

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, examines the environmental setting of the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan (Project), analyzes the Project's effects and the significance of its impacts, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts. This section contains separate subsections for each environmental issue area that was determined to need further study in this draft environmental impact report (Draft EIR). This scope was determined through the notice of preparation (NOP), which was published September 22, 2021, (see **Appendix L**), and through public and agency comments received during the NOP comment period from September 22, 2021 to October 22, 2021 (see **Appendix L**). Additionally, a scoping meeting was held on October 7, 2021. Environmental issues and their corresponding sections are:

- Section 4.1, Aesthetics
- Section 4.2, Air Quality
- Section 4.3, Biological Resources
- Section 4.4, Cultural Resources
- Section 4.5, Energy
- Section 4.6, Geology and Soils
- Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Emissions
- Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality
- Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning
- Section 4.11, Noise
- Section 4.12, Population and Housing
- Section 4.13, Public Services
- Section 4.14, Recreation
- Section 4.15, Transportation
- Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources
- Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems
- Section 4.18, Wildfire

Sections 4.1 through 4.18 provide a detailed discussion of the environmental setting, effects associated with the project, and mitigation measures designed to reduce significant impacts where required and when feasible. The residual impacts following the implementation of any mitigation measure are also discussed.

During preliminary environmental analysis it was also determined that certain issues under an environmental topic would not be significantly affected by implementation of the Project. These issues are discussed in **Section 7.0, Effects Found Not to be Significant**.

4.0.1 Approach to Environmental Analysis

Each potentially significant environmental issue area is addressed in a separate EIR Section (4.1 through 4.18) and is organized into the following subsections:

- “Environmental Setting” provides an overview of the existing physical environmental conditions in the study area that could be affected by implementation of the Project (i.e., the “affected environment”).

- “Regulatory Setting” identifies the plans, policies, laws, and regulations that are relevant to each resource area and describes permits and other approvals necessary to implement the Project. As noted above, the EIR needs to address possible conflicts between the Project and the requirements of Federal, State, regional, or local agencies, including consistency with adopted land use plans, policies, Specific Plan or other regulations for the area. Therefore, this subsection summarizes or lists the potentially relevant policies and objectives, such as from the applicable City of Beaumont General Plan and Municipal Code.
- “Impact Thresholds and Significance Criteria” provides the criteria used in this document to define the level at which an impact would be considered significant in accordance with CEQA. Significance criteria used in this EIR are based on the checklist presented in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, factual or scientific information and data, and regulatory standards of Federal, State, and local agencies.
- “Impacts and Mitigation Measures” are listed numerically and sequentially throughout each section, for each Project component. A bold font impact statement precedes the discussion of each impact and provides a summary of each impact and its level of significance. The discussion that follows the impact statement includes the analysis on which a conclusion is based regarding the level of impact.
- “Cumulative Impacts” identifies potential environmental impacts of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, in combination with the Project.
- “Significant Unavoidable Impacts” identifies environmental impacts that may remain significant even with implementation of reasonable and feasible mitigation measures.

“Mitigation Measures” are recommended where feasible to avoid, minimize, offset, or otherwise compensate for significant and potentially significant impacts of the Project, in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulation [CCR] § 15126.4). Each mitigation measure is identified by resource area, numerically, and sequentially. For example, mitigation measures in **Section 4.2, Air Quality**, are numbered AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3 and so on. Pursuant to CEQA, the EIR provides a brief discussion of potential significant impacts of a given mitigation measure, if applicable.

The level of impact of the Project is determined by comparing estimated effects with baseline conditions, in light of the thresholds of significance identified in the EIR. Under CEQA, the existing environmental setting normally represents baseline conditions as of the distribution date of the NOP which for the Project is September 22, 2021, unless more recent data is determined appropriate for utilization in the EIR. Project component-specific analyses are conducted to evaluate each potential impact on the existing environment. This assessment also specifies why impacts are found to be significant, potentially significant, or less than significant, or why there is no environmental impact.

