

**Beyond Convenience Store at SWC  
of Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth  
Street**

***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

October 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 EVALUATION FORMAT .....	4
1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	5
1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION .....	5
1.4 EVALUATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	6
<b>SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT .....	8
2.2 PROJECT LOCATION .....	8
2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	8
<b>SECTION 3 CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 AESTHETICS .....	13
3.1.1 Environmental Setting .....	13
3.1.2 Impact Analysis .....	13
3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES .....	15
3.2.1 Environmental Setting .....	16
3.2.2 Impact Analysis .....	16
3.3 AIR QUALITY .....	17
3.3.1 Environmental Setting .....	17
3.3.2 Impact Analysis .....	18
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	25
3.4.1 Environmental Setting .....	25
3.4.2 Impact Analysis .....	26
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	31
3.5.1 Environmental Setting .....	31
3.5.2 Impact Analysis .....	31
3.6 ENERGY .....	32
3.6.1 Environmental Setting .....	33
3.6.2 Impact Analysis .....	34
3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	36
3.7.1 Environmental Setting .....	37
3.7.2 Impact Analysis .....	37
3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	41
3.8.1 Environmental Setting .....	41
3.8.2 Impact Analysis .....	42
3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	44
3.9.1 Environmental Setting .....	44
3.9.2 Impact Analysis .....	44
3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	48
3.10.1 Environmental Setting .....	49
3.10.2 Impact Analysis .....	49
3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	52
3.11.1 Environmental Setting .....	53

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
3.11.2 Impact Analysis.....	53
3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES .....	54
3.12.1 Environmental Setting.....	54
3.12.2 Impact Analysis.....	54
3.13 NOISE .....	55
3.13.1 Environmental Setting.....	55
3.13.2 Impact Analysis.....	55
3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING .....	59
3.14.1 Environmental Setting.....	59
3.14.2 Impact Analysis.....	59
3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES .....	60
3.15.1 Environmental Setting.....	60
3.15.2 Impact Analysis.....	60
3.16 RECREATION .....	62
3.16.1 Environmental Setting.....	62
3.16.2 Impact Analysis.....	62
3.17 TRANSPORTATION.....	63
3.17.1 Environmental Setting.....	63
3.17.2 Impact Analysis.....	63
3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	68
3.18.1 Environmental Setting.....	68
3.18.2 Impact Analysis.....	69
3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	70
3.19.1 Environmental Setting.....	70
3.19.2 Impact Analysis.....	70
3.20 WILDFIRE .....	73
3.20.1 Environmental Setting.....	74
3.20.2 Impact Analysis.....	74
3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	75
3.21.1 Impact Analysis.....	76
REFERENCES.....	79
PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES.....	76

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A	CalEEMod Output Tables
Appendix B	Habitat Assessment and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, October 27, 2020
Appendix C	Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum, May 18, 2020
Appendix D	Fuel Calculations
Appendix E	Preliminary Soil Investigation and Infiltration Tests Report, October 30, 2019
Appendix F	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, May 8, 2020
Appendix G	Hydrology/Hydraulics Study, May 4, 2020 and Preliminary WQMP, August 25, 2020
Appendix H	Noise Impact Analysis, October 27, 2020
Appendix I	Traffic Impact Analysis, August 25, 2020

## **Page**

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1	Summer Construction Emissions Summary .....	19
Table 2	Winter Construction Emissions Summary .....	19
Table 3	Summer Operational Emissions Summary .....	21
Table 4	Winter Operational Emissions Summary .....	22
Table 5	Localized Significance Thresholds .....	24
Table 6	Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions .....	43
Table 7	Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions .....	43

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1	Regional Location Map .....	10
Figure 2	Vicinity Map .....	11
Figure 3	Site Plan .....	12

## SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Independently reviewed, analyzed and exercised judgment in making the determination, by the Development Review Committee on December 19, 2019 and February 21, 2020, 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:** Beyond Convenience Store
- 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:** Southwest corner of the Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth Street
- 5. Geographic Coordinates of Project Site:** 33° 55'44.19" N, 116° 57' 59.32" W
- 6. USGS Topographic Map:** Beaumont 7.5-minute USGS Topographic Quadrangle
- 7. Public Land Survey System:** Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Section 10
- 8. Thomas Guide Location:** Page 721, Grid G3, San Bernardino & Riverside Counties (2013)
- 9. Assessor Parcel Number:** 418-122-028
- 10. General Plan Designation:** General Commercial
- 11. Zoning:** Commercial General
- 12. Description of Project:** Beyond Food Mart, Inc. (Applicant) is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the development and operation of an eight-island fueling station with a 5,185 square-foot convenience store and an attached 1,404 square-foot drive-thru carwash in the City of Beaumont (APN:418-122-028). The Project Site is an approximately 1.39-acre parcel

located on the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street (see Figure 1-Regional Location and Figure 2-Project Vicinity). The current land use designation for the Project Site is General Commercial (CG). Approval of the CUP is required for the operation of a car wash and gas/service station, and for the sale of beer and liquor within the land use designation of CG. The fueling station would be composed of 8 fueling islands to include 16 fueling dispensers and two underground storage tanks (USTs) including a 30,000-gallon for storing unleaded fuel, and a 22,000-gallon split tank that would store 10,000 gallons of diesel and 12,000 gallons of unleaded premium fuel. The fueling islands would be located under a 4,310 square-foot canopy within the northern portion of the site, and the convenience store with carwash and drive-thru would be located on the southern portion of the site. A 6-foot tall concrete wall is proposed along the southern boundary of the Project Site.

Access to the site would be provided by a 35-foot driveway at Pennsylvania Avenue and a 35-foot driveway at Sixth Street that would be shared with the adjacent Auto Zone store (see Figure 3-Site Plan). The Project would include landscaping and a total of 26 parking spaces, including two handicap accessible spaces with designated loading/unloading space. The maximum height of the convenience store and canopy would not exceed 29 feet. The Proposed Project includes two bioretention basins with storm water retention volumes of 468 cubic-feet (CF) and 1,795 CF, respectively, to be located near the southern boundary of the Project Site. The Proposed Project is planned to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and will include 12 full-time employees.

**13. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The General Plan land use designation of the Project Site is General Commercial (CG). The CG land use designation allows for smaller commercial retail and service-related activities planned along 6th Street, Beaumont Avenue, and elsewhere in the Town Center Planning Area. The surrounding land use includes commercial developments to the north (pet care, tire shop), east (market, laundry mat) and west (automotive parts store). Vacant land occurs south of the Project Site.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Existing Use</b>	<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Zoning</b>
Site	Vacant	General Commercial	Commercial General
North	Garcia Tires, Classy K-9 Salon & Dog Wash	General Commercial	Commercial General
South	Vacant	General Commercial	Commercial General
West	Auto Zone Auto Parts	General Commercial	Commercial General
East	Beaumont Market, Laundromat, Beaumont Auto Spa	General Commercial	Commercial General

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

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

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

Rincon Consultants, Inc. contacted the Native American Heritage Commission for a records search in the commission's Sacred Lands File. The NAHC provided a list, dated April 30, 2020, of 21 Native American contacts to request information on potential cultural resources in the project vicinity. The City of Beaumont initiated the AB 52 consultation process on June 23, 2020.

## **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	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities /Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input 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.



Signature

11.02.20

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 is an undeveloped parcel in the City of Beaumont, located approximately 0.8 miles north of the I-10 freeway and approximately 0.63 miles northeast of the SR-79 highway intersection (refer to Figure 1-Regional Map). The Project Site is located on the southwestern corner of the Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street intersection (refer to Figure 2-Vicinity Map). The Project Site is relative flat and consists of dense weeds. The property has a current General Plan land use designation General Commercial and Zoning of Commercial General. The surrounding land use includes commercial developments to the north (pet care, tire shop), east (market, laundry mat) and west (automotive parts store), and vacant land to the south. Development in this area consist of commercial and nonconforming residential uses.

### **2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Beyond Food Mart, Inc. (Project Applicant) is requesting approval of Conditional Use Permit to develop and operate an 8-island fueling station and a 5,185 square-foot convenience store and an attached 1,404 square-foot drive-thru carwash in the City of Beaumont (APN:418-122-120). The Project Site is approximately 1.39-acre parcel lot located on the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street (see Figure 1-Regional Location and Figure 2-Project Vicinity). The current land use designation of the Project Site is General Commercial (CG). Approval of a CUP is required for the Proposed Project and sale of beer and liquor within the land use designation of CG. The fueling station would be composed of 8 fueling islands to include 16 fueling dispensers and two underground storage tanks (USTs) including a 30,000-gallon for

*Beyond Convenience Store  
Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth Street, Beaumont*

storing unleaded fuel, and a 22,000-gallon split tank that would store 10,000 gallons of diesel and 12,000 gallons of unleaded premium fuel. The fueling islands would be located under a 4,310 square-foot canopy within the northern portion of the site, and the convenience store with drive-thru carwash would be located on the southern portion of the site. A 6-foot tall concrete wall is proposed along the southern boundary of the Project Site.

Access to the site would be provided by a 35-foot driveway at Pennsylvania Avenue and a 35-foot driveway at Sixth Street that would be shared with the adjacent Auto Zone store (see Figure 3 Site Plan). The shared driveway would require the relocation of approximately 5 parking spaces on the AutoZone property. The Project would include landscaping and a total of 26 parking spaces including two handicap accessible spaces with designated loading/unloading space. The maximum height of the convenience store and canopy would not exceed 29 feet. The Proposed Project also includes two bioretention basin with storm water retention volumes of 468 cubic-feet (CF) and 1,795 CF, respectively. Both basins would be located on the southern boundary of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would require approximately 12 full-time employees.

*Beyond Convenience Store  
Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth Street, Beaumont*

**Figure 1 - Regional Map**

*Beyond Convenience Store  
Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth Street, Beaumont*

**Figure 2 - Vicinity Map**

*Beyond Convenience Store  
Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth Street, Beaumont*

**Figure 3 - Site Plan**

## 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 commercial development, public facilities and undeveloped lands.

