 36,877. For 2018, the City was estimated to have a population of 49,241. The City is one of the fastest growing cities in Riverside County and in California. The Community Development Element of the City General Plan outlines the standards for development intensity and population density for each land designation.

3.14.2 Impact Analysis

a) *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)?*

Less than Significant Impact. The General Plan is not intended to induce population growth but rather, to identify the plans, policies and programs necessary to accommodate anticipated growth within the City and surrounding region. The population growth estimates based on the General Plan Update are consistent with SCAG growth forecasts. If there is a minor increase in population growth as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project, this population growth would be accounted for in the General Plan and considered insignificant. The Proposed Project would require an estimate of four to six employees. It is anticipated that this demand for employment will be met by the existing local population. Short-term construction activities at the Project Site would not attract new employees to the area since a pool of construction labor exists in the region. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The Project Site is currently vacant and does not contain housing that could potentially be displaced. The Project Site is designated “Community Commercial”, which is intended to serve adjacent neighborhoods. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

15.	**PUBLIC SERVICES.** **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:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
(a)	Fire Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(e)	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.15.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Beaumont will oversee the development of adequate and dependable services to meet the needs of existing and future development (Community Development Element Policy 20). These services include fire protection, law enforcement, hospital/healthcare services and education.

3.15.2 Impact Analysis

a) 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 fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Beaumont contracts with the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) for Citywide services, including fire protection, public service and emergency medical aid response. Fire protection services are supplemented by the California Department of Forestry station in the City. Six County fire stations serve the city, with three stations based outside but near Beaumont's boundaries. Fire Station No. 20, located at 1550 E. Sixth Street, is approximately 0.16 miles southwest of the Project Site. In order to minimize the need for additional fire station facilities, the Fire Department reviews all new development plans. Proposed projects are required to comply with applicable fire protection and prevention requirements, such as building setbacks, emergency access and interior sprinklers. Additionally, the Project Applicant will be required to pay a one-time mitigation fee to support the development of new fire station facilities under Beaumont City Ordinance 795 and a separate fee for emergency preparedness under City Ordinance 814. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) 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 police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Beaumont Police Department provides police protection services in the area of the Project Site. The closest police station, located at 660 Orange Avenue, is approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project Site. According to the CityGeneral Plan, City General Fund revenues are typically used to provide and supplement police services, as required. Revenues from the Proposed Project would be allocated to finance an increased demand for police protection services. The Project Applicant would be required to pay a one-time basic service facility fee under City Ordinance 506. An increase in demand for police protection resulting from the Proposed Project's commercial use has been accounted for in the General Plan and would be considered insignificant. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *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 schools?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located within the Beaumont Unified School District (BUSD). The increase in employment from the Proposed Project is anticipated to be fulfilled by the existing population. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in an increase in population growth within the area, thereby not increasing the number of students. The Project Applicant will be required to pay applicable development fees in support of public school facilities. This fee will be sufficient in mitigating potential impacts of the Proposed Project on schools. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *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 parks?*

Less than Significant Impact. The City shall improve the requirement of establishing five acres of parkland for every one thousand persons in conjunction with residential development.[34] The City of Beaumont and Cherry Valley Recreation and Park District own and operate park facilities. Population growth resulting from the implementation of the General Plan will lead to an increased demand for public parks. The City's Local Park Code and the State of California Quimby Act require new development to provide parkland dedications or appropriate fees in case the Proposed Project might have direct or indirect impacts on parks. The increase in employment from the Proposed Project is anticipated to be fulfilled by the local population. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require the construction or expansion of parks to meet demands. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

[34] City General Plan. Page 52.

e) 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 other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on public facilities/services because an increase in the City's population is not anticipated with the Proposed Project. Furthermore, the Project Applicant's payment of development impact fees will mitigate any potential impacts on public services. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.16 RECREATION

16.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

The General Plan's Resource Management Element addresses open space and recreational resources. The City manages parks and recreational facilities to ensure these facilities stay in good condition. The City intends to increase the recreational facilities available to residents. The Project Site is primarily surrounded by commercial and residential development.

3.16.2 Impact Analysis

a) 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The implementation of the Proposed Project is not expected to lead to substantial population growth. As a result, the Proposed Project would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. It would not require the construction or expansion of park or other recreational facilities to meet demands. The Project Applicant's payment of required fees will serve to mitigate any potential impacts related to the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities from the Proposed Project. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) 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?

