

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
BEAUMONT, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THE FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE BEAUMONT POINTE
PROJECT, INCLUDING THE BEAUMONT POINTE SPECIFIC PLAN,
AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT; PRE-ZONING AND
ANNEXATION; ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT;
AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the Beaumont Pointe project (“Project”) has been proposed to the City of Beaumont on approximately 539.9 acres of land (the “Property”) located in the unincorporated area of the County of Riverside and in the Sphere of Influence (as such term is defined in Govt. Code Section 56076) of the City of Beaumont, including the Beaumont Pointe Specific Plan (the "BPSP"), General Plan Amendment, Parcel Map and Development Agreement and Final Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to annex the Property into the City of Beaumont pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, commencing with Section 56000 of the California Government Code and

WHEREAS, the City, by resolution adopted concurrently herewith has requested the Riverside County Formation Commission accept Owner’s application for annexation of the Property into the City and to take proceedings required for the annexation; and

WHEREAS, the Project includes 4,995,000 square feet of industrial and warehouse uses on approximately 232.6 acres to be developed with industrial uses to accommodate users such as industrial incubators, light manufacturing, parcel hub, warehouse/storage, fulfillment center, high cube warehouse, cold storage warehouse and 246,000 square feet of general commercial, community recreation, commercial, retail, restaurant and hospitality land uses, together with a 125- room hotel (approximately 90,000 square feet), and related amenities; and approximately 277.1 acres of open space; -and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Res. Code, §§ 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.) the City determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") should be prepared pursuant to CEQA in order to analyze all potential adverse environmental impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the City issued a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of a Draft EIR on or about September 6, 2020 and circulated the NOP until October 6, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City solicited comments from potential responsible agencies; and

WHEREAS, the City received written and verbal comments in response to the NOP, which assisted the City in narrowing the issues and alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, on or about December 22, 2022, the City initiated a 48 day public review period by filing a Notice of Completion and Availability with the State Office of Planning and Research and releasing the Draft EIR (the "Draft EIR") for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, the City also provided a Notice of Completion and Availability to all organizations and individuals who had previously requested such notice, and published the Notice of Completion in a newspaper of general circulation in the Project area on or about December 22, 2022. The Notice of Completion was also mailed to all residents and property owners within three hundred (300) feet of the Project. Copies of the original Draft EIR were provided to interested public agencies, organizations and individuals. Copies of the original Draft EIR were available at the City's Planning Department, on the City's website at: <https://www.beaumontca.gov/1143/Beaumont-Pointe-Specific-Plan>, and at the City's public library, and free copies were available to the public; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15086, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others during the 48 day comment period; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared the Final EIR SCH No. 2020099007, including the Draft EIR, response to comments and revisions the Draft EIR (collectively, the "FEIR") as and, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.5, the City provided copies of the FEIR to all commenting agencies and persons requesting copies of the responses; and

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Project on November 29, 2023 and continued the item to the January 10, 2024 Planning Commission agenda to consider the following entitlements: General Plan Amendment (PLAN2019-0284), Pre-Zoning the Property to specific plan (PLAN2019-0283); Beaumont Pointe Specific Plan (SP2019-0003); Beaumont Pointe Sign Program (PLAN2022-0856); Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 38161 (PM2022-0014); Minor Amendment to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan; and certification of the FEIR and annexation of the Property into the City (collectively the "Entitlements") and approval of a Development Agreement ("DA"); and

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission held a continued public hearing on the Project, the Entitlements and the DA on January 10, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the City supplemented the FEIR with the following: (1) Supplemental

CEQA Memorandum dated March 4, 2024 to address the Planning Commission's recommendations which were incorporated into the Project, and (2) additional memoranda dated March 7, 2024 and March 18, 2024 to address late comments to the FEIR (collectively, "Supplemental CEQA Memoranda"), each prepared by T&B Planning, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Beaumont (the "City Council"), at its regularly scheduled public meeting on March 19, 2024, held a public hearing on the Project, the Entitlements and the DA and continued the item to the April 16, 2024 City Council agenda; and

WHEREAS, as contained herein, the City has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision on the Project and the Entitlements; and

WHEREAS, all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in the FEIR as supplemented by the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda, which are sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project have been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS, the FEIR prepared in connection with the Project as supplemented by the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda sufficiently analyze both the feasible Mitigation Measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen the Project's potential environmental impacts and a range of feasible alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing these effects while feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives of the Project in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, all of the findings and conclusions made by the City Council pursuant to this Resolution and in the accompanying staff report, and the facts, analysis and conclusions in the FEIR as supplemented, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference, are based upon these documents and the oral and written evidence presented to it as a whole, and not based solely on the information provided in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, environmental impacts which the City finds are less than significant and do not require mitigation are described in the FEIR and Supplemental CEQA Memoranda; and

WHEREAS, environmental impacts that are potentially significant but which the City finds can be mitigated to a level of less than significant through the imposition of feasible Mitigation Measures are identified in the FEIR and the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda; and

WHEREAS, environmental impacts that are potentially significant but which the City finds cannot be fully mitigated to a level of less than significant despite the imposition of all feasible Mitigation Measures are identified in the FEIR and the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda; and

WHEREAS, alternatives to the Project that might eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts are described in the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the City Council has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the FEIR, the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings; and

WHEREAS, the FEIR, the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda, the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program reflect the independent judgment of the City Council and are deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the Project; and

WHEREAS, no comments made in the public hearings conducted by the City or any additional information submitted to the City following publication of the FEIR have produced substantial new information requiring recirculation or additional environmental review under State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 and do not change the findings and conclusions in the Final EIR, the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda, the Findings or the Statement of Overriding Considerations; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BEAUMONT DOES RESOLVE, DECLARE AND DETERMINE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby Certifies the FEIR as supplemented by the Supplemental CEQA Memoranda and adopts the Finding of Facts and Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation and Monitoring Report for the Project as contained in **Exhibit "A"** attached hereto and which are incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby makes the following findings and adopts the General Plan Amendment, pre-zoning to specific plan, the Beaumont Pointe Specific Plan and the Sign Program, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 38161, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by this reference.

1. The proposed amendment is in the public interest, and there will be a community benefit resulting from the amendment: The proposed amendment serves the public interest and provides a community benefit by (i) allowing for economic diversification of the City; and (ii) providing an opportunity for additional jobs, goods and services not currently available to the City's residents.
2. The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan: (i) a plan of services for the Project has been prepared for

the General Plan Amendment and provides operation and maintenance of community activities and events, public safety, transit, maintenance of public works, sanitary sewers and trash collections to insure that adequate public services and facilities are provided in a timely manner for the Property; (ii) the Project will provide a mix of jobs and services opportunities to the City's labor force and residents; (iii) the Project will accommodate travel demand with traffic mitigation measures meeting the City's General Plan adopted Level of Service D; and (iv) the Project is compatible with surrounding land uses and is consistent with the existing industrial character of the area. Further detailed findings of consistency between the Project and the General Plan are set forth in the FEIR which findings and supporting evidence has been previously considered by the City Council in connection with the project and are attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein by this reference.

3. That the proposed amendment will not conflict with provisions of the zoning ordinance or subdivision regulations, in that the Project: (i) provides for the design and development of a quality development project with long-term value; (ii) provides for diversification of the City's economy by establishing a variety of commercial and industrial uses; (iii) will assist with the development of a circulation system that serves the needs of the City through traffic mitigation measures meeting the City's General Plan adopted Level of Service D; and (iv) is compatible with surrounding land uses, consistent with the existing industrial character of the area.
4. In the event that the proposed amendment is a change to the land use policy map, the amendment will not adversely affect surrounding properties: The amendment provides for orderly expansion of the City boundary as the subject site is located within the City's sphere of influence.

Zone Change/Pre-Zone & Annexation (Specific Plan)

1. That the proposed change of zone or zoning ordinance text amendment is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan: (i) a plan of services for the Project has been prepared for the General Plan Amendment and provides operation and maintenance of community activities and events, public safety, transit, maintenance of public works, sanitary sewers and trash collections to insure that adequate public services and facilities are provided in a timely manner for the Property; (ii) the Project will provide a mix of jobs and services opportunities to the City's labor force and residents; (iii) the Project will accommodate travel demand with traffic mitigation measures meeting the City's General Plan adopted Level of Service D; and (iv) is the Project is compatible with surrounding land uses and is consistent with the existing industrial character of the area. Further detailed findings of consistency between the Project and the General Plan are set forth in the FEIR which findings and supporting evidence has been previously considered by the City Council in connection with the project and are attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein by this reference.

