

Final Environmental Impact Report
SCH No. 2022070351

Orchard Logistics Center

City of Beaumont, California

Lead Agency
City of Beaumont
550 East 6th Street
Beaumont, CA 92223

CEQA Consultant
T&B Planning, Inc.
3200 El Camino Real, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92602

Project Applicant
Orchard Logistics Venture, LLC
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 230
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Lead Agency Discretionary Permits
Plot Plan PP2022-0440
Parking Variance

March 2024



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1.0 Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Public Review Process.....	1-1
1.2 List of EIR Commenters.....	1-2
Section 2.0 Responses to Comments Received During the Public Review Period	2-1
Section 3.0 Clarifications and Revisions	3-1



SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 15088 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Beaumont, as the Lead Agency, has evaluated the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Orchard Logistics Center (Project) (SCH No. 22022070351) and has prepared written responses to these comments. This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and represents the independent judgment of the lead agency.

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) *The Draft EIR or a revision of the draft;*
- (b) *Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary;*
- (c) *A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;*
- (d) *The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and*
- (e) *Any other information added by the Lead Agency.*

The Planning Commission will consider certification of the EIR, adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Findings and Facts, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations as part of the approval process for the Project.

This Final EIR document is organized as follows:

Section 1 provides a brief introduction to this document, a summary of the public review process, and a list of commenters.

Section 2 provides responses to the public comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period. Responses are provided in the form of individual responses to comment letters received. Comment letters are followed immediately by the responses to each letter.

Section 3 contains revisions and clarifications to the Draft EIR as a result of the comments received from agencies and interested persons as well as errata identified in the EIR. This information does not constitute significant new information and recirculation of the EIR for further review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 is not required.

1.1 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

In compliance with Section 15201 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Beaumont (City) has taken steps to provide opportunities for public participation in the environmental review process. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study were distributed on July 20, 2022 to responsible agencies, local government agencies, and interested parties for a 30-day public review period (from July 20, 2022 to August 18, 2022) in order to solicit comments and inform agencies and the public of the Project. The NOP was also distributed to the State of California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (SCH) for distribution to State agencies. The NOP was posted on the City's website, Press-Enterprise Newspaper on July 20, 2022, and at the Riverside County Clerk's office on July 19, 2022. The Project was described; potential environmental effects associated with Project



implementation were identified; and agencies and the public were invited to review and comment on the NOP. Additionally, the City held a Public Scoping Meeting on August 3, 2022 via live streaming to provide an overview of the Project, explain the CEQA process, and accept public comment. A copy of the NOP and comments received during the 30-day public review period are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The City received 3 comment letters in response to the NOP. Table 2-2 of the Draft EIR provides a brief summary of the NOP comments received that address environmental and related issues.

CEQA requires that a Draft EIR have a review period lasting at least 45 days for projects that have been submitted to the SCH for review (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15105(a)). The Draft EIR was distributed to various public agencies, organizations, and individuals on November 14, 2023; the EIR was available for public review and comment for a period of 45 days. The review period started on November 14, 2023 and ended on December 28, 2023. The City used several methods to elicit comments on the Draft EIR. A Notice of Availability (NOA) and the Draft EIR was distributed to the SCH for distribution to State agencies and was posted on the City's website. The NOA was posted also at the Riverside County Clerk's office on November 13, 2023. The NOA was mailed to responsible agencies, local government agencies, and interested parties that received the NOP, to individuals who had previously requested the NOA or EIR, and to individuals who provided NOP comments on November 14, 2023. The NOA was also published in the Press-Enterprise Newspaper on November 14, 2023; the NOA and Draft EIR were made available for review on the City's website at <https://www.beaumontca.gov/1276/Orchard-Logistics-Dowling-Ranch>

The City of Beaumont Planning Commission, as the final approval body, will hold a public hearing at which they will consider approving the proposed Project, associated actions, and certification of the Final EIR for the Project.

1.2 LIST OF EIR COMMENTERS

In accordance with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, following is a list of the agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted comments on the Draft EIR. The City received comments from six (6) agencies during the public review period.

Responses to each comment are in Section 2.0. The comment letter has been assigned a letter (i.e., A, B, C) and each comment within the transmittal is divided into sequential numbered comments (i.e., A-1, A-2, A-3).

