

# **High Sands Car Wash Remodel and Retail Development**

***Prepared for:***

City of Beaumont  
Carole Kendrick, Senior Planner  
550 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street Beaumont, California 92223

***Prepared by:***

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

April 2021

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 EVALUATION FORMAT.....	5
1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	6
1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION .....	6
1.4 EVALUATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	7
<b>SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT.....	9
2.2 PROJECT LOCATION.....	9
2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	9
<b>SECTION 3 CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 AESTHETICS.....	14
3.1.1 Environmental Setting.....	14
3.1.2 Impact Analysis.....	14
3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES .....	17
3.2.1 Environmental Setting.....	17
3.2.2 Impact Analysis.....	18
3.3 AIR QUALITY .....	19
3.3.1 Environmental Setting.....	19
3.3.2 Impact Analysis.....	19
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	26
3.4.1 Environmental Setting.....	26
3.4.2 Impact Analysis.....	27
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	35
3.5.1 Environmental Setting.....	35
3.5.2 Impact Analysis.....	35
3.6 ENERGY .....	38
3.6.1 Environmental Setting.....	38
3.6.2 Impact Analysis.....	38
3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	41
3.7.1 Environmental Setting.....	41
3.7.2 Impact Analysis.....	42
3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	45
3.8.1 Environmental Setting.....	45
3.8.2 Impact Analysis.....	45
3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	47
3.9.1 Environmental Setting.....	48
3.9.2 Impact Analysis.....	48
3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	51
3.10.1 Environmental Setting.....	52
3.10.2 Impact Analysis.....	52
3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	56
3.11.1 Environmental Setting.....	56

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
3.11.2 Impact Analysis .....	56
3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES .....	57
3.12.1 Environmental Setting .....	58
3.12.2 Impact Analysis.....	58
3.13 NOISE .....	59
3.13.1 Environmental Setting .....	59
3.13.2 Impact Analysis.....	59
3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING .....	64
3.14.1 Environmental Setting .....	64
3.14.2 Impact Analysis.....	64
3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES .....	65
3.15.1 Environmental Setting .....	65
3.15.2 Impact Analysis.....	65
3.16 RECREATION .....	67
3.16.1 Environmental Setting .....	68
3.16.2 Impact Analysis.....	68
3.17 TRANSPORTATION.....	68
3.17.1 Environmental Setting .....	69
3.17.2 Impact Analysis.....	69
3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	76
3.18.1 Environmental Setting .....	76
3.18.2 Impact Analysis.....	76
3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	78
3.19.1 Environmental Setting .....	78
3.19.2 Impact Analysis.....	78
3.20 WILDFIRE .....	82
3.20.1 Environmental Setting .....	83
3.20.2 Impact Analysis.....	83
3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE .....	84
3.21.1 Impact Analysis.....	84
REFERENCES.....	88
PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES.....	89

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	CalEEMod Output Tables
Appendix B	Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis Prepared in September 2020
Appendix C	Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation, October 6, 2020
Appendix D	Fuel Calculations
Appendix E	Soil Investigation and Infiltration Tests Report
Appendix F	Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, May 12, 2020
Appendix G	Preliminary Hydrology Study, August 31, 2020, Revised January 14, 2021
Appendix H	Noise Impact Analysis, March 12, 2021
Appendix I	Traffic Impact Analysis, March 12, 2020

**Page**

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summer Construction Emissions Summary .....	21
Table 2	Winter Construction Emissions Summary .....	21
Table 3	Summer Operational Emissions Summary .....	23
Table 4	Winter Operational Emissions Summary.....	23
Table 5	Localized Significance Thresholds .....	25
Table 6	CNDDDB Potential to Occur.....	28
Table 7	MSHCP Conservation Goals for Project Area .....	33
Table 8	Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions .....	46
Table 9	Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions .....	47

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Regional Location Map .....	11
Figure 2	Vicinity Map .....	12
Figure 3	Site Plan .....	13

## SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Independently reviewed, analyzed and exercised judgment in making the determination, by the Development Review Committee on March 18, 2021, pursuant to Section 21082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

CEQA requires the preparation of an Initial Study when a Project 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 Project, 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:** High Sands Car Wash Remodel and Retail Development
2. **Lead Agency Name:** City of Beaumont  
Planning Division  
550 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Beaumont, CA 92223
3. **Contact Person:** Carole Kendrick, Senior Planner  
**Phone Number:** 951-769-8518
4. **Project Location:** West of Highland Springs Avenue, between 8<sup>th</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Street
5. **Geographic Coordinates of Project Site:** 33°55'50.49" N, 116°56'51.13" 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 and C3, San Bernardino & Riverside Counties (2013)
9. **Assessor Parcel Number:** 419-150-026, -027, -046
10. **General Plan Designation:** Downtown Mixed Use
11. **Zoning:** Local Commercial
12. **Description of Project:** High Sands, Inc. ("Project Applicant") is proposing the development of a drive-thru-restaurant and a 6,392 square-foot office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash on a 2.38-acre Project Site in the City of Beaumont, Riverside County.

Construction is anticipated to begin in late 2021 and be completed in late 2022. The Proposed Project is anticipated to be fully operational by year 2023.

The Project Site is located on parcels having addresses of 655, 675, and 695 Highland Springs Avenue (see Figure 1-Regional Location and Figure 2-Project Vicinity). The existing vacant parcels are described as Assessor's Parcel Nos. 419-150-026 and -027. APN 419-150-046 is the location of an existing auto service building and a car wash; the car wash would be remodeled as part of the Proposed Project. Operations in the auto service building include oil change, smog checks, and general auto repair and are not proposed to change. Highland Springs Avenue will be widened to 55 feet along the vacant parcels, thereby reducing the buildable area of the Project Site to 2.31 acres. The table below details the net and gross acreage of each parcel. A lot line adjustment will be required to incorporate vacuum parking spaces into the developed parcel. A parcel merger will be prepared to combine the two vacant parcels into one.

<b>APN</b>	<b>Gross</b>	<b>Net</b>
419-150-026	0.788	0.754
419-150-027	0.791	0.757
419-150-046	0.798	0.798
Project Site	2.378	2.309

The proposed drive-thru restaurant will be 3,320 square-feet (SF) (See Figure 3-Site Plan). The drive-through speakerphone would be located near the southwest corner of the restaurant. The hours of operation will be 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM.

The proposed office building will be one-story and 6,392 SF. The hours of operation will be 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The remodel of the car wash will include removal of an existing perimeter wall, relocation of existing curb, relocation of an existing trash enclosure, and addition of a new driveway. An additional 429 SF will be added to the existing car wash building area of 3,801 SF. The hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM during the summer and 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM during the winter.

No renovation of the existing auto service building is proposed; the building has a first floor of 1,284 SF and a basement of 1,540 SF. The current hours of operation are 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The Project Applicant is requesting a variance for reduced parking requirements. Total parking provided on the Project Site will be 75 standard spaces, one standard accessible space, and five van accessible spaces.

Three bio-retention trenches with a total storage volume of 3,690 cubic feet (CF) and an underground detention chamber system with a storage volume of 15,673 CF are proposed for peak attenuation of storm flows. Access to the Project Site would be provided by a proposed 28-foot wide driveway off of Highland Springs Avenue along the northernmost parcel. This driveway will be restricted to right turn in-out. The existing driveway on the developed parcel will be replaced with a 30-foot ADA compliant driveway. This driveway will be restricted to right turn in-out. The existing eastbound stop control currently utilized by the auto related businesses south of the Project Site will be maintained. There are 2 existing access points leading to the alley south of the Project Site: one from Highland Springs Ave and one from the southwest portion of the

Project Site by the lube facility. Landscaping will be provided on the northern and eastern boundaries as well as internal. Structure heights will be a maximum of 23 feet for the office building and restaurant. A six-foot block wall will be constructed along the entire length of the western property boundary.

The Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and current zoning of Local Commercial (LC). The Downtown Mixed-Use designation supports the downtown area by accommodating a mix of uses at a variety of densities and intensities. The LC Zone is intended to permit development that provides for a range of commercial service and retail land uses that are in proximity to residential neighborhoods consistent with the General Plan.

**13. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Project Site is surrounded by commercial development (Walgreens, medical and dental offices, and one unoccupied building), a utility plant, vacant land, and a single-family residence. Land uses at adjacent properties and their land use designations are shown below.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Existing Use</b>	<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Zoning</b>
Site	Parcels -026, -027: Vacant; Parcel -047: Car Wash and Auto Service Building	Downtown Mixed Use	Local Commercial
North	Medical and Dental offices	Downtown Mixed Use	Local Commercial
South	Commercial building	Downtown Mixed Use	Local Commercial
East (City of Banning)	Medical and Dental offices, Walgreens; San Gorgonio Memorial Hospital	Professional Office; Public Facilities; General Commercial	Professional Office; Public Facilities; General Commercial
West	Vacant Land; Single-Family Residence	Downtown Mixed Use	Local Commercial

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

None.

**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?**

On January 25, 2021 AB 52 notification letters were sent to 21 Native American tribal governments or designated tribal representatives via certified mail. Follow-up emails were subsequently sent on February 15 and February 24, 2021. Of the 21 tribes or tribal

representatives (in some cases multiple letters were sent to representatives of the same tribe), one response was received.

Responses and consultation requests were received from the following tribe:

- The San Fernando Band of Mission Indians (February 15, 2021): In an email, Donna Yocum stated that they do not wish to comment on the project and would defer to the San Manuel Tribe because Beaumont is not within their traditional or tribal boundaries.

Pursuant to PRC 21080.3.1(d), each tribal government or representative was given 30 days upon receipt of the AB 52 notification letter to provide a request for consultation on the Project. One of the 21 tribal representatives responded to the initial notification letter. No additional responses or requests were received. The City of Beaumont, as lead agency, has fulfilled its obligations under AB 52 to engage in tribal consultation with all other tribal governments.



## 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 twenty (20) 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.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology /Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning                | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing               | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities /Service Systems          | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

Carole Kendrick  
Signature

3.31.2021  
Date

Carole Kendrick  
Name

Senior Planner  
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 a Mitigated Negative Declaration (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 consists of one developed parcel with an existing car wash and auto service building, and two vacant parcels. It is within the boundaries of the City of Beaumont and located approximately 0.2 miles north of Interstate 10 (I-10) and approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the State Route 79 (SR-79) and I-10 intersection. The Project Site is located along Highland Springs Avenue, between 8th Street and 6th Street. The Project Site is relatively flat and consists of a mix of ruderal vegetation and bare ground. The Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and zoning of Local Commercial. The Project Site is surrounded by commercial development (Walgreens, medical and dental offices), vacant commercial building with a paved parking lot, utility plant, vacant land and single-family residence.

### **2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

High Sands, Inc. (“Project Applicant”) is proposing the development of a drive-thru-restaurant and a 6,392 square-foot office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash on a 2.38-acre Project Site in the City of Beaumont, Riverside County. Construction is anticipated to begin in late 2021 and be completed in late 2022. The Proposed Project is anticipated to be fully operational by year 2023.

The Project Site is located on parcels having addresses of 655, 675, and 695 Highland Springs Avenue. The existing vacant parcels are described as Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 419-150-026 and -027. APN 419-150-046 is the location of the existing car wash to be remodeled and an auto service building. Highland Springs Avenue will be widened to 55 feet along the vacant parcels,

thereby reducing the buildable area of the Project Site to 2.31 acres. The table below details the net and gross acreage of each parcel. A lot line adjustment will be required to incorporate vacuum parking spaces into the developed parcel. A parcel merger will be prepared to combine the two vacant parcels into one.

<b>APN</b>	<b>Gross</b>	<b>Net</b>
419-150-026	0.788	0.754
419-150-027	0.791	0.757
419-150-046	0.798	0.798
Project Site	2.378	2.309

The proposed drive-thru restaurant will be 3,320 square-feet (SF). The drive-through speakerphone would be located near the southwest corner of the restaurant. The hours of operation will be 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM.

The proposed office building will be one-story and 6,392 SF. The hours of operation will be 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The remodel of the car wash will include removal of an existing perimeter wall, relocation of existing curb, relocation of an existing trash enclosure, and addition of a new driveway. An additional 429 SF will be added to the existing car wash building which currently consists of 3,801 SF. The hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM during the summer and 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM during the winter.

No renovation of the existing auto service building is proposed; the building has a first floor of 1,284 SF and a basement of 1,540 SF. The current hours of operation are 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The Project Applicant is requesting a variance for reduced parking requirements. Total parking provided on the Project Site will be 75 standard spaces, one standard handicap accessible space, and five van handicap accessible spaces. A six-foot block wall will be constructed along the entire length of the western property boundary.

Operations in the auto service building include: oil change, smog checks, and general auto repair. Three bio-retention trenches with a total storage volume of 3,690 cubic feet (CF) and an underground detention chamber system with a storage volume of 15,813 CF are proposed for peak attenuation of storm flows.

Access to the Project Site would be provided by a proposed 28-foot wide driveway off of Highland Springs Avenue along the northernmost parcel. This driveway will be restricted to right turn in-out. The existing driveway on the developed parcel will be replaced with a 30-foot ADA-compliant driveway. This driveway will be restricted to right turn in-out. The existing eastbound stop control currently utilized by the auto related businesses south of the Project Site will be maintained. There are 2 existing access points leading to the alley south of the Project Site: one from Highland Springs Ave and one from the southwest portion of the Project Site by the lube facility. Landscaping will be provided on the northern and eastern boundaries as well as internal. Structure heights will be a maximum of 23 feet for the office building and restaurant.



**REGIONAL LOCATION**

Car Wash Remodel and Retail  
Beaumont, California

Source: Lilburn Corp., March, 2021.

**LILBURN**  
CORPORATION

**FIGURE 1**



**PROJECT SITE**

Highland Springs Ave

6th Street

Highland Springs Ave

**PROJECT VICINITY**  
Car Wash Remodel and Retail  
Beaumont, California

0 200  
Feet  
Source: Lilburn Corp., March, 2021.

**LILBURN**  
CORPORATION

**FIGURE 2**





## 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 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 medical and dental offices, public facilities, commercial development, residential development, undeveloped land and a vacant building.

