

## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan (Project), within the City of Beaumont (City). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies consider the environmental consequences before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority. An EIR analyzes potential environmental consequences in order to inform the public and support informed decisions by local and state governmental agency decision makers. This document focuses on impacts determined to be potentially significant for this Project.

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the City's CEQA procedures. The City, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports as necessary to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on City technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this Draft EIR was derived from on-site field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments including air quality/health risk assessments, biological reports, cultural resources reports, geological reports, a greenhouse gas emissions assessment, hazard and hazardous materials assessments, a hydrology report, a preliminary water quality management plan, noise modeling, a traffic impact assessment, and a water supply assessment.

### **1.2 Environmental Procedures**

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects as associated with implementation of the proposed Project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. CEQA established six main objectives for an EIR:

1. Disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. Identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
3. Prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
4. Disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
5. Foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
6. Enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation in CEQA; it is intended to provide an objective, factually supported analysis, and full disclosure of the environmental consequences of a proposed project and its potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Before approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information in the EIR; determine whether the EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency; adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives; and adopt a statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts cannot be avoided.

### 1.2.1 EIR Format

The purpose of this EIR is to provide environmental review of the Project, such that the City will be able to utilize this EIR to satisfy CEQA for Project-related permits or approvals and to provide CEQA analysis.

This Draft EIR is organized into nine sections:

- Section 1.0** **Executive Summary** provides a Project summary and summary of environmental impacts, and the proposed mitigation measures and alternatives.
- Section 2.0** **Introduction** provides CEQA compliance information.
- Section 3.0** **Project Description** provides Project history, as well as the environmental setting, Project characteristics and objectives, phasing, and anticipated permits and approvals that may be required for the Project.
- Section 4.0** **Environmental Impact Analysis** provides a discussion of the existing conditions for each of the environmental impact areas. This section also describes methodologies for significance determinations, identifies both short-term and long-term environmental impacts of the Project, recommends mitigation measures to reduce the significance of environmental impacts, and identifies any areas of potentially significant and unavoidable impacts. This section includes a discussion of cumulative impacts that could arise as a result of the implementation of the proposed Project.
- Section 5.0** **Other CEQA Considerations**, summarizes unavoidable significant impacts, and discusses significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and energy conservation, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix F.
- Section 6.0** **Alternatives**, describes potential Project alternatives, including alternatives considered but rejected from further consideration, the No Project Alternative, various Project Alternatives, and identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
- Section 7.0** **Effects Found Not to Be Significant**, describes potential impacts that have been determined not to be significant throughout the EIR process.
- Section 8.0** **EIR Consultation and Preparation** identifies the CEQA Lead Agency and EIR preparation team, as well as summarizes the EIR consultation process.
- Section 9.0** **References.**

Based on significance criteria, the effects of the proposed Project have been categorized as either “less than significant,” “less than significant with mitigation,” or “potentially significant.” Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts, to avoid or lessen impacts. In the event the proposed Project results in significant impacts even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the decision-makers are able to approve a proposed Project based on a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This determination would require the decision-makers to provide a discussion of how the benefits of the proposed Project outweigh identified unavoidable impacts. The CEQA Guidelines provide in part the following:

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

### 1.3 Project Location

The Project site is located within the San Gorgonio Pass area, which is located between the Coachella, San Jacinto, and Moreno valleys and includes the incorporated cities of Banning, Beaumont, and Calimesa as well as the unincorporated communities of Cherry Valley, Cabazon, and Banning Bench. The Project site is in the northwestern portion of the City within the County of Riverside (County) and regional access to the site is provided by Interstate (I-) 10 via the Cherry Valley Boulevard exit approximately 3,000 feet west of the Project site.

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

### 1.4 Project Summary

The Project includes the adoption of the new Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan (Specific Plan), In addition to the Specific Plan, other related Project entitlements include a General Plan Amendment, Tentative Parcel Map, approval of a Plot Plan/Site Plan, and a Development Agreement.