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Date of Letter</u>
<i>Agencies and Organizations</i>	
A. California Highway Patrol	December 29, 2023
B. Riverside County Department of Environmental Health	December 15, 2023
C. Riverside County Department of Waste Resources	November 29, 2023
D. Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	November 28, 2023
E. Riverside Transit Agency	November 28, 2023
F. Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation	November 28, 2023



SECTION 2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

All of the comment letters received by the City have been included and responded to in this Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). Comments that address environmental concerns have been thoroughly addressed. Comments that do not require a response are indicated below and include those that (1) do not address the adequacy or completeness of the Draft EIR (i.e., are outside the scope of CEQA); (2) do not raise environmental issues; (3) do not address the Project; or (4) request the incorporation of additional information not relevant to environmental issues.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) outlines the parameters for public agencies and interested parties to submit comments and the Lead Agency's responsibility for responding to specific comments. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a), comments should be related to:

[T]he sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible...CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or suggested by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(c) further advises that, “[r]eviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.” Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(d) notes that, “[e]ach responsible agency and trustee agency shall focus its comments on environmental information germane to that agency's statutory responsibility;” but, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(e), “[t]his section shall not be used to restrict the ability of reviewers to comment on the general adequacy of a document or of the lead agency to reject comments not focused as recommended by this section [CEQA Guidelines Section 15204].”

Section 15088 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Evaluation of and Response to Comments, states:

- a) *The lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The lead agency shall respond to comments raising significant environmental issues received during the noticed comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments.*



- b) *The lead agency shall provide a written proposed response, either in a printed copy or in an electronic format, to a public agency on comments made by that public agency at least 10 days prior to certifying an environmental impact report.*
- c) *The written response shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the Lead Agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. There must be good faith, reasoned analysis in response. Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice. The level of detail contained in the response, however, may correspond to the level of detail provided in the comment (i.e., responses to general comments may be general). A general response may be appropriate when a comment does not contain or specifically refer to readily available information, or does not explain the relevance of evidence submitted with the comment.*
- d) *The response to comments may take the form of a revision to the draft EIR or may be a separate section in the final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes in the information contained in the text of the draft EIR, the lead agency should either:*
 - 1. *Revise the text in the body of the EIR; or*
 - 2. *Include marginal notes showing that the information is revised in the response to comments.*

This section includes responses to substantive Draft EIR comments received by the City. With respect to comment letters received, aside from certain courtesy statements, introductions, and closings, individual comments within the body of each letter have been identified and numbered. A copy of each comment letter and the City's responses to each applicable comment are included in this section. Brackets delineating the individual comments and a numeric identifier have been added to the right margin of the letter. Responses to each comment identified are included on the page(s) following each comment letter. Responses to comments are being sent to the agencies and organizations that provided comments at least 10 days prior to the Planning Commission's consideration of certification of the EIR.

Revisions to the Draft EIR have been prepared to make minor corrections and clarifications to the Draft EIR as a result of City review, and comments received during the public review period (refer to Section 3.0, *Draft EIR Clarifications and Revisions*, of this document). Therefore, this Response to Comments section, and the Draft EIR Clarifications and Revisions section, are included as part of this Final EIR along with the Draft EIR for consideration by the Planning Commission prior to a vote to certify the EIR.

As further discussed in Section 3.0 of this document, the Draft EIR revisions and information presented in the responses to comments do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines; therefore, the EIR does not need to be recirculated prior to its certification.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER A

From: Rusk, Steven@CHP
To: ckendrick@beaumontca.gov
Cc: [OPR State Clearinghouse](#)
Subject: SCH # 2022070351
Date: Friday, December 29, 2023 1:36:12 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon,

Sorry for the delay, but we would like to submit a response for the subject line Environmental Document Review.

The California Highway Patrol San Gorgonio Pass Area received Environmental Impact documents for the proposed project referenced 'Orchard Logistics Center' for State Clearinghouse (SCH) number 2022070351. After review, the California Highway Patrol San Gorgonio Pass Area's interest in commenting arises from our concern for the safety of motorists as well as potential impacts on our operations.

1. The Area's first concern is the driveway intended for emergency vehicle access at the northwest corner of the proposed construction site (Circled in red in visual below). The Area is concerned that construction traffic will attempt to utilize this access point as an ingress/egress point for State Route 60. Since this access point was not engineered as an on-ramp/off-ramp, vehicles using this access point pose a substantial risk for injury or fatal traffic collisions. Using preplanned entry and exit points and proper signage to alert motorists could help alleviate these risks.

A-1

A-2



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report



2. Upon completion of construction, the concern remains that commercial truck tractor combination vehicles will attempt to utilize the access point referenced above for State Route 60. Vehicles attempting to enter State Route 60 at this access point pose a substantial risk for traffic traveling at the posted speed limit.
3. Beaumont Avenue (State Route 79) at Interstate 10 is the nearest approved freeway access. This access point has had a substantial increase in commercial traffic due to the construction of similar distribution facilities as proposed in the subject EIR. This increase in traffic has already created a delay for California Highway Patrol units responding to emergency incidents on Interstate 10 and State Route 60. The Area believes the current infrastructure needs to be improved for the proposed increase in commercial traffic. Additional Caltrans-engineered freeway access points should be considered to help alleviate traffic concerns for the city of Beaumont, Interstate 10, and State Route 60.