#### 3.1.2 Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City General Plan does not contain any designated scenic vistas that would be affected by the implementation of the Proposed Project. The Project Site is currently vacant. The surrounding land use includes commercial developments to the north (pet care, tire shop), east (market, laundry mat), west (automotive parts store) and vacant land to the south of the Project Site. The Project Site has a General Plan designation of General Commercial (GC) and zoning of Commercial General (CG). A CUP is required for establishment of a gas station and car wash tunnel within the CG Zone. Development of the Proposed Project has been anticipated by the General Plan. Additionally, the maximum height of the proposed structures is 29 feet. Therefore, the Proposed Project would adhere to the City's municipal code for Commercial General Zone to ensure that building structures will not exceed 50 feet. The Proposed Project would be anticipated to change the general aesthetics of the area as the Project Site is currently vacant; however, it would not obstruct natural scenic views or vistas. With approval of the CUP, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and would provide the general area with compatible commercial services. The

San Timoteo Badlands area is considered a scenic vista, therefore development proposals within the Badlands area will be given special attention.<sup>1</sup> The Project Site is located approximately 15 miles southeast of the San Timoteo Badlands. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not impact scenic resources. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is not adjacent to or near any State-eligible or State-designated Scenic Highway<sup>2</sup>. The nearest State Scenic Highway is Route 243, which is approximately 4.5 miles east of the Project Site. According to the City General Plan, proposed projects that are either within the San Timoteo Badlands or that could affect views of or alter ridgelines will be given special consideration to reduce aesthetic/visual resource impacts to a less-than-significant level. The Proposed Project is approximately 15 miles southeast of the San Timoteo Badlands and will not affect views of or alter ridgelines. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Development of the Proposed Project would not cause damage to the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site or its surroundings. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the City General Plan designation with approval of the CUP and would enhance the surrounding community with commercial uses. The surrounding properties are either vacant or developed for commercial uses. The Proposed Project is the development of a convenience store, drive-thru car wash and a gas station. It would maintain similar aesthetics and building design as the surrounding establishments. In addition, per Beaumont Municipal Code Section 12.06.040.F, 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 maximum shade. 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, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Development of the Proposed Project would take place on a site that is currently vacant. City of Beaumont 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

---

<sup>1</sup> City General Plan. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/63/General-Plan?bidId=>. Page 161

<sup>2</sup> Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element. Figure C-8: Scenic Highways.

the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of October through May. The use of a night 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 receptors are the single-family residences south of Auto Zone. Auto Zone already includes lighting on the outside of the building and in the parking lot. In addition, the area is already lit from existing surrounding land uses, including the pet care and tire shop to the north, and market and laundromat to the east. Moreover, there are traffic lights present on the 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and 6<sup>th</sup> Street has streetlights in the area of the project. 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. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not generate a significant amount of light and glare when compared to the surrounding area. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **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.) Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<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 General Plan land use designation of the Project Site is General Commercial (CG).<sup>3</sup> It is neither considered useful for agriculture nor is it within an existing zone for forest land or farmland. The majority of the Project Site is covered with non-native seasonal grasses and invasive weeds.

### **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.** Lands within the City General Plan Area are not designated as prime farmlands, unique farmlands, or farmlands of statewide importance.<sup>4</sup> The Project Site is identified as “Urban and Built-Up Land”.<sup>5</sup> 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.** According to the Riverside County Parcel Report for the Project Site, the site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. According to the City General Plan, no agricultural properties within the General Plan Area are currently covered under the provisions of a Williamson Act Contract. Additionally, the Project Site is within a Commercial General zoning district. 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))?*

---

<sup>3</sup> City General Plan Land Use Designation Map. <https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/64/General-Plan-Map?bidId=>.

<sup>4</sup> City General Plan. Page 138.

<sup>5</sup> The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Riverside County Important Farmland 2016 Sheet 1 of 3

**No Impact.** According to the City General Plan, Beaumont does not have a zoning designation for, nor does it contain forestry-related timberland or timberland production sites within city limits. Furthermore, the Project Site has a current zoning of Commercial General. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is currently vacant with only one tree present on the eastern edge of the site; the tree is not a species found in a southern California forest. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The City General Plan does not include any lands designated as forest land within the General Plan area. Therefore, no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use will result from the implementation of the Proposed Project. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site does not support agricultural or forest land use. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use no-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>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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 South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the basin establishes a program of rules and regulations administered by SCAQMD to obtain attainment of the state and federal air quality standards. The most recent AQMP (AQMP 2016) was adopted by the SCAQMD 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 Proposed Project is located within the City of Beaumont's Commercial General zone district. The proposed uses are consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan was adopted before the 2016 AQMP was adopted. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Proposed Project have already been accounted for in the AQMP and approval of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** In August 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 (PM10 and PM2.5). 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 early 2021 and be completed in late 2021. The resulting emissions generated by construction of the Proposed Project are shown in Table 1 and Table 2, which represent summer and winter construction emissions, respectively.

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

Source/Phase	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation	1.6	17.4	7.9	0.0	3.5	2.0
Grading	1.3	14.4	6.6	0.0	2.9	1.7
Building Construction	2.0	14.6	14.1	0.0	1.0	0.8
Paving	1.0	7.8	9.3	0.0	0.6	0.4
Architectural Coating	7.8	1.5	2.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.0</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)**

Source/Phase	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation	1.6	17.4	7.8	0.0	3.5	2.1
Grading	1.3	14.4	6.6	0.0	2.9	1.7
Building Construction	2.0	14.6	13.8	0.0	1.0	0.8
Paving	1.0	7.8	9.3	0.0	0.6	0.4
Architectural Coating	7.8	1.5	2.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.1</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.<sup>6</sup> 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., in July 2020. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximatively 1,401 daily trips. The Trip Generation rates from the TIA were input into the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 model. Additionally, in accordance with the site plan, CalEEMod operational emissions include the following design features:

- a) Improve Destination Accessibility with a two-mile distance to a downtown job center,
- b) Increase Transit Accessibility with a two-mile distance to the nearest transit station, and
- c) Improve Pedestrian Network by including improvements of the adjacent intersection, curb, gutter, and sidewalks.

Approximately 2,740 gpd of gasoline throughput is anticipated with operation of the Proposed Project. Fuel dispensing emissions were calculated using SCAQMD guidelines (RULE 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing). The VOC emissions can be calculated using 0.53 pounds per 1,000 gallons of gasoline (0.15 pounds of VOC per 1,000 gallons from the loading of gasoline into storage tanks (Phase I) and 0.38 pounds of VOC per 1,000 gallons from the dispensing of gasoline into vehicle fuel tanks (Phase II)). Emissions associated with the operational activities are listed in Table 3 and Table 4.

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

Source	ROG/ VOC <sup>1</sup>	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	2.5	17.9	28.0	0.1	9.0	2.5
Fuel Dispensing	1.5	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Total Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>2.5</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

<sup>1</sup> VOC emissions, SCAQMD guidelines (RULE 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing).

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

Source	ROG/VOC <sup>1</sup>	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	2.1	17.9	24.4	0.1	9.0	2.5
Fuel Dispensing	1.5	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Total Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>2.5</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

<sup>1</sup> VOC emissions, SCAQMD guidelines (RULE 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing).

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 limited to SCAQMD Rules:

- Rule 201-Permit to Construct: A person shall not build, erect, install, alter or replace any equipment or agricultural permit unit, the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants or the use of which may eliminate, reduce or control the issuance of air contaminants without first obtaining written authorization for such construction from the Executive Officer. A permit to construct shall remain in effect until the permit to operate the equipment or agricultural permit unit for which the application was filed is granted or denied, or the application is canceled.
- Rule 203-Permit to Operate: A person shall not operate or use any equipment or agricultural permit unit, the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants, or the use of which may reduce or control the issuance of air contaminants, without first obtaining a written permit to operate from the Executive Officer or except as provided in Rule 202.
- Rule 461-Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing Facilities: Applicability This rule applies to the transfer of gasoline from any tank truck, trailer, or railroad tank car into any stationary storage tank or mobile fueler, and from any stationary storage tank or mobile fueler into any mobile fueler or motor vehicle fuel tank.
- Rule 1138- Control of Emissions from Restaurants: (a) Applicability This rule applies to owners and operators of commercial cooking operations, preparing food for human consumption. The rule requirements currently apply to chain-driven charbroilers used to cook meat. All other commercial restaurant cooking equipment including, but not limited to, under-fired charbroilers, may be subject to future rule provisions.
- Rule 1401- New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants: This rule specifies limits for maximum individual cancer risk (MICR), cancer burden, and noncancer acute and chronic hazard index (HI) from new permit units, relocations, or modifications to existing permit units which emit toxic air contaminants listed in Table I. The rule establishes allowable risks for permit units requiring new permits pursuant to Rules 201 or 203.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.**

Construction

According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions, should be based on a 70- or 30-year exposure period; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the proposed project. Consequently, an important consideration is that the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would be limited to the periods of construction, for which most diesel-powered off-road equipment use would occur during the construction period (can vary) and only over an 7.5- month period. Given the temporary nature of construction activities, the concentrations and durations of any toxic exposure that might occur would be very limited. Therefore, considering the relatively low mass of diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions that would be generated during even the most intense season of construction, the relatively short duration of construction activities, and overall and the highly dispersive properties of DPM, construction related TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to an incremental increase in cancer risk that exceeds 10 in one million or a hazard index greater than 1.0.

As indicated in the most-recent OEHHA Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments (February 2015) it is up to local air districts to determine whether construction-related Health Risk Assessments (HRA) are to be required. SCAQMD, at this time does not have recommendations for how to conduct a construction HRA for CEQA purposes using the revised OEHHA guidelines, but have been tasked with going through a public process to develop those recommendations to bring to the SCAQMD Board for approval. Per current SCAQMD guidance, a construction-based health risk assessment is not required.

Operational

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 version 2016.3.2 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 1.39 acres, however, the “1-acre scenario” was used to represent a worst-case scenario as larger sites are typically granted a larger emission allowance. The nearest sensitive receptor land use is residences adjacent to the southwest corner of the Project Site and therefore LSTs are based on 25-meter distance (nearest residential receptor to the proposed car wash tunnel). 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)	17.4	13.8	3.5		2.1	
Operational Emissions (Max. Total from Table 3 and Table 4) <sup>1</sup>	17.9	28.0	0.9		0.25	
<b>Highest Value (lbs./day)</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.25</b>
LST Thresholds	103	1,000	6	2 <sup>†</sup>	4 <sup>*</sup>	1 <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 1-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.

<sup>\*</sup> Construction emissions LST

<sup>†</sup> Operational emissions LST

<sup>1</sup> Per LST Methodology, mobile source emissions do not need to be included except for land use emissions and on-site vehicle emissions. It is estimated that approximately 10 percent of mobile emissions will occur on the Project Site.

As shown in Table 5, the Proposed Project’s emissions are not anticipated to exceed the LSTs. In addition, operational toxic exposure was assessed. Per SCAQMD Risk Tool V1.103, the proposed project is anticipated to generate a toxic risk of 5.5 in one million which is less than 10 in one million, the District’s threshold. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project does not contain land uses typically associated with the emission of objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the Proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities; and the temporary storage of domestic solid waste (refuse) associated with the Proposed Project’s (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It should be noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City of Beaumont solid waste regulations. The Project would be also required to comply with

SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Gas dispensing activities would also have the potential to create odors. With implementation of SCAQMD applicable dispensing rules and regulations that minimize release of fuel vapors, odors from the gas station will be minimized. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<b>4.</b>	<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 consists of a convenience store with an attached drive-thru car wash and gas station in a 1.39-acre parcel. A Habitat Assessment and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis dated October 27, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by RCA Associates, Inc. (RCA) (see Appendix B for report). RCA evaluated the Project Site in relation to the MSHCP areas including criteria cells, core habitat, linkages, and areas proposed for conservation. The MSHCP also requires riparian/riverine and vernal pool habitat assessment within the Project Site, which were conducted by a biologist from RCA.