Each of the specific Project entitlement applications and associated supporting documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this Draft EIR and are available for review in the City Planning Department located within the Beaumont Civic Center located at 550 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Beaumont, CA 92223.

The purpose of this Draft EIR for the Project is to review the existing conditions at and in the vicinity of the Project site; identify and analyze the potential environmental impacts; and suggest feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce significant adverse environmental effects, as described **Section 6.0, Alternatives**. This Project entails the development of an approximately 188-acre site with e-commerce, commercial development, and open space components (see **Table 1-1, Existing and Proposed Land Use Plan**). The Project would also include 6.7 acres of public and private roads. Construction of the Project, including recordation of final subdivision map(s); and design review may be progressively implemented in stages, provided that vehicular access, public facilities, and infrastructure are constructed to adequately service the development, or as needed for public health and safety. However, note that actual phasing sequence and years may vary depending on market conditions.

**Table 1-1: Existing and Proposed Land Use Plan**

Land Use	Existing Sunny-Cal Specific Plan (2007)		Summit Station Specific Plan (2022)	
	Acres	Dwelling Units	Acres	Square Feet
Low Density Residential	158.65 acres	560 du	--	--
E-Commerce Center				
E-Commerce	--	--	139.8 acres	2,507,465 sf
Office				50,000 sf
Commercial				
Hotel (220 rooms)	--	--	10.9 acres	100,000 sf
Retail				25,000 sf
Restaurant				25,000 sf
Open Space				
Park/Trail	21.15 acres		0 acres	
Buffer/Open Space	8.71 acres		30.6 acres	
Road	9.8 acres		6.7 acres	
<b>Total</b>	<b>200 acres</b>		<b>188 acres</b>	

Source: Kimley-Horn. 2022. Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan. Table 1.  
 du = dwelling units; sf = square feet  
 Note: Land use acreages are net of roads and are rounded

## 1.5 Project Purpose and Objectives

The Project implements the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan, as amended; serves as an extension of the General Plan; and, can be used as both a policy and a regulatory document. The purpose of this Project is to implement the vision laid out in the Project objectives by providing development standards, and design guidelines to direct future development within the Project area.

In order to promote a high-quality development, as well as the functional integrity, economic viability, environmental sensitivity, and positive aesthetic impact of the Project, specific planning and development objectives for the Project were identified.

The Project includes the following objectives:

1. Provide a comprehensive land use plan that designates the distribution, location, and extent of land uses.
2. Provide a land use plan that is sensitive to the environment through avoidance of sensitive resources, aesthetically pleasing through application of design guidelines, and places compatible land uses and facilities in an appropriate location.
3. Develop a state-of-the-art logistics/e-commerce center with complimentary commercial uses that take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, is feasible to construct, is economically competitive with, and in the general vicinity of, similar logistics/e-commerce center uses.
4. Develop and operate a large format logistics center that is in close proximity to the I-10 freeway to support the distribution of goods throughout the region and that also limits truck traffic disruption to sensitive receptors within the surrounding region.
5. Facilitate the development of underutilized land currently planned for residential uses with uses that maximize the use of the site as a large format e-commerce center consisting of one or more buildings with total e-commerce building space in excess of 2,557,465 square feet in size and approximately 150,000 square feet of mixed commercial uses responding to market demand.
6. Provide a system of infrastructure that includes public and private transportation, sewer, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, and other essential facilities to serve the needs of the Project.
7. Provide access patterns that minimize traffic conflicts.
8. Develop project identity through the identification of project design elements such as architecture, landscaping, walls, fencing, signage, and entry treatments
9. Facilitate the establishment of design guidelines and development standards that create a unique, well-defined identity for the proposed Project.
10. Positively contribute to the economy of the region through new capital investment, creation of new employment opportunities, and expansion of the tax base.
11. Establish landscape guidelines that emphasize the use of drought-tolerant and water-efficient plant materials.
12. Provide and plan that incorporates appropriate buffers with the surrounding development through the use of landscaped setbacks and expanded parkways along Cherry Valley Boulevard and Brookside Avenue.