2. That the proposed change of zone or zoning ordinance text amendment will not adversely affect surrounding properties in that the Project: (i) provides for the design and development of a quality development project with long-term value; (ii) provides for diversification of the City's economy by establishing a variety of commercial and industrial uses; (iii) will assist with the development of a circulation system that serves the needs of the City through traffic mitigation measures meeting the City's General Plan adopted Level of Service D; and (iv) is compatible with surrounding land uses, consistent with the existing industrial character of the area
3. That the proposed change of zone or zoning ordinance text amendment promotes public health, safety, and general welfare and serves the goals and purposes of this Zoning Ordinance: The proposed amendment serves the public interest and provides a community benefit by (i) allowing for economic diversification of the City; (ii) providing an opportunity for additional jobs, goods and services not currently available to the City's residents; and (iii) allowing for orderly expansion and development of the City through infrastructure improvements consistent with the adopted General Plan Circulation Element.

SECTION 3. That the City Council hereby authorizes staff to negotiate and execute the Minor Amendment to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan required to conform the plan to the Project. **SECTION 4.** That this Resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption by the City Council.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Beaumont, California, held on the 21st day of May, 2024, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

CITY OF BEAUMONT CITY COUNCIL

David Fenn, Mayor

ATTEST:

Nicole Wheelwright, City Clerk

Exhibit "A"

[see attached]

Exhibit "B"

[see attached]

Exhibit “C”

General Plan Applicability Analysis

General Plan Policy	Applicability
Land Use and Community Design (Chapter 3)	
<i>Goal 3.1: A City structure that enhances the quality of life of residents, meets the community’s vision for the future, and connects new growth areas together with established Beaumont neighborhoods.</i>	
<p>Policy 3.1.12: Establish buffers between open space areas and urban development by encouraging less intensive rural development within proximity to the open space areas.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is bordered to the west and to the south by open space and conservation land uses. The Specific Plan designates PA 9 for Open Space, which accommodates landscaped, manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, project signage, as well as the natural slopes which form a buffer between the Specific Plan’s developed areas and the Open Space – Conservation in PA 10. These areas would not be developed with the Project’s proposed structures. Some disturbance would occur within the areas designated as Open Space; however, the disturbance would be limited to grading and landscaping. Therefore, the Project would establish a buffer between open space areas and urban development and would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.1.12.</p>
<p>Policy 3.4.8: Where industrial uses are near existing and planned residential development, require that industrial projects be designed to limit the impact of truck traffic, air and noise pollution on sensitive receptors, especially in El Barrio.</p>	<p>No Conflict. Existing residential land uses near the Project site are those that abut the Project site on the south and to the north beyond the SR-60 Freeway. As concluded in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, Section 4.13, <i>Noise</i>, and Section 4.17, <i>Transportation</i>, the Project would result in unavoidable impacts to air quality, noise, and transportation, but these effects are significant due to their effect on the region. However, all mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.4.8.</p>
<p>Policy 3.5.2: Continue to work towards the implementation of streetscape and sign standards.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would develop the Project site in accordance with the Development Standards from Chapter 3 and Design Guidelines from Chapter 4 of the Specific Plan, which establish comprehensive streetscape design standards for interior streets. The Development Standards and the Design Guidelines that define the Project’s design theme are intended to create a welcoming visual environment.</p> <p>Additionally, a Sign Program for the Project is being processed concurrently with the Specific Plan. The Sign Program provides adequate and appropriate project, street, building, tenant identification, pedestrian path, and wayfinding signage for the anticipated variety of building sizes, designs, and uses. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.5.2.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>Policy 3.5.3: Promote quality design in the review of commercial and residential projects.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would include “Activities Park” within the General Commercial land uses that would consist of landscaping, seating, video screen walls, and programming for wellness activities such as yoga, movies on the lawn, “biergarten” games, and a large climbing wall. In addition, to encourage social interaction, the Industrial and General Commercial building sites within Project site may include outdoor employee break areas with tables affixed to the ground to provide employees with a location to eat, gather, and enjoy being outside. The Project Applicant would develop the site in accordance with the Development Standards established in Chapter 3 and the Design Guidelines established in Chapter 4 of the Specific Plan, which includes comprehensive architectural and landscape standards and development criteria that provide for an attractive, contemporary industrial/business park. Additionally, the development standards provide regulations for building placement and orientation, floor area ratio, height, setbacks, open space, landscaping, signage, walls and fencing, roadways, and utilities and service areas. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.5.3.</p>
<p><i>Goal 3.7: A City with a high-quality pedestrian environment for people, fostering interaction, activity, and safety.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 3.7.2: Create pedestrian-oriented streetscapes by establishing unified street tree planting, sidewalk dimensions and maintenance, pedestrian amenities, and high-quality building frontages in all new development</p>	<p>No Conflict. Passive recreational opportunities are provided to employees and visitors of Project site through curb-adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths. These amenities encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project. Provisions for sidewalks and pedestrian walkways, bicycle storage facilities, and employee and visitor gathering areas interior to the planning areas are set forth in Chapter 4, Design Guidelines, of the Specific Plan.</p> <p>The Project includes installation of sidewalks along the Project site’s frontage with Jack Rabbit Trail and 4th Street and along Industrial Way. The Project provides a plant palette for three categories: Entrance Planting, Native California Planting, and Industrial Screen Planting. Landscaping is selected to complement and enhance the setting of the site, while ensuring the conservation of the site’s natural vegetation and habitats. Therefore, the Project would create pedestrian-oriented streetscapes by establishing unified street tree planting, sidewalks, and high-quality building frontages. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.7.2.</p>
<p><i>Goal 3.8: A City that encourages a healthy lifestyle for people of all ages, income levels, and cultural backgrounds.</i></p>	