14 CCR § 15382 and Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21068 define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the Project. A potentially significant effect is one that, if it were to occur, would be considered a significant impact; however, the occurrence of the impact is uncertain. PRC § 21100(b)(3) states that mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects on the environment, including,

but not limited to, measures to reduce the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, shall be included in the EIR. Subsection (d) of PRC § 21100 adds that for the purposes of this section (PRC § 21100), any significant effect on the environment shall be limited to substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse changes in physical conditions which exist within the area as defined in PRC § 21060.5. Therefore, a “potentially significant” effect and “significant” effect are treated the same under CEQA in terms of procedural requirements and the need to identify feasible mitigation. 14 CCR § 15364 and PRC § 21061.1 states that “feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, considering economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. A mitigation measure is determined to be feasible if it would avoid or substantially lessen a significant effect on a resource (PRC § 21082.3). A “less than significant” impact is one that would not result in a substantial adverse change in the physical environment (applicable significance thresholds would not be exceeded in consideration of Project Design Features and existing laws, ordinances, standards or regulations).

Both direct and indirect effects of the Project are evaluated for each environmental resource area (14 CCR § 15126.2 and PRC § 21065.3). Direct effects are those that are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect effects are reasonably foreseeable consequences that may occur at a later time or at a distance that is removed from the Project area, such as growth-inducing effects and other effects related to changes in land use patterns, population density, or growth rate, and related effects on the physical environment.

Cumulative impacts are discussed below and throughout Section 4.0, at the end of each individual resource section.

There are no mitigation measures proposed when there is “no impact” or the impact is determined to be “less than significant” prior to mitigation (14 CCR § 15126.4(a)(3)). Where sufficient feasible mitigation is not available to reduce impacts to a less than significant level, the impacts are identified as remaining “significant and unavoidable.”

4.0.2 Cumulative Impact Methodology

CEQA Requirements

Under the CEQA Guidelines, “a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts” (14 CCR § 15130(a)(1)). According to CEQA, an EIR must discuss cumulative impacts if the incremental effect of a project, combined with the effects of other projects is “cumulatively considerable” (14 CCR § 15130(a)). Together, these projects compose the cumulative scenario which forms the basis of the cumulative impact analysis.

Cumulative impacts analysis should highlight past actions that are closely related either in time or location to the Project being considered, catalogue past projects, and discuss how they have harmed the environment and discuss past actions even if they were undertaken by another agency or another person. Both the severity of impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence are to be reflected in the discussion,

“but the discussion need not provide as great a detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the Project alone. The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact” (14 CCR § 15130(b)).

For purposes of this EIR, the proposed Project would cause a cumulatively considerable and therefore significant cumulative impact if:

- The cumulative effects of other past, current, and probable future projects without the Project are not significant and the Project’s incremental impact is substantial enough, when added to the cumulative effects, to result in a significant impact.
- The cumulative effects of other past, current, and probable future projects without the Project are already significant and the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the already significant effect. The standards used herein to determine whether the contribution is cumulatively considerable include the existing baseline environmental conditions, and whether the Project would cause a substantial increase in impacts, or otherwise exceed an established threshold of significance.

The approach and geographic scope of the cumulative impact evaluation vary depending on the environmental topic area being analyzed. The individual “Cumulative Impacts” subsections within each environmental topic present impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed Project. Each section of the Draft EIR begins with a summary of the approach and the geographic area relevant to that environmental topic area. For most environmental topic areas, the list approach is used. The list of potentially relevant projects as well as methodology and relevant planning documents are discussed in each impact section’s discussion of “Cumulative Impacts.”

The cumulative analysis must be in sufficient detail to be useful to the decision-maker in deciding whether, or how, to alter the Project to lessen cumulative impacts. **Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects** list provides a list of projects that were used in assessing the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed Project. Most of the projects included in the cumulative analysis are undergoing, or will be required to undergo, their own independent environmental review under CEQA. Significant adverse impacts of the cumulative projects would be required to be reduced, avoided, or minimized through the application and implementation of mitigation measures. The net effect of these mitigation measures is assumed to be a general lessening of contribution to cumulative impacts. This discussion, found at the end of each impact section, provides an analysis of overall cumulative effects of the Project taken together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects.

Geographic Scope

In respect to this EIR analysis, cumulative effects can generally be geographically classified as localized, site-specific resource issues, regional, watershed level resource issues and global resource issues. At the localized, site-specific resource scale, the Project’s cumulative impacts have been analyzed for all 18 resource topics.