## 1.6 Summary of Project Alternatives

The CEQA Guidelines (§ 15126.6[a]) state that an EIR must address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The alternatives were based, in part, on their potential ability to reduce or eliminate the impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable for the proposed Project.

The following alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project, but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. These alternatives are analyzed in detail in **Section 6.0, Alternatives**, of this Draft EIR.

- No Project/Existing Specific Plan
- Reduced Building Intensity

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative, and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Impacts involving air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation were found to be significant and unavoidable. **Section 6.8, Environmentally Superior Alternative** identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

### **1.6.1 NO PROJECT/EXISTING SPECIFIC PLAN**

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

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

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

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

Infrastructure improvements including water, wastewater, drainage, extension of electrical and natural gas, and roadway improvements and right-of-way dedications identified in the Project would still be required to be extended into the Project site under the Sunny-Cal Specific Plan.

## 1.6.2 REDUCED BUILDING INTENSITY

Alternative 2 would entail the development of e-commerce and commercial uses, but at a smaller square footage (15 percent less) than what was proposed for the Project. The Alternative would involve the development of 2,173,846 square feet of e-commerce space. Additionally, since the project footprint would be smaller, it is anticipated that the amount of graded area would be smaller as well. Modifications would occur to multiple on-site features such as drainage basins, parking, and landscaping. Off-site improvements to the adjacent roadways of Cherry Valley Boulevard and Brookside Avenue would remain consistent with the Project.

## 1.6.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior Alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated and states that if the environmentally superior Alternative is the No Project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The environmentally superior Alternative is Alternative 2: Reduced Building Intensity. Because Alternative 2 would reduce the e-commerce development footprint by 15 percent, this Alternative has fewer environmental impacts than the proposed Project or the No-Project/Existing Specific Plan Alternative.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that if the “No Project” alternative is found to be environmentally superior, “the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The No Project/Existing Specific Plan Alternative was not found to be environmentally superior.

The context of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of several factors including the reduction of environmental impacts to a less than significant level, the Project objectives, and an alternative’s ability to fulfill the objectives with minimal impacts to the existing site and surrounding environment. The Reduced Building Intensity Alternative would be the environmentally superior Alternative because it would reduce some of the potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project. However, while the Reduced Building Intensity Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, it is not capable of meeting all of the basic objectives of the Project.

## 1.7 Areas of Controversy

Prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) from September 22, 2021 to October 22, 2021, (see **Appendix L, Notice of Preparation**). In addition, a public scoping meeting was held during the 30-day public review period, on October 7, 2021 at 6:00 PM at the Beaumont Civic Center. Pursuant to health and safety measures taken by the State of California, the San Bernardino County Members of the public, Project applicants and consultants, and staff were able to participate in the meeting. A total of six comment letters were received in response to the NOP. The comment letters received during the NOP comment period; along with Scoping Reports for the NOP,

providing a more detailed summary of the issues raised during the public scoping meeting, are included in **Appendix L, Notice of Preparation**. Areas of concern identified during the scoping period include: Traffic, Lighting, Noise, Solid Waste, and Residential Property Values. No other areas of controversy are known to the lead agency.

## 1.8 Unavoidable Significant Impacts

The Projects potentially significant impacts are defined in **Sections 4.1, Aesthetics** through **4.18, Wildfire** of this Draft EIR. As noted in these sections, most of the potentially significant impacts identified can be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures. There are unavoidable significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation, as summarized below:

- Air Quality

The Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (Impact 4.2-1).

The Project would 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 (Impact 4.2-2).

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment (Impact 4.7-1).

The Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Impact 4.7-2).