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>Policy 3.8.3 Ensure the design of context-specific streetscaping that promotes safe travel for all users, including signs, curbs, trees and landscaping to provide a more pleasant environment for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project Applicant proposes curb adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project site. In addition, all driveways and intersections to and from the Project site would be stop-controlled to ensure safety for all transportation users. Based on the Project’s roadway improvements, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.8.3</p>
<p>Policy 3.9.1: Use Crime Prevention through Environmental Design strategies (CPTED) in new and existing development to improve public safety, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Active public space</i> • <i>Building design to promote “eyes on the street”</i> • <i>Clean delineation between private and public space</i> • <i>Natural access control between public and private space</i> • <i>Maintenance of public places</i> • <i>Removal or repair of vandalism or broken property.</i> 	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is within the northwestern SOI for the City of Beaumont, which is characterized as undeveloped and vacant. Under exiting conditions, there are no sidewalks or pedestrian facilities along the perimeter of the Project site.</p> <p>The implementation of the Project would result in the development of the Project site with Industrial and General Commercial uses. The implementation of the Project would provide a clean delineation between public and private space through signage, walls, and fencing. The Project’s proposed buildings would feature security lighting to enhance security on site. Additionally, building facades would face public roadways including SR-60 Freeway, Jack Rabbit Trail, Entertainment Way, and 4th Street.</p> <p>The implementation of the Project would not interfere with the City’s ability to maintain public places or remove or repair vandalism or broken property. As such, the Project As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.9.1.</p>
<p><i>Goal 3.10: A City designed to improve the quality of the built and natural environments to reduce disparate health and environmental impacts</i></p>	
<p>Policy 3.10.2: Reduce particulate emissions from paved and unpaved roads, construction activities, and agricultural operations.</p>	<p>No Conflict. During the Project’s construction phase, water would be sprayed throughout the site to abate dust particulate emissions as required by South Coast AQMD Rule 403. Additionally, Mitigation Measure MM 4.3-2 shall ensure that all 75-horsepower or greater diesel-powered equipment is powered with California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Tier 4 Final engines, except where the project applicant establishes to the satisfaction of the City of Beaumont that Tier 4 Final equipment is not available. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.10.2.</p>
<p>Policy 3.10.4: Designate truck routes to avoid sensitive land uses, where feasible.</p>	<p>No Conflict. This is not a Project specific policy; however, the Project does not propose truck routes in proximity to sensitive land uses. Located along the south side of the SR-60 Freeway, access to the regional transportation system from the Project site is provided via 4th Street at the Potrero interchange,</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>approximately 1.25 miles to the east. Due to the Project site's proximity to SR-60, trucks accessing the Project site would efficiently reach the State highway system to facilitate the movement of goods throughout the region. In addition, Jack Rabbit Trail will only provide gated, emergency access to the SR-60 Freeway. No access to the SR-60 Freeway is proposed, except during an emergency in order to restrict truck traffic along Jack Rabbit Trail, which would be one of the main roadways that connects to the proposed commercial development. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.10.4.</p>
<p>Policy 3.10.7: Support practices that promote low impact development, including water resilient communities, prevention of urban runoff, and mitigation of industrial pollution.</p>	<p>No Conflict. In accordance with the Project's WQMP, the Project would install LID BMPs (e.g., bioretention and biotreatment) to detain stormwater on site for runoff mitigation. The Project proposes to install four detention basins within drainage management areas. The detention basins would remove pollutants from runoff and filter the water, thereby providing first-flush capture, detention, and filtration of stormwater runoff before it is discharged from the Project site. Additionally, the Project proposes structural and non-structural source control BMPs (see Table 4.10-4 of this EIR) to mitigate industrial pollution. Furthermore, the Project would slightly reduce peak stormwater flows by approximately 98 cfs and would not cause adverse hydrologic or biologic impacts to downstream receiving waters, including groundwater. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.10.7.</p>
<p>Policy 3.11.5: Preserve watercourses and washes necessary for regional flood control, ground water recharge areas and drainage for open space and recreational purposes. These include San Timoteo Creek, Little San Gorgonio Creek and Noble Creek, among others.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As further discussed in Section 4.10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, of this EIR, the Project site is not within the recharge area for Little San Gorgonio Creek. The Project Applicant proposes to preserve 124.7 acres on site as Open Space and 152.4 acres as Open Space – Conservation. The Project would result in a 98 cfs reduction in peak stormwater runoff rates, and drainage from the development areas would continue to flow to San Timoteo Creek.</p> <p>The implementation of the Project would not interfere with the City's ability to preserve watercourses and washes necessary for regional flood control, groundwater recharge areas and drainage for open space and recreational purposes. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.11.5.</p>
<p>Policy 3.11.7: Preserve permanent open space edges or greenbelts that provide a buffer for separation between adjoining developments.</p>	<p>No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.1.12. The Project Applicant proposes to preserve 124.7 acres on site as Open Space and 152.4 acres as Open Space – Conservation. The Project's on-site Open Space designated areas would provide a buffer between the proposed Industrial and Commercial uses from the existing open space to the west and south. Additionally, the SR-60 Freeway would provide a buffer from the proposed development and existing</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>single-family residences to the north and northeast. Furthermore, the proposed Industrial and Commercial uses would be compatible with the proposed Hidden Canyon industrial development to the east. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.11.7.</p>
<p>Policy 3.11.8: Work with Riverside County and adjacent cities, landowners, and conservation organizations to preserve, protect, and enhance open space and natural resources consistent with the MSHCP.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would provide 124.7 acres of open space to accommodate landscaped manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, and natural open space as a buffer to adjacent conservation area and 152.4 acres of open space – conservation. The Open Space – Conservation area would be preserved as natural habitat and dedicated to the RCA as required by the MSHCP. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.11.8.</p>
<p>Policy 3.11.9: Continue to maintain the Badlands and Potrero area as primarily a functioning wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As described in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i>, of this EIR, the Project site is located within Criteria Cells 933, 936, 1030, 1032, and 1125 of Subunit 1 (Potrero/Badlands) of The Pass Area Plan, and with “offsite” proposed conservation located within Cell Group A’ of Subunit 3 (Badlands North) of the Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan.</p>
<p>Policy 3.11.10: Require the provision of open space linkages and conservation between development projects, consistent with the conservation efforts targeted in the MSHCP.</p>	<p>The MSHCP defines a “Core” as a “block of Habitat of appropriate size, configuration, and vegetation characteristics to generally support the life history requirements of one or more Covered Species.” The Project proposes a Criteria Refinement that will support the assembly of Proposed Core 3 in a manner consistent with the existing Cell Criteria. The intent of conserved lands at the Project site is to expand the edge of Core 3.</p> <p>The Project will impact 112.45 acres of lands described for conservation by the MSHCP Cell Criteria. The Project will offset those impacts with 122.81 acres of replacement lands that are not described by the Cell Criteria, including 41.21 acres on site and 78.40 acres off-site. In addition, the Project will conserve the remaining 93.42 acres of on-site lands described by the Cell Criteria, for a combined conservation area of 213.03 acres, compared with a total of 205.87 acres described by the MSHCP.</p> <p>The Project’s on-site conservation includes 133.27 acres within the Criteria Area (Cells 933, 936, 1030, 1032, and 1125) and 1.36 acres on site that are not part of a Criteria Cell (but adjacent to Cells). Of the offsite lands, approximately 37.89 acres are in Cell 1125 of Cell Group A’, and 40.51 acres are not a part of a Criteria Cell but are adjacent to Cell Group A’. Although the Project does not achieve minimum described acreage for some of the individual Cells, the Project proposes an overall greater amount of conservation than is described, including the expansion of conservation to the northwest and the southeast into undescribed lands that will extend the</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>conserved edge. The conservation of undescribed lands in the northwestern portion of Cell 933 will extend conservation to SR-60 to link up with the undercrossing constructed as part of the freeway improvements.</p> <p>Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policies 3.11.9 and 3.11.10.</p>
<p><i>Goal 3.12: A City that minimizes the extent of urban development in the hillsides, and mitigates any significant adverse consequences associated with urbanization.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 3.12.1: Develop policies for hillside development in order to protect the natural environment and views.</p>	<p>No Conflict. Under existing conditions, the Project site is characterized by rugged steep ridges and hillsides with narrow canyons that are generally situated on the southwest portion of the site. Relatively gentle ridges, broad canyons, and valleys are located on the northwest and southeast portions of the site. The existing topography of the site consists of low rolling hills and canyons, ranging in elevation between the 2,300 and 2,450- foot contours msl.</p> <p>The Project would entail extensive grading activities to allow for the development of the proposed Industrial and Commercial uses. However, the proposed development is in proximity to developing areas to the east that are designated for Industrial uses. Additionally, the southern portion of the Project site and the areas surrounding the proposed structures will be designated as Open Space and Open Space - Conservation, which will also help preserve the scenic views within this area. As discussed above, although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. Therefore, the Project would preserve the scenic views within the area and would not result in an impact on scenic vistas. The Project would be consistent with General Plan Policy 3.12.1.</p>
<p>Policy 3.12.2: Limit the extent and intensity of uses and development in areas of unstable terrain, steep terrain, scenic vistas, and other critical environmental areas.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is adjacent to and in part within the San Timoteo Badlands, which is characterized with mountainous terrain. The Project site contains hillsides, ridges, canyons, and valleys in the northwestern and southeastern portions of the site. These areas include PAs 9 and 10 which are designated as Open Space and Open Space - Conservation, respectively. Areas designated as Open Space - Conservation would serve to protect the natural resources on site and no development would occur in this area. As previously discussed, grading would occur on PAs 1 through 9.</p> <p>Landform modifications would occur under the Project in PAs 1-8 and remedial grading would occur in PA 9, along with landscaped, manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas,</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>project signage, as well as the natural slopes which form a buffer between the Specific Plan's developed areas and PA 10. Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, no grading would occur within PA 10 or between the north-northeast property line and SR-60 Freeway, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. The boundary between PA 9 and PA 10 is designated as the "Limits of Disturbance" on the Land Use Plan. This designation means that all development activity will take place inside of the limits of disturbance (i.e., within PA 9 or within PAs 1-8) and not on PA 10. PA 9 would include natural slopes which form a buffer between the developed areas and PA 10, which would be dedicated to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), pursuant to the MSHCP. Therefore, this area would preserve deeply incised hillsides and watercourse along with the habitats associated with these landforms.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, a Geotechnical Report was prepared to evaluate geological conditions on the Project site and feasibility of development. As discussed, the Project's proposed 2:1 cut and fill slopes are considered grossly stable and surficially stable; and, impacts relating to unstable soils and geologic units, including landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, and liquefaction would be less than significant. Furthermore, mandatory adherence to the recommendations contained in the site-specific geotechnical report during Project construction would ensure impacts associated with geological hazards are less than significant.</p> <p>Moreover, as discussed in Threshold b above, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant. As such, the Project would be consistent with General Plan Policy 3.12.2.</p>
<p>Policy 3.12.3: Control the grading of land, pursuant to the City's Municipal Code, to minimize the potential for erosion, landslides, and other forms of land failure, as well as to limit the potential negative aesthetic impact of excessive modification of natural landforms.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would require extensive grading in order to develop the site with the proposed Industrial and General Commercial land uses. However, the Project's grading plan would be in accordance with the standards identified in the City's Municipal Code, to minimize the potential for erosion, landslides, and other forms of land failure. The Project's grading would occur within the central portion of the Project site where the proposed buildings would be located. Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project Applicant does not propose to grade the northwestern or southern portions of the Project site within PA 10 or between the north-northeast property line and SR-60 Freeway, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. Future development would be subjected to the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Report (see Section 5 of <i>Technical Appendix F1</i>, of this EIR), in accordance with the CBC and Beaumont Municipal Code Section 17.1.040. The</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>Geotechnical Report includes requirements for: supplemental subsurface exploration, general earthwork and grading, fill placement and compaction, remedial grading, manufactured slopes, surface drainage, subdrainage, oversized rock materials, deep fill areas/settlement monitoring, preliminary foundation recommendations, retaining walls, sulfate potential, corrosion potential, preliminary pavement design, and temporary excavations. Mandatory compliance with the recommendations contained within the Project site's Geotechnical Report (as required by the CBSC, Beaumont Building Code, and conditions of approval) would ensure that the Project is engineered and constructed to maximize stability and preclude safety hazards to on-site and abutting off-site areas. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.12.3; see also discussion under Policy 3.12.2.</p>
<p>Policy 3.12.4: Recognize the value of ridgelines and hillsides as significant natural and visual resources and strengthen their role as features which define the character of the City and its individual neighborhood.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project designates 152.4 acres (PA 10) as Open Space – Conservation, which is intended to be dedicated to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), pursuant to the Western Riverside County MSHCP, for preservation to augment existing, adjacent conserved lands in this part of Riverside County. This area consists of deeply incised hillsides and watercourses along with the habitats associated with these landforms. As discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, of the EIR, although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project would not allow grading within PA 10, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. No development would occur in this area. The Specific Plan would implement measures to ensure that Project design elements visually enhance and do not degrade the surrounding area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 3.12.4.</p>
<p>Policy 3.12.12: Establish buffers between open space areas and urban development by encouraging less intensive rural development within proximity to the open space areas.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is bordered to the north by SR-60 and to the east by new industrial development. The Project site is bordered to the west and to the south by open space and conservation land uses which are buffered under the Beaumont Specific Plan by PA 9 and PA 10 which abut the open space areas and are designated as Open Space and Open Space – Conservation, respectively. PA 9 will be developed with landscaped, manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, as well as the natural slopes which form a buffer between the Specific Plan's developed areas and the Open Space – Conservation in PA 10. PA 10 will remain ungraded and undeveloped. These areas would not be developed with the Project's proposed structures. PA 9 will also be developed with project signage along the SR-60 frontage only. As further described in Section 3.0. of this EIR, the Project's on-site Open Space designated areas would provide a buffer between the proposed development and adjoining natural open space. As</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	such, the Project would be consistent with General Plan Policy 3.12.4.
	Mobility (Chapter 4)
<i>Goal 4.1: Promote smooth traffic flows and balance operational efficiency, technological, and economic feasibility.</i>	
Policy 4.1.1: Reduce vehicular congestion on auto-priority streets to the greatest extent possible.	No Conflict. The Project Applicant would be required to pay TUMF fees, DIF fees, and fair share improvement fees that the City would use to ensure the implementation of roadway improvements in the area in order to minimize traffic congestion. Additionally, the Project would include the following improvements to accommodate site access and maintain acceptable peak hour operations: install a traffic signal, and construct southbound left turn lane with a minimum of 200-feet of storage and a right turn lane, an eastbound left turn lane with a minimum of 100-feet of storage and a through lane, and westbound through lane and a right turn lane with a minimum of 100-feet of storage at the intersection of Jack Rabbit Trail & 4th Street; construct an eastbound shared left-through lane and stripe the southbound right turn lane at the intersection of Potrero Boulevard and 4th Street; construct 4th Street at its ultimate full-width as a Collector (66-foot right-of-way) from the western Project boundary to Jack Rabbit Trail and with a minimum of one lane of travel in each direction from Jack Rabbit Trail to Potrero Boulevard. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.1.1.
Policy 4.1.5: Require residential and commercial development standards that strengthen connections to transit and promote walking to neighborhood services.	No Conflict. The Project Applicant proposes curb adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project site. Additionally, the Project would provide pedestrian and bicycle network improvements within the development connecting to existing off-site facilities to the east along 4th Street. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.1.5.
Policy 4.1.6: Review and coordinate circulation requirements with Caltrans, as it pertains to freeways and state highways.	No Conflict. The TIA has been prepared in accordance with the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies. The TIA analyzed freeway mainline and ramp junction impacts to the State Highway System, including the I-10 and SR-60. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.1.6.
<i>Goal 4.2: Support the development of a comprehensive network of complete streets throughout the City that provides safe, efficient, and accessible connectivity for users of all ages and abilities.</i>	
Policy 4.2.2: Maintain standards that align with SB 743 and multi-modal level of	No conflict. Consistent with SB 743, the City of Beaumont adopted thresholds based on VMT. The VMT assessment