RCA Associates, Inc. conducted a literature review of background data as well as the environmental setting of the Project Site prior to conducting field investigations. The entire Project Site was assessed to determine the extent of plant communities and to evaluate the presence of any areas which may have any jurisdictional features or may support riparian/riverine habitat.

### **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.** A search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was conducted for the Beaumont USGS quadrangle and the surrounding eight quadrangles. The CNDDB database was reviewed to locate previously record occurrences of sensitive plant and wildlife and determine the distance from the Project Site. In addition, the Riverside County MSHCP was reviewed for additional information on the known occurrences of the species within Riverside County. There are several special status wildlife species which have been documented in the region and those species occurring in the Beaumont Quadrangle and the surrounding eight quadrangles.

#### **Federal and State Listed Species**

There are eighteen federal and/or State listed wildlife species, which have been documented in the region including southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), southern California legless lizard (*Anniella stebbinsi*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*), Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*), northwestern San Diego pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus fallax fallax*), Stephen's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), western yellow bat (*Lasius xanthinus*), San Diego desert wood rat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*), Los Angeles pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*), coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), purple martin (*Progne subis*), yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*), western spadefoot (*Spea hammondii*), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), and least bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*). There is one federal and/or State listed invertebrate occurring in the region, which is the crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*). The Project Site is not located within the Riverside County HCP fee area for Stephen's kangaroo rat.<sup>6</sup>

There are fourteen federal and/or State listed plants that have been documented in the region including chaparral sand-verbena (*Abronia villosa var. aurita*), Yucaipa onion (*Allium marvinii*), Horn's milk-vetch (*Astragalus hornii var. hornii*), Coachella Valley milk-vech (*Astragalus lentiginosus var. coachellae*), Jaeger's milk-vetch (*Astragalus pachyphus var. jaegeri*), Palmer's mariposa-lily (*Calochortus palmeri var. palmeri*), Plummer's mariposa-lily (*Calochortus plummerae*), Payson's jewelflower (*Caulanthus simulans*), smooth tarplant (*Centromadia pungens ssp. laevis*), Parry's spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi var. parryi*), Mojave tarplant (*Deinandra mohavensis*), mesa horkelia (*Horkelia cuneata var. puberula*),

---

<sup>6</sup> Riverside County. Riverside County Information Technology. Available at [https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC\\_Public](https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public)

spiny-haired blazing star (*Mentzelia tricuspis*), and narrow-leaf sandpaper-plant (*Petalonyx linearis*). Special status plants are unlikely to occur on the Project Site given the past disturbances which have occurred during previous years.

### Plant Communities

The Project Site consists of a ruderal vegetation community. Various grass species, wall barley (*Hordeum murinum*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), and red brome (*Bromus matritensis*), were the dominant species on the Project Site. Other plants scattered throughout the site include shortpod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), cheeseweed mallow (*Malva parviflora*) and Russian pigweed (*Axyris amaranthoides*). Multiple ornamental trees and shrubs (unidentified) have been planted and line the western edge of the property. No shrubs were seen beyond this border into the property, and only two Trees of Heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) were observed on the site.

### Nesting Birds

The Project Site contains marginal nesting bird habitat for avian species given the presence of few trees and shrubs along the southern, eastern and western edges of the site. Nesting birds are protected under CDFW code and/or Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). A few common bird species were observed within the project area during surveys, including ravens (*Corvus corax*), Anna's hummingbirds (*Calypte anna*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*). There is relatively low potential for nesting birds to utilize the few shrubs on the site and trees along the edge of the property. Potential impacts to nesting birds can be eliminated or significantly reduced with implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1.

Focused surveys were not conducted for any of the species of special concern, except for the burrowing owl. Suitable burrows for use by burrowing owls were not observed during the field investigations but there is suitable habitat present on-site. The species could potentially inhabit the Project Site in the future given that owls are sometimes found in disturbed urban areas. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-2 would ensure that potential impacts to burrowing owls are reduced to the extent possible.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** Vegetation suitable for nesting birds should be removed outside of the nesting bird season. The nesting bird season typically occurs from February 15 to August 31. If grading and clearing activities must occur during the nesting season, a nesting bird survey should be conducted within seven days prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities to determine if any nesting birds occur within the Project Site. If nesting birds are not found within the Project Site, no further actions will be required. If nesting birds are observed, no impacts shall occur within 250 feet (500 feet for raptors) for any active nests. Moreover, construction activity may only occur within 250 feet of an active nest at the discretion of the project's biological monitor. Compliance shall be ensured by a qualified biologist and the City.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2:** A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls should be conducted 30-days prior to the start of future ground clearing activities to ensure no burrowing owls have moved onto the site since the initial surveys conducted in May 2020. Compliance shall be ensured by a qualified biologist and the City.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, 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.** The Western Riverside County MSHCP Consistency Analysis evaluates the Proposed Project with respect to the project's compliance with the protection of species associated with riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools. Under the MSHCP, riparian/riverine habitat is defined as lands which contain habitat dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent, or emergent mosses and lichens, which occur close to or which depend upon soil moisture from a nearby freshwater source, or areas with freshwater source, or areas with freshwater flow during all or a portion of the year. None of the riparian/riverine species listed in the MSHCP were found on the property nor were any riparian plant species observed during the field investigations. Furthermore, no riparian/riverine habitat is present on the site and plant species typically associated with riparian/riverine areas were not present on the property. 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.** The lack of suitable habitat for fairy shrimp is due to the soil on-site that is made up of sandy loam soils which cannot hold water for a long enough duration to allow for the formation of vernal pools. Consequently, the site does not support any sensitive plants that are associated with wetland features. In order to be considered a vernal pool under the MSHCP, a feature must be a wetland (based on the presence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soil, and wetland hydrology). The feature must also have a natural origin. There are no features on the Project Site that meet the MSHCP definition of vernal pools. No vernal pools were observed during the field investigations on the Project Site, therefore it does not support suitable habitat for fairy shrimp. Other non-vernal pool features, like depressions, drainages and road ruts, which may provide habitat for fairy shrimp, were absent from the site. It is RCA's opinion that the Project Site lacks suitable habitat for fairy shrimp.

Aerial photographs were reviewed to determine if any potential natural drainage features and water bodies that may be under the jurisdiction of either the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and/or CDFW were present on site. The review showed that no jurisdictional areas were on the site; plant species typically associated with jurisdictional areas were not observed. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

*d) Would the project Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is currently surrounded by commercial development, roads and vacant land. Regionally, it is surrounded by commercial, industrial and residential development and highways. It would not be suitable for facilitating the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species nor as a native resident or

migratory wildlife corridor. Moreover, according to the assessment, there are no documented terrestrial migration corridors in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The Proposed Project will not impact any MSHCP-designated corridors or habitat linkages. The site does not provide any wildlife corridors which are used for migration, movement or dispersal of wildlife. The Project Site is located in an area where habitat has been fragmented due to past development activities, agricultural activities, and on-going developments in the surrounding region. Therefore, the incremental loss of wildlife habitat associated with the Proposed Project is expected to be negligible.

The Urban/Wildland Interface guidelines of the MSHCP address indirect effects associated with locating development in the MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project Site is not located in any Criteria Cells. The nearest Criteria Cell is approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, no 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 tree on the eastern end of the Project Site is within a public ROW and is planned to be removed. With approval of the tree removal permit, the Proposed Project would not conflict with a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No 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 MSHCP will provide for the protection and preservation of important and significant biological resources consistent with local, State and Federal regulations.<sup>7</sup> As a local permittee, the City of Beaumont has adopted the MSHCP and will comply with all applicable requirements when considering actions associated with the General Plan's implementation.

RCA evaluated the Project Site in relation to the MSHCP areas including criteria cells, core habitat, linkages and areas proposed for conservation. The assessment analyzes the Proposed Project's compliance with biological aspects of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The Project Site is not located within any Criteria Cells and is not within an area of public/quasi-public conserved lands or within any pre-existing conservation agreements. As stated above, no riparian/riverine species listed in the MSHCP were found on the Project Site nor were any riparian plant species observed during the field investigations. Additionally, there are no features on the site that meet the MSHCP definition of vernal pools. No potential jurisdictional waters were observed on the site during field investigations. The Proposed Project does not include the construction of or any improvements to any MSHCP Covered Roads.

---

<sup>7</sup> City General Plan. Page 51.

The Project Site was inspected for habitat for Delhi Sands Flower Loving Fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis*) as part of the MSHCP Habitat Assessment conducted on May 12, 2020. Prior to visiting the site, a literature search was conducted of the environmental setting of the site which included a review of the most recent records (CNDDDB 2020) for the area. The Project Site has been disturbed in the past and supports a ruderal plant community and does not support Delhi soils. Therefore, due to the lack of suitable soils (Delhi sand) the Proposed Project will not have any impacts on the species.

The wildlife observed on the site and near the site were common species typically found in urban areas. Wildlife activity was moderate with avian species. Some of the common birds seen during the survey included western kingbird, dove, hummingbirds, raven, and northern mockingbird.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 will ensure that the Proposed Project remains in compliance with the MSHCP:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4:**

- Drainage: The Proposed Project shall not create additional flow offsite. Measures should be taken to assure that project stormwater discharge is no greater in volume and velocity than the current undeveloped conditions and that the water leaving the site complies with all applicable water quality standards.
- Toxics: In concert with drainage requirements, the Proposed Project is subject to Riverside Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for Urban Runoff, Santa Ana Region, adopted September 17, 2004, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharge Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit). Implementation of both the WQMP and the general permit would reduce potential impacts of toxics to the MSHCP conservation area to a level of less than significant.
- Lighting: Night lighting shall be directed in such a way as to protect wildlife species from direct night lighting.
- Noise: The project area is already subject to relatively high ambient noise levels due to street traffic and noise from adjacent residential developments. The completed project would not impact any MSHCP Conservation Areas with noise levels above the existing ambient noise level. The construction site is far enough away from any MSHCP Conservation Areas that temporary construction-related noise impacts would not negatively impact biological resources within a Conservation Area.
- Invasive Species: No invasive species from MSHCP shall be included in any landscaping for the Proposed Project.
- Barriers: As needed, the Proposed Project should include the incorporation of rocks/boulders fencing, walls, signage and/or other appropriate measures to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation and illegal trespass and dumping into the MSHCP Conservation Area. Any barriers shall be outside of the MSHCP Conservation Area.
- Grading: Project related grading would be outside of any MSHCP Conservation Areas.