The Project would result in significant cumulative GHG emissions.

- Noise

Noise impacts would be less than significant with the exception of cumulative off-site traffic noise along Cherry Valley Boulevard (from Project access to Hannon Road, from Hannon Road to Union Street, and from Union Street to Nancy Avenue). Cumulative traffic noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to buildout of the proposed Project and other projects in the vicinity.

- Transportation

The Project would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b) (Impact 4.15-2).

The Project would result in significant cumulative transportation impacts.



## 1.9 Summary of Environmental Impacts & Mitigation Measures

**Table 1-2, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**, is a summary of significant impacts and proposed mitigation measures associated with the Project as identified in this EIR. Refer to **Sections 4.1** through **4.18**, for a detailed description of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the Project. All impacts of the Project can be mitigated to less than significant levels with the exception of air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation.

**Table 1-2: Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Section 4.1, Aesthetics</b>		
<b>Impact 4.1-1:</b> Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.1-2:</b> Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.1-3:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.1-4:</b> Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.2, Air Quality</b>		
<b>Impact 4.2-1:</b> Would the Project, conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	<p><b>MM AQ-1:</b> Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Beaumont to demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower meets California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards. Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit’s Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.</li> <li>• Construction equipment shall be properly maintained according to manufacturer specifications.</li> <li>• All construction equipment and delivery vehicles shall be turned off when not in use, or limit on-site idling for no more than 5 minutes in any 1 hour.</li> <li>• On-site electrical hook ups to a power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills, and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.</li> </ul>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<p><b>MM AQ-2:</b> The Project shall utilize “Super-Compliant” low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits (i.e., have a lower VOC content than what is required) put forth by SCAQMD’s Rule 1113 for all architectural coatings. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 building permits, the Beaumont Building and Safety Department shall confirm the plans include the following specifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All architectural coatings will be super-compliant low VOC paints.</li> <li>• Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.</li> <li>• Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.</li> <li>• For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of cleanup water and take it to the hazardous waste center (<a href="http://www.cleanup.org">www.cleanup.org</a>).</li> <li>• Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.</li> <li>• Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.</li> <li>• Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.</li> <li>• Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM AQ-3:</b> Prior to issuance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 occupancy permits (unless otherwise specified), the Project operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.</li> <li>• Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site (Phase 1 only).</li> <li>• Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided (Phase 1 only).</li> <li>• Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities within 200 yards of a building entrance (Phase 1 only).</li> </ul>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day.</li> <li>• Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service.</li> <li>• Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.</li> <li>• Provide meal options on-site or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.</li> <li>• Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM AQ-4:</b> Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 building permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.</li> <li>• The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed in the future to supply power to trailers with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) during the loading/unloading of refrigerated goods. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to the loading docks determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check as the logical location(s) to receive trailers with TRUs.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM AQ-5:</b> Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for Phase 1, the Planning Department shall confirm that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.</li> <li>• For non-essential idling, truck drivers shall shut down the engine after five minutes of continuous idling operation (pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485). Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged.</li> <li>• Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.</li> </ul>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>MM AQ-6:</b> Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements require the Project Applicant to provide \$1.00 per square foot in funding for fleet upgrade financing to be used over the term of their lease on Zero Emissions (ZE) and Near Zero Emissions (NZE) delivery vans or trucks. This requirement shall apply to new leases only (not renewals) and for the first 10 years of the Project’s life. The funding shall be provided in the form of lease allowance/concession. The allowance shall be a reimbursement once ZE or NZE medium/heavy duty vehicles are purchased and can be used at any time during the lease term (i.e., the landlord shall reimburse the tenant once the tenant provides receipt of paid invoice for the order). If a tenant leases their fleet, this allowance shall also cover the cost to lease ZE or NZE trucks. This measure would also facilitate compliance with SCAQMD Rule 2305</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.2-2:</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?</p>	Significant Unavoidable Impact	Refer to <b>MM AQ-1</b> through <b>AQ-6</b> above.
<p><b>Impact 4.2-3:</b>                      Would the proposed project, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Refer to <b>MM AQ-1</b> through <b>AQ-6</b> above.