Each of the cumulative impact categories (EIR Section 4.0) is analyzed and regulated by different agencies and associated regulatory or policy documents, in order to best protect the resource in question. The analysis of cumulative effects considers a number of variables, including geographic (spatial) limits, time (temporal) limits, and the characteristics of the resource being evaluated. The geographic scope of each analysis is based on the topography surrounding the Project site and the natural boundaries of the resource affected, rather than jurisdictional boundaries. The geographic scope of cumulative effects will often extend beyond the scope of the direct effects, but not beyond the scope of the direct and indirect effects of the proposed Project. The EIR addresses the Project's potentially significant impacts, recommends Project-specific mitigation measures, and then also identifies existing or recommended measures to address potential cumulative impacts.

Cumulative Analysis Approach

There are two commonly used approaches, or methodologies, for establishing the cumulative impact setting or scenario. One approach is to use a "list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, ..." (14 CCR § 15130(b)(1)(A) and PCR § 21083(b)(2)). The other is to use a "summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect" (14 CCR § 15130(b)(1)(B) and PCR § 21100(e)).

This EIR uses the list-based approach to provide a broad understanding and context for analyzing the cumulative effects of a project.

From a broad perspective, the Project is situated northeast of Interstate 10, in a rapidly developing, and extreme northern portion of the City of Beaumont in Riverside County. The Project represents commercial, e-commerce, and open space development, on approximately 2,707,465 square feet on approximately 188 acres. The Project would include various uses such as e-commerce, commercial uses, and reserved land for open space. The Project would include other associated facilities and improvements such as a perimeter fencing, parking, onsite and perimeter landscaping, lighting, and exterior sidewalks.

Specific cumulative projects were developed in consultation with City staff and incorporated into the Project Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) (refer to **Section 4.15, Transportation**, and **Appendix K, Traffic Impact Analysis and Vehicle Miles Travelled**). Traffic Study Table 4 and Figure 9, Location of Cumulative Projects specifically show the 53 cumulative projects used in the TIA, which were then factored into the cumulative analysis for related quantitative environmental issues, such as air quality and noise. The 53 cumulative projects are listed below in **Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects**.

Taken together, the projects identified above and included in the TIA cumulative analysis, together with previously certified local and regional planning program EIRs, provide context as to the nature of potential cumulative projects.

Types of Projects Considered

Impacts associated with implementation of the Project would be near- and long-term as the proposed Project would include future construction and operational activities associated with the Project buildout.

The following project summaries represent past, present and probable future projects that could result in cumulative impacts when combined with the Beaumont Summit Station Specific Plan Project. Related projects and other possible development in the Project area determined as having the potential to interact with the proposed Project to the extent that a significant cumulative effect may occur are outlined in **Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects.**

Table 4-1: Cumulative Projects

Project#	Description	Land Use	Quantity	Units
1	Noble Creek Vistas	Single-Family Detached Housing	648	DU
2	Cougar Ranch	Single-Family Detached Housing	148	DU
3	Oak Valley Greens Senior Center	Senior Adult Housing-Detached	372	DU
4	Oak Valley Village	Shopping Center	490.000	KSF
5	Kirkwood Ranch	Single-Family Detached Housing	403	DU
6	Sundance Corporate Center	General Office Building	300.000	KSF
7	Beaumont Commons	Single-Family Detached Housing	120	DU
8	Tuscany Townhomes	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)	188	DU
9	Prologis	General Light Industrial	2,200.000	KSF
10	Beaumont Industrial Park	Industrial Park	2,890.000	KSF
11	San Gorgonio Village	Shopping Center	130.000	KSF
12	Jerome Taurek	Single-Family Detached Housing	244	DU
13	Legacy Highlands (Phase 1)	Single-Family Detached Housing	1,159	DU
14	Hidden Canyon Industrial Park	No Land Use	2,890.000	KSF
15	Fairway Canyon	Single-Family Detached Housing	1,650	DU
16	Potrero Creek Estates	Single-Family Detached Housing	700	DU
17	High-Cube Fullfillment Center	High-Cube Parcel Hub Warehouse	4,500.000	KSF
	General Light Industrial	General Light Industrial	500.000	KSF
	Hotel	Hotel	125	Room
	Multipurpose Recreational Facility (Go-Cart)	Multipurpose Recreational Facility	77.00	KSF
	Rock Climbing	Rock Climbing Gym	26.000	KSF
	Miniature Golf	Miniature Golf Course	36	Hole
	Trampoline Park	Trampoline Park	24.000	KSF
	Bowling Alley	Bowling Alley	40.000	KSF
18	Beyond Beaumont Commercial		6.580	KSF
19	CUP 03629	Mini-Warehouse	90	Storage Units
20	TR 31966	Single-Family Detached Housing	60	DU
21	TTM 30545 Holbert Ranch	Single-Family Detached Housing	131	DU
22	Borstein Property	Single-Family Detached Housing	209	DU
	San Gorgonio Crossing	High-Cube Warehouse	1,861	KSF
23	Heartland	Single-Family Detached Housing	988	DU
		Shopping Center	126.000	KSF
23	Heartland	Single-Family Detached Housing	988	DU
		Shopping Center	126.000	KSF
24	American Villas	Single-Family Detached Housing	36	DU
	8th Street Condos	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)	16	DU
	Pennsylvania Ave Apartments	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)	8.000	DU
25	Sundance	Single-Family Detached Housing	4,716	DU
26	Rolling Hills Ranch Industrial Prologis	Warehousing	1,200.000	KSF