A-3

A-4

Steven Rusk, Lieutenant
California Highway Patrol – San Gorgonio Pass Area
195 Highland Springs Ave.
Beaumont, CA 92223
(951) 846-5300



Responses to Comment A

California Highway Patrol, dated December 29, 2023

A-1 This comment consists of introductory remarks and comments regarding the Project are responded to below in the response to Comments A-2 to A-4. Thus, no further response is required.

A-2 The commenter expresses concern with construction vehicles utilizing the emergency vehicle access at the northwest corner of the Project site at the intersection of Western Knolls Avenue and State Route 60 (SR-60) during construction activities. During Project construction and over the useful life of the Project, access at this location would be controlled via a “lock box”-controlled gate or similar means. This emergency vehicle access point would be signed (ingress and egress) as “Emergency Access Only.” Final design and construction of this gated access would be approved by the City of Beaumont CalFire/Riverside County Fire Department and imposed as a condition of approval, as follows:

Condition of Approval TR-1

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall indicate the location of a controlled gate, “lock box,” and signage, at the northwest corner emergency vehicle access on the Project site plan and grading plan, which shall be installed prior to grading of the site.

Construction equipment and construction worker vehicles would not be permitted access to the Project site via this location. To promote traffic safety and reduce potential traffic hazards such as identified by the commentor, the following condition of approval would also be included:

Condition of Approval TR-2

The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a City-approved Construction Traffic Management Plan (Plan). The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the issuance of the first development permit. The Plan and its requirements shall be provided to all contractors as one component of building plan/contract document packages. Typical elements and information incorporated in the Plan would include, but not be limited to:

- ***Name of on-site construction superintendent and contact phone number.***
- ***Identification of Construction Contract Responsibilities*** - For example, for excavation and grading activities, describe the approximate depth of excavation, and quantity of soil import/export (if any).
- ***Identification and Description of Truck Routes*** - to include the number of trucks and their staging location(s) (if any).
- ***Site Access During Project Construction***-The Plan shall identify permissible construction equipment and construction worker access points. Permissible access points shall be clearly identified within the Plan document(s), with corresponding on-ground signage or other directional aids. The Plan shall specifically note that construction traffic



(including construction equipment and construction worker vehicles) shall not access the Project site via the emergency access point located at the Project site northwest corner.

- **Identification and Description of Material Storage Locations (if any).**
- **Location and Description of Construction Trailer (if any).**
- **Identification and Description of Traffic Controls** - *Traffic controls shall be provided per the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) if the occupation or closure of any traffic lanes, parking lanes, parkways or any other public right-of-way is required. If the right-of-way occupation requires configurations or controls not identified in the MUTCD, a separate traffic control plan must be submitted to the City for review and approval. All right-of-way encroachments shall be subject to permitting through the City.*
- **Identification and Description of Parking** - *Estimate the number of workers and identify parking areas for their vehicles.*
- **Identification and Description of Maintenance Measures** - *Identify and describe measures taken to ensure that the work site and public right-of-way would be maintained (including dust control).*

With the exception of emergency conditions, no vehicles would use the emergency access point at the northwest corner of the Project site. Under normal conditions, no Project traffic (construction or other) would use the emergency access point at the northwest corner of the Project site. On this basis, Project traffic (construction or other) would not pose a substantial risk for injury or fatal traffic collisions at the Project site emergency access point. Implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan outlined above would promote preplanned Project site entry and exit points and would provide proper signage to alert motorists. In this manner, the Plan would act to avoid potential traffic conflicts and promote traffic safety. Thus, no additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

A-3 The commenter expresses concern with vehicles utilizing the emergency vehicle access at the northwest corner of the Project site during operational activities. During Project construction and over the useful life of the Project, the intersection at the northwest corner of the Project site would be restricted to emergency access only. The City will impose Condition Of Approval TR-1 provided in response to Comment A-2, to ensure access at this location be controlled via a “lock box”- controlled gate or similar means. In this manner, vehicles would not be allowed to access State Route 60 via the Project emergency access point. On this basis, Project traffic would not result in or cause a substantial risk affecting traffic along SR-60. Thus, no additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

A-4 The commenter states that the increase in traffic at Beaumont Avenue (State Route [SR] 79) at Interstate 10 (I-10) is currently creating delays for the California Highway Patrol units in responding to emergency incidents and believes the current infrastructure needs to be improved for increased in traffic generated from the Project.

As shown in Exhibit 4-1 and 4-2 of the Project’s Traffic Analysis (*Technical Appendix II* of the Draft EIR), 70% of truck trips and 60% of passenger cars trips leaving the Project site



would head east on 4th Street then to California Avenue and all inbound trips use Veile Avenue then 4th Street to enter the Project site. The sum of the passenger car equivalent trips is less than 50 on both of these segments. Design and construction of state and interstate highway systems are the responsibility of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and beyond control of the City and Project Applicant. However, to off-set Project contributions to freeway traffic conditions, the Project Applicant is required to pay Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) providing funding for improvement of the regional freeway system.