No Impact. The Proposed Project is a commercial development and its demand for employment is anticipated to be filled by the local population. It would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to meet demands of residential development. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

17.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines s § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.17.1 Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project is anticipated to open in 2021. Access to and from the Project Site would be via a right-in/right-out only driveway on 8th Street and another on Highland Springs Avenue. Regional access to the Project Site is available from the I-10 Freeway via Highland Springs Avenue. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), dated March 9, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Urban Crossroads to provide an assessment of potential traffic impacts that may result from the Proposed Project and to identify traffic mitigation measures required to maintain the established Level of Service (LOS) standard for the elements of the impacted roadway system (see Appendix I for report).

3.17.2 Impact Analysis

a,b) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities? Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines s § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project is the development of a QSR, convenience store and gas station. It is a land use project that would allow commercial services to be more accessible to residents of the neighborhoods north and west of the Project Site. The Beaumont Transit Department plans to have a bus stop adjacent to the Project Site, so the Proposed Project would be easily accessible to residents.
The traffic study was prepared in accordance with the County of Riverside's Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide (August 2008), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, and through consultation with

City of Beaumont staff during the scoping process. The LOS operations included in the TIA for study area intersections and freeway facilities are informational and are not anticipated to support Senate Bill 743, which would replace automobile delay-based LOS with vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A traffic study scoping package was reviewed and approved by the City of Beaumont and the City of Banning staff prior to the preparation of the traffic study to ensure that the TIA satisfies the City of Beaumont's requirements. The City of Beaumont has established LOS D as the minimum LOS for all roadways/intersections within the City. Therefore, any intersection operating at LOS E or F will be considered deficient for the purpose of the TIA. The City of Banning shall maintain peak hour LOS C or better on all local intersections.

Nine study area intersections, listed below, were evaluated in the TIA (see Exhibit 1-2 of Appendix I). This list includes intersections where the Proposed Project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more peak hour trips per the County of Riverside's traffic study guidelines. The 50-hour trip criterion is a traffic engineering rule of thumb that is accepted and widely used within the Riverside County for estimating a potential area of influence.

- Pennsylvania Av. & 8th St.
- Xenia Av. & 8th
- Allegheny St. & 8th St
- Driveway 1 & 8th St. – Future Intersection
- Highland Springs Av. & 8th St./Wilson St.
- Highway Springs Av. & Driveway 2 – Future Intersection
- Highland Springs Av. & 6th St./Ramsey St.
- Highland Springs Av. & I-10 WB Ramps
- Highland Springs Av. & I-10 EB Ramps

Trips generated by the Proposed Project have been estimated based on trip generation rates collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, (10th Edition, 2017). The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate a total of 1,100 trip-ends per day, 145 AM peak hour trips and 100 PM peak hour trips.

For the traffic study, potential deficiencies to traffic and circulation have been assessed for each of the following conditions: existing (2020), existing plus Proposed Project, opening year cumulative (2021) without Proposed Project, and opening year cumulative (2021) with Proposed Project. The following intersections are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the peak hours under Opening Year Cumulative (2021) Without Project traffic conditions:

- Pennsylvania Avenue & 8th Street – LOS F AM peak hour; LOS E PM peak hour
- Highland Springs Avenue & 8th Street/Wilson Street– LOS D AM peak hour; LOS F PM peak hour
- Highland Springs Avenue & 6th Street/Ramsey Street– LOS D PM peak hour only

With the addition of traffic generated from the Proposed Project, there are no additional study area intersections anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS under Opening Year Cumulative (2021) With Project traffic conditions, in addition to the intersections identified under Opening Year Cumulative (2021) Without Project traffic conditions. There are no movements that are anticipated to experience queuing issues during the weekday AM or

weekday PM peak 95th percentile traffic flows for Opening Year Cumulative (2021) traffic conditions, consistent with Existing (2020) traffic conditions.