Project#	Description	Land Use	Quantity	Units
27	Dowling Orchard Business Park	Warehousing	548.820	KSF
28	Farmer Boys	Shopping Center	6.752	KSF
	Ramona Tire / Firestone	Shopping Center	4.792	KSF
29	Aspen Creek (TT 31426)	Single-Family Detached Housing	106	DU
30	Taurek (Tract No. 31162)	Single-Family Detached Housing	244	DU
31	Pacific Scene (Tract No. 32850)	Single-Family Detached Housing	95	DU
32	Jack Rabbit Trail	Single-Family Detached Housing	2,000	DU
		Shopping Center	49.005	KSF
33	Four Seasons (Tract NO. 31462)	Single-Family Detached Housing	2,041	DU
		Shopping Center	95.832	KSF
34	TTM 33931 Fiesta Oak Valley / Mesa Verde Estates	Single Family Residential	3535	DU
		Condos/Townhomes	453	DU
		Active Park	48.000	Acre
		Recreational Community Center	9.000	KSF
		Elementary School	1200	Student
		Commercial Retail	200.000	KSF
35	Summerwind Ranch	Single-Family Detached Housing	3,683	DU
		Elementary School	1,200	Student
		Middle School/Junior High School	900	Student
		Business Park	1,579.000	KSF
		Shopping Center	1,000.000	KSF
36	Sun Cal / Various Builders	Single-Family Detached Housing	2,366	DU
		Shopping Center	505.296	KSF
37	World Logistics Center	Warehousing	21,450.000	KSF
38	TAZ 28	Single-Family Detached Housing	193	DU
		General Office Building	182.342	KSF
		Shopping Center	130.244	KSF
39	TAZ 29	General Light Industrial	59.512	KSF
		General Office Building	49.876	KSF
		Business Park	26.737	KSF
		Shopping Center	69.827	KSF
40	TAZ 30	General Office Building	2.363	KSF
		Shopping Center	1.688	KSF
41	TAZ 31	General Office Building	86.826	KSF
		Shopping Center	62.019	KSF
42	TAZ 32	Single-Family Detached Housing	94	DU
43	TAZ 33	General Light Industrial	35.109	KSF
		Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)	41	DU
		General Office Building	9.605	KSF
		Business Park	78.147	KSF
		Shopping Center	6.861	KSF
44	TAZ 34	General Office Building	76.459	KSF
		Shopping Center	54.613	KSF
45	TAZ 35	Single-Family Detached Housing	28	DU
46	TAZ 36	Single-Family Detached Housing	17	DU
47	TAZ 37	Single-Family Detached Housing	6	DU
		General Office Building	16.618	KSF
		Shopping Center	11.870	KSF
48	TAZ 38	General Office Building	97.269	KSF
		Shopping Center	69.478	KSF

Project#	Description	Land Use	Quantity	Units
49	TAZ 39	General Office Building	42.460	KSF
		Shopping Center	103.023	KSF
50	TAZ 40	Single-Family Detached Housing	478	DU
51	Singleton Heights (Mastercraft) TR 26811	Single-Family Detached Housing	268	DU
52	Sunset Ranch (Osborne/Dunham) TR 31450	Single-Family Detached Housing	231	DU
53	JP Ranch ⁵	Single-Family Detached Housing	689	DU
		Shopping Center	72.700	KSF