#### 3.1.2 Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The southern portion of the City is designated as Open Space to help preserve the scenic views within this area.<sup>1</sup> The Project Site is located in the northern portion of the City. It is currently vacant. The San Bernardino Mountains are visible from the Project Site. The surrounding land use includes medical and dental offices to the north and east, vacant building on developed land to the south, and residential and vacant land to the west of the Project Site. Beaumont Municipal Code Section 17.02.070 requires a Plot Plan to establish a new land use, or to assume an existing use, consistent with the zoning of the proposed location of the use, prior to the use and occupancy for such land use. A lot line adjustment will be required to incorporate vacuum parking spaces into the developed parcel. Development of the Proposed Project would be consistent with Elevate Beaumont 2040 –

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

General Plan Update (2040 General Plan) with approval of the Plot Plan and lot line adjustment.

The Project Site has a land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and zoning of Local Commercial (LC). Fast food drive-thru restaurants and offices are permitted within the LC Zone.<sup>2</sup> The maximum height of any building shall not exceed 60 feet within the LC Zone. The maximum height of the proposed structures is 23 feet. The Proposed Project would be anticipated to change the general aesthetics of the area as two of the parcels are currently vacant; however, it would not obstruct natural scenic views or vistas. Except for the vacant land to the west, the Project Site is almost completely surrounded by developed land. The LC Zone is intended to permit development that provides for a range of commercial service and retail land uses that are in proximity to residential neighborhoods consistent with the General Plan. The Proposed Project would provide the general area with compatible commercial services. Therefore, less than 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.** The Project Site is not adjacent to or near any State-eligible or Officially designated State Scenic Highway.<sup>3</sup> The nearest designated State Scenic Highway is State Route 243 (*Banning-Idyllwild Panoramic Highway*), which is approximately 4 miles east of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with development standards applicable to the LC Zone, such as providing a minimum front yard setback of five (5) feet and maximum building height of 60 feet, to reduce aesthetic/visual resource impacts to a less-than-significant level. 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 degrade to the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site or its surroundings. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the 2040 General Plan designation with approval of Plot Plan and lot line adjustment. It would enhance the surrounding community with commercial uses. The surrounding properties are either vacant or developed for commercial and residential uses. The general area consists of public facilities, commercial centers and offices. The Proposed Project is within an urbanized area. It would maintain similar aesthetics and building design as the surrounding establishments. In addition, per Beaumont Municipal Code Section 17.06.040, the Project Applicant would be required to plant single trunk, low branching trees in windy areas and design, where possible, north/south oriented parking areas to provide

---

<sup>2</sup> City of Beaumont. Zoning Code Amendment Final.

<http://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36838/Zoning-Code-Amendment-Final>

<sup>3</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.1-4-Scenic Highways and Roadways.

<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

maximum shade.<sup>4</sup> Compliance to this code will improve and maximize the landscaping within the off-street open parking areas to provide 30% or more shade coverage in ten years, adding aesthetics to the area. Therefore, the Proposed Project may change the current aesthetics of the vacant parcel, but this change would not be degrading. Less than 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 restaurant and office building would take place on parcels that are currently vacant. The existing car wash on APN 419-150-047 would be remodeled. City's Municipal Code prohibits construction activities within one-quarter mile of an occupied residence or residences other than between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May. The use of any lighting required during construction would be limited to these hours. Permanent lighting installed for the Proposed Project will be directed away from sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptor is the single-family residence west of the Project Site. The area is already lit from existing surrounding land uses, including the existing car wash and auto service building on the Project Site, the medical and dental offices to the north and east, residential development to the west, and the commercial uses to the south. There are existing street lights present along Highland Springs Avenue near the Project Site (the closest being on the southeast corner of the Project Site). The Proposed Project would be required to conform to Chapter 8.5 of the City Municipal Code, which establishes height limit, lamp power limit, lighting curfew and maximum lumen and shielding for commercial/industrial zones. A six-foot high block wall is proposed along the western boundary of the Project Site, thereby minimizing light exposure to the adjacent residence. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not generate a significant amount of light and glare when compared to the surrounding area. Less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>4</sup> City of Beaumont. Zoning Code Amendment Final.  
<http://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36838/Zoning-Code-Amendment-Final>

### 3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

2.	<b>AGRICULTURE &amp; FOREST RESOURCES.</b> (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.) <b>Would the project:</b>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.2.1 Environmental Setting

The Project Site is in the northeastern portion of the City of Beaumont. The Project Site has a 2040 General Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and Zoning of Local Commercial. It is neither considered useful for agriculture nor is it within an existing zone for forest land or farmland. The Project Site consists of a mix of ruderal vegetation and bare ground.

### 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.** The Project Site is identified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 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.<sup>5</sup> There are no lands with active Williamson Act contracts within the City. Additionally, the Project Site is currently zoned Local Commercial. The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. 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))?*

**No Impact.** The City does not have a zoning designation for, nor does it contain forestry-related timberland or timberland production sites within city limits.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the Project Site has a current zoning of Local Commercial. 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 northern parcels of the Project Site are currently vacant with a few non-native trees on-site. The Project Site consists of a mix of ruderal vegetation and bare ground and is surrounded on nearly all sides by developed land. It would not be considered 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 2040 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

---

<sup>5</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.2-3-Williamson Act Contracts. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>6</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.2-19. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

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 and off-site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

3.	<b>AIR QUALITY.</b> (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.) <b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 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 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 SCAB. The 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 in 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 City of Beaumont adopted the 2040 General Plan and certified the Final Programmatic EIR. Implementation of the updated 2040 General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Noise, and Transportation and therefore, the City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations concurrent with certification of the Final EIR. In addition, even though the anticipated growth from the 2040 General Plan may exceed the growth projections in the AQMP, the control measures contained within the 2016 AQMP will apply to new development. Therefore, development associated with buildout of the 2040 General Plan will not obstruct implementation of the 2016 AQMP.<sup>7</sup> The Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and current zoning of Local Commercial (LC). The Proposed Project is an allowable use under the 2040 General Plan designation and Zoning Code. Therefore, approval of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP and the Proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan. Less than 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.** In November 2020, Lilburn Corporation screened the Proposed Project's construction and operational emissions using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 prepared by the SCAQMD (see Appendix A 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<sub>2</sub>), and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Two of the analyzed pollutants, ROG and NOx, 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 late 2021 and be completed in late 2022. 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.3-18.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>



**Table 1**  
**Summer Construction Emissions Summary**  
**(Pounds per Day)**

<b>Source/Phase</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
Site Preparation	1.5	13.3	11.1	0.0	2.4	0.8
Grading	1.8	20.2	10.2	0.0	7.6	4.2
Building Construction	2.3	17.6	16.7	0.0	1.5	0.9
Paving	1.4	9.3	12.3	0.0	0.7	0.5
Architectural Coating	10.8	1.4	2.1	0.0	0.2	0.1
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
<b>Significant</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

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)**

<b>Source/Phase</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
Site Preparation	1.5	18.3	11.0	0.0	2.4	0.8
Grading	1.8	20.2	10.1	0.0	7.6	4.2
Building Construction	2.3	17.6	16.3	0.0	1.5	0.9
Paving	1.4	9.3	12.2	0.0	0.7	0.5
Architectural Coating	10.8	1.4	2.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
<b>Significant</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

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<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>).

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<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> 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](http://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 in accordance with the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the Proposed Project by Ganddini Group, Inc., November 25, 2020. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,140 daily trips. The Trip Generation rates from the TIA were input into the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 model.

The resulting emissions generated by operations of the Proposed Project are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, which represent summer and winter construction emissions, respectively.

**Table 3  
Summer Operational Emissions Summary  
(Pounds per Day)**

<b>Source</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1.9	11.8	25.0	0.1	8.9	2.4
<b>Total Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
<b>Significance</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Source: CalEEMod 2016.3.2, Summer Emissions

**Table 4  
Winter Operational Emissions Summary  
(Pounds per Day)**

<b>Source</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1.6	11.8	21.4	0.1	8.9	2.4
<b>Total Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
<b>Significance</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Source: CalEEMod 2016.3.2, Winter Emissions

As shown in Table 3 and Table 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 not 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 1138- Control of Emissions from Restaurants: 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.

Therefore, less 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 2.38 acres, however, only 2-acres is anticipated to be disturbed. Therefore, 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 the residential development adjacent to 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)**

	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>		<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	
Construction Emissions (Max. from Table 1 and Table 2)	20.2	16.7	7.6		4.2	
Operational Emissions (Max. Total from Table 3 and Table 4)	12.0	25.1	0.2 <sup>1</sup>		0.6 <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>
LST Thresholds	149	1541	10*	3 <sup>†</sup>	6*	2 <sup>†</sup>
<b>Greater Than Threshold</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Sources: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Summer and Winter Emissions; SCAQMD Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology; SCAQMD Mass Rate Look-up Tables for 2-acre site in SRA No. 29, distance of 25 meters.

Note: PM10 and PM2.5 emissions are separated into construction and operational thresholds in accordance with the SCAQMD Mass Rate LST Look-up Tables.

\* Construction emissions LST

† Operational emissions LST

1 It is estimated that approximately 2.5 percent of mobile emissions will occur on the Project Site

Source: <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/appendix-c-mass-rate-lst-look-up-tables.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

As shown in Table 5, the Proposed Project’s emissions are not anticipated to exceed the LSTs. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Less than 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, such as keeping lids closed on all paint containers, per SCAQMD Rule 1113. 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. There will also be odors due to cooking food

at the fast-food restaurant. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1138 would ensure that these odors are minimized to the extent feasible. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.	<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.4.1 Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project is the development of drive-thru restaurant and an office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash. A Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis (BRA) was prepared for the Proposed Project by Jennings Environmental, LLC in September 2020 (see Appendix B for report). The BRA was designed to address potential effects of the Proposed Project to designated critical habitats and/or any species currently listed or formally proposed for listing as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or species designated as sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the California Native Plant Society (CNPS).

### 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.** Existing documentation relevant to the Project Site was reviewed. The most recent records of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) managed by CDFW, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat Mapper, and the California Native Plant Society's Electronic Inventory (CNPSEI) of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California were reviewed for the following quadrangle containing and surrounding the Project site: *Beaumont*, USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle. These databases contain records of reported occurrences of federal- or state-listed endangered or threatened species, California Species of Concern (SSC), or otherwise special status species or habitats that may occur within or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, a general reconnaissance survey was conducted within the Project site to identify the potential for the occurrence of special status species, vegetation communities, or habitats that could support special status wildlife species. All plant species observed within the Project Site were recorded. Vegetation communities within the Project Site were identified, qualitatively described, and mapped onto a high-resolution imagery aerial photograph. Plant communities were determined in accordance with the *Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition*. All wildlife and wildlife signs observed and detected, including tracks, scat, carcasses, burrows, excavations, and vocalizations, were recorded. Additional survey time was spent in those habitats most likely to be utilized by wildlife (native vegetation, wildlife trails, etc.) or in habitats with the potential to support state- and/or federally listed or otherwise special status species.

#### Federal and State Listed Species

According to the CNDDDB, CNPSEI, and other relevant literature and databases, 33 sensitive species including 5 listed species and 1 sensitive habitat, have been documented in the *Beaumont* quad. This list of sensitive species and habitats includes any State and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species, CDFW designated Species of Special Concern (SSC), and otherwise Special Animals. "Special Animals" is a general term that refers to all of the taxa the CNDDDB is interested in tracking, regardless of their legal or protection status. The CDFW considers the taxa on this list to be those of greatest conservation need.

An analysis of the likelihood for the occurrence of all CNDDDB sensitive species documented in the *Beaumont* quad is provided in Table 6. This analysis takes into the potential for each species to occur on the site, based on required habitat elements and range relative to the current site conditions.

**Table 6**  
**CNDDDB Potential to Occur**

Scientific Name	Common Name	Occurrence Potential
<i>Abronia villosa</i> var. <i>aurita</i>	chaparral sand-verbena	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Aimophila ruficeps canescens</i>	southern California rufous-crowned sparrow	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Allium marvinii</i>	Yucaipa onion	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Anniella stebbinsi</i>	Southern California legless lizard	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	pallid bat	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Aspidoscelis hyperythra</i>	orange-throated whiptail	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri</i>	coastal whiptail	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Astragalus hornii</i> var. <i>hornii</i>	Horn's milk-vetch	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Astragalus lentiginosus</i> var. <i>cochellae</i>	Coachella Valley milk-vetch	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Astragalus pachypus</i> var. <i>jaegeri</i>	Jaeger's milk-vetch	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Bombus crotchii</i>	Crotch bumble bee	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Calochortus palmeri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i>	Palmer's mariposa-lily	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Calochortus plummerae</i>	Plummer's mariposa-lily	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Caulanthus simulans</i>	Payson's jewelflower	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Centromadia pungens</i> ssp. <i>laevis</i>	smooth tarplant	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Chaetodipus californicus femoralis</i>	Dulzura pocket mouse	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.



Scientific Name	Common Name	Occurrence Potential
<i>Chaetodipus fallax</i>	northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Chorizanthe parryi</i> var. <i>parryi</i>	Parry's spineflower	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Deinandra mohavensis</i>	Mojave tarplant	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>	Stephens' kangaroo rat	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Horkelia cuneata</i> var. <i>puberula</i>	mesa horkelia	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	loggerhead shrike	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Lasiurus xanthinus</i>	western yellow bat	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Mentzelia tricuspis</i>	spiny-hair blazing star	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Neotoma lepida intermedia</i>	San Diego desert woodrat	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Perognathus longimembris brevinasus</i>	Los Angeles pocket mouse	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Petalonyx linearis</i>	narrow-leaf sandpaper-plant	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>	coast horned lizard	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Progne subis</i>	purple martin	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest</i>	Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Spea hammondi</i>	western spadefoot	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	American badger	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.
<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	least Bell's vireo	Suitable habitat for this species does not occur on site. As such, this species is considered absent from the Project Site.

### Field Survey Results

Species observed or otherwise detected on or in the vicinity of the Project Site during the surveys included; common raven (*Corvus corax*) and house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*). The Project Site is located within a developed area of Beaumont. Although part of the Project Site is undeveloped, very little evidence of any wildlife existed on-site and only two bird species were observed during the site survey. No State and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species are documented/or expected to occur within the Project Site. No plant species with the California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) of 1 or 2 were observed on-site or documented/expected to occur on-site. No other sensitive species were observed within the site or buffer area. There is some habitat within the Project Site and adjacent area suitable for nesting birds in general. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 should be implemented to avoid any potential project-related impacts to nesting birds.

#### **Mitigation Measure BIO-1:**

Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist prior to any construction activities taking place during the nesting season to avoid potentially taking any birds or active nests. In general, impacts to all bird species (common and special status) will be avoided by conducting work outside of the nesting season (generally March 15<sup>th</sup> to September 15<sup>th</sup>), and conducting a worker awareness training. However, if all work cannot be conducted outside of the nesting season, a project-specific Nesting Bird Management Plan will be prepared to determine suitable buffers.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level.