VMT Assessment: Removing LOS and congestion from CEQA and shifting to VMT as the metric for analyzing transportation impacts, is based on SB 743 which still preserves local government authority to make planning decisions (that is LOS and congestion can still be measured for planning purposes). VMT analysis is deemed beneficial for several reasons one of which is it is critical to achieving the State's GHG emissions reductions goals. It also aligns transportation analysis under CEQA with a number of state goals for planning, environmental protection, and improvement of human health. LOS traffic studies may be required for planning approvals but will no longer be part of the CEQA process as of July 1, 2020. The CalEEMod output from modeling the Proposed Project's air quality and greenhouse gas emissions show the project vehicle miles traveled, based on use to be 900,150 per year, or an average daily VMT of 2,466.26. The CaleEEMod construction emissions were estimated based on parameters used to estimate construction emissions such as those associated with worker and vendor trips, and trip lengths. The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads, which determined that the Proposed Project would generate 1,100 total daily trips. Operational emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD's 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ threshold of significance.

Because the Proposed Project is consistent with the current land use designation of Community Commercial under the General Plan, the future emissions estimates of the City's Climate Action Plan therefore account for the implementation of the Proposed Project. The project emissions do not exceed thresholds for Greenhouse Gas emissions (see Section 3.8) and it will also meet Title 24 to lower GHG emissions.

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to require the construction of any other off-site improvements, but there are improvement needs identified at off-site intersections for future cumulative traffic analysis scenarios. Therefore, the Project Applicant's responsibility for the Project's contributions towards off-site deficient intersections is fulfilled through payment of fair share and/or payment into pre-existing fee programs (if applicable) that would be assigned to the future construction of the identified recommended improvements. The Project Applicant would be required to pay requisite fees and/or fair share contributions consistent with the City's requirements.

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to minimize potential on-site/access impacts to a level below significant:

Mitigation Measure T-1: – Driveway 1 & 8th Street– install a stop control on the northbound approach and a right turn lane (driveway).

Mitigation Measure T-2: Highland Springs Avenue & Driveway 2 - install a stop control on the eastbound approach and a right turn lane (driveway).

Mitigation Measure T-3: 8th Street is an east-west oriented roadway located along the Project's northern boundary. According to the City of Beaumont Circulation Element, 8th Street is currently built out to its ultimate half-section. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements are recommended, as needed for site access along the Project's frontage, consistent with the City's standards.

Mitigation Measure T-4: Highland Springs Avenue is a north-south oriented roadway located along the Project's eastern boundary. According to the City of Beaumont Circulation Element, Highland Springs Avenue is currently built out to its ultimate half-section. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements are recommended, as needed for site access along the Project's frontage, consistent with the City's standards.

With incorporation on these mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would be consistent CEQA guidelines and adhere to the established LOS standards of the City of Beaumont and City of Banning.

c) *Would 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)?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is the development of a gas station, convenience store and restaurant with an attached drive-thru. The Project Site includes a 35-inch driveway on 8th Street and another one on Highland Springs Avenue. The Proposed Project does not include geometric design features or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. The Project Site is almost perfectly square-shaped and is not adjacent to windy roads. Furthermore, the 8th Street and Highland Springs Avenue intersection has traffic lights, which decreases potential safety hazards resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site includes a 35-inch driveway on 8th Street and another one on Highland Springs Avenue. The driveways are wide enough to allow evacuation and emergency vehicles simultaneous access. The City Fire Department shall have the authority to inspect the Project Site as often as necessary to ensure that there are no hazards violating fire safety, such as inadequate emergency access. Moreover, implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 to T-4 will ensure potential significant impacts are reduced to less than significant.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

18.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would 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	☐	☐	☒	☐

18.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.18.1 Environmental Setting

In November 2019, McKenna et al. completed a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Project Site. The purpose of the assessment was to identify and document any tribal cultural resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) that may potentially occur within the Project Site and to evaluate resources determined to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. The Pass Cahuilla, Desert Cahuilla and Mountain Cahuilla are the main Cahuilla populations associated with western Riverside County. Twenty-two Cahuilla villages were present in the larger Coachella Valley and San Gorgonio Pass, a relatively narrow valley associated with the Project Site and its surrounding area.

3.18.2 Impact Analysis

a,i,ii) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in a 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)? Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in 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?

Less than Significant Impact. California Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) was approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014. AB52 specifies that CEQA projects with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the bill requires lead agency consultation with California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed of proposed projects in that geographic area. The legislation further requires that the tribe-requested consultation be completed prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project.