Compliance shall be ensured by a qualified biologist and the City.

The Project Site is not located within the MSHCP Additional Survey Areas for Burrowing Owl. However, given the presence of suitable habitat, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 should be

implemented to ensure that potential impacts to burrowing owls are reduced to a less than significant level.

### **3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

5.	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <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)	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 Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum, dated May 18, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Rincon Consultants (see Appendix C). The purpose of this memorandum is to document the results of the tasks performed by Rincon, specifically, a cultural resources records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), historical map and aerial imagery review, Native American outreach, archival research and a cultural resources survey of the Project Site. This study was completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (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.** The EIC records search identified 148 previously recorded cultural resources within a 1.0-mile radius of the Project Site. No cultural resources were identified on the Project Site. Of the 148 resources, 140 were historic-period buildings, two are historic-period structures, five are historic-period archaeological sites, and one was a prehistoric-period archaeological site. Rincon reviewed available historical topographic maps and aerial imagery of the project site to determine past land use. Historical topographic maps from 1901 to 2018 depict the Project Site as undeveloped land. Development to the north, south and west of the Project Site is seen as early as 1942, with structures and orchard planting to the east in 1953. Aerial imagery spanning from 1953 to 2016 show the Project Site as an undeveloped lot. Imagery as early as 1953, depicts development to the north, south, east and west of the Project Site.

Rincon conducted an archaeological pedestrian field survey of the project site. Transect intervals were spaced 10 to 15 meters apart. No cultural resources were observed during the pedestrian field survey. The only exposed ground surface was observed along the eastern boundary adjacent to the dirt access turnout and consisted of a medium brown silty sand with coarse pebbles and small cobbles. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 27, 2020, to request a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) and a contact list of Native Americans culturally affiliated with the project area. A response was received from the NAHC on April 30, 2020, stating the SLF search had been completed with "negative" results. Based on the results of the cultural resources technical memorandum, no significant cultural resources were identified in the Project Site that would be impacted by the Proposed Project. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources were identified or anticipated. However, Rincon recommends a standard unanticipated discovery measure, presented below, in the event of a discovery of cultural resources during the execution of the current project.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1:** A qualified archaeologist shall oversee excavations in the younger alluvial deposits during the first two days of ground disturbance. If the archaeologist determines it necessary, an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented. The monitoring program should be in accordance with current professional guidelines and protocols. The program should be flexible and account for changes in findings by treating resources in a professional manner and evaluated in accordance with current CEQA criteria. Compliance shall be ensured by the qualified Archaeologist and the City.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** 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 any bones are uncovered during the course of project-related ground disturbance and the archaeologist determines that it is likely human, all appropriate cultural resources and health and safety laws will be followed and the developer will work with the NAHC-appointed Most Likely Descendent to determine appropriate measures for avoidance and preservation or other suitable treatment. Compliance shall be ensured by the qualified Archaeologist and the City.

### 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"/>

6.	<b>ENERGY</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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, like Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and Uniform Building Code, will be enforced by the City of Beaumont. Furthermore, the City encourages measures to reduce energy consumption during construction and operation of proposed projects.

### **Building Energy Conservation Standards**

The California Energy Commission (CEC) adopted Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations: Energy Conservation Standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings in June 1977 and standards are updated every three years. In addition to reducing California's energy consumption, Title 24 also decreases GHG emissions. Title 24 ensures that building designs conserve energy. The requirements allow for opportunities to incorporate new energy efficiency technologies and methods into proposed developments. In June 2015, the CEC updated the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The 2016 Standards improved upon the previous 2013 Standards for new construction of and additions and alterations to residential and nonresidential buildings. The CEC updated the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards in May 2018. The 2019 Title 24 standards state that nonresidential buildings will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. The updated Standards enable the use of highly efficient air filters to trap hazardous particulates from both outdoor air and cooking and improve kitchen ventilation systems.

### **Senate Bill 350**

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

### **Senate Bill 100**

Senate Bill 100 (SB 100) was signed into law September 2018 and increased the required Renewable Portfolio Standards. SB 100 requires that the total kilowatt-hours of energy sold by electricity retailers to their end-use customers must consist of at least 50 percent renewable resources by 2026, 60 percent renewable resources by 2030, and 100 percent renewable resources by 2045. SB 100 also includes a State policy that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of all retail sales of electricity to California end-

use customers and 100 percent of electricity procured to serve all State agencies by December 31, 2045. Under the bill, the State cannot increase carbon emissions elsewhere in the western grid or allow resource shuffling to achieve the 100 percent carbon-free electricity target.

### **3.6.2 Impact Analysis**

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

#### **Less than Significant Impact.**

##### **Electricity**

The Proposed Project consists of a gas station, convenience store with an attached drive-thru car wash tunnel. 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 37260.897803 GWh of electricity in 2018. The Project Site is currently vacant and does not use electricity. Consequently, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in electricity demand. The estimated electricity demand for the Proposed Project is 0.083219 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 Project Site is currently vacant and has 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 937,882,107 therms in 2018.<sup>8</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 Proposed Project's

---

<sup>8</sup> California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

estimated natural gas demand is 146.276 therms per year; 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 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 21,003 gallons of diesel fuel for operation of heavy-duty equipment. Assuming all construction worker trips are from light duty autos, it is estimated 3,516 gallons of fuel will be consumed and fuel consumption from construction vendor (material deliver) trips is 1,891 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. The Proposed Project is the development of a convenience store, gas station and drive-thru car wash. The Proposed Project would result in an estimated 385,064 gallons of fuel consumption per year based on 4,173,598 miles driven. As a worst case analysis, half the miles were modeled with an automobile fuel efficiency of 24 miles per gallon and half were modeled at 7 miles per gallon.<sup>9</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. No 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 (CAP) with the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the building energy sector. The City has partnered with Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas

---

<sup>9</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>.

Company (SCG) to form the Energy Leader Partnership (ELP). ELP's goal is to reduce the City's municipal and community-wide energy footprint. CAP also involves implementing a variety of retrofits in municipal lighting and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems and conducting various forms of outreach in the community to encourage adoption of energy efficiency and renewable energy programs offered by SCE and SCG. Under CAP, commercial buildings will be held to net-zero energy performance standards by 2030.

Under Resource Management Element Policy 8 of the City General Plan, the City encourages incorporation of energy conservation features in new developments. In addition, the City shall continue to enforce the energy conservation standards in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and other state laws on energy conservation design, insulation and appliances.<sup>10</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, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

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

<sup>10</sup> City General Plan. Page 76.

7.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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**

According to the City General Plan, Beaumont is located along the northern boundary of the Peninsular Ranges in the San Gorgonio Pass.<sup>11</sup> The City is located within a seismically active region at the junction of the Transverse Ranges and the Peninsular Ranges. The City could be affected by the San Jacinto Fault, the San Andreas Fault Zone in the San Gorgonio pass area, the Banning Fault, and Beaumont Plains Fault Zone. The City and its designated spheres of influence are mostly undeveloped; nearly one-half of the City's land area consists of vacant land. A preliminary soil investigation and infiltration tests report (soils report), dated October 30, 2019, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Soil Exploration Co., Inc. (see Appendix E for report). It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that the information and recommendations contained in the soils report are brought to the attention of the architect and engineer for the project and incorporated into design plans, and necessary steps are taken to ensure that contractor and subcontractor carry out the recommendations (see Appendix E)

### **3.7.2 Impact Analysis**

a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The San Jacinto Fault, considered to be one of the most active faults in southern California, crosses the southern portion of the City and sphere of influence.<sup>12</sup> The San Andreas Fault is approximately six miles northeast of the City. The branch of the Banning Fault closest to Beaumont is inactive. The Project Site is not within a state designated Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.<sup>13</sup> However, according to the soils report, it is probable that not all-active or potentially active faults in the region have been identified. Furthermore, seismic potential of the smaller and less notable faults is not sufficiently developed for assignment of maximum magnitudes and associated levels of ground shaking that might occur at the site due to these faults. 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. During its design life, the Project Site is expected to experience

<sup>11</sup> City General Plan. Page 60.

<sup>12</sup> City General Plan. Page 60.

<sup>13</sup> California Department of Conservation. Fault Activity Map of California 2010.

moderate to strong ground motions from earthquakes on regional and/or nearby causative faults. To ensure that potential adverse impacts involving earthquake faults are reduced to the extent feasible, the recommendation highlighted in the soils report should be carried out. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

The Project Site and its immediate vicinity have low susceptibility to liquefaction.<sup>14</sup> Groundwater is over 300 feet below the ground surface of the Project Site. However, surface or near-surface groundwater conditions can develop in areas where groundwater conditions did not exist prior to site development. There is no way to predict depth to which the groundwater may fluctuate with seasonal changes and from one year to the next due to precipitation, irrigation, land use, climatic conditions and other factors. Subdrains, horizontal drains or other devices may be recommended in future for graded areas that exhibit nuisance seepage conditions.

According to the soils report, the borings from field work revealed that the Project Site is underlain by alluvial soils consisting of silty sand. The earth materials are medium dense to very dense. The potential for seismically induced dynamic settlement of the onsite sandy soils during a strong earthquake is low, however cannot be precluded. To reduce potential impacts to less than significant level, the following mitigation measure should be implemented:

---

<sup>14</sup>Riverside County General Plan: Safety Element Figure S-3 Generalized Liquefaction.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** During construction, the upper foundation soils should be over-excavated and recompacted. All grading and backfills should be performed in accordance with the City of Beaumont Grading Ordinance. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that the information and recommendations contained in the soils report are brought to the attention of the architect and engineer for the project and incorporated into design plans, and necessary steps are taken to ensure that contractor and subcontractor carry out the recommendations. The City Engineer would inspect the work to ensure compliance.

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

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

**No impact.** Landslides and slope failure can result from ground motion generated by earthquakes. The slopes within the San Timoteo Badlands are the most susceptible to landslides in the City. These slopes are approximately 12 miles northwest of the Project Site. The Project Site and its vicinity are relatively flat. The Project Site is not on or close to areas with existing landslides or with high susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Development of the approximately 1.39-acre Project Site 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.

Moreover, Soil Exploration Co., Inc. recommends the following mitigation measure to minimize the possibility of serious erosion:

**Mitigation Measure GEO-2:** Drainage should be directed to established swales and then to appropriate drainage structures. Water, either natural or irrigation, should not be permitted to pond or saturate the surface soils. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure that the information and recommendations contained in the soils report are brought to the attention of the architect and engineer for the project and incorporated into design plans, and necessary steps are taken to ensure that contractor and subcontractor carry out the recommendations. The City Engineer would inspect the work to ensure compliance.

---

<sup>15</sup> Riverside County General Plan: Safety Element Figure S-4 Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map

With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2, impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level.