- 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.** According to the databases, no USFWS designated critical habitat occurs within or adjacent to the Project Site. The habitat on-site consists of a mix of ruderal vegetation/bare ground with Mediterranean mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*) being the dominant ruderal vegetation. The site shows signs of recent vegetation management in the form of mowing and historical disturbance in the form of vehicle use and pedestrian traffic. The southern portion of the Project Site is a developed parcel with existing commercial businesses (e.g. car wash and auto service building) with paved parking lots.

The Project Site is located within the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The MSHCP is intended to balance the demands of the growth of western Riverside County with the need to preserve open space and protect species of plants and animals that are threatened with extinction. The MSHCP describes the protection of Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools within the MSHCP Plan Area as important to the conservation of certain amphibian, avian, fish, invertebrate and plant species. The MSHCP describes guidelines to ensure that the biological functions and values for species inside the MSHCP Conservation Area are maintained.

Riparian/Riverine areas are lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent vegetation, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or

which depend upon soil moisture from nearby freshwater sources, or areas with freshwater flow during all or a portion of the year. Riverine habitat includes all wetlands and deepwater habitats contained in natural or artificial channels periodically or continuously containing flowing water or which forms a connecting link between the two bodies of standing water. The term riparian is used to define the type of wildlife habitat found along the banks of a river, stream, lake, or other body of water. Riparian habitats are ecologically diverse and can be found in many types of environments including grasslands, wetlands, and forests. The Project site does not contain any areas that meet the definition of Riparian/Riverine. Therefore, 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.** A general assessment of jurisdictional waters regulated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and CDFW was conducted for the Project Site. Pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, USACE regulates the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the United States. The State of California (State) regulates the discharge of material into waters of the State pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and the California Porter- Cologne Water Quality Control Act. CDFW regulates all substantial diversions, obstructions, or changes to the natural flow or bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake, which supports fish or wildlife. The initial assessment was conducted by a desktop survey through the USGS National Hydrography Dataset for hydrological connectivity. Aerial imagery of the site was examined and compared with the surrounding USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps to identify drainage features within the survey area as indicated from topographic changes, blue-line features, or visible drainage patterns. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Water Program “My Waters” data layers were reviewed to determine whether any hydrologic features and wetland areas had been documented within the vicinity of the site. Similarly, the Soil maps from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) - Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (USDA 2020) were reviewed to identify the soil series on-site and to check if they have been identified regionally as hydric soils. Upstream and downstream connectivity of waterways (if present) was reviewed in the field, on aerial imagery, and topographic maps to determine jurisdictional status. No obvious signs of jurisdictional features were observed during the literature review.

The Project Site was surveyed with 100 percent visual coverage and no drainage features were present on site. As such, the Project Site does not contain any wetlands, waters of the U.S., or Waters of the State. No definable bed or bank features exist on the Project Site. As such, the Project Site does not contain any areas under CDFW jurisdiction. Additionally, none of the requirements for wetland designation (hydric vegetation, hydric soils, and/or wetland hydrology) were present on site. As such, there are no wetlands currently present on site.

Vernal Pools are seasonal wetlands that occur in depression areas that have wetlands indicators of all three parameters (soils, vegetation, and hydrology) during the wetter portion of the growing season but normally lack wetlands indicators of hydrology and/or vegetation during the drier portion of the growing season. Obligate hydrophytes and facultative wetlands plant species are normally dominant during the wetter portion of the growing season, while upland species (annuals) may be dominant during the drier portion of the growing season.

The determination that an area exhibits vernal pool characteristics should consider (1) the length of time the area exhibits upland and wetland characteristics, and (2) the manner in which the area fits into the overall ecological system as a wetland. Evidence concerning the persistence of an area's wetness can be obtained from its history, vegetation, soils, and drainage characteristics, uses to which it has been subjected, and weather and hydrologic records. The Project Site does not contain the appropriate soils, vegetation, or hydrology to allow for vernal pools. 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 not within or adjacent to any area the meets the definition of an urban/wildland interface. The site is fenced off and mostly surrounded by other fenced off developed parcels. The Project Site is currently surrounded by commercial and residential development, roads and vacant land. Regionally, it is surrounded by public facilities, commercial and residential development, and highways. It would not be suitable for facilitating the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to Section 12.12.130 of the City Municipal Code, "No person, firm, corporation, public district, public agency or political subdivision shall remove or severely trim any tree planted in the right of- way (ROW) of any City street without first obtaining a permit from the City Engineer to do so." The trees on the Project Site are not within a public ROW. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f) *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 with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Project Site is located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Consistency Analysis was performed by Jennings Environmental, LLC to demonstrate consistency with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The MSHCP addresses incidental take of "covered" species. Of the 146 species addressed in the Western Riverside County MSHCP, 118 are adequately conserved simply by implementing the conservation program. Incidental take of these 118 species is permitted by the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The remaining 28 species are partially conserved. They would be adequately conserved when certain additional conservation requirements are implemented. The additional requirements are identified in the species-specific conservation objectives for those 28 species. The Riverside Conservation Authority (RCA) is the governing body that administers the MSHCP. Their database was researched prior to conducting the filed survey.

The RCA’s website and databases were searched. This includes the MSHCP plan itself and any relevant protocol survey requirements. The database also includes a mapping program that contains site-specific information related to criteria cell location, special survey areas for plants and animals, and vegetation mapping. A summary of the MSHCP Conservation Goals and Policies as they relate to this Project is provided below in Table 7.

**Table 7  
MSHCP Conservation Goals for Project Area**

Conservation Goals	Within /Adjacent	Not Within /Adjacent
Proposed Constrained Linkages: <b>None</b>		X
Core Areas: <b>None</b>		X
Linkages: <b>None</b>		X
Constrained Linkage:		X
Habitat Block:		X
Core: <b>None</b>		X
Criteria Cell:		X
Pre-existing conservation Area		X
Riparian/Riverine or Vernal Pool Habitat		X
Narrow Endemic Plant Survey Area		X
Urban/Wildlife Interface		X
Mammal Survey Area		X
Amphibian Survey Area		X
Burrowing Owl Survey Area		X

The Proposed Project is located within The Pass Area Plan of the MSHCP. The target conservation acreage range for The Pass Area Plan is 22,510 – 27,895 acres; it is composed of approximately 13,970 acres of existing Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands and 8,540 – 13,925 acres of Additional Reserve Lands.

Fairy Shrimp

The MSHCP contains coverage for three species of fairy shrimp (Riverside, vernal pool, and Santa Rosa fairy shrimps). As mentioned in the Vernal Pool discussion, the site does not contain vernal pools. Vernal pools are a required constituent element for all three fairy shrimp species in the MSHCP. As such, they are considered absent from the Project Site.

Riparian Birds

The MSCHP includes coverage for many riparian birds, including least Bell’s vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and yellow-billed cuckoo. As mentioned above in the Riparian/Riverine section, the site does not contain any riparian or riverine habitats which are a required constituent element for the riparian bird species. As such, these species are considered absent from the Project Site.

Delhi sands flower-loving fly

The Delhi Sands flower-loving fly is found at low numbers and is narrowly distributed within the Plan Area. USFWS has identified three main population areas are known to currently or to have at one time existed in the Plan Area. One is located in the northwestern corner of the

Plan Area, a second is located in the Jurupa Hills, and the third is located in the Agua Mansa Industrial Center area. Because the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly requires a specific Habitat type, this species will require site-specific considerations, protection and enhancement of this limited Habitat type, and species-specific management to maintain the Habitat and populations. The Project Site does not contain the appropriate soils for this species and is not within or near known areas for this species.

#### Species Not Adequately Conserved

Of the 146 Covered Species addressed in the MSHCP, 118 species are considered to be adequately conserved. The remaining 28 Covered Species will be considered to be adequately conserved when certain conservation requirements are met, as identified in the species specific conservation objectives for those species. For 16 of the 28 species, particular species-specific conservation objectives must be satisfied to shift those particular species to the list of Covered Species Adequately Conserved. The Project Site does not contain the appropriate habitats for any of these species. There is no occurrence potential for any of these species to occur within the Project Site.

The MSHCP Conservation Area comprises a variety of existing and proposed Cores, Linkages, Constrained Linkages, and Noncontiguous Habitat Blocks (referred to herein generally as "Cores and Linkages"). The Cores and Linkages within the Pass Area Plan include:

- Contains the Proposed Constrained Linkage 22
- Contains the Proposed Constrained Linkage 23
- Contains a portion of Proposed Core 3
- Contains a portion of Proposed Linkage 6
- Contains Proposed Linkage 12
- Contains a portion of Existing Core I
- Contains a portion of Existing Core K
- Contains a portion of Existing Noncontiguous Habitat Block B

PQP Lands are a Subset of MSHCP Conservation Area lands totaling approximately 347,000 acres of lands known to be in public/private ownership and expected to be managed for open space value and/or in a manner that contributes to the Conservation of Covered Species. Existing Roads within Existing PQP Lands are existing roadways within existing PQP Lands, including interstates, freeways, State highways, city and county maintained roadways, as well as local roads, which are not city, or county maintained that provide property access. The Project Site is not located within or adjacent to any PQP Lands and will not impact a covered road.

Subunits are areas within an area plan that contain target conservation acreages along with a description of the planning species, biological issues, and considerations. The Project Site is not located within a subunit area or cell criteria. In addition, it is not located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area. The Project Site is not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these species.

The Proposed Project would not impact any of the covered species or habitats described in the MSHCP or any federally or state-listed species. However, there are two BMPs that could

qualify as required for this project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 will ensure that the Proposed Project remains in compliance with the MSHCP.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2:**

- To avoid attracting predators of the species of concern, the Project Site shall be kept as clean of debris as possible during construction and operations. All food-related trash items shall be enclosed in sealed containers and regularly removed from the site(s). The contractor and Project Applicant shall ensure that employees abide by this BMP.
- Construction employees shall strictly limit their activities, vehicles, equipment, and construction materials to the Proposed Project footprint and designated staging areas and routes of travel. The construction area(s) shall be the minimal area necessary to complete the project and shall be specified in the construction plans. Construction limits will be fenced with an orange snow screen. Exclusion fencing should be maintained until the completion of all construction activities. Employees shall be instructed that their activities are restricted to the construction areas.

**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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3.5.1 Environmental Setting**

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. A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation, dated October 6, 2020, was conducted for the Proposed Project by McKenna et al. (see Appendix C). 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. This study was completed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

**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. relied on preliminary research completed for an adjacent property research in November, 2019, and supplemented that research for the Project Site. The field survey for the Project Site was completed on September 10, 2020.

The standard archaeological records search confirmed the Project Site was not previously surveyed for cultural resources but identified a minimum of 29 studies within one mile of the Project Site. Only six cultural resources, both prehistoric and historic, have been recorded from those 29 studies. None of these resources is within the Project Site but three resources are located north of the Project Site, north of 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

The archaeological records search identified resources documented in the Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Data File, including 13 properties determined “potentially eligible for National Register listing. A total of 109 of the 130 were specifically identified as not eligible for National register listing but may be of local interest. The remaining resources have not been evaluated. None of the resources are within one mile of the Project Site.

The Project Site yielded no evidence of any recorded prehistoric archaeological resources, historic archaeological resources, or built environments<sup>8</sup> (historic structures). Numerous historic structures have been recorded west of Pennsylvania Avenue, and research identified earlier improvements within the Project Site, but these improvements have since been removed (no physical evidence). Nonetheless, since the San Gorgonio Pass is known to have been a major trade route during both prehistoric and historic times, there is a low to moderate potential for the presence of buried prehistoric and/or historic archaeological resources.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) responded to the McKenna et al. request for data pertaining to a development project at 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Highland Springs Avenue; this response was designed to cover an area larger than the project-specific site. As such, the findings also included the Project Site and McKenna et al. was informed the Commission’s files have no records of any sacred or religious sites in the general area. No burials were reported. McKenna et al. relied on the letters sent for the development project at 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Highland Springs Avenue to those Native American representatives identified by the Commission, requesting information on any issues, concerns, or resources they may be aware of and requested written responses. To date, McKenna et al. has received no responses to the letters sent to local Native American representatives.

The Project Site is relatively close to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians reservation and the Morongo. As a rule, the Morongo request copies of technical reports for review and to ensure no Native American resources will be adversely impacted by any proposed projects.

#### Archaeological Resources

No evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources were identified within the Project Site. Much of the site was dominated by intrusive grasses and trees, while approximately 1/3 of the Project Site was paved. Visual inspection yielded no evidence of the previous improvements, save the presence of mature trees. The native soils have been disturbed by disking, weed abatement, peripheral road development, and impacts from

---

<sup>8</sup> Standing structures or other features considered to be structural, but not archaeological (e.g. buildings, bridges, above ground utilities).



demolition activities (occurring in the 1980s). No evidence of foundations was found, but gravel within the properties were indicative of driveway or parking areas.

### Built Environment

There are no standing structures on the two northern parcels and the structures on the southern parcel (-046; 655 Highland Springs Avenue) are all modern (post-1990). There are no historic structures within the Project Site and, therefore, there will be no impacts to historic structures.

### Ethnic Resources or Historic Landscapes

No physical or documentary evidence was found to suggest the Project Site (all three parcels) is associated with a specific ethnic group or indicative of a cultural landscape, as each is defined in the guidelines and policies. Therefore, these are not issues requiring addressing in this overall investigation.

Based on the relative sensitivity for the Project Site to be associated with prehistoric archaeological resources and historic archaeological resources, McKenna et al. is recommending the following:

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1:**

A qualified archaeologist shall oversee excavations in the younger alluvial deposits (Holocene) during the first two days of ground disturbance. If the archaeologist determines it necessary, an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented. The monitoring program shall be conducted in accordance with current professional guidelines and protocols. The program should be designed to be flexible and account for changes in findings through the management of the resources in a professional manner and via evaluation in accordance with the current CEQA criteria. If Native American resources are identified, a Native American (Morongo) representative should be included in any monitoring program.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, the Proposed Project would not substantially change the significance of historical and archaeological resources.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The NAHC files have no records of any burials in the general area. The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. To ensure potential impacts are reduced to less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-2:**

If, at any time, human remains or suspected human remains are identified within the Project Site, the Contractor will halt work in the immediate vicinity of the find and establish a buffer zone around the find. If the archaeological consultant is on-site, the archaeological consultant will oversee the level of protection. The City will be immediately notified and the City will contact the County Coroner (within 24 hours). The Coroner has the authority to examine the find in situ and make a determination as to the nature of the find:

- a) If the remains are determined to be human, the Coroner will determine whether or not they are likely of Native American origin. If so, the Coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission and the Commission will name the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). In consultation between the City, Property Owner, MLD, and consulting archaeologist, the disposition of the remains will be defined. If there is a conflict, the Native American Heritage Commission will act as a mediator.
- b) If the remains are determined to be archaeological, but not of Native American origin, the City, Property Owner and archaeological consultant will determine the management of the find and the removal from the site. The Property Owner would be responsible for any costs related to the removal, analysis, and reburial.
- c) If the remains are determined to be of forensic value, the Coroner will arrange for the removal of the remains and oversee the analysis and disposition.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2, the Proposed Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

### 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 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, including Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and Uniform Building Code, will be enforced by the City of Beaumont. The analysis presented is based on energy consumption calculations provided from the Proposed Project's land uses input to CalEEMod.