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>service (MMLOS) methodologies. Incorporate these into impact assessments when appropriate.</p>	<p><i>(Technical Appendix K2)</i> prepared for the Project included analysis of VMT impacts resulting from implementation of the Project. The VMT assessment for the Project has been reviewed and approved by the City.</p> <p>The City has not adopted MMLOS methodologies, however, the TIA <i>(Technical Appendix K1)</i> analyzes LOS and multi-modal transportation. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.2.2.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2.5: Ensure that existing and future roadway improvements balance the needs of all users, including pedestrians and bicyclists.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Chapter 4, <i>Design Guidelines</i>, of the Specific Plan, the Project includes installation of sidewalks along the Project site’s frontage with Jack Rabbit Trail and 4th Street and along Industrial Way, a proposed private road located along the north side of the proposed industrial buildings. Access to the Project’s proposed industrial and commercial uses would be separated to allow for safe access for visitors to the Project’s commercial uses. Jack Rabbit Trail provides access to PAs 1 and 2 while primary access to the Industrial PAs 3 through 8 is provided by 4th Street along the south, with Industrial Way providing secondary access along the north. Additionally, the Project would include the installation of bicycle racks and lockers at each of the proposed light industrial buildings and the Project proposes curb adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not conflict be consistent with General Plan Policy 4.2.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 4.3: A healthy transportation system that promotes and improves pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety in Beaumont.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 4.3.1: Reduce the potential for car collisions through design improvements, speed limit enforcement, and education efforts, prioritizing areas with a high level of collision incidence</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project site is currently undeveloped and therefore is not in an area with a high level of collision incidences. Roadways would be constructed consistent with the Specific Plan (see Figure 3-8, Conceptual Circulation Plan) and designed in accordance with City standards. Roadway alignments, designations, and widths provided at the subdivision stage are subject to detailed engineering review and approval by the City Engineer. Traffic control measures shall be installed consistent with the TIA (Technical Appendix K1) and as determined by the City Engineer. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project Applicant would be required to pay TUMF, DIF, and fair share fees; and the Project would include roadways improvements consistent with City Requirements to accommodate site access and maintain acceptable peak hour operations. Driveways and access points shall conform to the City’s standard intersection spacing and access spacing. Additionally, sight distances would be reviewed by the City Engineer to ensure that setbacks allow for clear, unobstructed sight distances at intersections. Based on</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	the Project's required design improvements, the Project would reduce the potential for car collisions and the Project would not conflict be consistent with General Plan Policy 4.3.1.
Policy 4.3.5: Integrate land use and transportation infrastructure to support higher-density development, a balanced mix of residential and commercial uses, and a connected system of sidewalks, bikeways, greenways, and transit.	No Conflict. The Project involves a mixed development of 232.6 acres of light industrial use, 30.2 acres of commercial use (i.e., hotel, restaurants, recreation-based retail uses), 124.7 acres of open space, and 152.4 acres of open space - conservation use. The Project also includes a detailed circulation plan, which is organized to ensure efficient access to individual tenant areas, as well as to public places. Because the Project would integrate land use and transportation infrastructure to support a balanced mix of land uses, the Project would not conflict with Policy 4.3.5.
<i>Goal 4.4: A balanced transportation system that provides adequate facilities for people in the City to bicycle, walk, or take transit to their destinations.</i>	
Policy 4.4.3: Improve safety for all active transportation users.	No Conflict. The Project Applicant proposes curb adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project site. In addition, all driveways and intersections to and from the Project site would be stop-controlled to ensure safety for all transportation users. Based on the Project's roadway improvements, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.4.3.
<i>Goal 4.6: An efficient goods movement system that ensures timely deliveries without compromising quality of life, safety, or smooth traffic flow for Beaumont residents.</i>	
Policy 4.6.1: Prioritize goods movement along specific routes in the City, consistent with the adopted layered network, to foster efficient freight logistics.	No Conflict. The Project site is situated in close proximity to the regional transportation network which connects the site to the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, both major gateways for international trade, the Inland Empire and the Western United States. Located along the south side of the SR-60 and I-10 Freeway, access to the regional transportation system from the site is provided via 4th Street, and access to the SR-60 and I-10 Freeway from 4th Street through an industrial area to the east. Interim regional access to the Project site is available from the SR-60 Freeway via Western Knolls and Veile Avenue/6th Street interchanges and the I-10 Freeway via the Oak Valley Parkway and Beaumont Avenue interchanges. Once the Potrero Boulevard interchange is constructed, regional access to the Project site would be available from the SR-60 Freeway/Potrero Boulevard and I-10 Freeway/Oak Valley Parkway interchanges. Due to the Project site's proximity to SR-60, trucks accessing the Project site would efficiently reach the State highway system to facilitate the movement of goods throughout the region. In addition, the Project would be consistent with SCAG's Connect SoCal goals, which are described in detail in EIR Section 4.11, <i>Land Use and</i>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<i>Planning.</i> Based on the foregoing, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.6.1.
Policy 4.6.2: Minimize or restrict heavy vehicle traffic near sensitive areas such as schools, parks, and neighborhoods.	No Conflict. The closest sensitive area to the Project site is an existing single-family residence located approximately 483 feet south of the Project site's southernmost boundary. Other residential uses are located north across Frontage Road (1,253 feet) and beyond SR-60. However, the Project would not restrict access to or from the existing residence; the Project would provide private residential access on site to the existing residence; cars and trucks will not pass by this residence under the proposed roadway plan. truck trips would be routed through an industrial area to Potrero Boulevard and would not pass by sensitive areas. Based on these restrictions, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 4.6.2.
Health and Environmental Justice (Chapter 6)	
<i>Goal 6.7: A City that safely and systemically addresses toxics, legacy pollutants, and hazardous materials.</i>	
Policy 6.7.1: Prohibit new non-residential uses that are known to release or emit toxic waste at levels that are harmful to human health while continuing to allow R&D uses, medical uses, and other necessary services such as dry cleaners.	No Conflict. The Project Applicant proposes to develop the Project site with industrial and commercial uses. However, the building occupants within the industrial land use will include warehousing, manufacturing, fulfillment, parcel hub and/or similar uses. Manufacturing uses may include manufacturing on-site and shipment of goods and/or shipment/transport of goods to the Project site for manufacturing on-site. Building occupants within the commercial land uses will include restaurants, recreation, and entertainment (e.g., athletic fields, batting cages, miniature golf courses, health clubs, etc.). The full list of permitted, conditionally permitted, and ancillary uses allowed within the Project site are listed on Table 3-1 of the Specific Plan. Based on the facilities and uses that would be allowed at the Project site, hazardous materials (e.g., diesel fuel, lubricants, solvents, corrosives, hazardous materials, etc.) could be used during the course of daily operations at the Project site, subject to mandatory regulatory compliance to insure safe use and disposal. It is possible that other hazardous materials also could be used during the course of daily operations at the Project site. In the event that hazardous materials, other than those common materials described above, are associated with future operations, the hazardous materials would only be stored and transported to and from the Project site subject to applicable safety regulations. General cleaning activities on site that contain toxic substances are usually low in concentration and small in amount; therefore, there is no significant risk to humans or the environment from the use of such cleaning products.