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 and occurs at approximately 2607 to 2610 feet in elevation. Ramona sandy loam (RaB2) is the only soil type found within the Project Site.<sup>16</sup> RaB2 is well-drained, has low permeability and occurs on alluvial fans and terraces. According to the City General Plan, no unusual soil constraints to future development is anticipated within the City. 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>17</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. Implementation of the recommendations mentioned in the soils report (see Appendix E) can reduce potential impacts to the extent possible. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant 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 soils report, the expansion potential of the onsite soils is anticipated to be very low. Therefore, no 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 Pennsylvania Avenue that provides sewer service to the area. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>16</sup> Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web Soil Survey.

<sup>17</sup> Riverside County Information Technology. Geographic Information System (GIS) "Map my County."

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>18</sup> The majority of level areas throughout the City contain very few significant paleontological sites.<sup>19</sup> The extreme southern areas of the Beaumont planning area have a higher potential for paleontological findings since it remains less disturbed by agricultural cultivation and is subject to less human disturbance. The Project Site is in the northern part of the planning area, where there is more development and lower potential for paleontological findings. In addition, the Project Site is currently vacant with non-native seasonal grasses and invasive weeds. No unique geologic feature is present on the site. The possibility of uncovering paleontological resources cannot be excluded, and therefore, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 should be implemented.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-3:** Should Paleontological resources be encountered during excavation and grading activities all work would cease until appropriate salvage measures are established.<sup>20</sup> If required, the Project Applicant shall prepare and file with the City a paleontological monitoring program. The City will ensure compliance.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3 below would ensure that potential impacts on paleontological resources can be reduced to a less than significant level.

### 3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

8.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<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 MMTCO2e below the 2020 GHG Limit.

---

<sup>18</sup> Riverside County Information Technology. Geographic Information System (GIS) "Map my County."

<sup>19</sup> City General Plan. Page 119.

<sup>20</sup> City General Plan. Page 75.

### **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 early 2021 and completed in early 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 Urban Crossroads, which determined that the Proposed Project would generate 1,401 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 6 and Table 7, the Proposed Project’s emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD’s 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E threshold of significance. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

**Table 6**  
**Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions**  
**(Metric Tons per Year)**

Source/Phase	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
Site Preparation	1.6	0.0	0.0
Grading	2.6	0.0	0.0
Building Construction	227.3	0.0	0.0
Paving	6.5	0.0	0.0
Architectural Coating	1.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Total MTCO2e</b>	<b>240.4</b>		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
<b>Significant</b>	<b>No</b>		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

**Table 7**  
**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	27.3	0.0	0.0
Mobile	1,934.2	0.1	0.0
Waste	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water	1.1	0.0	0.0
Construction Amortized over 30 years	8.0		
<b>Total MTCO2e</b>	<b>1,973.5</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: The City’s Roadmap to Greenhouse Gas Reduction” which commits the City to a more energy efficient pathway. The Project Site is zoned General Commercial under the General Plan. The future emissions estimates of the City’s climate action plan therefore account for the implementation of the Proposed Project as it is consistent with the General Plan. The project design incorporates standards such as Title 24 to lower GHG emissions. In addition, approval of the project will bring products and services to consumers that are currently not provided in the area, thereby reducing vehicle miles travelled. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

9.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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. The Safety Element under the City General Plan is concerned with identifying ways to reduce the potential for accidents and the health risk posed from hazards and hazardous materials.

#### 3.9.2 Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Components of the Proposed Project that may involve potential impacts from hazardous materials include the gas station, two USTs, and one healy tank (clean air separator). One of the USTs will hold 30,000 gallons of Regular Unleaded Gasoline. The other UST is a Split Tank, which will hold 12,000 gallons of Premium Unleaded Gasoline and 10,000 gallons of Diesel.

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

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

Development of the Project Site would disturb approximately 1.39 acres and would therefore be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Requirements of the permit include development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

The purpose of the SWPPP is to: 1) identify pollutant sources that may affect the quality of discharges of storm water associated with construction activities and 2) identify, construct, and implement storm water pollution control measures to reduce pollutants in storm water discharges from the construction site during and after construction. The SWPPP must include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control and abate pollutants. Implementation of mitigation measure WQ-1 in Section 3.11 would ensure that potential impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials to the public or to the environment are reduced to a less than significant level.

- b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

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

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

The City of Beaumont will work with County, State and Federal agencies involved in the regulation of hazardous materials' storage, use and disposal. The City will work with the

Riverside County Fire Department in requiring hazardous materials users and generators to identify safety procedures for responding to accidental spills and emergencies. Additionally, the Proposed Project is subject to NPDES permit requirements and would therefore include a SWPPP.

The construction, installation, and operation of the USTs and gas station is to adhere to all regulations and requirements set forth in the 'California Code of Regulations; Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16: Underground Storage Tank Regulations.' These regulations provide mandatory product implementation and operational procedures to reduce the risk of accidental release. Some of these required appurtenances include, but are not limited to, primary and secondary containment chambers, installation of 24/7 monitoring devices, monitoring programs and reporting procedures, constant vacuum seal of the fueling system, and vapor sensors. Permitting and design of fueling system must be diligently reviewed and approved by County Programs, including the 'South Coast Air Quality Management District' and 'Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Management Branch.' The California Health and Safety Code, Statutes of Chapter 6.7, Underground Storage of Hazardous Materials provides further regulations in regard to permitting the operation of the USTs. Site design and operating procedures are to adhere to California Stormwater Quality Association standard BG-22, which requires implementation of operational BMPs to avoid above ground storm water pollution and discharge into storm drain system. Some of these operational requirements include training employees on proper leak and spill prevention and cleanup practices, and the maintenance and cleaning of the fueling area. Furthermore, an UST permit must be obtained from the County Hazardous Materials Management Branch, which is responsible for routine inspections of fueling station operations and USTs.

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

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is approximately 0.33 miles southeast of Palm Innovation Academy, located at 751 Palm Ave. 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. Although the Project Site is not within 1/4 mile of a school, the Proposed Project would adhere to all California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Chapter 16 - Chapter 18 requirements and pursue the proper permitting and design approvals. It would comply with all Environmental Protection Agency requirements by adhering to all requirements set forth in the 2015 UST Regulations. The Proposed Project would adhere to all local ordinances with approval from the pertinent Riverside County departments. Therefore, no significant impacts are 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. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.<sup>21</sup>

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, dated May 8, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Robin Environmental Management (REM) (see Appendix F). REM's field engineer contacted State and local agencies to determine if any records were filed of former operations of UST of gasoline/product or any other hazardous substances on the Project Site or operations within a one-mile radius. No records were found in reference to historical usage or handling of UST or any hazardous substances on the Project Site. In addition, during the on-site inspection of the Project Site and adjacent parcels, the use, storage, and generation of any quantity of hazardous materials was not observed. No regulatory agency data was found regarding historic or present use of the subject property in regard to hazardous materials previously or presently used, stored, treated, disposed or generated at the Project Site.

The Project Site was not listed on the following environmental regulatory database record research (NETR records search): NPL, RCRA-TSD, CERCLIS, NFRAP, RCRA-G, ERNS, CORRACTS, CORTESE, CALSITES, LUST, UST, and SWF. REM conducted a government records search for environmental liens placed by the federal environmental agency under CERCLA regulations for the Project Site and found that there were none for the Project Site. Records available at the City of Beaumont also show that there are no environmental liens placed by the local environmental agency for the subject site. Therefore, no 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. The nearest airport to the Project Site is the Banning Municipal Airport, located approximately 6 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 in the southwest corner of the Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street intersection. These streets are not major roadways identified as evacuation routes.<sup>22</sup> The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan that outlines responsibilities and procedures to be followed in the event of an emergency or Citywide disaster. The City and the Riverside County Fire Department established certain design standards to ensure that site planning and building design consider public safety and fire prevention; these standards include requirements governing emergency access. During construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the City and

---

<sup>21</sup> Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor database. Accessed March 17, 2020

<sup>22</sup> City General Plan. Exhibit 5.3 Safety Plan.

County. Site access for operations would be subject to approval of the Site Plan by the City. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Proposed development under the General Plan is subject to environmental and building permit review procedures to ensure adequate and appropriate site design and construction methods are implemented to reduce the risk of wildland fires. For new development, the creation of defensible areas around building structures, and use of fire-resistant building materials will provide protection from wildland fires. 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>23</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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>23</sup> CalFire. VHFHSZ Local Responsibility Area Map for the Western Riverside County Region

### **3.10.1 Environmental Setting**

According to the City General Plan, the City's water supply has been sourced from groundwater supplies within the Beaumont Groundwater Storage Unit (BSU). The BSU is part of the Beaumont Hydrologic Subarea of the San Timoteo Hydrologic Area and the northern portion of the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit. The City is serviced by the Beaumont/Cherry Valley Water District. The District draws groundwater from shallow wells in Little San Gorgonio Canyon. The increase in urban runoff due to increasing urban/suburban growth has resulted in the degradation of the surface water quality.

### **3.10.2 Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 1.39 acres and is therefore subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES. Construction activities covered under the State's General Construction permit include removal of vegetation, grading excavating, or any other activity that causes the disturbance of at least one acre. The General Construction permit requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a SWPPP.

A preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), dated November 24, 2019 was prepared for the Proposed Project by Love Engineering and approved by the City of August 31, 2020. The WQMP is included in Appendix G. The WQMP 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 site. See part b below for project compliance to sustainable groundwater management plan.

The implementation of the 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 as listed in the final WQMP to be approved by the City.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project's water demands would be met by the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD) which draws groundwater from shallow wells in Little San Gorgonio Canyon. The Beaumont Groundwater Basin has a large storage capacity for banked water.<sup>24</sup> During wet years, BCVWD can bank State Water Program water for dry 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, based on the City's 2007 General Plan projected build-out population. The build-out population estimate will set the ultimate water demand. The Proposed Project is the development of a drive-thru car wash, convenience store and gas station. It includes approximately 14,554 square feet of landscaping, which is 26.63% of the total site. It is consistent with the 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. In addition, as is required by BCVWD, landscaped areas which have turf shall have smart irrigation controllers and systems shall have automatic rain sensors. Landscaping in non-turf areas should be drought-tolerant with drip or bubbler irrigation systems. In addition, the car wash tunnel will utilize recycled water. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** 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 convenience store, drive-thru car wash and gas station. 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 basins. According to the City General Plan, future development under the General Plan will not result in any additional soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Soils within City limits are classified as Ramona-Placentia, Hanford, and Yolo Soils Association.<sup>25</sup> These soils are generally well drained, have low soil permeability, and have relatively low inherent fertility. The Project Site does not fall within any geological boundary which would contribute to the soil erosion or loss of topsoil to the Project Site or surrounding properties. Moreover, the Project Applicant is required to design temporary drainage facilities and erosion control measures to minimize erosion and silt deposition during site grading activities.