#### 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 the development of a drive-thru-restaurant and an office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash. Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electricity to the City of Beaumont. According to the California Energy Commission, the commercial building sector of the Southern California Edison planning area consumed 36202.653241GWh of electricity in 2019.<sup>9</sup> The two northern parcels of the Project Site are currently vacant and do not use electricity. Consequently, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in electricity demand. The increased electricity demand from the Proposed Project estimated for an additional 9,309 square-feet of commercial use is approximately 0.203833 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 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 two northern parcels of the Project Site are currently vacant and have no demand for natural gas. Consequently, development of the Proposed Project would create a permanent increase in demand for natural gas. According to the California Energy Commission, the natural gas consumption of the SoCalGas planning area commercial building sector was 974,982,675 therms in 2019.<sup>10</sup> 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. The estimated natural gas demand for the proposed structures is 700.339 therms per year;<sup>11</sup> it would represent an insignificant percentage to the overall demand in SoCalGas's service area. 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.

## 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

---

<sup>9</sup> California Energy Commission. Electricity Consumption by Planning Area.  
<https://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/electbyplan.aspx>

<sup>10</sup> California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

<sup>11</sup> Per CalEEMod outputs. Estimated electric generation is for proposed additional commercial uses on-site.

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 D for fuel calculations), the Proposed Project construction activities would consume an estimated 27,136.67 gallons of diesel fuel for operation of heavy-duty equipment. Assuming all construction worker trips are from light duty autos, it is estimated 7,337.55 gallons of fuel will be consumed and fuel consumption from construction vendor (material deliver) trips is 3,522.97 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.

During operations of the Proposed Project, fuel consumption would be from customer visits, trips by maintenance staffs, employee vehicle trips and delivery trucks.<sup>12</sup> The Proposed Project would result in an estimated 363,111.0 gallons of fuel consumption per year based on 4,154,440 miles driven.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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. Less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 adopted a Climate Action Plan known as the Sustainable Beaumont Plan 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. The Sustainable Beaumont Plan 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.

---

<sup>12</sup> Vehicle trips are for the proposed restaurant and office building.

<sup>13</sup> Per CalEEMod Annual outputs.

<sup>14</sup> 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>.

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.<sup>15</sup> 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, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

7.	<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.7.1 Environmental Setting

The City is within the San Geronio Pass region of Southern California, south of the San Bernardino Mountains, within the San Jacinto Mountains of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province of California. The region surrounding the City is a geologically complex area, in part due

<sup>15</sup> City General Plan. Page 76.

to movement along faults such as the San Andreas Fault, Banning Fault, and San Gorgonio Fault. The Peninsular Ranges extend from the Los Angeles Basin to the tip of Baja California and are bounded by the Elsinore Fault Zone and the Colorado Desert on the east and the Pacific Coast on the west. The geology in the northern reaches of the range, including the San Jacinto Mountains, consists of Paleozoic gneiss, schist, and other older metamorphic rocks; Mesozoic granitic rocks of the Southern California batholith; and Cenozoic marine and terrestrial deposits. The highest point in the range is San Jacinto Peak at approximately 10,805 feet above mean sea level. A preliminary Soil Investigation and Infiltration Rests Report, dated March 16, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Soil Exploration Company, Inc. (see Appendix E for report).

### 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 is a northwesterly to southeasterly trending fault zone located south of the City and sphere of influence. There is a 9 percent average probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake along the San Jacinto Fault within 30 years, with a maximum probability of 35 percent occurring in the City and its Sphere of Influence.<sup>16</sup> The San Andreas Fault is approximately six miles northeast of the City. The Banning Fault extends east from the Beaumont area for at least 25 miles and passes near the communities of Calimesa, Cherry Valley, Banning, Cabazon and Whitewater. The Project Site is not within a state designated Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.<sup>17</sup> The Project Site is located approximately 5.90 miles from the San Jacinto fault. It is located in a region of generally high seismicity, as is the case for all of Southern California. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the building design standards of the CBC Chapter 33 for construction of new buildings and/or structures related to seismicity and specific engineering design and construction measures would be implemented to anticipate and avoid potential impacts from seismic activity. Therefore, less than 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.** The Project Site is located in a region of generally high seismicity, as is the case for all of Southern California. 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 can reduce potential ground-shaking impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>16</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.6-17. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>17</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.6-4 Faults and Fault Zones. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

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?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** Strong ground shaking can result in liquefaction. Areas overlying groundwater within 30 to 50 feet of the surface are considered susceptible to liquefaction hazards. The Project Site is not within 30 to 50 feet of groundwater. The Project Site and surrounding area have very low susceptibility to liquefaction. Therefore, less than significant 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?*

**Less than Significant 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 12 miles northwest of the Project Site. The Project Site and its vicinity are relatively flat (0 to 5 degrees of slope).<sup>18</sup> Therefore, less than significant 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 Impact.** Development of the approximately 1.58-acre vacant parcels would disturb more than one acre of soil and therefore, the Proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ). The Construction General Permits requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A SWPPP is required for construction of the Proposed Project and will include a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize soil erosion. Standard construction BMPs such as those identified in Caltrans' Construction Best Management Practices Field Manual and Troubleshooting Guide that prevent loss of topsoil and erosion during site preparation and construction. Examples include: watering of the site or other soil stabilization method, sand-bagging or straw bales along site perimeters, disturbed areas to be treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed upon and installation of landscaping as soon as possible.

Additionally, runoff from the Project Site during operations will be directed to the bio-retention trenches, and overflow from the bio-retention trenches will be directed to the underground detention chamber systems. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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 elevations on-site ranging from approximately 2595 to 2600 feet in elevation. According to the BRA, Ramona

---

<sup>18</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.6-5 Steep Slopes. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

sandy loam (RaB2) is the only soil type found within the Project Site.<sup>19</sup> RaB2 is well-drained, has low permeability and occurs on alluvial fans and terraces. As stated above, the potential for liquefaction at the Project Site is very low. Because of the site's relatively flat topography and low liquefaction potential, it would not be susceptible to lateral spreading. Although the Project Site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence, it is not located in an area with active subsidence.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the Project Site is in a relatively flat area, so it is not susceptible to on or off-site landslides. 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. Compliance with building codes would ensure that effects of these hazards are reduced to the extent feasible. Therefore, less than 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 Impact.** 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. According to the Geotechnical report, the expansion potential of the sandy foundation soils at the site is expected to be very low. The Proposed Project will comply with the CBC Code in Title 24, as related to the construction of structures and facilities on expansive soils to ensure building stress is reduced. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 connect to an existing sewer line in Highland Springs Avenue that provides sewer service to the area. Therefore, less than 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.<sup>21</sup> The majority of level areas throughout the City contain very few significant paleontological sites.<sup>22</sup> A paleontological overview was prepared by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County for the general area as part of the Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation. McKenna et al. used the data compiled by the Museum and supplemental data from the Riverside County GIS system to

---

<sup>19</sup> Jennings Environmental, LLC. Biological Resources Assessment. September 2020.

<sup>20</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.6-7 Subsidence Potential. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>21</sup> Riverside County Information Technology. Geographic Information System (GIS) "Map my County."

<sup>22</sup> City General Plan. Page 119.



assess the potential for the Project Site to yield evidence of fossil specimens. The paleontological overview identified the Project Site as consisting entirely of "... Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Jacinto Mountains." Despite these deposits of Quaternary Alluvium (Upper Pleistocene and Holocene deposits), the shallow deposits are not considered sensitive for paleontological specimens. However, deeper deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium (Late Pleistocene), likely present in pockets, have been associated with paleontological specimens. Shallow excavations are not likely to impact fossil bearing deposits, but deeper excavations may impact Older Quaternary Alluvium (fossil bearing deposits) and, therefore, Mitigation Measures GEO-1 should be implemented.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:**

Should older Quaternary Alluvial deposits be encountered during site preparation activities, a qualified paleontologist shall oversee the excavations to ensure that any paleontological specimens are identified, recovered, analyzed, reported, and curated in accordance with CEQA and the County of Riverside policies and guidelines. This program should be conducted while these older deposits are impacted and while the paleontological consultant deems the program necessary.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would ensure less than significant impacts to paleontological resources occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

**3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

**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 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> 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 A for model output). Construction is anticipated to begin in late 2021 and completed in late 2022. 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 Ganddini Group, Inc., which determined that the Proposed Project would generate 1,140 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 concentration of GHG: Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). The Proposed Project would not generate Fluorinated gases as defined by AB 32, only the GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O) 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 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year has been adopted by SCAQMD for non-industrial type projects.

As shown in Table 8 and Table 9, the Proposed Project’s emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD’s 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e threshold of significance. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

**Table 8  
Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions  
(Metric Tons per Year)**

<b>Source/Phase</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>CH<sub>4</sub></b>	<b>N<sub>2</sub>O</b>
Site Preparation	3.3	0.0	0.0
Grading	5.7	0.0	0.0
Building Construction	174.0	0.0	0.0
Paving	8.6	0.0	0.0
Architectural Coating	1.7	0.0	0.0
<b>Total MTCO<sub>2</sub>e</b>	<b>193.3</b>		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
<b>Significant</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>Amortized over 30 years</b>	<b>6.4</b>		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

**Table 9  
 Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions  
 (Metric Tons per Year)**

Source/Phase	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
Area	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	102.3	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1,813.7	0.0	0.0
Waste	7.0	0.4	0.0
Water	11.1	0.0	0.0
Construction Amortized over 30 years	6.4		
<b>Total MTCO<sub>2</sub>e</b>	<b>1,955.18</b>		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
<b>Significant</b>	<b>No</b>		

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.** In October 2015, the City adopted a climate action plan known as the Sustainable Beaumont Plan, which commits the City to a more energy efficient pathway. The Sustainable Beaumont Plan provided measures to meet the goal of reducing community GHG emissions 15 percent decrease from 2005 levels, as recommended in the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The goal for 2030 is to reduce GHG emissions 41.7 percent below 2012 levels, which would put the City on a path toward the State’s long-term goal to reduce emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The reduction measures listed in the Sustainable Beaumont Plan are estimated to reduce 162,174 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e by 2030, which meets the 2030 target (SB 2015, p. 64). The Sustainable Beaumont Plan will serve as a foundation that can be built upon in updated versions of the 2040 General Plan or similar document to meet the 2030 goals and beyond.

The Project Site is zoned Local Commercial under the 2040 General Plan. The future emissions estimate of the Sustainable Beaumont Plan therefore account for the implementation of the Proposed Project as it is consistent with the 2040 General Plan. The project design incorporates standards such as Title 24 to lower GHG emissions. In addition, the Proposed Project involves construction of a local-serving retail and office space, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, less than 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.

**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 Impact.** Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would require the routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of limited quantities of common hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, solvents, paint, fertilizers, pesticides, and other similar materials. All materials required during construction would be kept in compliance with State and local regulations. Operations would include standard maintenance (i.e., landscape upkeep, exterior painting and similar activities) involving the use of commercially available products (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, gas, oil, paint, etc.) the use of which would not create a significant hazard to the public.

Development of the vacant parcels of the Project Site would disturb approximately 1.58 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).

- (a) 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, such as incorporation of standard construction BMPs to prevent off-site erosion (e.g. watering of the site or other soil stabilization method, sand-bagging along site perimeters, disturbed areas to be treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed upon and installation of landscaping as soon as possible). Implementation of BMPs 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, less than 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. 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.

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. 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. Therefore, less than 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 located approximately 0.24 miles east of the Sundance Elementary 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, less than 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 by the State environmental agency as an environmental concern at the Project Site.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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 not located within an airport land use plan.<sup>24</sup> There are no airports within the City.<sup>25</sup> The nearest airport to the Project Site is the Banning Municipal Airport, located approximately 5 miles southeast of the Project Site. The Project Site is not 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.** The Project Site is located along Highland Springs Avenue, between 8th Street and 6th Street. The 2040 General Plan Circulation Element provides for appropriate evacuation routes and circulation throughout the General Plan Area to facilitate rapid response to emergency situations. The portion of Highland Springs Avenue along the Project Site is considered an evacuation route.<sup>26</sup> The Proposed Project includes ROW dedications to Highland Springs Avenue. The City has an adopted Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS)/National Incident Management System (NIMS). This plan establishes the emergency organization, assigns tasks, specifies policies and general procedures, and provides for coordination of planning efforts of the various emergency staff and service elements. It is an extension of the State Emergency Plan.<sup>27</sup> New development plans are subject to review and approval by the RCFD, thereby ensuring that the Proposed Project does not interfere with evacuation. The City and 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, less than significant impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>23</sup> Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor database. Accessed October 1, 2020

<sup>24</sup> Riverside County. Map my County. [https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC\\_Public](https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public)

<sup>25</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.8-26. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>26</sup> City General Plan. Figure 9.2 Evacuation Routes.

<sup>27</sup> City General Plan. Page 224.

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 2040 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. Furthermore, 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 (see Wildfire Section for further discussion).<sup>28</sup> Therefore, less than 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flood on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>28</sup> City General Plan. Figure 9-3 Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map.

### 3.10.1 Environmental Setting

The Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD) provides potable water service to the City of Beaumont and currently serves over 50,000 residents. Water supplies available to support development within the City consist primarily of groundwater extracted from the Beaumont Basin (also referred to as the Beaumont Storage Unit (BSU) or Beaumont Management Zone (BMZ) and Edgar Canyon/Little San Gorgonio Creek.<sup>29</sup> Water supplies available to support development within the City consist primarily of groundwater extracted from the Beaumont Basin and Edgar Canyon.<sup>30</sup> The Proposed Project's water demands would be met by the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD). The Beaumont Basin has a large storage capacity for banked water.<sup>31</sup>

The City has adopted the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations to reduce pollutants in urban runoff and in storm water. The City of Beaumont falls under the Santa Ana Watershed and is a co-permittee in the Santa Ana Watershed's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The permit lead is the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. As part of the NPDES regulations, the City of Beaumont was issued a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit.<sup>32</sup> This State Permit places pollution prevention requirements on planned developments, construction sites, commercial and industrial businesses, municipal facilities and activities, and residential communities.

A preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) dated May 12, 2020 was prepared for the vacant parcels of the Proposed Project by MTH2 Engineering, Inc. (see Appendix F). Additionally, a Preliminary Hydrology Study, dated August 31, 2020, was prepared for the vacant parcels of the Proposed Project by MTH2 Engineering Inc. (see Appendix G).

The Project Site's current sources of water demand are the car wash and the auto service building. According to the Geotechnical report, no groundwater was encountered during the exploratory borings drilled to a maximum depth of 20 feet; groundwater in the vicinity of the site is estimated to be at least 300 feet below the surface.

### 3.10.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 1.58 acres of vacant parcels and is therefore subject to the 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 (CGP) include removal of vegetation, grading excavating, or any other activity that causes the

---

<sup>29</sup>City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.18-1.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>30</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.18-3.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>31</sup> BCVWD. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepared January 2017.

<sup>32</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.6-37.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>



disturbance of at least one acre. The CGP requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a SWPPP.

The preliminary WQMP prepared for the Proposed Project is intended to comply with the requirements of the County of Riverside for Ordinance No. 457, which includes the requirement for the preparation and implementation of a Project-Specific WQMP. The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the implementation and funding of the WQMP and will ensure that it is amended as appropriate to reflect up-to-date conditions on the Project Site.

The implementation of a WQMP is enforceable under the County of Riverside Water Quality Ordinance. Review and approval of the WQMP 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 defined 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.**

BCVWD water supplies are projected to increase from 9,792 AFY supplied in 2015 to 28,960 AFY by 2040.<sup>33</sup> This projection will meet BCVWD's projected customer water demand of 25,381 AFY by 2040. BCVWD plans to purchase additional imported water from the State Water Project (SWP) through the San Geronio Pass Water Agency when possible to add to the storage account balance to prepare for future shortfalls that may occur during dry years. BCVWD expects the imported water that is requested for purchase in the future (either for storage or distribution) to be supplied, and if in any year the request is not met, the shortfall will be delivered once imported water is available. BCVWD anticipates banking 35,000 AF of water over the next 20 years, thus bringing the storage account to 60,560 AF. When the groundwater storage account reaches this amount, BCVWD will be able to meet year 2040 water demands with no SWP for over three years.

At the time the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared, the population served by BCVWD is expected to nearly double by 2040-50. The Proposed Project is the development of an office building and drive-thru restaurant, and remodel of a car wash. The office building and drive-thru restaurant would be developed on two currently vacant and undeveloped parcels. The Proposed Project includes approximately 8,340.32 square-feet of irrigated landscaping on the undeveloped parcels, which is 12.6% of the undeveloped portion of the site. Subject to approval of Plot Plan, the Proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan and would therefore be included in BCVWD's projections for water demands.

---

<sup>33</sup> BCVWD. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepared January 2017. Page 6-62.

The existing car wash and auto-service building are estimated to currently use 2.77 AFY of water.<sup>34</sup> With the addition of the proposed office building and restaurant, the Project Site's water usage would increase by approximately 5.53 AFY. This water demand would account for approximately 0.022% of BCVWD's projected customer water demand by 2040.

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. Less than 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.** Erosion is the process by which soils are removed from the Project Site most commonly by wind or water. Erosion is more likely to occur if soils are left unprotected. The Proposed Project would include the construction of a restaurant and office building on currently vacant lots. The hazard of soil erosion would be reduced after construction of the Proposed Project by protecting soil via landscaping and directing stormwater runoff to bioretention trenches and underground detention chamber. NPDES permit requirements address the control of erosion and siltation. This includes the CGP which requires the effective implementation of erosion control measures. The Santa Ana RWQCB conducts inspections and enforces the CGP at construction sites. A SWPPP is required for construction of the Proposed Project and will include a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize soil erosion. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii, iii, iv) *substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 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.** The purpose of the project Hydrology Study is to develop the incremental volume increase in runoff for the proposed development to preliminarily design the proposed detention facilities. Under existing conditions on the vacant parcels, the site generally drains towards the east, and south in Highland Springs Avenue. Under proposed conditions, an underground detention chamber system would detain the incremental increase in storm runoff. Runoff from the development will be directed to bioretention trenches, and overflow from the bioretention trenches will be directed to the underground detention chamber systems. The detention chamber system will have an overflow outlet for storm events larger than the critical storm, and a low flow outlet to release the stored volume at or below the pre-development rate to an under sidewalk drain to Highland Springs Avenue through the use of a sump and pump system.

---

<sup>34</sup>Based on factor of 3.50 AFY per acre for commercial uses. County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521. Table 4.19-BI. February 2015.

As stated in the Hydrology Study, the pre-development to post-development incremental increase of runoff volume is 19,363 CF for the 100 year, 24-hour event. The total volume for the bio-retention trenches equates to 3,690 CF and the proposed detention chamber system would provide 15,813 CF of storage.

The Project Site is within the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC and WCD). The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps portions of the City within the 100-year flood plain zones. The eastern boundary of the Project Site is within Flood Zone X, which is an area with 0.2% annual chance flood, area of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile.<sup>35</sup> This zone corresponds to areas with moderate to low risk of flooding.<sup>36</sup> Since the Project Site would not significantly increase runoff or impede or redirect flows, impacts would be less than significant 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?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** Due to the inland distance from the Pacific Ocean (approximately 70 miles) and any other significant body of water, tsunamis and seiches are not potential hazards in the vicinity of the Project Site. The eastern boundary of the Project Site is within Flood Zone X, which is an area with 0.2% annual chance flood, area of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile.<sup>37</sup> This zone corresponds to areas with moderate to low risk of flooding.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 1.58 acres of vacant parcels and is therefore subject to the NPDES permit requirements. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES. Construction activities covered under the State's CGP include removal of vegetation, grading excavating, or any other activity that causes the disturbance of at least one acre. The CGP requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a SWPPP.

The preliminary WQMP prepared for the Proposed Project is intended to comply with the requirements of the County of Riverside for Ordinance No. 457, which includes the requirement for the preparation and implementation of a Project-Specific WQMP. The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the implementation and funding of the WQMP and will ensure that it is amended as appropriate to reflect up-to-date conditions on the Project Site.

---

<sup>35</sup> FEMA. National Flood Hazard Layer.

<sup>36</sup> Definitions of FEMA Flood Zone Designations.  
[https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/NM/FEMA\\_FLD\\_HAZ\\_guide.pdf](https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/NM/FEMA_FLD_HAZ_guide.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> FEMA. National Flood Hazard Layer.

<sup>38</sup> Definitions of FEMA Flood Zone Designations.

[https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/NM/FEMA\\_FLD\\_HAZ\\_guide.pdf](https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/NM/FEMA_FLD_HAZ_guide.pdf)

At the time the UWMP was prepared, the population served by BCVWD is expected to nearly double by 2040-50. The Proposed Project is the development of an office building and drive-thru restaurant, and remodel of a car wash. The office building and drive-thru restaurant would be developed on two currently vacant and undeveloped parcels. The Proposed Project includes approximately 8,340.32 square-feet of irrigated landscaping on the undeveloped parcels, which is 12.6% of the undeveloped portion of the site. Subject to approval of Plot Plan, the Proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan and would therefore be included in BCVWD’s projections for water demands.

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. Less than significant 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3.11.1 Environmental Setting**

The strategy for the remainder of land in the City is to focus development within the City limits on undeveloped lots in order to foster compact development patterns, create walkable communities, and preserve the natural environment and critical environmental areas. These infill areas include Downtown, Town Center and around the potential Metrolink Station near Pennsylvania Avenue and Second Street. Neighborhoods, districts, and corridors are the fundamental building blocks of all cities; mapping these can help better understand how people live, shop, work, play, and get around in Beaumont. The larger Beaumont planning area has been subdivided into twelve smaller subareas. Each subarea has unique identifying features and demonstrate what makes Beaumont special.

**3.11.2 Impact Analysis**

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is within the Downtown Beaumont subarea. Downtown Beaumont is comprised of three districts – 6th Street Corridor, 6th Street Corridor Extended, and Beaumont Avenue.<sup>39</sup> The community vision for a downtown is based on a higher intensity, walkable urban core with a mix of residential, office, retail and civic land uses. The Project Site is part of the 6th Street Corridor Extended district. The intent of this district is to provide additional opportunities for multifamily residential development and commercial uses in a mixed-use setting. Stand-alone commercial uses are permitted along the south side

---

<sup>39</sup> City of Beaumont. General Plan. Figure 3.3 General Plan Subareas.

of 8th Street. Additional neighborhood-supportive uses and medical office uses along Highland Springs Avenue provide compatible uses close to San Gorgonio Hospital, located in the City of Banning. The Project Site has a land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and zoning of Local Commercial (LC). The Downtown Mixed-Use designation supports a lively, thriving Downtown area by accommodating a mix of uses at a variety of densities and intensities. The LC Zone is intended to permit development that provides for a range of commercial service and retail land uses that are in proximity to residential neighborhoods consistent with the 2040 General Plan.

The Proposed Project is the development of an office building and drive-thru restaurant on the vacant parcels, and remodel of the existing car wash. It would serve nearby residential communities, like those north of 8th Street and west of Allegheny Street. The Proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan zoning and land use designation. Moreover, the Proposed Project includes uses that are acceptable within the Downtown Beaumont subarea and 6th Street Corridor Extended district.

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 does not include the construction of a linear feature. Therefore, less than significant 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?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site has a 2040 General Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use and current zoning of Local Commercial (LC). The Proposed Project is the development of an office building and drive-thru restaurant on the vacant parcels, and remodel of the existing car wash. A lot line adjustment will be required to incorporate vacuum parking spaces into the developed parcel. A parcel merger will be prepared to combine the two vacant parcels into one. The proposed office building and restaurant would be permitted within the LC zone. The existing car wash and auto service building are conditionally permitted. A Plot Plan is required to establish a new land use, or to assume an existing use, consistent with the zoning of the proposed location of the use, prior to the use and occupancy for such land use. 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, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

12.	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12.	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### 3.12.1 Environmental Setting

The upper portion of the Planning Area is located in MRZ-3 where the significance of mineral deposits are undetermined; the lower portion of the Planning Area is located either in MRZ-3 or in an unstudied area (no MRZ designation issued). Approximately 11,00 acres within the City limits and approximately 5,730 acres within the City’s SOI are within MRZ-3; approximately 7,930 acres within the City limits and approximately 1,420 acres within the City’s SOI are within an unstudied area.

### 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.** The Project Site is located within MRZ-3, where the significance of mineral deposits is undetermined.<sup>40</sup> 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 2040 General Plan designation for the Project Site. There have been no significant amounts of mineral deposits found in the City. However, since much of the City is flat and characterized by alluvial materials, which eroded and washed down from the mountains, extracting aggregate resources from open spaces adjacent to the flood channel in the western portion of the City and its Sphere of Influence may be possible. The Project Site is located in the eastern portion of the City and therefore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with resources extraction near the flood channel. There are no delineated sites or locations of mineral resources within the City or Sphere boundaries. Therefore, less than 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?*

**No Impact.** The City does not contain any locally important mineral resource recovery sites.<sup>41</sup> Although the current Zoning Ordinance has a Mineral Resources Overlay Zone (Section 17.03.160) neither the City’s 2006 General Plan, existing Zoning Map, or any specific

---

<sup>40</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.11.-1 Mineral Resource Zones. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>41</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Figure 5.11.-1 Mineral Resource Zones. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

plan within the Planning Area identifies a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.<sup>42</sup> The Project Site has a current zoning of Local Commercial and is within a commercial area of the city. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.13 NOISE

13.	<b>NOISE</b> Would the project result in:	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.13.1 Environmental Setting

The ambient noise environment in the City is dominated by transportation-related noise. Freeway noise will continue to impact planning areas located along the I-10 and SR-60 Freeway corridors. The Project Site is located approximately 0.2 miles north of the I-10. A Noise Impact Analysis, dated December 30, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Ganddini Group, Inc. (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 with Mitigation Incorporated.** The unit of measurement used to describe a noise level is the decibel (dB). The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies within the sound spectrum. Therefore, the “A-weighted” noise scale, which weights the frequencies to which humans are sensitive, is used for measurements. Noise levels using A-weighted measurements are written dB(A) or dBA. Noise standards for land use compatibility are stated in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and the Day-Night Average Noise Level (DNL). CNEL is a 24-hour weighted average measure of community noise. CNEL is obtained by adding five decibels to sound levels in the evening

---

<sup>42</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.11-7. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

(7:00 PM to 10:00PM), and by adding ten decibels to sound levels at night (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM). This weighting accounts for the increased human sensitivity to noise during the evening and nighttime hours. DNL is a very similar 24-hour average measure that weights only the nighttime hours. The equivalent continuous noise level, Leq, is a level of steady state sound that in a stated time period, and a stated location, has the same A-weighted sound energy as the time-varying sound.

### Construction Impacts

Construction noise sources are regulated within the City of Beaumont under Section 9.02.110(F) of the City's Municipal Code which prohibits construction activities within one-quarter mile of an occupied residence or residences other than between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May. Section 9.02.110(F) prohibits sound levels at any time to exceed fifty- five dB(A) for intervals of more than fifteen minutes per hour as measured in the interior of the nearest occupied residence or school. The interior noise level is the difference between the projected exterior noise level at the structure's facade and the noise reduction provided by the structure itself. Typical buildings generally provide a conservative 20 dBA noise level reduction with "windows closed". The projected interior noise level can be estimated by subtracting the building shell design from the predicted exterior noise level. A "windows closed" condition requires mechanical fresh air ventilation (e.g. air conditioning) be provided in habitable dwelling units. Therefore, project construction noise would be significant if it occurs outside of the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September or the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May; or if it results in an exterior noise level at an occupied residence or school that exceeds 75 dBA for any 15-minute period.

Modeled unmitigated construction noise levels reached 66.8 dBA Leq at the building façade of the nursing home to the northwest, 69.5 dBA Leq at the building façade of the hospital use to the northeast, 68.0 dBA Leq at the nearest single-family residential dwelling unit to the west, and up to 65.5 dBA Leq at the nearest multi-family residential dwelling unit to the west of the Project Site.