<p><b>Impact 4.2-4:</b>                      Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<p><b>Section 4.3, Biological Resources</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact 4.3-1:</b>                      Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	<p><b>MM BIO-1:</b> Project activities shall not be initiated within 100 feet of any least Bell’s vireo suitable habitat area(s) during the species’ breeding season (March 15- August 31) unless a negative USFWS protocol survey has been conducted within one year of construction kickoff and findings were negative.</p> <p>If groundbreaking activities occur outside the least Bell’s vireo nesting season (i.e., September 16-March 14), a qualified biologist shall perform a presence/absence survey within suitable habitat on-site, and shall continue these surveys on a monthly basis, especially as breeding season commences.</p> <p>If least Bell’s vireo nesting is discovered, either during protocol surveys, monthly presence/absence surveys, or incidentally, no Project activities shall occur within 300 feet of any least Bell’s vireo nest site until it has been confirmed that the young have fledged, and the nest is no longer active. A qualified biologist shall always be</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<p>present when construction crews are working within 1/8 mile surrounding an identified least Bell's vireo nest site to ensure that the birds do not react unfavorably to Project activities. If the qualified biologist observes signs of agitation stemming from Project activities, the activities shall cease and not resume until the birds' behavior normalizes. If the birds continue to exhibit signs of agitation, Project activities shall be adjusted to avoid impacts on nesting least Bell's vireo. Additionally, in the presence of least Bell's vireo nests, noise level from Project activities shall not to exceed 65 dBA at the edge of occupied habitat. If this is not possible, a noise barrier shall be constructed to keep noise at or below 65 dBA to avoid adverse impacts to any least Bell's vireo nest/s.</p> <p>During the least Bell's vireo breeding season, artificial light shall not be cast into suitable habitat.</p> <p>A qualified biologist shall conduct a training session for Project personnel prior to grading in conformance with MSCHP best management practices requirements. The training shall include a description of least Bell's vireo and its habitats, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act (Act) and the MSHCP, the need to adhere to the provisions of the Act and the MSHCP, the penalties associated with violating the provisions of the Act, the general measures that are being implemented to conserve the species of concern as they relate to the Project, and the access routes to and Project site boundaries within which the Project activities must be accomplished.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-2:</b> A qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction presence/absence survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If burrowing owls are documented on-site, the owls will be relocated/excluded from the site outside of the breeding season following accepted protocols, as specified in the MSHCP.</p> <p><b>MM BIO-3:</b> Vegetation clearing and ground disturbing activities should be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1 through August 31). If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to any disturbance of the site, including disking, demolition activities, and grading. If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests depending on the level of activity within the buffer and species observed, and the buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied, and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<p><b>Impact 4.3-2:</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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p><b>MM BIO-4:</b> Prior to any ground-disturbing activity near jurisdictional features, applicable permits shall be obtained through the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW for impacts on jurisdictional features. Based on the results of the aquatic resources delineation for the proposed Project, the proposed Project would permanently impact 0.25 acre of USACE-jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S. and RWQCB-jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the State (i.e., NWW-1, NWW-1A, NWW-2, NWW-2A, NWW-2B, NWW-2C, NWW-3A, NWW-3B, and NWW-3B1). Additionally, the proposed Project would permanently impact 2.17 acres of CDFW-jurisdictional vegetated streambed (i.e., NWW-1, NWW-1A, NWW-2, NWW-2A, NWW-2B, NWW-2C, NWW-3A, NWW-3B, and NWW-3B1) and 0.24 acre of CDFW-jurisdictional riparian habitat (i.e., NWW-2A and NWW-3B). The Project applicant shall be obligated to implement/comply with the permit conditions and mitigation measures required by the resource agencies regarding impacts on their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p>A minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio (0.25 acre USACE/0.25 acre RWQCB/2.41 acres CDFW) is typically required, though ratios may be higher. Compensatory mitigation to offset impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources may be implemented through off-site, permittee-responsible mitigation, in-lieu fee program or mitigation bank credit purchase (e.g., Riverpark Mitigation Bank), or a combination of these options depending on availability. The proposed mitigation strategy is the purchase of 4.82 re-establishment and/or rehabilitation credits (2:1 mitigation ratio) from the Riverpark Mitigation Bank. The regulatory agencies will make the final determination of the final compensatory mitigation requirements during the permit evaluation process. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project applicant will provide the City of Beaumont with purchase confirmation.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.3-3:</b>                      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?</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.3-4:</b>                      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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.3-5:</b>                      Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Impact 4.3-6:</b> Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Refer to <b>MM BIO-2</b> and <b>MM BIO-4</b> above.
<b>Section 4.4, Cultural Resources</b>		
<b>Impact 4.4-1:</b> Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.4-2:</b> Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	<b>MM CUL-1:</b> A qualified archaeological monitor will be present during Project-related ground-disturbing activities in undisturbed native sediments.  <b>MM CUL-2:</b> In the event that potentially significant cultural materials are encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, all work will be halted in the vicinity of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the archaeological resource.
<b>Impact 4.4-3:</b> Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outdoors of dedicated cemeteries?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.5, Energy</b>		
<b>Impact 4.5-1:</b> Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.5-2:</b> Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.6, Geology and Soils</b>		
<b>Impact 4.6-1:</b> Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.



Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<p><b>Impact 4.6-2:</b>                      Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong seismic ground shaking?</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<p><b>Impact 4.6-3:</b>                      Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<p><b>Impact 4.6-4:</b>                      Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landslides?</li> </ul>	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<p><b>Impact 4.6-5:</b>                      Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	<p><b>MM GEO-1: Settlement Monitoring Program.</b> A Settlement Monitoring Program would be implemented, consisting of the surveying of surface monuments to monitor settlement of alluvial soils left in-place and/or proposed fills deeper than 30 feet (design plus remedial grading). Survey monument readings for both deep fill areas and for fill over compressible natural ground (Qal) should be conducted following the completion of fill placement. Survey monument locations should be selected by the geotechnical consultant. Survey readings should be taken weekly for the first month and on a weekly basis thereafter until vertical movement of the fill mass achieve 90 percent of primary compression, begin secondary compression or the estimated remaining settlement is less than one inch. Construction of proposed structures would not commence until approved by the geotechnical consultant based on the results of the settlement monitoring. Survey benchmarks used for the monitoring would be confirmed with the geotechnical consultant prior to initial readings being performed.</p> <p><b>Foundation and Grading Plan Review.</b> New retaining walls with maximum heights of up to 50± feet would be constructed as part of the new development. Additional review of the global stability of the proposed site grading be performed by SCG once more detailed rough grading plans become available. An additional subsurface exploration may be required to evaluate the geotechnical design considerations of the retaining wall and new slope configurations.</p> <p><b>Over excavation.</b> Benching of the sidewalls would be required during fill placement. The horizontal extent of the benching should be sufficient to reduce the inclination of the native fill contact to 3h:1v or flatter. Following completion of the over excavations, the subgrade would be evaluated by the geotechnical engineer to verify its suitability to serve as the structural fill subgrade. Some localized areas of deeper excavation may be required if loose, porous, or low-density materials are</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		encountered at the base of the over excavation. Materials suitable to serve as the structural fill subgrade within the building area should consist of moderate strength alluvial soils which possess an in-situ density equal to at least 85 percent of the ASTM D-1557 maximum dry density. These materials would be moisture conditioned to 0 to 4 percent above optimum moisture content prior to placement of any new fill soils. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill.
<b>Impact 4.6-6:</b> 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 with Mitigation Incorporated	Refer to <b>MM GEO-1</b> above.
<b>Impact 4.6-7:</b> 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 with Mitigation Incorporated	Refer to <b>MM GEO-1</b> above.
<b>Impact 4.6-8:</b> Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No Impact	No mitigation required.
<b>Impact 4.6-9:</b> Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	<p><b>MM GEO-2: Paleontological Construction Monitoring and Compliance Program.</b> The following measures would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant:</p> <p><b>Retain a Qualified Paleontologist.</b> Prior to initial ground disturbance, the Applicant shall retain a Project paleontologist, defined as a paleontologist who meets the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards for Qualified Professional Paleontologist, to direct all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources.</p> <p><b>Paleontological Monitoring.</b> Ground disturbing construction activities (including grading, trenching, foundation work, and other excavations) in areas mapped as high paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored on a full-time basis by a qualified paleontological monitor during initial ground disturbance. Areas mapped as low to high paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored when ground-disturbing activities exceed five feet in depth, because underlying sensitive sediments could be impacted. Areas considered to have an undetermined paleontological sensitivity shall be inspected and further assessed if construction activities bring potentially sensitive geologic deposits to the surface. The Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program shall be supervised by the Project paleontologist. Monitoring must be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, who is defined as an individual who has experience with collection and salvage of paleontological</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<p>resources. The duration and timing of the monitoring would be determined by City based on recommendation from the Project paleontologist. If the Project paleontologist determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, they may recommend to the City that monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely. Monitoring would be reinstated if any new or unforeseen deeper ground disturbances are required and reduction or suspension would need to be reconsidered by the Supervising Paleontologist. Ground disturbing activity that does not exceed five feet in depth would not require paleontological monitoring.