---

<sup>24</sup> BCVWD. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

<sup>25</sup> City General Plan. Page 105.

Development of the approximately 1.39-acre Project Site 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.

Moreover, implementation of mitigation measure GEO-2 would minimize the possibility of serious erosion and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** A Hydrology/Hydraulics Study, dated May 4, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Love Engineering (see Appendix G). The purpose of this study is to analyze the 10 year and 100 year, 3 hour, 6 hour, and 24 hour storm flows for the site under existing conditions and developed conditions to determine the necessary detention volume to mitigate storm flows due to development. The results of the study show that flows exiting the Project Site under proposed conditions are less than or equal to the flows exiting the Project Site under existing conditions. Although development often increases stormwater runoff, there are factors that can contribute to reduction in stormwater runoff. The reduction of stormwater runoff from the Project Site under proposed conditions is due to the increase in the length of the path of travel, thus yielding a longer time of concentration. However, the storm flow volumes were increased for the 24 hour storms. Since the stormwater runoff under proposed conditions is less than or equal to runoff under existing conditions, there will be no downstream impacts. There will be no offsite run-on and the Project Site will be protected from the 100-year storm through the onsite area drains and detention basin. The basin will still be needed for water quality purposes. There is an existing 42" storm drain in Pennsylvania Avenue that the basin outlet will tie into.

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. According to the City General Plan, the General Plan Area is not exposed to significant hazards due to dam or levee failure(s). The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps portions of the City within the 100-year flood plain zones. The Project Site is within 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>26</sup> Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>26</sup> FEMA. National Flood Hazard Layer.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the percent of impervious surface from 18% to 72%.<sup>27</sup> The flow rate under proposed conditions is the same as that under existing conditions. The volume, however, increases from 3,273 CF to 5,211 CF (delta=1,938 CF). The Proposed Project includes two bioretention basins to mitigate the Hydraulic Conditions of Concern. Basin #1 will have a volume of 468 CF and Basin #2 will have a volume of 1,795 CF, for a total basin volume of 2,263 CF. The bioretention basins are anticipated to achieve a complete on-site retention of the increased stormwater runoff.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Due to the inland distance from the Pacific Ocean and any other significant body of water, tsunamis and seiches are not potential hazards in the vicinity of the Project Site. 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>28</sup> This zone corresponds to areas with moderate to low risk of flooding.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, no 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"/>

<sup>27</sup> Hydrology/Hydraulics Study for Beyond Food Beaumont. Love Engineering. May 4, 2020.

<sup>28</sup> FEMA. National Flood Hazard Layer.

<sup>29</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)

### **3.11.1 Environmental Setting**

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

### **3.11.2 Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City General Plan Area has been subdivided into smaller Planning areas. The Project Site is part of the 6<sup>th</sup> St. Corridor Planning Area. Commercial and industrial uses are the predominant land uses within this Planning Area, with residential uses north of Sixth Street. The Project Site is currently vacant and within a General Commercial (CG) zone. The CG Zone is intended to permit development that provides for a range of commercial service and retail land uses. The Proposed Project is the development of a convenience store, gas station and drive-thru car wash, and would serve nearby residential communities. It would be conditionally permitted within the CG Zone. Approval of the CUP is required for the establishment of the drive-thru car wash and gas station within the CG zone. 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 include the construction of a linear feature. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site has a current land use zoning of General Commercial (CG). Approval of the CUP is required for establishment of the drive-thru car wash and gas station within the CG zone. With approval of the CUP, the Proposed Project would comply with applicable requirements for structures in the CG zone. In addition, the Project Site is located within the Sixth Street Overlay. This overlay provides for the development of mixed uses (residential and/or commercial). The Proposed Project would be consistent with the uses permitted and conditionally permitted in the CG zone and Sixth Street Overlay. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

12.	MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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 General Plan Area is lacking in any known or identified mineral resources. Development under the General Plan will not restrict access to mineral resources outside of the General Plan Area. There may be accretions of aggregates along watercourses and drainage ways that can be valuable for local construction.

#### 3.12.2 Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to the California Department of Conservation, Mineral Land Classification map, the Project Site is located in the San Bernardino Production-Consumption (P-C) region, specifically in Special Report (SR) 143. The Project Site and its immediate vicinity occur within Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3).<sup>30</sup> This zone is defined as an area containing mineral deposits with a significance that cannot be evaluated from available data. According to the City General Plan, there are no known or identified mineral resources of regional or Statewide importance within the General Plan Area.<sup>31</sup> Additionally, development under the General Plan will not restrict access to mineral resources outside of the General Plan Area. The Proposed Project's demand for mineral resources will be considered less than significant due to the abundance of available aggregate resources in the Southern California region. Mineral resource mining would not be compatible with the surrounding land uses and the General Plan designation for the Project Site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** Analysis under the City General Plan concludes that development under the General Plan will not result in a significant loss of available locally important mineral resource

---

<sup>30</sup> California Department of Conservation. Mineral Land Classification of Aggregate Resources SR 143 Plate 7.16

<sup>31</sup> City General Plan. Page 152

recovery site. There are no delineated sites of mineral resources within the General Plan Area. Undeveloped areas of the General Plan Area may yield sand, gravel and aggregate that can be used for local construction activities as long as mineral extraction does not conflict with other policies or land uses. The Project Site has a current zoning of General Commercial and is within a commercial area of the city. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.13 NOISE

13.	NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 350 feet north of the I-10. A Noise Impact Analysis, dated October 27, 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 (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

Modeled unmitigated construction noise levels when combined with existing measured noise levels could reach 74.3 dBA Leq at the nearest commercial property line to the north, 70.5 dBA Leq at the nearest residential dwelling unit to the north, 71 dBA Leq at the nearest residential dwelling unit to the northeast, 76.2 dBA Leq at the nearest commercial property line to the east, up to 70.6 dBA Leq at the nearest residential dwelling unit to the east, up to 72.2 dBA Leq at the nearest residential dwelling unit to the southwest, up to 79.6 dBA Leq at the nearest commercial property line to the west, up to 70.1 dBA Leq at the mobile home park to the west, and up to 67.9 dBA Leq at the nearest residential dwelling unit to the northwest of the Project Site.

Construction noise sources are regulated within Section 9.02.110(F) of the City of Beaumont 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. Furthermore, 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 between 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.

Impacts related to construction noise will be further minimized with adherence to applicable Municipal Ordinances and implementation of the mitigation measures N-1 to N-7 presented below. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Existing and Existing Plus project noise levels along acoustically significant area roadways were modeled utilizing the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Prediction Model FHWA-RD-77-108 in order to quantify the Proposed Project's contribution to increases in ambient noise levels.

For off-site project generated noise, 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.

Per the noise modeling, all of the modeled roadway segments are anticipated to change the noise a nominal amount (approximately 0.03 to 0.23 dBA CNEL). Therefore, a change in noise level would not be audible and would be considered less than significant.

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

The SoundPLAN noise model was utilized to estimate project peak hour operational noise at noise measurement locations and at adjacent properties in order to determine if it is likely to exceed the City's noise thresholds at nearby receptors.

Daytime peak hour project operational noise operational noise levels are expected to range between 42 and 62 dBA Leq; and nighttime operational noise levels are expected to range between 23 and 46 dBA Leq at nearby land uses. Per Section 9.02.070 of the Municipal Code, all standards were adjusted to be no lower than 57.8 dBA Leq which is the lowest measured noise level in the project vicinity. Operational daytime noise levels will not exceed the City's exterior or interior daytime and nighttime noise standards.

#### Noise Impacts to the Proposed Project (Noise/Land Use Compatibility)

In order to evaluate the Proposed project in light of the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards provided in the City of Beaumont General Plan Noise Element, 2040 traffic noise levels associated with Pennsylvania Avenue and 6<sup>th</sup> Street was modeled utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model - FHWA-RD-77-108. The proposed convenience store is located approximately 200 feet south of the centerline of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and approximately 80 feet west of the centerline of Pennsylvania Avenue. Pennsylvania Avenue is designated as a Major Highway and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue is designated as an Arterial Highway. Future noise levels associated with 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue vehicle traffic is expected to reach 74.5 dBA CNEL at the northeast corner of the proposed convenience store. This noise level falls below the maximum acceptable noise level for commercial land uses. This impact is 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. The contractor and City shall ensure compliance.

**Mitigation Measure N-2:** The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project Site. The contractor and City shall ensure compliance.

**Mitigation Measure N-3:** Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use. The contractor shall ensure compliance.

**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. The contractor and City shall ensure compliance.

**Mitigation Measure N-5:** Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors. The contractor and City shall ensure compliance.

**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. The contractor shall ensure compliance.

**Mitigation Measure N-7:** The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. The contractor and City shall ensure compliance.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** 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.

A peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.20 is the threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to normal dwellings. It is also the level at which groundborne vibration can become annoying. Impacts would be significant if construction activities result in groundborne vibration of 0.20 PPV or higher at a sensitive receptor.

Construction equipment is anticipated to be located at a distance of at least 55 feet or more from any receptor. Temporary vibration levels associated with project construction would be less than significant. At 55 feet, which is the distance to the closest off-site building, the commercial use to the west, use of a vibratory roller would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.064 and a bulldozer would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.027. Use of either a vibratory roller or a bulldozer would not be considered annoying to nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant. No mitigations are required.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located approximately 6 miles west of the Banning Municipal Airport. The Project Site is neither within an airport land use plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.<sup>32</sup> The Proposed Project would

---

<sup>32</sup> Riverside County Information Technology GIS. Map My County. Accessed July 15, 2020.

not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

14.	<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> <b>Would the project:</b>	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. For 2018, the City was estimated to have a population of 49,241. The City is one of the fastest growing cities in Riverside County and in California. The Community Development Element of the City General Plan outlines the standards for development intensity and population density for each land designation.

#### **3.14.2 Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The General Plan is not intended to induce population growth but rather, to identify the plans, policies and programs necessary to accommodate anticipated growth within the City and surrounding region. The population growth estimates based on the General Plan are consistent with SCAG growth forecasts. If there is a minor increase in population growth as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project, this population growth would be accounted for in the General Plan and considered insignificant. The Proposed Project would require an estimate of 12 employees. It is anticipated that this demand in employment will be provided by the existing local population. Short-term construction activities at the Project Site would not attract new employees to the area since a pool of construction labor exists in the region. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is currently vacant and does not contain housing that could potentially be displaced. The Project Site is designated “General Commercial”, which corresponds to smaller commercial retail and service-related activities found along 6th Street.

This land use designation permits a range of retail and service-oriented land uses, which is intended to serve adjacent neighborhoods. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this land use designation. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES**

15.	<b>PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <i>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:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(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 City of Beaumont will oversee the development of adequate and dependable services to meet the needs of existing and future development (Community Development Element Policy 20). These services include fire protection, law enforcement, hospital/healthcare services and education.