According to the City General Plan, the cultural remains of the Native American Cahuilla peoples have been found in numerous locations throughout the City and region. In November 2019, Mckenna et al. completed a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Project, which included communication with Native American tribes identified by the Native

American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as local Native American representatives wishing to be notified of projects in the area.

The Commission reported that the Sacred Lands File (SFL) has no recorded tribal cultural resources occurring in the project area. McKenna et al. staff also sent letters to Native American representatives identified by the Commission, requesting information pertaining to issues, concern, or resources they may be aware of. As of November 29, 2019, McKenna et al. has not received responses to letters sent to local Native American representatives who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the Project Site. The Morongo Band of Mission reservation is relatively close to the Project Site. The Morongo are likely to contact the City directly and will request copies of technical reports to review to ensure that no Native American resources will be impacted by the Proposed Project.

According to CEQA Guidelines, the identification of potential "tribal cultural resources" is beyond the scope of the study prepared by Mckenna et al. and needs to be addressed through government-to-government consultations between the City of Beaumont and the pertinent Native American groups pursuant to AB52. Letters were sent out to 15 tribal contacts informing them of the project and inviting to consult. Tribes' requests for additional project information, coordination, or consultation with the Lead Agency, and/or Native American monitoring, have been acknowledged at the conclusion of the AB52 consultation with the City. One response has been received from the Torrez Martinez Band, stating that they do not have any concerns about the project and deferring to the Soboba Band as they are closer to the Project Site. No further consultation was requested, and the review period ended on June 22, 2020. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

19.	UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.19.1 Environmental Setting

The City is serviced by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD) for water treatment and delivery system. The City of Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) recycles wastewater made available to the community. Electrical service is provided by Sempra Energy Company, which will be able to provide service to future development within the City. The SoCal Gas Company provides basic residential and business gas services with no constraints to substantial future development. Landfill and recycling services are provided by Waste Management.

3.19.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would 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 or expansion of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Less than Significant Impact. The implementation of the City's Sewer Master Plan will avoid the need for additional septic tank use within the General Plan Area. New development under the General Plan will be served through the City sewer system and wastewater treatment plant. The Project Site would be served by an existing sewer collection system with connection to an existing sewer lateral in Highland Springs Avenue. The BCVWD will provide water service to the Proposed Project. There is an existing 6-inch water line in 8th Street that the Proposed Project would connect to. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or existing facilities.

Design review at the project level will ensure that the Proposed Project will not create nor modify drainage patterns that would impede or redirect flood flows. Implementation of the Proposed Project is anticipated to increased peak volume by 4,696 cubic feet (see Appendix G). As a result, an underground detention system with minimum storage volume of 4,700 cubic feet is proposed for peak attenuation. Implementation of the City Master Plan of Drainage ensures that future increases in the peak rates of runoff are managed and maintained within acceptable parameters. Furthermore, implementation of storm water Best Management Practices will ensure that the Proposed Project appropriately conveys storm water runoff without adversely impacting upstream or downstream drainage characteristics. Therefore, no construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities are required with implementation of the Proposed Project.

Southern California Edison (SCE) will provide basic electrical services to the Project Site. The Proposed Project will receive electrical power by connecting to SCE's existing power lines. Total electricity demand in SCE's service area is estimated to increase by approximately 12,000 Gigawatt Hour (GWh) between the years 2015 and 2026. Gigawatt hour is a unit of energy representing one billion watt hours. The commercial building sector of the Southern California Edison planning area consumed 37260.897803 Gigawatt Hour (GWh) of electricity in 2018.[35] The estimated electricity demand for the Proposed Project 0.2178114 GWh per year. The increase in electricity demand from the Proposed Project is insignificant compared to the projected electricity demand for SCE's entire service area.

[35] California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

The Project Site would be serviced by Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). According to the California Energy Commission, the natural gas consumption of the SoCalGas planning area commercial building sector was 937.882107 therms in 2018.[36] The Proposed Project's estimated natural gas demand is 0.00096611 therms per year; it would represent an insignificant percentage to the overall natural gas demand in SoCalGas's commercial building sector. The existing SoCalGas facilities are expected to sufficiently serve the increased demand of natural gas.