Project construction would not be anticipated to exceed the exterior construction noise threshold of 75 dBA at residential or school uses. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the hours of construction specified in the City's Code. Impacts related to construction noise will be further minimized with adherence to the applicable Municipal Ordinances and implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-7 below.

### Noise Impacts to Off-Site Receptors Due to Project-Generated Trips

Increases in ambient noise along affected roadways due to project generated vehicle traffic is considered substantial if they result in an increase of at least 5 dBA CNEL and: (1) the existing noise levels already exceed the applicable land use compatibility standard for the affected sensitive receptors set forth in the Safety Element of the City's General Plan; or (2) the project increases noise levels by at least 5 dBA CNEL and raises the ambient noise level from below the applicable standard to above the applicable standard.

Modeled Existing traffic noise levels range between 68.4-76.2 dBA CNEL at the right-of-way of each modeled roadway segment. The modeled Existing Plus Project traffic noise levels range between 68.7-76.2 dBA CNEL at the right-of-way of each modeled roadway segment.



All modeled roadway segments are anticipated to change the noise a nominal amount (between approximately 0.02 to 0.33 dBA CNEL). Therefore, a change in noise level would not be audible and would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

#### Noise Impacts to Off-Site Receptors Due to On-Site Operational Noise

The Proposed Project would generate onsite noise from stationary sources such as rooftop mechanical equipment, parking lot areas, drive-through (including speaker and queuing lane), car wash vacuum equipment, and the car wash tunnel. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project Site are the existing single-family detached residential property line located adjacent to the west of the Project Site, the hospital property line located approximately 90 feet northeast of the Project Site, and the nursing home property line located approximately 100 feet northwest of the Project Site. In addition, multi-family residential property lines are located approximately 380 feet to the west of the Project Site.

Per the City of Beaumont Municipal Code Section 9.02.050, the exterior residential noise level thresholds are 55 dBA Leq during the daytime (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM) and 45 dBA Leq during the nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) and, per Section 9.02.090, the maximum non-residential exterior thresholds are 75 dBA Leq during the daytime and 50 dBA Leq during the nighttime.

With incorporation of attenuation due to proposed buildings and proposed and existing walls and when combined, operational noise levels generated by the drive-through, car wash and HVAC equipment would reach up to 54.0 dBA Leq during the daytime and 42.2 dBA Leq during the nighttime at the property line of the single-family residential use to the west; 52.3 dBA Leq during the daytime and 38.2 dBA Leq during the nighttime at the hospital property line to the northeast; 48.1 dBA Leq during the daytime and 38.7 dBA Leq during the nighttime at the nursing home property line to the northwest; and 46.8 dBA Leq during the daytime and 29.5 dBA Leq during the nighttime at the multi-family residential property line to the west. The City's exterior residential noise level thresholds are 55 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the daytime and 45 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the nighttime and for nonresidential uses 75 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the daytime and 50 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the nighttime. Operational noise levels would not exceed the City's daytime or nighttime exterior standards.

Typical buildings generally provide a conservative 20 dBA noise level reduction with "windows closed". Per Section 9.02.080 of the City's Municipal Code, maximum residential interior noise level standards are 45 dBA Leq during the daytime and 35 dBA Leq during the nighttime and the maximum interior noise level standards for hospital uses is 45 dBA Leq. Therefore, as operational noise levels generated by the Proposed Project reached up to approximately 54.0 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the daytime and 42.2 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during the nighttime at residential property lines and up to approximately 52.3 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at hospital property lines, with incorporation of an approximate 20 dBA noise level reduction with "windows closed," interior noise levels would not exceed City interior noise standards.

Furthermore, the existing ambient noise levels within the project vicinity range between 63.7 dBA  $L_{max}$  to 78.7 dBA  $L_{max}$  and 52.4 dBA Leq to 69.1 dBA Leq. Therefore, project operational noise would also not result in substantially greater noise levels than currently exist at the Project Site. Project operation is not expected to result in violations of the City of Beaumont Municipal Code and project operational noise levels would be considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure N-1:**

During all project site excavation and grading on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards.

**Mitigation Measure N-2:**

During construction, the contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptor nearest the Project Site, which is the adjacent residence west of the site.

**Mitigation Measure N-3:**

During construction, the contractor shall ensure that all diesel-powered equipment, as applicable, be shut off and not left to idle when not in use.

**Mitigation Measure N-4:**

The contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the Project Site during all project construction.

**Mitigation Measure N-5:**

The contractor shall ensure that jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors during project construction.

**Mitigation Measure N-6:**

The Project Proponent shall mandate that the construction contractor prohibit the use of music or sound amplification on the Project Site during construction.

**Mitigation Measure N-7:**

During construction, the contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment.

With incorporation of these Mitigation Measures, the Proposed Project would not 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 City Municipal Code.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Vibration amplitudes are usually expressed as either peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root mean square (RMS) velocity. The PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal in inches per second. The RMS of a signal is the average of the squared amplitude of the signal in vibration

decibels (VdB), ref one micro-inch per second. The Federal Railroad Administration uses the abbreviation “VdB” for vibration decibels to reduce the potential for confusion with sound decibel.

The threshold at which there is a risk to architectural damage to historic and some older buildings is a peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.25, at older residential structures a PPV of 0.3, and at new residential structures and modern commercial/industrial buildings a PPV of 0.5. A PPV of 0.4 is the threshold at which groundborne vibration becomes severe in regard to annoyance.

Use of vibratory roller equipment could cause annoyance at nearby sensitive receptors. Annoyance is expected to be short-term, occurring only during site grading and preparation. The use of a vibratory roller within 10 feet or a large bulldozer within two feet of the portion of the western property line that lies adjacent to existing residential structures could result in architectural damage. Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-8 would reduce temporary vibration levels associated with project construction to less than significant.

As the Proposed Project consists of an approximately 6,392 square-foot office building and 3,320 square-foot fast-food restaurant with drive through window as well as renovations to an existing car wash use, it does not include any sources of operational vibration.

**Mitigation Measure N-8:**

Vibrator rollers, or any other equivalent vibratory equipment, shall not be utilized within 10 feet and large bulldozers within two feet of the portion of the western property line that lies adjacent to existing residential structures.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan.<sup>43</sup> The nearest airport to the Project Site is the Banning Municipal Airport, located approximately 5 miles southeast of the Project Site. The Project Site is not 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.

---

<sup>43</sup> Riverside County. Map my County. [https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC\\_Public](https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public)

### 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.14.1 Environmental Setting

According to the United States Census Bureau, the City of Beaumont had a population of 36,877 in 2010. For 2018, the population was estimated at 49,241. The City is one of the fastest growing cities in Riverside County and in California. The City has grown rapidly in the last two decades, with a population growth rate four times higher today than in the year 2000.<sup>44</sup> Much of the suburban growth has been in the form of low-density single-family subdivisions and strip commercial development located away from the City’s original grid-pattern town center.

#### 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.** Demographic trends show that Beaumont will continue to experience a significant amount of population growth. The proposed restaurant and office building would be consistent with the 2040 General Plan zoning of Local Commercial. Because the Proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 General Plan, any population increase attributable to the Proposed Project has been accounted for in the 2040 General Plan. The proposed restaurant and office building would require an estimated total of 30 new employees. It is anticipated that this demand in employment will be met by the existing local labor pool. 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, less than 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 consists of two vacant parcels and one parcel developed with a car wash and auto service building. No housing exists on the Project Site that could potentially be displaced. The Project Site has a zoning of Local Commercial, which covers smaller commercial, retail and service-related activities along Highland Springs Avenue (at the eastern end of the 6th Street Corridor). This land use designation permits a range of

---

<sup>44</sup> City of Beaumont. 2040 General Plan. Page 12.

neighborhood supportive retail and service-oriented land uses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this zoning. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

<b>PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>					
15.	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.15.1 Environmental Setting

The Community Facilities and Infrastructure Element of the General Plan establishes a framework for managing and enhancing existing utility networks, services, and facilities.

#### 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. A five minute response time is the goal of the City and current fire response times approximately 8 to 12 minutes. Fire Station No. 20, located at 1550 E. 6th Street, is approximately 400 feet southwest of the Project Site. This station is equipped with one paramedic engine. The engine company operating out of Station 20 is technically a resource that is part of the City of Banning contract with the RCFD. However, operational funding for this Station and the associated apparatus, which is owned by CAL FIRE, is shared equally between Beaumont, Banning and the County.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.14-1.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

In order to minimize the need for additional fire station facilities, new development plans are subject to review and approval by the RCFD. Proposed projects are required to comply with applicable fire protection and prevention requirements, such as building setbacks, emergency access and interior sprinklers. In addition, the Proposed Project is subject to all conditions of approval required by the RCFD. 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, less than 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.** Community safety has been a serious concern for Beaumont residents. While violent crime rates have steadily decreased in the County, the number of violent crimes in Beaumont has generally increased over the last ten years. The Beaumont Police Department provides police protection services in the area of the Project Site. The target service ratio is 1.0 to 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents.<sup>46</sup> The closest police station, located at 660 Orange Avenue, is approximately 1.46 miles west of the Project Site. In order to fund police protection services, the City is annexing new residential developments into existing Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) or forming a new CFD. These CFDs will fund public safety and municipal services, which aligns with Beaumont 2040 Plan Policy 5.8.3 that requires new development to pay its fair share of required improvements, maintenance, and services. The Project Applicant would be required to pay a one-time basic service facility fee. Any increase in demand for police protection resulting from the Proposed Project has been accounted for in the 2040 General Plan and would be considered less than significant. Therefore, less than 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 local labor pool. The Proposed Project does not include development of new housing that would contribute to an increase in population not accounted for in the 2040 General Plan. It is not anticipated to result in an increase in population growth within the area, and therefore would not increase 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,

---

<sup>46</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.14-5.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

less than 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.** According to the 2040 General Plan, the City intends to improve the requirement of establishing five acres of parkland for every one thousand persons in conjunction with residential development. The City of Beaumont and the Cherry Valley Recreation and Park District own and operate park facilities that serve residents of the city. Population growth resulting from the implementation of the 2040 General Plan will lead to an increased demand for public parks. The City currently exceeds park ratios established in the 2040 General Plan. In addition, access to parks in Beaumont is generally high. 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. No increase in the City's population is anticipated from implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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. In addition, the Project Applicant's payment of development impact fees will mitigate any potential impacts on public services. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.16 RECREATION

16.	<b>RECREATION. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**3.16.1 Environmental Setting**

The Open Space designation refers to open space lands used for recreation and conservation including parks, trails, and golf courses. The Beaumont-Cherry Valley Recreation and Park District (BCVRPD) is a Special District within the City of Beaumont. BCVRPD operates facilities estimated at 60.5 acres within City boundaries. The City will protect the rural landscape, including quality access to air and water, open space, and mountain views. In protected open space areas, the City will promote active open space corridors and trails that support natural vegetation, scenic vistas, and sensitive habitats as well as recreational opportunities.<sup>47</sup>

**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?*

**No Impact.** The Proposed Project does not include development of new housing that would contribute to an increase in population not accounted for in the 2040 General Plan. 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. Therefore, no 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 labor pool. 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.	<b>TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines s § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>47</sup> City of Beaumont. General Plan. Page 32.



17.	<b>TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3.17.1 Environmental Setting**

The Proposed Project is anticipated to be constructed and fully operational by 2023. The Proposed Project would provide one restricted right turn in-out access driveway at Highland Springs Avenue and will share the existing access to Highland Springs Avenue currently being used by the carwash. The Project also proposed reciprocal access with the southerly adjacent property. A Traffic Impact Analysis, dated November 25, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Ganddini Group, Inc. to provide an assessment of traffic operations resulting from development of the Proposed Project and to identify measures necessary to mitigate potentially significant traffic impacts (see Appendix I for report). This report is summarized herein.

**3.17.2 Impact Analysis**

a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?*

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The Proposed Project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 1,140 daily vehicle trips, including 58 trips during the AM peak hour and 47 trips during the PM peak hour.

Based on the study intersections identified in the approved scoping agreement, the study area consists of the following study intersections within the Cities of Beaumont and Banning and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) jurisdiction:

1. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Eighth Street (EW)
2. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Memorial Drive (EW)
3. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Project Driveway (EW)
4. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at 6th Street (EW)
5. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at I-10 WB Off-Ramp (EW)
6. Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at I-10 EB On-Ramp (EW)

The following scenarios are analyzed during typical weekday morning and evening peak hour conditions:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing Plus Project Conditions
- Opening Year (2022) Without Project Conditions
- Opening Year (2022) With Project Conditions

The City of Beaumont General Plan Policy 4.1.2, seeks to maintain the following target Levels of Service: Level of Service D along auto-priority streets within the City of Beaumont. I-10, Highland Springs Avenue, and Sixth Street are auto-priority roadways. Level of Service E is

considered acceptable on non-auto-priority streets. Eight Street and Memorial Drive are non auto-priority roadways.

The City of Banning General Plan Policy 4.C.6, seeks to maintain peak hour Level of Service D (or better) on roadways and intersections. California Department of Transportation endeavors to maintain a target LOS [Level of Service] at the transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D" on State highway facilities". The California Department of Transportation acknowledges this may not always be feasible and recommends consultation with the California Department of Transportation to determine the appropriate target Level of Service. For consistency with local requirements, this analysis defines Level of Service D as the minimum acceptable Level of Service for State Highway facilities.

The current COVID-19 pandemic and related stay-at-home orders imposed by State and local municipalities have generally resulted in a reduction of peak hour volumes compared to pre-pandemic conditions. In addition to the current public health restrictions, it is anticipated that the pandemic may have a lasting effect on travel behaviors, such as an increase telecommuting. To provide a conservative analysis, the existing volumes used in this analysis are based on counts from December 2019 obtained from the Highland Springs and 8th Retail Traffic Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads, April 23, 2020). Since the December 2019 counts were collected within the past 12 months, no adjustment factors have been applied. Inbound and outbound AM and PM peak hour turning movement volumes for the existing auto facilities south of the project site were added to the Highland Springs Avenue at Project South Driveway based on counts at the existing driveway. This approach is likely to overestimate actual volumes since the long-term trend of work from home is expected to hold even as public health restrictions are eased.

The TIA assumes the following improvements will be constructed by the Proposed Project to provide Project Site access.

#### Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Project North Driveway (EW) - #2

- Install eastbound stop control.
- Construct the eastbound approach to consist of one right turn only lane.

#### Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Project South Driveway (EW) - #3

- Maintain existing eastbound stop control currently utilized by the auto related businesses south of the proposed site.
- Modify the eastbound approach to consist of one right turn only lane.

#### *Existing LOS*

The study intersections currently operate within acceptable Levels of Service (D or better) during the peak hours for Existing conditions.

#### *Existing Plus Project LOS*

The study intersections are forecast to operate within operate within acceptable Levels of Service (D or better), during the peak hours for Existing Plus Project conditions.

### *Opening Year (2022) Without Project LOS*

The study intersections are forecast to operate within acceptable Levels of Service (D or better) during the peak hours for Opening Year (2022) Without Project conditions, except for the following study intersections that are projected to operate at deficient Level of Service E/F:

- Highland Springs Avenue at Eighth Street – #1 (PM peak hour LOS F)
- Highland Springs Avenue at Project South Driveway – #3 (PM peak hour LOS E)

Mitigation Measure T-1 is recommended for Opening Year (2022) Without Project conditions to maintain acceptable Levels of Service at the study intersections as specified by the City-established operating requirements for General Plan consistency.

The Level of Service E at the Project South Driveway relates only to commercial trips exiting the stop-controlled westbound approach (slightly offset and opposite the site), which are forecast to operate at Level of Service E without the project. The eastbound approach at the Project Site driveway would continue to operate at Level of Service B. The northbound and southbound movements along Highland Springs Avenue are uncontrolled and would continue to operate at Levels of Service A. The commercial driveway is not forecast to satisfy the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) peak hour volume traffic signal warrant; therefore, no improvement is recommended. Furthermore, the 95th-percentile queue length for the northbound driveway approach is not forecast to exceed two vehicle lengths, which can be stored on-site without negatively impacting on-site circulation. As an optional interim measure, Mitigation Measure T-2 would provide acceptable Level of Service improvement for the deficient Walgreen westbound-east leg driveway. The City planned Highland Springs Avenue median will provide access restrictions for minor driveways.

### *Opening Year (2022) With Project LOS*

The study intersections are projected to operate within acceptable Levels of Service (D or better) during the peak hours for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions, except for the following study intersections that are projected to operate at unacceptable Level of Service without improvements:

- Highland Springs Avenue at Eighth Street – #1 (PM peak hour LOS F)
- Highland Springs Avenue at Project South Driveway – #3 (PM peak hour LOS E)

The Level of Service E at the Project South Driveway relates only to commercial trips exiting the stop controlled westbound approach (slightly offset and opposite the site), which are forecast to operate at Level of Service E without the project. The eastbound approach at the project site driveway would continue to operate at Level of Service C. The northbound and southbound movements along Highland Springs Avenue are uncontrolled and would continue to operate at Levels of Service A. The commercial driveway is not forecast to satisfy the California MUTCD peak hour volume traffic signal warrant; therefore, no improvement is recommended. Furthermore, the 95th-percentile queue length for the northbound driveway approach is not forecast to exceed two vehicle lengths, which can be stored on-site without negatively impacting on-site circulation.

The project impact at the study area intersections is forecast to increase delay by less than 5.0 seconds; therefore, the project does not exceed the City-established operational

thresholds that would require improvements related to the project for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions.

Mitigation Measure T-1 would maintain acceptable Levels of Service at the study intersections for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions. Since the improvements are required for the Without Project condition, the project-related impact is considered to be indirect/cumulative. Therefore, the project shall contribute its fair share of the cost to construct the necessary improvements through payment of applicable development impact fees.

As an optional interim measure, Mitigation Measure T-2 would provide acceptable Level of Service improvement for the deficient Walgreen westbound-east leg driveway. The City planned Highland Springs Avenue median will provide access restrictions for minor driveways.

The TIA assumes the Proposed Project will be required to comply with the following conditions as part of the City of Beaumont standard development review process:

- A construction work site traffic control plan shall comply with State standards set forth in the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of a grading permit or start of construction. The plan shall identify any roadway, sidewalk, bike route, or bus stop closures and detours as well as haul routes and hours of operation. All construction related trips shall be restricted to off-peak hours to the extent possible.
- All on-site and off-site roadway design, traffic signing and striping, and traffic control improvements relating to the proposed project shall be constructed in accordance with applicable State/Federal engineering standards and to the satisfaction of the City of Beaumont.
- Site-adjacent roadways shall be constructed or repaired at their ultimate half-section width, including landscaping and parkway improvements in conjunction with development, or as otherwise required by the City of Beaumont.
- Adequate off-street parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of City of Beaumont.
- Adequate emergency vehicle access shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Riverside County Fire Authority.
- The final grading, landscaping, and street improvement plans shall demonstrate that sight distance requirements are met in accordance with applicable City of Beaumont Department of Public Works sight distance standards.

#### *Queuing Analysis*

The proposed storage lengths for the project driveways are forecast to provide adequate queuing capacity with the addition of new project trips.

The project driveways are not forecast to satisfy the California MUTCD peak hour volume warrant.

The Proposed Project is the development of a drive-thru restaurant and an office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash and auto service building. It is a land use project that would allow commercial services to be more accessible to residents of neighborhoods nearby. Sidewalks are provided intermittently on the north and south sides of Highland Springs

Avenue and are not provided adjacent to the Project Site. The study area is currently served by PassTransit bus service. Routes 3, 4, and 6 run along Highland Springs Avenue. There are currently existing bicycle lanes along 6th Street. The Proposed Project would be easily accessible to residents.

The following Mitigation Measure is required to address unacceptable LOS for Opening Year (2022) Without and With Project conditions:

**Mitigation Measure T-1:**

Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Eighth Street (EW) – #1

- Restripe northbound lanes to provide a second through lane. This improvement is as noted “By Others” because it is a requirement of another development as noted in the Highland Springs and 8th Retail Traffic Impact Analysis (Urban Crossroads, April 23, 2020).

**Mitigation Measure T-2:**

Highland Springs Avenue (NS) at Project South Driveway – #3

- Install right-turn-only sign for the hours of 3:00 to 6:00 PM on the Walgreen’s westbound-east leg driveway. This improvement is an optional interim measure, as the City planned Highland Springs Avenue median will provide future access restrictions for minor driveways.

The Project Applicant and the City shall ensure that this Mitigation Measure is implemented via on-site inspections. Implementation shall occur before the Certification of Occupancy is issued.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1, impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines s § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The amended CEQA Guidelines, specifically Section 15064.3, recommend the use of Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) as the primary metric for the evaluation of transportation impacts associated with land use and transportation projects. In general terms, VMT quantifies the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project or region.

The City of Beaumont adopted its VMT guidelines on June 16, 2020 via the Recommended Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment (January 2020) developed for Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) agencies (WRCOG TIA Guidelines); therefore, the project-related VMT impact has been assessed based on guidance from this document.

The WRCOG TIA Guidelines, as adopted by the City of Beaumont, include guidance for certain types of projects/activities that generally will not require a VMT analysis. A presumption of less than significant VMT impact for the following activities is based on substantial evidence

provided in the OPR Technical Advisory, or is related to projects that are local serving, thus reducing the number of trips/trip lengths and VMT:

- Projects located in a Transit Priority Areas (TPA)
- Projects located in a low-VMT generating area
- Local-serving K-12 schools
- Local parks
- Day care centers
- Local-serving gas stations
- Local-serving banks
- Local-serving hotels (e.g. non-destination hotels)
- Student housing projects
- Local serving community colleges that are consistent with the assumptions noted in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)
- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips:
  - 11 single family housing units
  - 16 multi-family, condominiums, or townhouse housing units
  - 10,000 square feet of office
  - 15,000 square feet of light industrial
  - 63,000 square feet of warehousing
  - 79,000 square feet of high-cube transload and short-term storage warehouse

The WRCOG TIA Guidelines include screening criteria for certain types of projects that are local serving in nature or generate a low number of vehicle trips and may be presumed to have a less than significant impact. Among the project type screening land uses are local serving retail projects with less than 50,000 square feet. Local serving retail projects will generally redistribute shopping trips rather than create new trips. By adding retail opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving proximity, local serving retail projects tend to shorten trips and reduce VMT. Similarly, the proposed restaurant would add dining opportunities into the community, thereby improving proximity and reducing VMT. Since the Proposed Project involves construction of a 3,320 square foot local-serving restaurant, which is significantly less than the 50,000 square feet screening criteria, the retail component of project-related VMT impact is presumed to be less than significant. Consistent with State guidance, the WRCOG TIA Guidelines include screening criteria for projects that generate less than 110 daily trips based on the Categorical Exemption under CEQA for additions to existing buildings of 10,000 square feet or less. The 110 daily trip threshold is generally derived from the number of trips generated by 10,000 square feet of office land uses. Since the proposed office component generates less than 110 daily trips, the office component of project-related VMT impact is presumed to be less than significant. Combined, the proposed restaurant and office uses total 8,880 square feet, which also satisfies the Categorical Exemption for additions to buildings less than 10,000 square feet.

The Proposed Project involves construction of a local-serving retail and office space below the project type screening square footage thresholds. Therefore, the project VMT impact may

be presumed less than significant based on the WRCOG TIA Guidelines, as adopted by the City of Beaumont, and criteria for Categorical Exemption under CEQA. The Proposed Project includes a remodel of an existing car wash. Because the car wash is an existing local serving facility, it is not anticipated to increase the number of vehicle trips.

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

- 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 with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Proposed Project is the development of a drive-thru restaurant and an office building, and the remodel of an existing car wash and auto service building. It would provide one restricted right turn in-out access driveway at Highland Springs Avenue and will share the existing access to Highland Springs Avenue currently being used by the carwash. The Proposed Project also includes reciprocal access with the southerly adjacent property. These design features would ensure that cars enter and exit the Project Site as safely as possible. Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 would also ensure that the Proposed Project does not cause hazards beyond Project Site boundaries. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not include geometric design features or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. The Project Site has a rectangular shape and is not adjacent to windy roads. As stated in the TIA, the proposed storage lengths for the project driveways are forecast to provide adequate queueing capacity with the addition of new project trips. The project driveways are not forecast to satisfy the California MUTCD peak hour volume traffic signal warrant. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are anticipated with implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Beaumont Code of Ordinances requires that minimum driveway width shall be 12 feet per lane for a one-way driveway and 25 feet for a two-way driveway.<sup>48</sup> The Proposed Project would provide one restricted right turn in-out access 28-foot wide driveway off of Highland Springs Avenue along the northernmost parcel. The existing driveway on the developed parcel will be replaced with a 30-foot ADA compliant driveway. The driveways would be wide enough to allow evacuation and emergency vehicles simultaneous access. The County 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. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>48</sup>City of Beaumont. Code of Ordinances. [https://library.municode.com/ca/beaumont/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO\\_CH17.05OREPALOST\\_17.05.050ACRE](https://library.municode.com/ca/beaumont/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO_CH17.05OREPALOST_17.05.050ACRE)

### 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.18.1 Environmental Setting

The City lies within the traditional territory of the Pass (or Wanakik) Cahuilla and a small portion of Serrano ancestral territory. Additionally, recorded and unrecorded tribal cultural resources exist within the City of Beaumont and its Sphere of Influence, including along Highways 60 and 79.<sup>49</sup>

#### 3.18.2 Impact Analysis

- i) *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)?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** McKenna et al.'s archaeological records search identified resources documented in the Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Data File, including 130 properties within the core area of Beaumont. Of these 130, only 13 were determined "potentially eligible for National Register listing. A total of 109 of the 130 structures were specifically identified as not eligible for National register listing but may be of local interest. The remaining resources have not been evaluated. None of the resources are within one mile of the Project Site.

---

<sup>49</sup> City of Beaumont. 2040 General Plan. Page 209.



- ii) *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.

The general area of the Project Site is geographically associated with both the Serrano and Cahuilla of Southern California. Though near the territorial boundary separating these two populations, the area is more generally considered part of the “Pass Cahuilla” territory, a reference to the San Gorgonio Pass. The “Pass Cahuilla” are one of the three main Cahuilla populations associated with western Riverside County (with the Desert Cahuilla and Mountain Cahuilla).

The Native American Heritage Commission responded to McKenna et al.’s request for data pertaining to a development project at 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Highland Springs Avenue. This request was designed to cover an area larger than the project-specific site. As such, the findings for that development also included the Project Site and McKenna et al. was informed the Commission’s files have no records of any sacred or religious sites in the general area.

As required by CEQA, AB 52 consultation is performed between the lead government agency and California Native American tribes who have requested notification of projects in their traditional area.

On January 25, 2021 AB 52 notification letters were sent to 21 Native American tribal governments or designated tribal representatives via certified mail. Follow-up emails were subsequently sent on February 15 and February 24, 2021. Of the 21 tribes or tribal representatives (in some cases multiple letters were sent to representatives of the same tribe), one response was received. Responses and consultation requests were received from the following tribe:

- The San Fernando Band of Mission Indians (February 15, 2021): In an email, Donna Yocum stated that they do not wish to comment on the project and would defer to the San Manuel Tribe because Beaumont is not within their traditional or tribal boundaries.

Pursuant to PRC 21080.3.1(d), each tribal government or representative was given 30 days upon receipt of the AB 52 notification letter to provide a request for consultation on the Project. One of the 21 tribal representatives responded to the initial notification letter. No additional responses or requests were received. The City of Beaumont, as lead agency, has fulfilled its obligations under AB 52 to engage in tribal consultation with all other tribal governments. Less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

19.	<b>UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 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 recycles wastewater made available to the community. Electrical service is provided by Southern California Edison. The Southern California Gas Company (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.** New development in the City is required to connect to the City's sanitary sewer system. All sewage generated within the City is treated at the City-owned Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 1 (WWTP). The Proposed Project will construct sewer laterals from the on-site structures to an existing 8" sewer line in Highland Springs Avenue. The Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District 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.

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) Master Drainage Plan (MDP) for the Beaumont Area, address the drainage problems of the City and City's SOI and provides an economical plan that considers flood protection for both existing and future development. The Beaumont MDP encompasses approximately 34 square miles of incorporated and unincorporated land in and around the City. Generally, the MDP boundary limits are the community of Oak Glen to the north, Highland Springs Avenue to the east, Beaumont City limits to the south, and Interstate 10 and Wildwood Canyon to the southwest and northwest, respectively. The Proposed Project would connect to the existing RCFCWCD 6'x6' RCB storm drain along Highland Springs Avenue. Therefore, no construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities are required with implementation of the Proposed Project.