In the vicinity of the Project, contemporary regional freeway system improvements include construction of the SR-60/Potrero Boulevard interchange, anticipated to be constructed by 2026. As discussed further below, the completed SR-60/Potrero Boulevard interchange would act generally to alleviate area traffic congestion and improve emergency response times.¹ For illustrative purposes, an overview of the SR-60/Potrero Boulevard interchange project and expected interchange project outcomes are summarized below.

SR-60/Potrero Boulevard Interchange Project Overview

The SR-60/Potrero Boulevard Interchange Project is on State Route 60 (SR-60) in the City of Beaumont, California (between Jack Rabbit Trail and the Interstate 10/SR-60 Junction) and includes a new 6-lane Potrero Boulevard overcrossing (3-lanes in each direction) with a temporary connection to Western Knolls Avenue.²

SR-60/Potrero Boulevard Interchange Project Outcomes

- Increases freight traffic efficiency on SR-60 Increases speed of truck traffic flow on I-10.
- Provides more predictable / reliable truck travel time on SR-60 & I-10.
- Eliminates undesirable ingress and egress accesses to SR-60 at three locations within the project limit and improves safety for truck and all modes of travel.
- Provides traffic congestion relief on I-10, I-215, SR-60, and adjacent three interchanges.
- Improves east-west freight linkage by providing full functional interchange when the SR-60 Truck Lanes project completes.
- Stimulates local and regional economic growth.
- Enhances trade value in California by extending the limit of PHFS on SR-60.

¹ State Route 60 Potrero Interchange Phase 2 Project Fact Sheet.

See: <https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/programs/Senate-Bill-1/TCEP/fact-sheets/19-Fact-Sheet-SR-60-Potrero-Interchange-Ramps-and-Realignment.pdf>

² Potrero Interchange Project Overview: See: <https://www.beaumontca.gov/992/Potrero-Interchange>.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

- Meets and exceeds performance measures as established in the California Freight Mobility Plan and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan.
- Attracts goods movement related economic interests such as developments in distribution centers, manufactures, commercial and industrial real estate lead to job creations.

Thus, with the implementation of the SR-60/Potrero Boulevard interchange, traffic and emergency response time would be improved in the Project area. Thus, no additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER B



County of Riverside DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

P.O. BOX 7909 • RIVERSIDE, CA 92513-7909
JEFF JOHNSON, DIRECTOR

12/15/2023

City of Beaumont
Attn: Carole Kendrick, Planning Manager
550 East 6th Street
Beaumont, CA 92223

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH REVIEW OF CITY OF BEAUMONT PLANNING CASES

Dear Ms. Kendrick:

City of Beaumont is responsible for implementing the requirements of CEQA^[1] for planning projects within their jurisdiction. To ensure compliance with CEQA^[2], City of Beaumont Planners distribute projects to the appropriate agencies/departments for review. Experienced staff with knowledge and background of state and local laws/regulations specific to their department, evaluate the proposed projects for compliance and provide applicable comments.

Proper review of proposed projects by appropriate staff ensures compliance with state and local laws and regulations as well as provides protection for the citizens of Riverside County and the environment from the potential adverse effects of a project.

For Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to conduct a project review, the following items will need to be addressed:

REVIEW FEES

Please refer to the attached “Environmental Health Review Fees” tier chart for the appropriate fees. A minimum initial deposit will be required to conduct reviews. Additional fees may be required depending on time spent on the project. These fees will need to be collected prior to DEH issuing a final project comments letter.

WATER AND WASTEWATER

DEH will request information to evaluate a project’s water source and method of sewage disposal. Information should be included in exhibits so that DEH can provide further comments as to what will be required for the project.

B-1

B-2

B-3

^[1] The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) CCR Title 14 15065 is a statute that requires state and local agencies to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment.

^[2] A project is an activity which must receive some discretionary approval (meaning that the agency has the authority to deny the requested permit or approval) from a government agency which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment.

Office Locations • Blythe • Corona • Hemet • Indio • Murrieta • Palm Springs • Riverside

Phone (888)722-4234
www.rivcoeh.org



ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP PROGRAM (ECP)

ECP conducts environmental reviews on planning projects to ensure that existing site conditions will not negatively affect human health or the environment. The intent of the environmental review is to determine if there are potential sources of environmental and/or human exposures associated with the project, identify the significance of potential adverse effects from the contaminants, and evaluate the adequacy of mitigation measures for minimizing exposures and potential adverse effects from existing contamination and/or hazardous substance handling.

B-4

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT BRANCH (HMMB)

HMMB will review projects to determine if hazardous materials are being handled and will provide further comments as part of the review process as it relates to the project.