The Proposed Project will be served by AT&T for telecommunication services. AT&T continues to drive reductions in emissions and increases in resource efficiency and alternative energy deployment. The company will enable their customers to lead more sustainable lives by expanding access technology, further integrating sustainability solutions.[37] The Proposed Project is the development of a gas station, convenience store and QSR with an attached drive-thru use. It would not adversely impact or conflict with AT&T's sustainability goals.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal dry and multiple dry years?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site will be serviced by the BCVWD. The BCVWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) estimated the City's water demand for multi-family, commercial, industrial, institutional/governmental and other categories from the actual 2015 through projected 2040. At the time the UWMP was prepared, the population served by BCVWD was expected to nearly double by 2040-50, based on the City 2007 General Plan projected build-out population.

The Project Site has a current General Plan designation of Community Commercial (CC), and the Proposed Project would be consistent with this designation. Any increase in demand for water resulting from the development and operation of the proposed uses has been accounted for in BCVWD's supply and demand projections.

The Beaumont Groundwater Basin has large storage capacity for banked water.[38] BCVWD banks imported water in BCVWD's storage account in the Beaumont Basin when available from San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency (SGPWA) and as funds permit. This imported water can be extracted in future years when water allocations are insufficient to meet demands. Banking water in the storage account is critical to meeting demands during dry years. During wet years, BCVWD can bank State Project Water for dry years.

Water supplies will be able to meet demand until 2040 for normal years. However, water supplies will not be able to meet demands for single and multiple dry years until 2040. The

[36] California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.
[37] AT&T. Progress Toward our 2020/2025 Goals. https://about.att.com/ecms/dam/csr/sustainability-reporting/PDF/2017/ATT-Goals.pdf.
[38] Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

deficit in supply is anticipated to be provided from previously banked water in the Beaumont Basin.[39]

The Proposed Project would be subject to the five (5) stages of action in the event of a water shortage. The District would declare a water shortage and impose voluntary water conservation on all its customers. Water demand projections rely on growth and population estimates from local land use plans. The Proposed Project is accounted for in the City General Plan and will not result in unaccounted water demand increases. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Compliance with BCVWD's development conditions, as listed in the Preliminary Review, will ensure that the Proposed Project does not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The Proposed Project is required to conform to the City of Beaumont and County of Riverside Landscaping Ordinances that pertain to water efficient landscape requirements. In addition, as is required by BCVWD, landscaped areas which have turf shall have smart irrigation controllers and systems shall have automatic rain sensors. Landscaping in non-turf areas should be drought-tolerant with drip or bubbler irrigation systems. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City General Plan, the City will continue to provide for the development of wastewater treatment infrastructure to accommodate future demand. The Proposed Project has a General Plan land designation of Community Commercial and its development is included in the City's expected future growth. Using data provided from a similar operation in Riverside County where total average monthly water use is 21,000 gallons and assuming 50% of the total water used is for irrigation, an average of 10,500 gallons per month would be discharged to the sewer system. The total daily wastewater generated to be treated at the City's facilities would therefore be 345 gallons per day.

As of 2015, the Beaumont WWTP had a wastewater treatment capacity of 4 million gallons per day (MGD) which is not sufficient to accommodate all expected future growth within the city. The facility is planned to expand to provide a minimum treatment capacity of 8.0 MGD. The Project Applicant will be required to pay developer impact fees to finance treatment plant expansion. Upon completion of the facility expansion, the Beaumont WTTP would have a surplus wastewater capacity of approximately 5.5 MGD to serve existing and future demands. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) *Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?*

Less than Significant Impact. The nearest landfill to serve the Proposed Project is the Riverside County Lamb Canyon Landfill. During a permit review process in 2007, the landfill's

[39] Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

capacity was increased, and the life of the facility was extended from 2024 to 2029. Wastes generated under build-out conditions will be directed to landfills with available capacity, as determined by the County. The General Plan EIR concludes that, upon implementation of the General Plan, compliance with the City's adopted Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) target waste reduction and recycling goals, and proper management and disposal of waste streams would not result in a significant exceedance of permitted landfill capacities. The General Plan land use designation for the Project Site is Community Commercial (CC), and the Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the requirements of this land use designation. Solid waste generation from the Proposed Project was accounted for in the General Plan and the City's expected increase in waste generation. Additionally, the Proposed Project is required to comply with Chapter 8.12 Solid Waste Management of the City's municipal code. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Riverside Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) was prepared in accordance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). The SRRE is included in the CIWMP and analyzes the local wastestream to determine where to focus diversion efforts, including programs and funding. The City of Beaumont requires all development to adhere to all source reduction programs set forth in the SRRE for all the disposal of solid waste including yard waste. The Project would adhere to the SRRE and comply with all other applicable local, State, and federal solid waste disposal standards. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.20 WILDFIRE