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	As concluded in Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this EIR, with mandatory regulatory compliance, the Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident conditions which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 6.7.1.
Policy 6.7.2: Continue to work with State, federal, regional, and local agencies to eliminate and reduce concentrations of regulated legacy pollutants.	No Conflict. There are no existing pollutants on site as the Project site is vacant and undeveloped. The Project would comply with State and federal Community-Right-to-Know laws, which allow the public to access information regarding the information about the amounts and types of chemicals that may be used by businesses on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 6.7.2.
Policy 6.7.5: Reduce particulate emissions from paved and unpaved roads, construction activities, and agricultural operations.	No Conflict. During the Project’s construction phase, water would be sprayed throughout the site to abate dust particulate emissions. Additionally, Mitigation Measure MM 4.3-2 shall ensure that all 75-horsepower or greater diesel-powered equipment is powered with California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Tier 4 Final engines, except where the project applicant establishes to the satisfaction of the City of Beaumont that Tier 4 Final equipment is not available. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 6.7.5.
Policy 6.7.6: Designate truck routes to avoid sensitive land uses, where feasible.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.10.4. The Project does not propose any truck routes in proximity to sensitive land uses. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 6.7.6.
Community Facilities and Infrastructure (Chapter 7)	
<i>Goal 7.3: Buildings and landscapes promote water conservation, efficiency, and the increased use of recycled water.</i>	
Policy 7.3.6: Encourage innovative water recycling techniques, such as rainwater capture, use of cisterns, and installation of greywater systems.	No Conflict. As disused in Section 4.19, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , and Section 4.8, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> , the Project would commit to using graywater (purple pipe) irrigation. Recycled water will be utilized and used for construction dewatering, irrigation of manufactured and replanted slopes within PA 9, as well as for irrigation of parkway landscaping and irrigation of landscaping within the General Commercial and Industrial land uses (PAs 1-8). The Project would connect a proposed 14-inch recycled water line that would connect to the existing 14-inch recycled water line within the adjacent Hidden Canyon development at 4th Street

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	(350 feet east of the Project site in the existing right of way). As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.3.6.
<i>Goal 7.4: Incorporate sustainable and improved stormwater management practices.</i>	
Policy 7.4.1: Incorporate low-impact development (LID) techniques to improve stormwater quality and reduce run-off quantity.	No Conflict. In accordance with the Project's WQMP, the Project would install LID BMPs (e.g., bioretention and biotreatment) to detain stormwater on site for runoff mitigation. The Project proposes to install four detention basins within drainage management areas. The detention basins would remove pollutants from runoff and filter the water, thereby providing first-flush capture, detention, and filtration of stormwater runoff before it is discharged from the Project site. Additionally, the Project proposes non-structural BMPs to mitigate industrial pollution. Furthermore, the Project would slightly reduce peak stormwater flows by approximately 98 cfs and would not cause adverse hydrologic or biologic impacts to downstream receiving waters, including groundwater. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.4.1.
Policy 7.4.3: Require new development and redevelopment projects to reuse stormwater on site to the maximum extent practical and provide adequate stormwater infrastructure for flood control.	No Conflict. The Project's proposed stormwater drainage system is designed to capture and convey the Project's stormwater flows into the Project's proposed on-site stormwater detention basins that would gradually release stormwater into the downstream public storm drain system. Additionally, flood protection facilities will be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) and with adequate access easements and facilities provided. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.4.3.
<i>Goal 7.5: Manage and effectively treat stormwater to minimize risk to downstream resources.</i>	
Policy 7.5.1: Ensure compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) MS4 permit requirements.	No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , the implementation of the Project would involve grading of more than one acre. Therefore, the Project developer would be required to obtain a NPDES General Construction Permit and comply with permit requirements effective at the time of construction. Additionally, as stated in Regulatory Requirement RR 10-5, prior to the issuance of building permits for each phase of the Project, the Project proponent shall provide evidence to the City that the Project comply with the requirements of the RWQCB Municipal Permit General MS4 Permit. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.5.1.
Policy 7.5.3: Minimize pollutant discharges into storm drainage system,	No Conflict. In accordance with the Project's WQMP, the Project would install LID BMPs (e.g., bioretention and