B-5

DISTRICT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (DES)

DES will review and provide comments on projects that include the following:

- Food Facilities
- Pools/Spas/Water Features
- Facilities that sell tobacco

B-6

LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY (LEA)

LEA will review and provide comments on projects that include the following:

- Landfills, transfer stations, composting sites, and other specific solid waste activities
- Facilities that handle medical waste
- Body art facilities
- Compliance with SB1383

B-7

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (951) 955-8980.

Sincerely,

Alberto Lopez, MEA, REHS
County of Riverside, Department of Environmental Health
Environmental Protection and Oversight Division
4080 Lemon Street, 10th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501



Responses to Comment B

Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (DEH), dated December 15, 2023

B-1 The commenter states that the City is responsible for implementing the requirements of CEQA for planning projects within their jurisdiction and explains the staff review process. As required by Section 15087 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a NOC and a NOA of the Draft EIR for the Project was filed with the SCH on November 14, 2023, and the NOA of the Draft EIR was also filed with the Riverside County Clerk. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review for a minimum of 45 days, from November 14, 2023, to December 28, 2023. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, the City, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, has evaluated the comments received on the Draft EIR (SCH No. 2022070351) for the proposed Orchard Logistics Project and has prepared this Final EIR with written responses to these comments. Thus, no further response is needed.

B-2 The commenter provides the Environmental Health Review Fees which would be required prior to DEH issuing a final Project comment letter. No further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

B-3 In order to conduct a Project review, DEH will request information to evaluate a Project's water source and method of sewage disposal. Section 5.4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of the Draft EIR discusses the Project's anticipated water demand and proposed water connection as well as the Project's wastewater generation and the capacity of existing treatment facility that would serve the Project site. As concluded, the Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 1 has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater generated by the Project. No new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Additionally, the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District has sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements/resources and no new or expanded entitlements are needed. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation is not required (refer to Draft EIR pp. 5-20 to 5-21). Thus, no further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

B-4 As part of the Project review, the Environmental Cleanup Program (ECP) conducts environmental reviews on planning projects to ensure that existing site conditions will not negatively affect human health or the environment. As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Draft EIR, the existing site condition does not represent an environmental concern associated with hazards or hazardous materials. The Project would not result in a significant risk to the public or the environment through the potential routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (refer to Draft EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-16). No further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

B-5 As part of the Project review, the Hazardous Materials Management Branch (HMMB) will review projects to determine if hazardous materials are being handled. This comment is noted. As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Draft EIR, with



compliance with applicable regulations, operation of the Project would not result in a significant risk to the public or the environment through the potential routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (refer to Draft EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-16). No further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

B-6 As part of the Project review, the District Environmental Services (DES) would review and provide comments on food facilities, pools, spas, and water features, and facilities that sell tobacco. The Project involves the construction and operation of an industrial building and does not propose food facilities, pools, spas, water features, and facilities that sell tobacco. No further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.

B-7 As part of the Project review, the local enforcement agency (LEA) would review and provide comments on landfills, transfer stations, composting sites, and other specific solid waste activities; facilities that handle medical waste; body art facilities; and compliance with SB1383. The Project involves the construction and operation of an industrial warehouse building and does not include landfills, transfer stations, composting sites, other specific solid waste activities, facilities that handle medical waste, or body art facilities. Furthermore, the Project would not conflict with SB 1383, which requires all businesses to divert organic materials instead of sending them to the landfill as of January 1, 2022. The City acknowledges Alberto Lopez as Riverside County DEH contact person. No further response is needed. No additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER C

From: [Avila, Katherine](#)
To: [Carole Kendrick](#)
Subject: RCDWR Review of DEIR for Orchard Logistics (Dowling Ranch) Project
Date: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 4:02:38 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Carole,

Our department has reviewed the DEIR for the Orchard Logistics Project and wasn't able to identify where landfill gas migration is addressed. This is in regard to the potential for landfill gas migration onto the Project site due to the close proximity of the closed Beaumont Landfill to the Project site. Page 2-11 refers to Section 4.6 Geology and Soils, and Section 5.0, Other CEQA Considerations as the location of where our department comments are addressed. Lastly, I also could not identify reference to AB 1826 or SB 1383 in Section 5.0 page 5-21. Please let me know if I missed it or if it is addressed in a different section.

← C-1

Have a great evening.

Thank you,

Katherine Avila
Urban/Regional Planner I
Riverside County Department of Waste Resources
(951) 486-3369 | Kaavila@rivco.org | Fax: (951) 848-0893



[RCDWR| Home \(rcwaste.org\)](http://RCDWR| Home (rcwaste.org))

Confidentiality Disclaimer

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the author's intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete all copies, both electronic and printed, and contact the author immediately.