20.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(c)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
(d)	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.20.1 Environmental Setting

Open space and undeveloped portions of the General Plan's Planning Area are at the highest risk for wildfires. However, since most of the Beaumont area consists of flat areas with sparse vegetation, the risk of wildfires is reduced. The City will continue to implement measures to reduce the potential for wildfires. The Project Site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).

3.20.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. Highland Springs Road is considered a major evacuation route. The Proposed Project does not require significant alternations to this evacuation route. The City General Plan's Circulation Element provides for appropriate evacuation routes and circulation throughout the General Plan Area to facilitate rapid response to emergency situations. Moreover, the General Plan provides for public education related to emergency conditions and emergency preparedness, response and evacuation plans. The City General Plan does not include elements that would conflict or interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b,c) Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is subject to environmental and building permit review procedures to reduce the risk of wildfires. The Project Site is relatively flat, with 2 to 5 percent slopes, and occurs at approximately 2603 to 2609 ft. in elevation. High winds are expected to cause potentially adverse effects within the General Plan Area. However, the implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce the risk of wildfires by eliminating the site's existing non-native grasses and providing a paved foundation. Moreover, the Project Site is surrounded by either vacant land, public facilities or commercial development and is not anywhere near an area of combustible vegetation. The risk of wildfires is low due to the lack of wildfire fuel factors. Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) will review the final design to ensure the mitigation of fire hazards and minimal impacts to the environment. Additionally, the Project Site is not within a VHFHSZ.[40] Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) 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?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site and its immediate vicinity is relatively flat and is not subject to post-fire slope instability. According to the City General Plan, peak rates of

[40] Calfire. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps.

runoff will be managed within acceptable parameters throughout the implementation of the City Master Plan of Drainage and City Capital Improvement Programs. The implementation of associated storm water BMPs will ensure that the Proposed Project appropriately conveys storm water runoff without affecting upstream or downstream drainage characteristics. As a result, the Proposed Project will not expose people or structure to significant risks, such as downslope flooding or landslides. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
(b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)	☐	☒	☐	☐
(c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3.21.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site is not associated with any endangered species or any species of concern. Development of the Proposed Project would not cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels or restrict the movement/distribution of a rare or endangered species. The Proposes Project would not affect any threatened or endangered species or habitat. The Project Site is not within the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat fee area nor is it required by the MSHCP to undergo burrowing owl surveys. The Project Site has very limited marginal nesting for ground-nesting bird species. Potential impacts to migratory/nesting bird species would be mitigated to a less than significant level with adherence to Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

There are potential impacts to cultural resources identified in the Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation prepared for the Project Site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2 and GEO-4 will ensure potential impacts to cultural resources are reduced to less than significant level. Implementation of these Mitigation Measures would prevent the elimination of important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual affects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the development when added to the impacts of other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future developments. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, developments taking place over a period. The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (a) and (b), states:

> (a) Cumulative impacts shall be discussed when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.
>
> (b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.

A cumulative project list was developed for the purposes of the Traffic Impact Analysis. Cumulative projects anticipated to contribute measurable traffic to study area intersections were included in the Opening Year Cumulative (2021) forecasts (see Appendix I, Table 4-2 for list of projects). The study area intersections are not anticipated to operate at an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS) under Opening year Cumulative (2021) with the addition of Proposed Project traffic.