Southern California Edison will provide basic electrical services to the Project Site. The Proposed Project will connect to the existing lines currently serving the car wash with auto service building. 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 36,202.653241 Gigawatt Hour (GWh) of electricity in 2019.<sup>50</sup> The estimated electricity demand for the proposed structures is 0.20 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. Therefore, no construction or expansion of SCE facilities are required with implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Project Site would be serviced by Southern California Gas Company's (SoCalGas) existing natural gas distribution system that serves the general area of the Project Site. According to the California Energy Commission, the natural gas consumption of the SoCalGas planning area commercial building sector was 974,982,675 therms in 2019. The estimated natural gas demand for the proposed structures is 7,003.39 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 would be served by either Verizon or Spectrum for telecommunication services. Neither providers are anticipated to fall short of services for potential customers. The Proposed Project's demand for telecommunication services is not significant enough to require relocation or construction of facilities.

Therefore, less than 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 Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD). The BCVWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) estimated the City's water supplies and demand for 2015 and projected supplies and demand

---

<sup>50</sup> California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

through 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's 2007 General Plan projected build-out population. The build-out population estimate sets the ultimate water demand.

BCVWD calculated the City's build-out population in 2015 at approximately 90,600 persons and 17,856 cumulative new Equivalent Dwelling Units. The City currently estimates an existing population of 49,241 persons. The 2040 General Plan proposes a maximum of 40,849 residential dwelling units and, based on development at a typical non-residential intensity, is anticipating approximately 33,075,597 square feet of non-residential uses (i.e. retail/service, office, industrial) in the 2040 General Plan area at 100 percent build-out. The 2015 UWMP concluded that future water demands within the service area will be met during any dry period of up to six consecutive dry years assuming future supply projects are implemented by the BCVWD. This analysis will be updated by BCVWD as part of the 2020 UWMP which will incorporate the 2040 General Plan.<sup>51</sup> Nonetheless, it is anticipated that future water projects will be required to increase water supplies.

The Project Site has a current Zoning of Local Commercial (LC), and the Proposed Project would be consistent with this 2040 General Plan designation. Any increase in water demand resulting from the development and operation of the proposed uses and renovations would have been accounted for in BCVWD's UWMP. BCVWD water supplies are projected to increase from 9,792 AFY supplied in 2015 to 28,960 AFY by 2040.<sup>52</sup> This projection will meet BCVWD's projected customer water demand of 25,381 AFY by 2040. The existing car wash and auto-service building are estimated to currently use 2.77 AFY of water.<sup>53</sup> With the addition of the proposed office building and restaurant, the Project Site's water usage would increase by approximately 5.53 AFY. This water demand would account for approximately 0.022% of BCVWD's projected customer water demand by 2040.

Compliance with BCVWD's development conditions, if any, 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 Standards that pertain to water efficient landscape requirements. Less than 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.** The Proposed Project has a 2040 General Plan land designation of Local Commercial and its development is included in the City's projected future growth.

The WWTP's current capacity of 4.0 million gallons per day (mgd) could be reached around 2022. The WWTP is in the process of a capacity expansion from 4.0 mgd to 6.0 mgd in order

---

<sup>51</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.18-35.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>52</sup> BCVWD. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepared January 2017. Page 6-62.

<sup>53</sup> Based on factor of 3.50 AFY per acre for commercial uses. County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521. Table 4.19-BI. February 2015.

to serve the projected City population for the next 20 years. The future capacity of 6.0 mgd could be reached around 2038 assuming the current City growth rate, which would be a conservative assumption since development would typically slow as the City approaches buildout. Maximum flow to the WWTP, beyond the 20-year planning period, is projected to be 8.0 mgd. To this end, the WWTP has been developed in a “modular” fashion by which capacity can be economically and efficiently increased with additional trains of process equipment.<sup>54</sup>

The existing car wash and auto-service building currently generate an estimate of 948 gallons per day (gpd).<sup>55</sup> With the addition of the proposed office building and restaurant, the wastewater generated at the Project Site would increase by approximately 1,896 gpd. This increase in wastewater generated would account for approximately 0.05% of the WWTP’s current capacity.

It is the City’s responsibility to provide sufficient wastewater conveyance and treatment services to customers within its service area. With the City’s current WWTP expansion, the City is anticipated to have adequate treatment capacity for current and future residents until approximately 2038. The WWTP discharge permit with the Santa Ana RWQCB stipulates that a capacity expansion will be needed when the influent flow reaches a certain proportion of the maximum design capacity (typically 75 percent). Because additional treatment capacity may be needed in the future, the proposed 2040 General Plan policies for Community Facilities and Infrastructure Goal 7.5 will ensure the City continues monitoring influent rates at the wastewater treatment plant as new development projects are proposed, and coordinates treatment capacity expansion as needed. Furthermore, the proposed 2040 General Plan policies for Land Use and Design Goal 3.2 will ensure that there will be adequate water and wastewater system capacity to meet projected demand, and the City will continue to implement comprehensive water and wastewater management programs and ensure that future developments pay their fair share for any needed infrastructure improvements. Therefore, less than 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, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City is within the service area of the Lamb Canyon Landfill, located just south of the City and operated by the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (RCDWR). Waste generated within the City is also taken to other Riverside County landfills, as well as various landfills throughout the state. Disposal of the municipal waste generated within the General Plan Area, of which the Proposed Project is included, is ultimately the responsibility of the County of Riverside. As such, the County will direct municipal wastes to any of the available disposal sites. This could be accomplished through direct transport to an alternative landfill, or through the construction and operation of a transfer facility. Wastes generated under buildout conditions will be directed to landfills with available capacity, as determine by the County. As part of its long-range planning and management activities, the RCDWR ensures that Riverside County has a minimum of 15 years of capacity,

---

<sup>54</sup> City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR. Page 5.18-36.  
<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>

<sup>55</sup> Based on factor of 1200 gpd per acre for commercial uses. County of Riverside Environmental Impact Report No. 521. Table 4.19-BJ. February 2015.

at any time, for future landfill disposal. The 15-year projection of disposal capacity is prepared each year by as part of the annual reporting requirements for the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

The Project Site has a current zoning of Local Commercial, and the Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the requirements of this zoning. Solid waste generation from the Proposed Project was accounted for in the 2040 General Plan and the City’s expected increase in waste generation. Therefore, less than 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.** Riverside County General Plan EIR No. 521 uses the following solid waste generation factor for commercial development: 2.4 tons per 1,000 square feet per year. The Proposed Project includes the development of a 3,320 square-foot drive-thru-restaurant and a 6,392 square-foot office building. These proposed structures are anticipated to generate 8.88 tons of solid waste annually.

The 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 Proposed Project would adhere to the SRRE and comply with all other applicable local, State, and federal solid waste disposal standards. Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

**3.20 WILDFIRE**

20.	<b>WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.20.1 Environmental Setting

Beaumont has also been identified by CAL FIRE as being located within a “wildland-urban interface”. The “wildland-urban interface” includes areas where homes or structures are intermixed with wildlands, which creates high wildfire risk. Historically, several fires have occurred in the wildland-urban interface in Riverside County and the threat intensifies under the Santa Ana winds and other extreme fire weather conditions.<sup>56</sup>

### 3.20.2 Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located along Highland Springs Avenue, between 8th Street and 6th Street. The 2040 General Plan Circulation Element provides for appropriate evacuation routes and circulation throughout the General Plan Area to facilitate rapid response to emergency situations. The portion of Highland Springs Avenue along the Project Site is considered an evacuation route.<sup>57</sup> The City has an adopted Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS)/National Incident Management System (NIMS). This plan establishes the emergency organization, assigns tasks, specifies policies and general procedures, and provides for coordination of planning efforts of the various emergency staff and service elements. Further, it is an extension of the State Emergency Plan.<sup>58</sup> The Proposed Project will not include features that would conflict or interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Highland Springs Avenue will be widened along the project frontage to ultimate width per the 2040 General Plan Circulation Element. Furthermore, new development plans are subject to review and approval by the RCFD, thereby ensuring that the Proposed Project does not interfere with evacuation. The City and 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, less than significant impacts are 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? Would the Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

**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

---

<sup>56</sup> City of Beaumont. General Plan. Page 228.

<sup>57</sup> City General Plan. Figure 9.2 Evacuation Routes.

<sup>58</sup> City General Plan. Page 224.

new development, the creation of defensible areas around building structures, and use of fire-resistant building materials will provide protection from wildland fires. Moreover, 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.<sup>59</sup> The Project Site is relatively flat, with elevations on-site ranging from approximately 2595 to 2600 feet in elevation. The implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce the risk of wildfires by eliminating the vacant parcels' existing ruderal vegetation and providing a paved foundation. Moreover, the Project Site is surrounded by either vacant land 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. Therefore, less than 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 are relatively flat and are not subject to post-fire slope instability. 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. The Proposed Project would retain the incremental increase in site-generated runoff. As a result, the Proposed Project will not expose people or structure to significant risks, such as downslope flooding or landslides. Therefore, less than 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>59</sup> City General Plan. Figure 9-3 Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map.



21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.** A Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis (BRA) was prepared for the Proposed Project by Jennings Environmental, LLC in September 2020. The BRA was designed to address potential effects of the Proposed Project to designated critical habitats and/or any species currently listed or formally proposed for listing as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or species designated as sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). According to the literature reviewed, 33 sensitive species, including 5 listed species and 1 sensitive habitat, have been documented in the *Beaumont* quad. The field survey yielded very little evidence of any wildlife existing on-site; only two bird species were observed during the site survey. No State and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species are documented/or expected to occur within the Project Site. Because the Project Site and immediate surrounding area contain habitat suitable for nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 should be implemented to ensure there are no potential significant impacts. To ensure that the Proposed Project is consistent with the MSHCP, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 should be implemented.

A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation, dated October 6, 2020, was conducted for the Proposed Project by McKenna et al. McKenna et al. found no physical evidence of archaeological or paleontological resources within the Project Site. This finding is based primarily on a visual examination of the exposed native soils per a surface survey. Likewise, no ethnic or historic landscapes were identified. Standing structures were limited to the southern parcel and confirmed to be modern and of no historical significance. While no surficial evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources was identified, the local Native American community considers the area of the San Gorgonio Pass to be highly sensitive for potentially significant Native American resources. The general area has been associated with early Beaumont (and Banning) development. With limited documentary resources available, archaeological evidence may be the only source of property-specific resource identification. There is still a potential for late-period historic archaeological evidence to be present in a shallow context. Therefore, Mitigation Measure CR-1 should be implemented to ensure less than significant impacts to archaeological resources occur.

- 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 Impact.** 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.*

Ganddini Group, Inc. accounted for ambient growth on roadways and trips generated by future development when forecasting future volume in the Traffic Impact Analysis. To account for trips generated by future development, trips generated by pending or approved other development projects in the City of Beaumont were added to the analysis. Two study intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable Level of Service without improvements for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions. Mitigation Measure T-1 would maintain acceptable Levels of Service at these study intersections. Mitigation Measure T-2 is an optional interim measure that will provide acceptable Level of Service improvements for the deficient Walgreen westbound-east leg driveway. Since improvements under Mitigation Measures T-1 and T-2 are required for the Without Project condition, the Proposed Project impact is considered to be indirect/cumulative. Therefore, the project shall contribute its fair share of the cost to construct the necessary improvements through payment of applicable development impact fees.

Development of the Proposed Project will be conditioned to comply with current SCAQMD rules and regulations to minimize impacts to air quality. Development of the restaurant and office building is not anticipated to generate significant impacts or generate significant operational mobile emissions. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,140 daily trips. The Proposed Project would be consistent with SCAQMD’s 3000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e threshold and therefore, it would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Given this consistency, it is concluded that the project’s incremental contribution to GHG emissions and their effects on climate change would not be cumulatively considerable. Approval of the Proposed Project does not require a zone change nor a general plan amendment and is consistent with the 2040 General Plan.

Therefore, impacts associated with the Proposed Project would not be considered cumulatively considerable. A less than significant impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Impacts related to construction noise will be minimized with adherence to applicable Municipal Ordinances and implementation of the mitigation measures N-1 to N-8. The Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction and operational emissions. However, the Project Proponent would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, such as Rules 402 nuisance and 403 fugitive dust during construction and Rules 201, 202 and 1138 during operations.

The City of Beaumont, as is the case for most of Southern California, is located within a seismically active region. However, the potential for adverse effects involving seismic activity to occur onsite is considered low.

## REFERENCES

Riverside County International Technology. Map My County. Accessed periodically.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. National Flood hazard Layer. Accessed 11/17/2020.

City of Beaumont. 2040 General Plan Update.

<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36620/Beaumont-GPU-Public-Draft>. Accessed periodically.

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](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/riv16_w.pdf). Accessed on 10/5/20.

California Department of Conservation. Fault Activity Map of California (2010).

<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed on 11/20/20.

Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances site list. Accessed 10/17/2020.

City of Beaumont. Beaumont General Plan 2040 Draft PEIR.

<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36627/DEIR-090720/>. Accessed periodically.

California Energy Commission. Tracking Progress.

[https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/energy\\_efficiency.pdf](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/energy_efficiency.pdf). Accessed 11/4/2020.

California Energy Commission. *2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards*.

[https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/title24/2019standards/documents/2018\\_Title\\_24\\_2019\\_Building\\_Standards\\_FAQ.pdf](https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/title24/2019standards/documents/2018_Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ.pdf). Accessed 11/20/2020.

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 9/10/2020.

Sustainable Beaumont: The City's Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reductions.

<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27815/Beaumont-Climate-Action-Plan?bidId=>. Accessed 11/18/2020.

Riverside County Department of Waste Resources. Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. Accessed 10/18/2020.

**PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES**

Ganddini Group, Inc. 655 Highland Springs Office- Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. March 12, 2021.

Ganddini Group, Inc. 655 Highland Springs Office – Commercial Project Noise Impact Analysis. July 8, 2020.

Jennings Environmental, LLC. Biological Resources Assessment, Jurisdictional Delineation, and MSHCP Consistency Analysis for High Sands Car Wash Remodel and Retail Development Project. September 2020.

Lilburn Corporation. CalEEMod Output for Highland Springs Office Commercial. August 2020.

MTH2 Engineering, Inc. Preliminary Hydrology Study for highland Springs Remodel and Development. August 31, 2020.

MTH2 Engineering, Inc. Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan. May 12, 2020.

McKenna et al. Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Redevelopment of APNs 419-150-026, -027, -046. October 6, 2020.

Soil Exploration Company, Inc. Preliminary Soil Investigation and Infiltration Tests Report. March 16, 2020.