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>natural drainages, and groundwater. Design the necessary stormwater detention basins, recharge basins, water quality basins, or similar water capture facilities to protect water quality by capturing and/or treating water before it enters a watercourse.</p>	<p>biotreatment) to detain stormwater on site for runoff mitigation. The Project proposes to install four detention basins within four DMAs. Additionally, the Project proposes non-structural BMPs to mitigate industrial pollution. Additionally, as further discussed in EIR Section 4.10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, the Project’s proposed storm drain system is designed to capture 100-year storm event peak flows. The Project’s proposed storm drain system has sufficient capacity to hold and treat peak stormwater flows. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.5.3.</p>
<p>Policy 7.5.5: Require hydrological/hydraulic studies and WQMPs to ensure that new developments and redevelopment projects will not cause adverse hydrologic or biologic impacts to downstream receiving waters, including groundwater.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As further discussed in EIR Section 4.10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, a Project-specific WQMP and a Project-specific Hydrology Study was prepared by Proactive Engineering Consultants West, Inc. (PECW). The WQMP identified BMPs that would be installed to mitigate water quality impacts and the Hydrology Study identified that the implementation of the Project would not result in substantial flooding on or off site. The detention basins to be installed on site would remove pollutants from runoff and filter the water, thereby providing first-flush capture, detention, and filtration of stormwater runoff before it is discharged from the Project site. Furthermore, the Project would slightly reduce peak stormwater flows by approximately 98 cfs and would not cause adverse hydrologic or biologic impacts to downstream receiving waters, including groundwater. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.5.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 7.6: A zero-waste program that increases recycling and reduces waste sent to the landfill.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 7.6.1: Encourage new construction and additions to avoid “Red List” materials and chemicals.¹</p>	<p>No Conflict. Refer to General Plan Policy 6.7.1. As concluded in Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, of this EIR, construction contractors would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of hazardous construction-related materials, including but not limited requirements imposed by the EPA and DTSC. With mandatory compliance of applicable hazardous materials regulations, the Project would not create significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during the construction phase. The Project Applicant proposes to develop the Project site with industrial and commercial uses. Based on the facilities and uses that would be allowed at the Project site, hazardous materials (e.g., diesel fuel, lubricants, solvents, corrosives, toxic substances hazardous materials, etc.) could be used during the course of daily operations at the Project site. As concluded in Section 4.9,</p>

¹ The “Red List” includes the worst types of materials and chemicals used in the building industry that are harmful to humans and the environment. For a list of material included on the “Red List,” see: <https://living-future.org/declare/declare-about/red-list/>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p><i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, of this EIR, with mandatory regulatory compliance, the Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident conditions which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.6.1.</p>
<p><i>Goal 7.7: Provide for a clean and healthy community through an effective solid waste collection and disposal system.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 7.7.3: Require businesses (including public entities) that generate four cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste per week, or a multifamily residential dwelling of five units or more, to arrange for recycling services.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would be required to coordinate with Waste Management, Inc. to develop a collection program for recyclables, such as paper, plastics, glass, and aluminum, in accordance with local and State programs, including AB 341, <i>Mandatory Commercial Recycling, and the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991</i>. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.7.3.</p>
<p><i>Goal 7.8: City-wide access to high-quality energy utility and telecommunication services.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 7.8.1: Ensure that adequate utility and telecommunication infrastructure support future development.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.19, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, the Project's proposed connections to existing utility infrastructure including electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications, as well as installation of on- and off-site stormwater management, water, and wastewater infrastructure would be adequate to support future development of the Project. Therefore, the Project not conflict with General Plan Policy 7.8.1.</p>
<p>Conservation and Open Space (Chapter 8)</p>	
<p><i>Goal 8.1: A City with green buildings and developments that promote energy efficiency.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.1.5: Encourage new development to reduce building energy use by adopting passive solar techniques and heat island reduction strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Maximizing interior daylighting</i> • <i>Using cool exterior siding, cool roofing, and paving materials with relatively high solar reflectivity to reduce solar heat gain</i> 	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i>, of this EIR, the Project shall implement the County of Riverside's 2019 Climate Action Plan (CAP) Screening Table Measures which include 20% project energy generated from solar, cool roofs, and water efficient landscaping. The Project would achieve a minimum of 201 Screening Table Points. Additionally, the Project would include skylights and clearstory windows to maximize day lighting. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.1.5.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Planting shade trees on south- and west-facing sides of new buildings to reduce energy load</i> • <i>Installing water efficient vegetative cover and planting, substantial tree canopy coverage</i> 	
<p>Policy 8.1.7: Encourage new buildings and buildings undergoing major retrofits to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards.</p>	<p>No Conflict. Energy efficiency/energy conservation attributes of the Project would be complemented by increasingly stringent State and federal regulatory actions addressing vehicle fuel economies and vehicle emissions standards; and enhanced building/utilities energy efficiencies mandated under California building codes (e.g., Title 24, California Green Building Standards Code). The Project proposes conventional industrial and commercial uses reflecting contemporary energy efficient/energy conserving designs and operational programs. Uses proposed by the Project are not inherently energy intensive, and the Project energy demands in total would comply with current Title 24 energy efficiency standards and due to the continued upgrades to Title 24 standards new construction would be comparable to, or less than, other industrial projects of similar scale and configuration in terms of energy use. Compliance with the Riverside County CAP provides additional energy efficiencies that exceed Title 24. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.1.7.</p>
<p><i>Goal 8.2: A City which encourages energy from renewable sources</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.2.1: Promote the incorporation of alternative energy generation (e.g., solar, wind, biomass) in public and private development.</p>	<p>No Conflict. Approximately 20% of the power needs of each building within the Beaumont Pointe Specific Plan shall be provided by Solar Photovoltaic panels or wind, installed on buildings or in collective arrangements. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.2.1.</p>
<p><i>Goal 8.4: A City that improves awareness and mitigation of negative air quality impacts.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.4.3: Avoid the siting of new project and land uses that would produce localized air pollution (e.g., Interstate 10, SR-60, high traffic roads, certain industrial facilities) in a way that would adversely impact existing air quality-sensitive receptors including schools, childcare center, senior housing, and subsidized affordable housing. The recommended minimum distance separating these uses should be 500 feet.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, the closest sensitive area to the Project site is an existing single-family residence located approximately 483 feet south of the Project site's southernmost boundary. Other residential uses are located north across Frontage Road (1,253 feet) and beyond SR-60. The Project would not result in localized exceedances of federal or state ambient air quality standard under construction or operation of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.4.3.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p><i>Goal 8.5: A City that preserves and enhances its natural resources.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.5.1: Minimize the loss of sensitive species and critical habitat in areas planned for future development.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i>, the Project would result in permanent impacts to vegetation communities described for conservation by the MSHCP associated with Cells 933, 936, 1030, 1032, and 1125 totaling 109.69 acres and would impact the following communities: chaparral (0.21 acre), Riversidean sage scrub (24.40 acres), non-native grassland (82.13 acres), and southern riparian scrub (0.03 acre). To offset these impacts, the Project would conserve 133.62 acres of replacement lands, including 0.32 acre of chaparral, 45.85 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 86.03 acres of non-native grassland, and 0.22 acre of southern riparian scrub consistent with the MSHCP (PDF 4-1).</p> <p>Additionally, no special-status plants were detected at the Study Area during focused plant surveys; therefore, no impact to special-status plants would occur. The Project would result in potential impacts to crotch bumble bee, coastal California gnatcatcher and burrowing owl during construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 through MM 4.4-3 would reduce impacts to special-status animals to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.5.1.</p>
<p>Policy 8.5.2: Require new developments adjacent to identified plant and wildlife habitat areas to maintain a protective buffer, minimize impervious surface, minimize light pollution, and emphasize native landscaping.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i>, the Project would erect wildlife fencing along the southern and western limits of the development footprint, connecting with SR-60 wildlife fencing, to provide a barrier between the edge of the development footprint and the adjacent MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project would provide 124.7 acres of open space to accommodate landscaped manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, and natural open space as a buffer to adjacent conservation area and 152.4 acres of open space – conservation. The Open Space – Conservation area would be preserved as natural habitat and dedicated to the RCA as required by the MSHCP. The Project through its design would also address edge effects relative to adjacent conserved lands. The Project’s night lighting would be designed to prevent spillage into the MSHCP conserved lands along the western and southern development boundary. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 8.5.3 for a discussion on native landscaping. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.5.2.</p>
<p>Policy 8.5.3: Encourage new development to support a diversity of native species and manage invasive species.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As shown on Figure 3-14, <i>Master Landscape Plan</i>, the Project provides a plant palette for three categories: Entrance Planting, Native California Planting, and Industrial Screen Planting; and selected to complement and enhance the setting of the site, while ensuring the conservation of the site’s</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	natural vegetation and habitats. Prohibited plant species are also identified to protect native habitats within and surrounding the Project due to their flammability or invasive nature. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.5.3.
Policy 8.5.7: Discourage the use of plant species on the California Invasive Plant Inventory.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 8.5.3. The Project Applicant would incorporate plants identified within the Project’s landscape plan and plant species list identified in the Specific Plan. Prohibited plant species are also identified to protect native habitats within and surrounding the Project due to their flammability or invasive nature. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.5.7.
<i>Goal 8.6: A City that protects and enhances its scenic vistas and views.</i>	
Policy 8.6.1: Protect and preserve existing, signature view of the hills and mountains from the City.	No Conflict. The Project site is within the Timoteo Badlands, which is characterized with mountainous terrain. The Project site’s northwestern and southern portions contain ridges, canyons, and hillsides that are visible from Frontage Road and SR-60. The Project’s proposed buildings would be built to a maximum height of 60 feet and therefore would be mainly visible from the SR-60. Landform modifications would occur under the Project in PAs 1-8 and remedial grading would occur in PA 9, along with landscaped, manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, project signage, as well as the natural slopes which form a buffer between the Specific Plan’s developed areas and PA 10. Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project Applicant does not propose to develop the northwestern or southern portions of the Project site, which would preserve distant ridgeline views. As such, public views to the site’s natural features would continue to be provided from the immediate surrounding area. Additionally, due to the location and orientation of the Project’s proposed buildings and signage, views to San Bernardino Mountains, San Gorgonio Mountains, and San Jacinto Mountains would not be obstructed. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.6.1.
Policy 8.6.3: Require the preparation of a grading analysis on hillside development to pre-determine where development should occur to minimize the impact of new development on views of the City’s hillsides. Policy 8.6.4: When grading is necessary, encourage grading for new development	No Conflict. The Project’s grading plan would be in accordance with the standards identified in the City’s Municipal Code, to minimize the potential for erosion, landslides, and other forms of land failure and preserve views of ridges, canyons, and hillsides. Future development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be subjected to the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Report (see Section 5 of <i>Technical Appendix F1</i> , of this EIR), in accordance with the CBC and Beaumont Municipal Code Section 17.1.040. Mandatory compliance with the