Impacts associated with the Proposed Project would not be considered individually or cumulatively adverse or considerable. Impacts identified in this Initial Study can be reduced to a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 to T-4.

c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Less than Significant Impact. The incorporation of the City of Beaumont policies, standards, and guidelines and proposed Mitigation Measures as provided in this Initial Study would ensure that the Proposed Project would have no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly on an individual or cumulative basis. Due to geologic hazards within the area of the Project Site, the Proposed Project can directly and indirectly human beings by causing the risk of loss, injury or death. Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 to GEO-4 would enforce structural integrity and minimize the potential threats relating to geologic hazards. The City has established LOS D as the minimum LOS for all roadways/intersection

within the City. With the Project Applicant's payment of required fees and fair contributions, the Proposed Project would not significantly impact the City's circulation system. Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 to T-4 would ensure safe access to and from the Project Site.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan. The increases in emissions from construction and operations of the Proposed Project are below the SCAQMD threshold. Moreover, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 to minimize impacts posed by construction emissions. The noise generated from construction and operations of the Proposed Project would lead to noise level increases considered acceptable by City standards. Traffic generated by the operation of the Proposed Project will result in less than significant noise level increases at receiving land uses adjacent to the project area roadway segments.

Any potential adverse impacts identified can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures stated above.

REFERENCES

AT&T. Progress Toward our 2020/202 Goals. https://about.att.com/ecms/dam/csr/sustainability-reporting/PDF/2017/ATT-Goals.pdf. Accessed May 1, 2020.

Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan.* https://bcvwd.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/January-2017-Urban-Water-Management-Plan-Final.pdf. Accessed 1/10/2020.

Calfire. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps. https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5907/beaumont.pdf. Accessed on 11/26/19.

California Air Resources Board. California Greenhouse Gas Emissions from 2000 to 2017. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/pubs/reports/2000_2017/ghg_inventory_trends_00-17.pdf. Accessed12/11/2019.

California Department of Conservation. "Riverside County Important Farmland 2016 Sheet 1 of 3." ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/riv16_w.pdf. Accessed on 11/19/19.

California Department of Conservation. Fault Activity Map of California (2010). http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/. Accessed on 11/20/19.

California Department of Conservation. Mineral Land Classification. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartVII/Plate_7-16.pdf. Accessed on 11/26/2019.

California Energy Commission. *2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards.* https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/title24/2019standards/documents/2018_Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ.pdf. Accessed 1/20/2020.

California Energy Commission. Tracking Progress. https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/energy_efficiency.pdf. Accessed 12/6/2019.

City of Beaumont General Plan Map. https://beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/66/Printable-General-Plan-Map?bidId=. Accessed 11/18/2019.

City of Beaumont General Plan Update CEQA Findings. https://beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/63/General-Plan?bidId=. Accessed periodically.

County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health. California Accidental Release. https://www.rivcoeh.org/HazMat/calarp. Accessed 11/25/19.

Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances site list. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=1905+business+center+dr+san+bernardino+ca+92408. Accessed 11/25/19.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. National Flood hazard Layer. https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed 1/7/2020.

McLeod, Samuel A. 2018 Paleontological Resources for the Proposed 6th and Maple Septic Tank
Conversion Project, McKenna et al. Project #1905, in the City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California. On file, McKenna et al., Whittier, California

Riverside County General Plan Safety Element. https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf. Accessed 11/21/19.

Riverside County International Technology. Map My County. Accessed periodically.
Sustainable Beaumont: The City's Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reductions. https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27815/Beaumont-Climate-Action-Plan?bidId=. Accessed 12/11/2019

Riverside County Department of Waste Resources. Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. Accessed 2/10/2020.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2016 Air Quality Management Plan http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2016-aqmp. Accessed March 13, 2020.

United States Census Bureau. *2010 Census of Population.* Accessed on 12/22/2019. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/beaumontcitycalifornia/POP010210#POP0100
United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. Accessed 11/22/19.

United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2018. National Transportation Statistics 2018. Available at: https://www.bts.gov/sites/bts.dot.gov/files/docs/browse-statistical-products-and-data/national-transportation-statistics/223001/ntentire2018q4.pdf.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 8th and Highland Springs Preliminary Drainage Study. February 2020.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan. February 2020.

McKenna et al., A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigations for a Commercial Development at 8th Street and Highland Springs Avenue in Beaumont, Riverside County, California. November 29, 2019.

Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. General Biological Assessment Beaumont Commercial Center. February 14, 2020.

Salem Engineering Group, Inc. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation. January 31, 2020.

Salem Engineering Group, Inc. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. January 9, 2020.

Urban Crossroads, Inc. Traffic Impact Analysis. March 9, 2020.