#### **3.15.2 Impact Analysis**

a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City of Beaumont contracts with the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) for Citywide services, including fire protection, public service and emergency medical aid response. Fire protection services are supplemented by the California Department of Forestry station in the City. Six County fire stations serve the City, with three stations based outside but near Beaumont's boundaries. Riverside County Fire Station 66, located at 628 Maple Avenue, is approximately 0.34 miles northwest of the Project Site. 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. Additionally, the Project Applicant will be required to pay a one-time mitigation fee to support the development of new fire station facilities under Beaumont City Ordinance 795 and a separate fee for emergency preparedness under City Ordinance 814. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Beaumont Police Department provides police protection services in the area of the Project Site. The closest police station, located at 660 Orange Avenue, is approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the Project Site. Public concerns have been related to the addition of businesses that sell alcohol could increase crime. The Beaumont Market across the street from the Project Site currently sells beer and wine. The Beaumont Police Department has indicated in an October 22, 2020 communication that the Proposed Project would increase crime rate as there are many alcohol-selling businesses along the I-10 freeway, but the increase would not be significant. According to the City General Plan, City General Fund revenues are typically used to provide and supplement police services, as required. Revenues from the Proposed Project would be allocated to finance an increased demand for police protection services. The Project Applicant would be required to pay a one-time basic service facility fee under City Ordinance 506. An increase in demand for police protection resulting from the Proposed Project would be accounted for in the General Plan and would be considered insignificant. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?*

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

d) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City shall improve the requirement of establishing five acres of parkland for every one thousand persons in conjunction with residential development.<sup>33</sup> The City of Beaumont and Cherry Valley Recreation and Park District own and operate park facilities. Population growth resulting from the implementation of the General

---

<sup>33</sup> City General Plan. Page 52.

Plan will lead to an increased demand for public parks. The City's Local Park Code and the State of California Quimby Act require new development to provide parkland dedications or appropriate fees in case the Proposed Project might have direct or indirect impacts on parks. The increase in employment from the Proposed Project is anticipated to be fulfilled by the local population. Therefore, no 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.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<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 General Plan's Resource Management Element addresses open space and recreational resources. The City manages parks and recreational facilities to ensure these facilities stay in good condition. The City intends to increase the recreational facilities available to residents. The Project Site is primarily surrounded by commercial and residential development.

#### 3.16.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

**No Impact.** The implementation of the Proposed Project is not expected to lead to substantial population growth. As a result, the Proposed Project would not lead to substantial physical

deterioration of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. It would not require the construction or expansion of park or other recreational facilities to meet demands. 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 population. It would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to meet demands of residential development. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### **3.17 TRANSPORTATION**

17.	<b>TRANSPORTATION.</b> <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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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 2022. Access to and from the Project Site would be via a right-in/right-out only access to Pennsylvania Avenue and an existing right turns in/out only access to Sixth Street currently being used by Auto Zone store. A Traffic Impact Analysis, dated August 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).

#### **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.**

Based on the study intersections identified in the approved scoping agreement, the study area consists of the following study intersections within the City of Beaumont jurisdiction:

1. Project Driveway (NS) at Sixth Street (EW)

2. Pennsylvania Avenue (NS) at Sixth Street (EW)
3. Pennsylvania Avenue (NS) at Project Driveway (EW)
4. Pennsylvania Avenue (NS) at I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp (EW)
5. Pennsylvania Avenue (NS) at I-10 Eastbound 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 has established Level of Service D as the target Level of Service and Level of Service E as a threshold standard. As stated in the Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (State of California, 2002), “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”. For consistency with local requirements, the TIA defines Level of Service D as the minimum acceptable Level of Service for State Highway facilities. The Proposed Project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 1,401 net daily trips, including 170 net trips during the AM peak hour and 162 net trips during the PM peak hour

#### *Existing*

The study intersections currently operate within acceptable Levels of Service during the peak hours for Existing conditions, except for the following study intersection that is projected to operate at deficient Levels of Service (E or F):

- Pennsylvania Avenue at I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp – (PM peak hour)

#### *Existing Plus Project*

The study intersections are forecast to operate within acceptable Levels of Service (D or better) during the peak hours for Existing Plus Project conditions, except for the following study intersection that is projected to operate at deficient Levels of Service:

- Pennsylvania Avenue at I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp – (PM peak hour)

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has been collaborating with the City of Beaumont to develop a long-term plan to construct a new freeway interchange and signalized ramps on Pennsylvania Avenue at the I-10 Freeway. The City of Beaumont has provided the conceptual design plan for the Pennsylvania Avenue Widening Project. The Opening Year (2022) analysis has been conducted with these lane geometrics and intersection controls.

As part of the project, the I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp would be relocated north on Pennsylvania Avenue. A project referred to as the New Gas Station NWC of Pennsylvania Avenue and I-10 WB Off Ramp located adjacent to the subject Project Site to the south is

proposing to construct the west leg of the intersection as a project driveway. The intersection lane geometrics and traffic volumes for this project have been included in this analysis.

The improvements are expected to fully resolve the existing deficient level of service during the PM peak hour for Existing Plus Project conditions. Without the Caltrans-planned interchange improvements, the Proposed Project would have significant impacts on LOS. To ensure that the Proposed Project will have no significant impacts at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue at I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp, Mitigation Measure T-1 should be implemented.

The Proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant Level of Service impacts at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for Opening Year (2022) traffic conditions, with the Caltrans-planned I-10 freeway interchange improvements at Pennsylvania Avenue would will resolve existing deficient level of service. Consultation between the City of Beaumont and Caltrans should determine whether or not this improvement should be implemented for interim conditions." This interim improvement is considered counter-intuitive since Caltrans currently has planned I-10 freeway interchange improvements at this location which once constructed will result in the interchange operating at acceptable LOS during the peak hours. Construction of the interim improvement may coincide with Caltrans planned improvements (which are more intensive) or interfere with the scheduling/construction of Caltrans planned improvements, deeming the interim improvement superfluous. Construction of the interim improvement may also be completed just prior to Caltrans starting construction on its planned freeway interchange project, thus negating any potential benefit of the interim improvement on the roadway network. This would depend on Caltrans construction schedule. Therefore, as recommended, the City of Beaumont and Caltrans should determine the necessity and feasibility of this interim improvement.

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

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.

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

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. The Proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions without improvements.

The TIA assumes the Proposed Project shall 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/California Department of Transportation sight distance standards.

#### *Queuing Analysis*

The existing storage length for the northbound right turn lane at the intersection of Project Driveway at Sixth Street and the eastbound right turn lane at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue at Project Driveway are forecast to provide adequate queueing capacity with the addition of new project trips. The proposed storage lengths for the project driveways are forecast to provide adequate queueing capacity with the addition of new project trips.

The Proposed Project is the development of a gas station, convenience store and a drive-thru car wash. It is a land use project that would allow commercial services to be more accessible to residents of the neighborhoods west, southwest and north of the Project Site. The study area is currently served by PassTransit bus service. Routes 1, 2, and 3 run along Sixth Street. There are currently existing bicycle lanes along Sixth Street. Sidewalks are provided intermittently on the north and south sides of Sixth Street, and generally not provided on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Proposed Project would be easily accessible to residents. It would not alter existing transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities.

**Mitigation Measure T-1:** Widen the I-10 Westbound Off-Ramp to provide for one exclusive left turn lane and one exclusive right turn lane. The City shall ensure compliance.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1, as dictated by the City and CalTrans, the Proposed Project would not result in LOS operational deficiency and would meet the minimum acceptable Level of Service for State Highway facilities..

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 Proposed Project involves construction of a local-serving gas station, which is listed as a VMT-reducing project in the WRCOG TIA Guidelines. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant VMT impact based on the local-serving nature of the project in accordance with the WRCOG TIA Guidelines, as adopted by the City of Beaumont. Therefore, no 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 Impact.** The Proposed Project is the development of a gas station, drive-thru car wash and convenience store. It includes a 35-foot driveway on Pennsylvania Avenue and a 35-foot driveway on Sixth Street that would be shared with the adjacent Auto Zone store. The Proposed Project does 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. Furthermore, the Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue intersection is a signalized intersection, which can help minimize potential safety hazards resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would share the existing driveway at Sixth Street currently utilized by the Auto Zone store. The driveway would include one inbound lane and one outbound lane with northbound stop-control and maintain

the existing lane configurations. Therefore, this new design feature is not anticipated to increase hazards. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant 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. The Proposed Project includes a 35-foot driveway on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Proposed Project would share the existing right turns in/out only access to Sixth Street currently being used by Auto Zone store. The driveways would be wide enough to allow evacuation and emergency vehicles simultaneous access. The City Fire Department shall have the authority to inspect the Project Site as often as necessary to ensure that there are no hazards violating fire safety, such as inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 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 Pass Cahuilla, Desert Cahuilla and Mountain Cahuilla are the main Cahuilla populations associated with western Riverside County. The cultural remains of the Native American Cahuilla peoples who inhabited the area until the mid1800s have been found in numerous locations throughout the City and region.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>34</sup> City General Plan. Page 119.

### **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)?*
- 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.

According to the City General Plan, the cultural remains of the Native American Cahuilla peoples have been found in numerous locations throughout the City and region. Rincon found 148 previously recorded cultural resources within a 1.0-mile radius of the Project Site. No cultural resources were identified on the Project Site. Moreover, review of historical topographic map from 1901 to 2018 s and aerial imagery spanning from 1953 to 2016 show that the Project Site has been undeveloped. Development to the north, south and west of the project site is seen as early as 1942.

Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 27, 2020, to request a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) and a contact list of Native Americans culturally affiliated with the project area. A response was received from the NAHC on April 30, 2020, stating the SLF search had been completed with “negative” results. On May 8, 2020, Rincon sent letters to 21 Native American contacts to request information on potential cultural resources in the project vicinity that may be impacted by project development. As of the date of the memorandum, no responses have been received. According to CEQA guidelines, this outreach does not constitute formal Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation. 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. Any mitigation measures required by the tribe(s) and agreed to by the City may become project Conditions of Approval (COAs). Therefore, as of the date of this Initial Study, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

19.	UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<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?	<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.** The implementation of the City's Sewer Master Plan will avoid the need for additional septic tank use within the General Plan Area. New development under the General Plan will be served through the City sewer system and wastewater treatment plant. The Proposed Project will construct sewer laterals from the convenience store with attached car wash to an existing 18" sewer line in Pennsylvania Avenue. The Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District will provide water service to the Proposed Project. There is an existing 6" water line in Pennsylvania Avenue 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.