General Plan Policy	Applicability
that complements the surrounding natural features.	recommendations contained within the Project site’s Geotechnical Report (as required by the CBSC, Beaumont Building Code, and conditions of approval) would ensure that the Project is engineered and constructed to maximize stability and preclude safety hazards to on-site and abutting off-site areas. Moreover, although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline view. The boundary between PA 9 and PA 10 is designated as the “Limits of Disturbance” on the Land Use Plan, meaning that no grading, fuel management or development activities will occur beyond the location of that line. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policies 8.6.3 and 8.6.4.
Policy 8.6.6: Limit light pollution from outdoor sources, especially in rural hillside and mountain areas, and open spaces, to maintain darkness for night sky viewing.	No Conflict. The Project’s proposed outdoor lighting would be in accordance with the standards established in City of Beaumont Municipal Code Chapter 8.50 (Outdoor Lighting Ordinance) to limit light pollution. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.6.6.
<i>Goal 8.7: A City where open space is preserved and used for resource conservation and/or recreation.</i>	
Policy 8.7.6: Preserve permanent open space edges or greenbelts that provide a buffer for separation between adjoining developments.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.1.12. The Project Applicant proposes to preserve 124.7 acres on site as Open Space and 152.4 acres as Open Space - Conservation. The location of the Open Space and Open Space - Conservation areas provide permanent preserve open space edges and provide a buffer from the proposed development to the MSHCP conserved lands to the south and west of the Project site and to the adjacent 60 Freeway. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.7.6.
<i>Goal 8.8: A City where the natural and visual character of the community is preserved.</i>	
<p>Policy 8.8.1: Promote the maintenance of open space through the implementation of the General Plan.</p> <p>Policy 8.8.2: Protect and preserve open space and natural habitat wherever possible.</p>	No Conflict. Under existing conditions, the Project site is within the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside but is designated for Rural Residential. The Project Applicant proposes to modify the Project site’s designation from Rural Residential uses to Industrial, General Commercial, Open Space, and Open Space - Conservation. The Project Applicant proposes to designate the central portion of the Project site as Industrial and General Commercial. The remaining portions of the Project site would be designated as Open Space and Open Space - Conservation. The Project Applicant does not propose to develop the areas designated as Open Space and Open Space - Conservation. These areas would be retained as open space. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 8.8.3.

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policies 8.8.1 and 8.8.2.
Policy 8.8.3: Work with Riverside County and adjacent cities, landowners, and conservation organizations to preserve, protect, and enhance open space, and natural resources consistent with the MSHCP.	No Conflict. The Project requires a Criteria Refinement to approve the Specific Plan, as designed, to be consistent with the MSHCP Reserve Assembly requirements. The Project designates approximately 152.4 acres as Open Space-Conservation within the southern portion of the Project site which is intended to be dedicated to the RCA, pursuant to the Western Riverside County MSHCP, for preservation to augment existing, adjacent conserved lands in this part of Riverside County. The Project Applicant does not propose to disturb the areas designated as Open Space - Conservation. The Project Applicant would preserve this area and retain the natural resources. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.8.3.
Policy 8.8.6: Establish buffers between open space areas and urban development by encouraging less intensive rural development within proximity to the open space areas.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.12.12. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.8.6.
<i>Goal 8.9: A City where the extent of urban development in the hillsides is minimized and mitigated.</i>	
Policy 8.9.2: Limit the extent and intensity of uses and development in areas of unstable terrain, steep terrain, scenic vistas, and other critical environmental areas.	No Conflict. The Project site is within the San Timoteo Badlands, which is characterized with mountainous terrain. The Project site contains hillsides, ridges, canyons, and valleys in the northwestern and southeastern portions of the site which per below will be preserved. These areas include PAs 9 and 10 which are designated as Open Space and Open Space - Conservation, respectively. Areas designated as Open Space - Conservation would serve to protect the natural resources on site and no development would occur in this area. As previously discussed, grading would occur on PAs 1 through 9. Landform modifications would occur under the Project in PAs 1-8 and remedial grading would occur in PA 9, along with landscaped, manufactured slopes, fuel modification areas, project signage, as well as the natural slopes which form a buffer between the Specific Plan's developed areas and PA 10. Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, no grading would occur within PA 10 or between the north-northeast property line and SR-60 Freeway, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. The boundary between