[County of Riverside California](#)



Responses to Comment C

Riverside County Department of Waste Resources, dated November 29, 2023

C-1 The commenter states that they were not able to locate where the landfill gas migration is addressed in the Draft EIR and references to AB 1826 and SB 1383. Haley & Aldrich, Inc. prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the Project, included as *Technical Appendix I* of the Draft EIR. Based on the findings of the Phase I ESA, the adjacent Former Beaumont Sanitary Landfill is a Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition (CREC). As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Draft EIR and the Phase I ESA (*Technical Appendix I*), vapor migration risk was conducted to determine whether off-site properties had the potential to contaminate the Project site, through movement of hazardous substances or petroleum products in any form. The records search indicated that it is unlikely that a potential source of vapor migration exists beneath the Project site. Groundwater is reported to be encountered at a depth of 125 feet below ground surface in the vicinity of the Project site. Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and Trichloroethylene (TCE) were not detected in groundwater samples collected beneath the Project site during the most recent sampling event in 2019. Additionally, the most recent low-level detections of PCE and TCE in groundwater adjacent to the Project site are an order of magnitude less than the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) of 2.8 and 7.5 ug/L, respectively, for vapor intrusion into a commercial/industrial building (refer to Draft EIR pp. 4.8-13 to 4.8-14). Additionally, as concluded the supplemental letter from Haley & Aldrich, Inc. (*Attachment A* to this Final EIR), methane concentrations in Landfill perimeter probes are low, either non-detect or 0.1 percent in 2020. Based on these findings, landfill gas migration is not considered to be of environmental concern.

AB 1826 (Chapter 727, Statutes of 2014) requires businesses to recycle their organic waste on and after April 1, 2016, depending on the amount of waste they generate per week while SB 1383 (Chapter 395, Statutes of 2016) requires every jurisdiction to provide organic waste collection services to all residents and businesses. Both statutes are related to residential and commercial uses. As discussed in Section 5.4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of the Draft EIR, the Project's increase in solid waste is well within the landfills remaining permitted capacity and is not anticipated to exceed the existing capacity. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing solid waste. (refer to Draft EIR pp. 5-21 to 5-22). CEQA does not require reference to or analysis of all applicable statutes and laws. Therefore, these were not included in the regulatory framework in the Draft EIR. However, it is acknowledged that the Project will comply with all applicable laws and this legislation will have a beneficial impact on landfills statewide. Thus, no additions, revisions, or corrections to the Draft EIR are needed.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER D

JASON E. UHLEY
General Manager-Chief Engineer



1995 MARKET STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501
951.955.1200
951.788.9965 FAX
www.rcflood.org

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

253867

November 28, 2023

City of Beaumont
550 East 6th Street
Beaumont, CA 92223

Attention: Carole Kendrick

Re: Orchard Logistics Center, APN 417-020-070

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) does not normally recommend conditions for land divisions or other land use cases in incorporated cities. The District also does not plan check City land use cases, or provide State Division of Real Estate letters or other flood hazard reports for such cases. District comments/recommendations for such cases are normally limited to items of specific interest to the District including District Master Drainage Plan facilities, other regional flood control and drainage facilities which could be considered a logical component or extension of a master plan system, and District Area Drainage Plan fees (development mitigation fees). In addition, information of a general nature is provided.

The District's review is based on the above-referenced project transmittal, received November 17, 2023. The District has not reviewed the proposed project in detail, and the following comments do not in any way constitute or imply District approval or endorsement of the proposed project with respect to flood hazard, public health and safety, or any other such issue:

- This project would not be impacted by District Master Drainage Plan facilities, nor are other facilities of regional interest proposed. D-1
- This project involves District proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities, namely The District will accept ownership of such facilities on written request by the City. The Project Applicant shall enter into a cooperative agreement establishing the terms and conditions of inspection, operation, and maintenance with the District and any other maintenance partners. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required. All regulatory permits (and all documents pertaining thereto, e.g., Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plans, Conservation Plans/Easements) that are to be secured by the Applicant for both facility construction and maintenance shall be submitted to the District for review. The regulatory permits' terms and conditions shall be approved by the District prior to improvement plan approval, map recordation, or finalization of the regulatory permits. There shall be no unreasonable constraint upon the District's ability to operate and maintain the flood control facility(ies) to protect public health and safety. D-2
- If this project proposes channels, storm drains larger than 36 inches in diameter, or other facilities that could be considered regional in nature and/or a logical extension a District's facility, the District would consider accepting ownership of such facilities on written request by the City. The Project Applicant shall enter into a cooperative agreement establishing the terms and conditions of inspection, operation, and maintenance with the District and any other maintenance partners. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required. The regulatory permits' terms and conditions shall be approved by the District prior to improvement plan approval, map recordation, or finalization of the regulatory permits. There shall be no unreasonable constraint upon the District's ability to operate and maintain the flood control facility(ies) to protect public health and safety.
- This project is located within the limits of the District's Area Drainage Plan for which drainage fees have been adopted. If the project is proposing to create additional impervious surface area, applicable fees should



Orchard Logistics Center

Final Environmental Impact Report

City of Beaumont

Re: Orchard Logistics Center, APN 417-020-070

- 2 -

November 28, 2023

253867

be paid (in accordance with the Rules and Regulations for Administration of Area Drainage Plans) to the Flood Control District or City prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Fees to be paid should be at the rate in effect at the time of issuance of the actual permit.