</p> <p><b>Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program.</b> After Project design has been finalized to determine the precise extent and location of planned ground disturbances, and prior to construction activity, a qualified paleontologist would prepare a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program to be implemented during ground disturbance activity for the Project. This program would outline the procedures for construction staff Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, paleontological monitoring extent and duration, salvage and preparation of fossils, the final mitigation and monitoring report, and paleontological staff qualifications. The program would be prepared in accordance with the standards set forth by current Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines (2010) and with proper implementation, would reduce or eliminate potential impacts to paleontological resources.</p> <p><b>Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program.</b> Prior to the start of construction, the Project paleontologist or his/her designee shall conduct training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. The WEAP shall be presented at a preconstruction meeting that a qualified paleontologist shall attend. In the event of a fossil discovery by construction personnel, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find before restarting work in the area. If it is determined that the fossil(s) is (are) scientifically significant, the qualified paleontologist shall complete the following conditions to mitigate impacts to significant fossil resources.</p> <p><b>Salvage of Fossils.</b> If fossils are discovered, the Project paleontologist or paleontological monitor should recover them. Typically, fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases, larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case, the paleontologist would have the authority to temporarily direct, divert, or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner.</p> <p><b>Preparation and Curation of Recovered Fossils.</b> Once salvaged, the City would ensure that significant fossils would be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<p>level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the Western Science Center), along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the Project paleontologist. Field collection and preparation of fossil specimens would be performed by the Project paleontologist with further preparation as needed by an accredited museum repository institution at the time of curation.</p> <p><b>Final Paleontological Mitigation Report.</b> Upon completion of ground-disturbing activity (and curation of fossils, if necessary) the qualified paleontologist should prepare a final mitigation and monitoring report outlining the results of the mitigation and monitoring program. The report should include discussion of the location, duration, and methods of the monitoring, stratigraphic sections, any recovered fossils, and the scientific significance of those fossils, and where fossils were curated.</p>
<b>Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>		
<p><b>Impact 4.7-1:</b>                      Would the Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment?</p>	<p>Significant Unavoidable Impact</p>	<p>Refer to <b>MM AQ-1</b> through <b>MM AQ-6</b> above. The following additional mitigation is also required.</p> <p><b>MM GHG-1:</b> Phase 1 of the Project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, conservatively anticipated to be approximately 8.87 kilowatt hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot).</p> <p>With expected energy consumption at 8.87 kWh/sf, a PV panel array covering approximately one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size requires approval by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE’s Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements for any facility connected to SCE’s distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export, the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to offset consumption.</p> <p>Should the energy consumption characteristics of a future tenant differ from this projection, there is sufficient space on the rooftop for the system to roughly triple on-site generation. The building shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage.</p> <p><b>MM GHG-2:</b> Prior to the issuance of a Phase 1 or Phase 2 building permit, the Project Applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the City of Beaumont demonstrating that the Project is designed to achieve Leadership in</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