Implementation of the City Master Plan of Drainage ensures that future increases in the peak rates of runoff are managed and maintained within acceptable parameters. Furthermore, implementation of storm water Best Management Practices will ensure that the Proposed Project appropriately conveys storm water runoff without adversely impacting upstream or downstream drainage characteristics. Therefore, no construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities are required with implementation of the Proposed Project.

Southern California Edison will provide basic electrical services to the Project Site. The Proposed Project will connect to the existing lines serving the adjacent AutoZone store. The Proposed Project will be conditioned to underground the existing power poles along Pennsylvania Avenue, along the project frontage and extending to the nearest power pole beyond the Project Site boundary. Total electricity demand in SCE's service area is estimated to increase by approximately 12,000 Gigawatt Hour (GWh) between the years 2015 and 2026. Gigawatt hour is a unit of energy representing one billion watt hours. The commercial building sector of the Southern California Edison planning area consumed 37260.897803 GWh of electricity in 2018.<sup>35</sup> The estimated electricity demand for the Proposed Project is 0.083219 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.

The Project Site would be serviced by Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). According to the California Energy Commission, the natural gas consumption of the SoCalGas planning area commercial building sector was 937.882107 therms in 2018.<sup>36</sup> The Proposed Project's estimated natural gas demand is 146.276 therms per year; it would represent an insignificant percentage to the overall natural gas demand in SoCalGas's commercial building sector. The existing SoCalGas facilities are expected to sufficiently serve the increased demand of natural gas.

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site will be serviced by the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD). The BCVWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) estimated the City's water demand to the multi-family, commercial, industrial, institutional/governmental and other categories from the actual 2015 values through 2040 on

---

<sup>35</sup> California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

<sup>36</sup> California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database.

<sup>37</sup> AT&T. Progress Toward our 2020/2025 Goals. <https://about.att.com/ecms/dam/csr/sustainability-reporting/PDF/2017/ATT-Goals.pdf>.

the basis that the changes in demand would be proportional to the changes in single family demand. 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 will set the ultimate water demand.

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

As stated in the 2015 UWMP, the Beaumont Groundwater Basin has large storage capacity for banked water. BCVWD banks imported water in BCVWD's storage account in the Beaumont Basin when available from San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency (SGPWA) and as funds permit. This imported water can be extracted in future years when water allocations are insufficient to meet demands. Banking water in the storage account is critical to meeting demands during dry years. During wet years, BCVWD can bank State Project Water for dry years.

According to the UWMP, water supplies will be able to meet demand until 2040 for normal years. However, water supplies will not be able to meet demands for single and multiple years until 2040. Difference between supply and demand will be provided from previously banked water in the Beaumont Basin.

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to the City General Plan, Beaumont will continue to provide for the development of wastewater treatment infrastructure to accommodate future demand. The Proposed Project has a General Plan land designation of General Commercial and its development is included in the City's expected future growth. As of 2015, the Beaumont WWTP had a wastewater treatment capacity of 4 million gallons per day (MGD), which is not sufficient to accommodate all expected future growth within the city. The facility

is planned to expand to provide a minimum treatment capacity of 8.0 MGD. The Project Applicant will be required to pay developer impact fees to finance treatment plant expansion. Upon completion of the facility expansion, the Beaumont WTP would have a surplus wastewater capacity of approximately 5.5 MGD to serve existing and future demands. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The nearest landfill to serve the Proposed Project is the Riverside County Lambs Canyon Landfill (approximately 3 miles south of the Project Site). During a permit review process in 2007, the landfill's capacity was increased, and the life of the facility was extended from 2024 to 2029. Wastes generated under build-out conditions will be directed to landfills with available capacity, as determined by the County. The City General Plan EIR concludes that, upon implementation of the General Plan, compliance with the City's adopted Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) target waste reduction and recycling goals, and proper management and disposal of waste streams would not result in a significant exceedance of permitted landfill capacities. The General Plan land use designation for the Project Site is General Commercial (CG), and the Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the requirements of this land use designation. Solid waste generation from the Proposed Project was accounted for in the General Plan and the City's expected increase in waste generation. Additionally, the Proposed Project is required to comply with Chapter 8.12 Solid Waste Management of the City's municipal code. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) *Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

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

### 3.20 WILDFIRE

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

20.	<b>WILDFIRE.</b> <b>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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**

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

### **3.20.2 Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is in the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street. According to the City General Plan Exhibit 5.3, these streets are not major roadways identified as evacuation routes. The General Plan Circulation Element provides for appropriate evacuation routes and circulation throughout the General Plan Area to facilitate rapid response to emergency situations. Moreover, the General Plan will provide for public education related to emergency conditions and emergency preparedness, response and evacuation plans. The Proposed Project will not include elements that would conflict or interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Furthermore, new development plans are subject to review and approval by the RCFD, thereby ensuring that the Proposed Project does not interfere with evacuation. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b, c) *Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** As shown on CalFire's Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) Local Responsibility Area Map for the Western Riverside County Region, the Project Site does not lie within a VHFHSZ and is not in area considered a wildfire risk. The Proposed Project is subject to environmental and building permit review procedures to reduce the risk of wildfires. The Project Site is relatively flat, with elevations on-site ranging from approximately 2607 to 2610 feet in elevation. High winds are expected to cause potentially adverse effects within the General Plan Area. However, the implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce the risk of wildfires by eliminating the site's existing non-native grasses and providing a paved foundation. Moreover, the Project Site is surrounded by either vacant land or commercial development and is not anywhere near an area of combustible vegetation. The risk of wildfires is low due to the lack of wildfire fuel factors. Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) will review the final design to ensure the mitigation of fire hazards and minimal impacts to the environment. Additionally, the Project Site is not within a VHFHSZ.<sup>38</sup> 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 is relatively flat and is not subject to post-fire slope instability. According to the City General Plan, peak rates of runoff will be managed within acceptable parameters throughout the implementation of the City Master Plan of Drainage and City Capital Improvement Programs. The implementation of associated storm water BMPs will ensure that the Proposed Project appropriately conveys storm water runoff without affecting upstream or downstream drainage characteristics. The Proposed Project will be conditioned to 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, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

---

<sup>38</sup> Calfire. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps.

21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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"/>
(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 Habitat Assessment and Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and Consistency Analysis was prepared for the Proposed Project by RCA Associates, Inc. (RCA). RCA conducted a site visit to assess the Project Site's potential to support special-status species and the presence of other sensitive resources protected by local, state and federal laws and regulations. The report contained an evaluation of potential impacts to special-status species and sensitive biological resources, which may occur as a result of the Proposed Project. There are eighteen federal and/or State listed wildlife species and fourteen federal and/or State listed plants occurring in the region. However, no listed or special status plant or wildlife species or sensitive habitats were observed within the Project Site during the field investigations. In addition, the Project Site does not contain any vernal pools or Urban/Wildlife interface areas. Nesting birds are not likely to utilize the few shrubs on the site and trees along the boundary but potential impacts to nesting birds can be reduced significantly or eliminated by implementing mitigation measure BIO-1. To ensure that the Proposed Project is consistent with the MSHCP and that potential impacts to burrowing owls do not occur on the site, mitigation measure BIO-2 should be implemented.

A Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum, dated May 18, 2020, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon). According to Rincon's Cultural Resources Records Search, 148 cultural resources were identified within 1.0-mile radius of the Project Site. None of these resources were found on the Project Site. As shown on historical topographic maps and aerial imagery, the Project Site is depicted as undeveloped land, with much of the surrounding area developed for at least 75 years. Furthermore, no prehistoric or historic-period cultural resources were observed during the field survey. The Native American Heritage Commission stated that the Sacred Lands File search returned with negative results for the Project Site. Based on the results of the cultural resources technical memorandum, no significant cultural resources were identified on the Project Site that would be impacted by the implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, Rincon recommends

a finding of no impact to historical resources. Because there is always a possibility of unanticipated discovery of cultural resources, Mitigation Measure CR-1 shall be implemented to avoid potential significant impacts.

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. This list of project includes the New Gas Station NWC of Pennsylvania Avenue and I-10 WB Off Ramp. The Proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions without improvements.

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 drive-thru car wash, gas station, and convenience store on a 1.39-acre is not anticipated to generate significant impacts or generate significant operational mobile emissions. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,401 daily trips. Approval of the project does not require a zone change nor a general plan amendment and is consistent with the 2007 Beaumont General Plan.

Therefore, impacts associated with the Proposed Project would not be considered individually adverse or unfavorable. 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-7. Mitigation measures N-4 and N-5, in particular, serve to mitigate construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

The City of Beaumont, as is the case for most of Southern California, is located within a seismically active region. The potential for seismically induced dynamic settlement of the onsite sandy soils during a strong earthquake is low but cannot be precluded. Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 can reduce the potential substantial adverse effect involving seismic activity and soil erosion.

## REFERENCES

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

Federal Emergency Management Agency. National Flood hazard Layer. Accessed 3/17/2020.

City of Beaumont. City of Beaumont General Plan Map. Accessed 4/18/2020.

<https://beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/66/Printable-General-Plan-Map?bId=>

California Department of Conservation. "Riverside County Important Farmland 2016 Sheet 1 of 3." Accessed on 3/5/20.

[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)

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

<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed on 11/20/19.

Riverside County General Plan Safety Element.

[https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06\\_Safety\\_080619.pdf](https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/2019/elements/Ch06_Safety_080619.pdf).

Accessed 3/4/2020.

United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. Accessed 4/23/2020.

<https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>

Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances site list.

<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=1905+business+center+dr+san+bernardino+ca+92408>. Accessed 3/17/2020.

Calfire. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5907/beaumont.pdf>.

Accessed on 3/17/2020.

CA Department of Conservation. Mineral Land Classification.

[ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_143/PartVII/Plate\\_7-16.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartVII/Plate_7-16.pdf) . Accessed on 3/17/2020.

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 5/4/2020.

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 4/20/2020.

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 6/10/2020.

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

<https://www.beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27815/Beaumont-Climate-Action-Plan?bId=>. Accessed 3/18/2020.

Riverside County Department of Waste Resources. Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. Accessed 3/18/2020.

### **PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES**

Ganddini Group, Inc. Sixth at Pennsylvania Beyond Food Mart Project Traffic Impact Analysis. July 29, 2020.

Ganddini Group, Inc. Sixth at Pennsylvania Beyond Food Mart Noise Impact Analysis. October 27, 2020.

Lilburn Corporation. CalEEMod Output for Beyond Food Mart. August 2020.

Love Engineering. Hydrology/Hydraulics Study for Beyond Food Beaumont. November 29, 2019.

Love Engineering. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan. November 24, 2019, approved by City of Beaumont August 31, 2020.

RCA Associates, Inc. Habitat Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis. October 27, 2020.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum. May 18, 2020.

Robin Environmental Management. Phase I Environmental Assessment Report. May 8, 2020.

Soil Exploration Co., Inc. Preliminary Soil Investigation and Infiltration Tests. October 20, 2019.