- An encroachment permit shall be obtained for any construction related activities occurring within District right of way or facilities, namely, _____. If a proposed storm drain connection exceeds the hydraulic performance of the existing drainage facilities, mitigation will be required. For further information, contact the District's Encroachment Permit Section at 951.955.1266.
- The District's previous comments are still valid.

GENERAL INFORMATION

This project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. Clearance for grading, recordation, or other final approval should not be given until the City has determined that the project has been granted a permit or is shown to be exempt.

If this project involves a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, then the City should require the applicant to provide all studies, calculations, plans, and other information required to meet FEMA requirements, and should further require that the applicant obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) prior to grading, recordation, or other final approval of the project and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) prior to occupancy.

The project proponent shall bear the responsibility for complying with all applicable mitigation measures defined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document (i.e., Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report) and/or Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, if a CEQA document was prepared for the project. The project proponent shall also bear the responsibility for complying with all other federal, state, and local environmental rules and regulations that may apply.

If a natural watercourse or mapped floodplain is impacted by this project, the City should require the applicant to obtain a Section 1602 Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or written correspondence from these agencies indicating the project is exempt from these requirements. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification may be required from the local California Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to issuance of the Corps 404 permit.

D-3

Very truly yours,

Amy McNeill
AMY MCNEILL
Engineering Project Manager

EM:blm



Responses to Comment D

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, dated November 28, 2023

D-1 The commenter provides introductory remarks about Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD), its role in development projects, and RCFCWCD's review of the Project. As stated, comments do not imply District approval or endorsement of the Project with respect to flood hazard, public health and safety, or any other such issue. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR; thus, no further response is required.

D-2 The comment states that the Project would not be impacted by RCFCWCD's Master Drainage Plan facilities, nor are other facilities of regional interest proposed. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR, thus, no further response is required.

D-3 The commenter provides general information that the Project may require permits such as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, on the requirements needed if the Project site is located in Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, on the requirements on CEQA and other applicable federal, state, and local environmental rules and regulations, and if a natural watercourse or mapped floodplain is impacted by the Project. The City acknowledges the comment; the Draft EIR discusses compliance with the NPDES permit in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft EIR. Additionally, the Project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR; thus, no further response is required.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER E

From: [Mauricio Alvarez](#)
To: [Carole Kendrick](#)
Subject: Orchard Logistics Center Project
Date: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 11:10:38 AM

Good Morning Carole,

Thank you for including Riverside Transit Agency in the development review of the Orchard Logistics Center Project. After reviewing the notice of availability of the DEIR, there are no comments to submit for this particular project at this time.

← E-1

Thank you,

Mauricio Alvarez, MBA
Planning Analyst
Riverside Transit Agency
p: 951.565.5260 | e: malvarez@riversidetransit.com
[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)
1825 Third Street, Riverside, CA 92507



Responses to Comment E

Riverside Transit Agency, dated November 28, 2023

E-1 The commenter states that the Riverside Transit Agency has no comments for the Project at this time. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR, thus, no further response is required.



Orchard Logistics Center Final Environmental Impact Report

COMMENT LETTER F

From: [Kristen Tuosto](#)
To: [Carole Kendrick](#)
Subject: CEQA Response: Orchard Logistics Center Project, City of Beaumont [CIT-BEAU-2022-6]
Date: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 1:44:22 PM

Dear Carole,

Thank you for contacting the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians) regarding the proposed project. The proposed project remains outside of Serrano ancestral territory, and, as a result, YSMN will not be requesting to receive consulting party status with the lead agency or to participate in the scoping, development, or review of documents created pursuant to legal and regulatory mandates.

Regards,
Kristen

Kristen Tuosto
Tribal Archaeologist
Kristen.Tuosto@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
O:(909) 864-8933 x 50-3421
M:
26569 Community Center Dr Highland, California 92346


← F-1



Responses to Comment F

Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, dated November 28, 2023

F-1 The commenter states that Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN) remains outside of Serrano ancestral territory, and, as a result, YSMN will not be requesting to receive consulting party status with the lead agency or to participate in the scoping, development, or review of documents created pursuant to legal and regulatory mandates. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR, thus, no further response is required.