		<p>Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification and meet or exceed CalGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time of building permit application.</p> <p><b>MM GHG-3:</b> The development (Phase 1 and Phase 2) shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with Riverside County Waste Management Department’s Design Guidelines for Recyclable Collection and Loading Areas.</p> <p><b>MM GHG-4:</b> Prior to the issuance of Phase 1 or Phase 2 occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all landscaping equipment used on-site shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This requirement shall be included in the third-party vendor agreements for landscape services for the building owner and tenants, as applicable.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.7-2:</b>                      Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions?</p>	<p>Significant Unavoidable Impact</p>	<p>Refer to <b>MM AQ-3</b> through <b>MM AQ-6</b> and <b>MM GHG-1</b> through <b>MM GHG-4</b>, above.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.8, Hazards</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact 4.8-1:</b>                      Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.8-2:</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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.8-3:</b>                      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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.8-4:</b>                      Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials Project sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p><b>MM HAZ-1:</b> The Applicant shall prepare a Soil Management Plan prior to the redevelopment of the site.</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Impact 4.8-5:</b> For a project located within 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 result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.8-6:</b> Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.8-7:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.9, Hydrology</b>		
<b>Impact 4.9-1:</b> Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.9-2:</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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.9-3:</b> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.9-4:</b> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impede or redirect flood flows?</li> </ul>		
<b>Impact 4.9-5:</b> In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.9-6:</b> Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning</b>		
<b>Impact 4.10-1:</b> Would the Project physically divide an established community?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.10-2:</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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.11, Noise</b>		
<b>Impact 4.11-1:</b> Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.11-2:</b> Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.11-3:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.12, Population and Housing</b>		
<b>Impact 4.12-1:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Impact 4.12-2:</b> Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.13, Public Services</b>		
<b>Impact 4.13-1:</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 any of the public services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire Protection?</li> <li>• Police Protection?</li> </ul>	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.14, Recreation</b>		
<b>Impact 4.14-1:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.14-2:</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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.15, Transportation</b>		
<b>Impact 4.15-1:</b> Would the Project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.15-2:</b> Would the Project, conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	Impact is significant, unavoidable, and unmitigable.
<b>Impact 4.15-3:</b> 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	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.15-4:</b> Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.



Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources</b>		
<p><b>Impact 4.16-1:</b>                      Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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:</p> <p>i. Would the Project be developed in an area 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 §5020.1(k)?</p> <p>ii. Would the Project contain 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 §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p><b>MM TCR-1</b> The Serrano Nation, (currently Mr. Mark Cochrane and/or Mr. Wayne Walker, but the representative could change depending on when a finding may occur), shall be notified if any cultural material is encountered during Project construction.</p>
<b>Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems</b>		
<p><b>Impact 4.17-1:</b>                      Would the Project 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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.17-2:</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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>
<p><b>Impact 4.17-3:</b>                      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?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>

Resource Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b>Impact 4.17-4:</b> Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.17-5:</b> Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Section 4.18, Wildfire</b>		
<b>Impact 4.18-1:</b> If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.18-2:</b> If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	No Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.18-3:</b> If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.
<b>Impact 4.18-4:</b> If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	Less than Significant Impact	No mitigation is required.