SECTION 3.0 CLARIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS

Corrections to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) text generated either from responses to comments or independently by the City, are stated in this section of the Final EIR. The information included in this section does not constitute substantial new information that requires recirculation of the Draft EIR. Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines states in part:

(a) *A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:*

- (1) *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- (2) *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- (3) *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
- (4) *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

(b) *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

None of the information contained in this section constitutes significant new information or changes to the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR. There were no new significant environmental impacts identified following circulation of the Draft EIR. Likewise, there were no substantial increases in the severity of environmental impacts identified after circulation of the Draft EIR. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required because the new information added to the EIR through these modifications clarifies or amplifies information already provided in the already adequate Draft EIR.

CLARIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

No clarifications or revisions to the Draft EIR are required.



Attachment A

Supplemental Letter from Haley & Aldrich, Inc.

14 December 2023
File No. 0204067-000

Trammell Crow So. Cal. Development, Inc.
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 230
Newport Beach, California 92660

Attention: Mr. Robert Chute
Senior Vice President

Subject: Orchard Logistics Project
Beaumont, California

Dear Mr. Chute:

Haley & Aldrich, Inc. (Haley & Aldrich) prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) for the Dowling Property, 38021 Highway 60 in Beaumont, California, dated 3 December 2021. Haley & Aldrich identified the adjacent Former Beaumont Sanitary Landfill as a Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition (CREC) in the Phase I, which is a closed landfill operated by Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (DWR). Following are our conclusions associated with this CREC.

- Haley & Aldrich has concluded that the Former Beaumont Sanitary Landfill does not adversely impact the proposed Orchard Logistics Project development.
- The footprint of the former landfill is over approximately 200 feet south of the Orchard Logistics Project proposed building footprint.
- Based on Haley & Aldrich's review of existing groundwater monitoring data collected between 2017 and 2020, and that this landfill is being maintained and monitored by the County of Riverside DWR, the presence of the adjacent former landfill is considered to be a CREC. Landfill gas probes and perimeter gas probes are monitored approximately every two months for total VOCs using a photoionization detector; DWR reports indicate that total VOC measurements in the gas probes are generally below 20 part per million volume.
- As stated in the Phase I, groundwater is sampled from four groundwater monitoring wells located on the Landfill site on a semi-annual basis. Groundwater is also monitored from the "Dowling Well", an irrigation well located on the center portion of the Orchard Logistics Project site and downgradient of the Landfill. Groundwater from the "Dowling Well" was requested to be sampled for three years and the last sampling event was completed in December 2019. Tetrachloroethene (PCE) and trichloroethene (TCE) were detected at concentrations of up to 0.49 and 0.18 micrograms per liter (ug/L), respectively, in the Fourth Quarter 2017 and Second Quarter 2018 sampling events. These concentration are an order of magnitude below the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 5 ug/L for both PCE and TCE, and below the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB) Environmental Screening Levels (ESL) of 2.8

ug/L for PCE and 7.5 ug/L for TCE for vapor intrusion from groundwater. Since then, PCE and TCE were not detected in groundwater samples collected from the "Dowling Well" in the Fourth Quarter 2018, Second Quarter 2019, and Fourth Quarter 2019 (the most recent sampling events). PCE has been the only VOC detected in the other Landfill related groundwater monitoring wells during the Fourth Quarter 2019 and Second Quarter 2020. PCE was detected in the sample collected from downgradient monitoring well (OBMW-04) located on the Landfill property, located south and adjacent to the subject site, at a concentration of 0.43 ug/L in June 2020. PCE concentrations in the groundwater samples collected from this well have been consistently below 0.5 ug/L since 2015, which is an order of magnitude below the MCL of 5 ug/L and the SFRWQCB ESL of 2.8 ug/L for vapor intrusion from groundwater.

- Methane concentrations in Landfill perimeter probes are low, either non-detect or 0.1 percent in 2020.
- A soil vapor extraction (SVE) system began operating at the Landfill in 2000. After 13 years of operation, DWR indicated that the SVE system had only removed approximately 10 pounds of target VOCs. They concluded that there appeared to be limited VOC contaminant mass in the Landfill, and therefore continued ongoing operation of the SVE system was not beneficial in extracting VOC vapors from the subsurface. Based on these findings, DWR recommended that operation of the SVE system be discontinued. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) concurred in a letter dated 5 September 2014 .
- Based on the above findings, Landfill gas migration is not considered to be of environmental concern relative to the proposed site development.

Sincerely yours,

HALEY & ALDRICH, INC.



Mathew T. Raithel

Senior Technical Specialist



Mehdi Miremadi

Principal Consultant

\\haleyaldrich.com\\share\\CF\\Projects\\0204067\\000_Ph_1\\Deliverables\\2023_1214_letter\\2023_1214_HAI_Orchard_Letter_F.docx