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>PA 9 and PA 10 is designated as the “Limits of Disturbance” on the Land Use Plan. This designation means that all development activity will take place inside of the limits of disturbance (i.e., within PA 9 or within PAs 1-8) and not on PA 10.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, geotechnical observation and testing shall be conducted during various stages of grading to avoid geological hazards associated with unstable soils. Mandatory adherence to the recommendations contained in the site-specific geotechnical report during Project construction would ensure impacts associated with geological hazards reduce to a less than significant level. Moreover, as discussed in Threshold a in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.9.2.</p>
<p>Policy 8.9.3: Control land grading to minimize the potential for erosion, landsliding, and other forms of land failure, as well as to limit the potential negative aesthetic impact of excessive modification of natural landforms.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project’s grading plan would be in accordance with the standards identified in the City’s Municipal Code, to minimize the potential for erosion, landslides, and other forms of land failure. Mandatory adherence to the recommendations contained in the site-specific geotechnical report (see Section 5 of <i>Technical Appendix F1</i>, of this EIR) during Project construction would ensure impacts associated with geological hazards reduce to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project Applicant does not propose to grade the northwestern or southern portions of the Project site within PA 10 or between the north-northeast property line and SR-60 Freeway. The Project would preserve the natural on-site landforms in PA 10, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. The Project’s on-site Open Space designated areas would provide a buffer between the proposed development and adjoining natural open space. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.9.3.</p>
<p>Policy 8.9.4: Recognize the value of ridgelines and hillsides as significant natural and visual resources and strengthen their role as features which define the character of the City and its individual neighborhood.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would implement measures related to the City of Beaumont to ensure that Project design elements visually enhance and do not degrade the surrounding area. As discussed under Threshold a, the Project’s proposed structures, which would reach a maximum height of 60 are not anticipated to block views to the San Gorgonio Mountains, San Bernardino Mountains, and San Jacinto Mountains. Additionally, the Project’s proposed Open Space and Open Space - Conservation land uses would ensure that the Project site’s existing hillsides, ridges, canyons, and valleys are preserved and retain their rural character. Although landforms in mid-ground views would be altered for the development, the Project would not allow grading within PA 10 or between the north-northeast property</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	line and SR-60 Freeway, which would preserve foreground landforms along the SR-60 Freeway and distant ridgeline views. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.9.4.
<i>Goal 8.10: A City that promotes the protection of biological resources</i>	
Policy 8.10.1: Work with landowners and government agencies in promoting development concepts that are sensitive to the environment and consider the preservation of natural habitats and further the conservation goals of the MSHCP.	No Conflict. The Open Space – Conservation area would be preserved as natural habitat and dedicated to the RCA as required by the MSHCP. Additionally, the Project Applicant has prepared a Criteria Refinement analysis demonstrating that the proposed Criteria Refinement would be at least equivalent to the existing Criteria as it applies to Effects on Habitats, Effects on Covered Species, Effects on Core Areas, Effects on Linkages and Constrained Linkages, Effects on Non-Contiguous Habitat Blocks, Effects on MSHCP Conservation Area Configuration and Management, Effects on Ecotones, and Acreage Contributed to the MSHCP Conservation Area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.10.1.
Policy 8.10.2: Work with landowners and government agencies in identifying areas within the City of Beaumont and its SOI that should be preserved as open space for passive recreation, resource management, or public safety and which meet the City’s preservation obligations per the MSHCP.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 8.10.1. Moreover, the Project would conserve 133.62 acres of replacement lands, including 0.32 acre of chaparral, 45.85 acres of Riversidean sage scrub, 86.03 acres of non-native grassland, and 0.22 acre of southern riparian scrub consistent with the MSHCP (PDF 4-1). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.10.2.
Policy 8.10.4: Preserve significant habitat and environmentally sensitive areas, including hillsides, rock outcroppings, and viewsheds through the application of the Hillside Ordinance Policies.	No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 8.6.1. As discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> , through the Project’s participation in the MSHCP, impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would be less than significant. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.4-1 through 4.4-5 would reduce the Project’s impacts to significant habitat and environmentally sensitive areas to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.10.4.
Policy 8.10.5: Require project proponents to hire a CDFW-qualified biologist or monitor for special status species or other wildlife of low or limited mobility. If present, prior to and during all ground- and habitat-disturbing activities, move out of harm’s way special status species or other wildlife of low or limited mobility that would otherwise be injured or killed.	No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the Project would crotch bumble bee, coastal California gnatcatcher, burrowing owl, and nesting birds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MMs 4.4-1 through 4.4-3, and 4.4-5 would require pre-construction surveys conducted by a qualified biologist prior to initial ground-disturbing activities (including vegetation clearing, clearing and grubbing, tree removal, site watering, equipment staging, grading, etc.). If species are present during the survey, measures would be taken to avoid impacts to the sensitive species either through relocation or establishment of buffer

General Plan Policy	Applicability
	<p>areas. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.10.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 8.11: A City where archaeological, cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and historical places are identified, recognized, and preserved.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.11.1: Avoid or when avoidance is not feasible, minimize impacts to sites with significant archaeological, paleontological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources, to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, there are no known prehistoric archeological resources present on the Project site. However, Mitigation Measure MM 4.5-2 would ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any significant archaeological resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, the Project site is identified as within an area of “High” Paleontological Sensitivity; however, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM 4.7-1 through 4.7-3 would ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any significant paleontological resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Similarly, as discussed in Section 4.18, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i>, although there are no tribal cultural resources are known to occur within the Project site, Mitigation Measures MM 4.18-1 through MM 4.18-3 would ensure impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.11.1.</p>
<p>Policy 8.11.2: Comply with notification of California Native American tribes and organization of proposed projects that have the potential to adversely impact cultural resources, per the requirements of AB 52 and SB18.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.18, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i>, the City of Beaumont sent notification to the Native American tribes with possible traditional or cultural affiliation to the area that previously requested consultation pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18 requirements. Of the tribes that were sent notifications letters, three requested consultation—Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Soboba Band of Mission Indians. In a letter dated December 15, 2020, the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians stated that they were unaware of specific cultural resources that may be affected by the Project but would like to be notified in the event cultural resources are discovered during development.</p> <p>The City conducted telephone consultations with Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Soboba Band of Mission Indians. Mitigation Measure MM 4.18-1 would reduce impacts associated with the unanticipated discovery of tribal cultural resources to less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.11.2.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>Policy 8.11.4: Require that any human remains discovered during implementation of public and private project within the City be treated with respect and dignity and fully comply with the California Native American Graves Protection and Reparation Act, California Public Resources Code Amended Status 1982 Chapter 1492, California Public Resources Code Statues 2006, Chapter 863, Section 1, CA Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, Public Resources Code Section 5097.94, SB 447 (Chapter 404, Statues of 1987) and other appropriate laws.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq. Mandatory compliance with State law would ensure that human remains, if encountered, are appropriately treated, and would preclude the potential for significant impacts to human remains. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 8.11.4.</p>
<p>Safety (Chapter 9)</p>	
<p><i>Goal 9.2: A City with improved community safety and reduced opportunities for criminal activity through appropriate physical design.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.2.1: Implement Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Site design techniques that maximize natural surveillance and reduce the potential for criminal activity.</i> • <i>Policies and regulations that encourage a mixture of compatible land uses to promote visibility and higher levels of activity and increased the safety of public use areas and of pedestrian travel.</i> • <i>Improve lighting and nighttime security across all City neighborhoods, especially in existing or potential crime problem areas.</i> • <i>Involve the City's Police Department in the development review process for evaluation of building and site plan</i> 	<p>No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.9.1. The Project would result in the development of the Project site with Industrial and General Commercial uses. The implementation of the Project would provide a clean delineation between public and private space through signage, walls, and fencing. The Project's proposed buildings would feature security lighting to enhance security on site. Additionally, building facades would face public roadways including SR-60 Freeway, Jack Rabbit Trail, Entertainment Way, and 4th Street. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.2.1.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p><i>vulnerabilities to criminal activities, especially for public areas within developments.</i></p>	
<p><i>Goal 9.4: A City that is protected from the effects of natural and man-made disasters.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.4.5: Require new development to provide access roads that allow both safe and efficient access of emergency equipment and community evacuation.</p>	<p>No Conflict. During the course of the City of Beaumont’s review of the Project, the City evaluated the Project’s design, including but not limited to proposed driveway locations and parking lot/drive aisle configuration, to ensure that adequate access would be provided for emergency vehicles at Project build out. The Conceptual Circulation Plan (Figure 3-8) identifies a looped perimeter road system (4th Street and Industrial Way) along with a phased series of 40-foot wide Interim Fire Access Loop Connections, to ensure adequate fire-fighting and emergency access, during construction and operation of the site. Under operational conditions, the Project would be required by Riverside County Ordinance No. 348, Section 21.32a, to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles on site. In addition, the Project site design provides for adequate egress in case of emergency evacuation.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, and Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i>, the Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.4.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 9.5: A City with enhanced fire and emergency response services.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.5.5: Coordinate with the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District to ensure that water pressure for existing and future developed areas is adequate for firefighting purposes.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i>, the Project would result in the installation of on-site fire hydrants, that are designed in accordance with the Riverside County Fire Department standards in coordination with Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District. The internal waterlines are anticipated to supply sufficient fire flows and pressure to meet the demands required for on-site fire hydrants. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.5.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 9.6: A City that protects human life, land, and property from the effects of wildland fire hazards.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.6.3: Ensure that development in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones minimizes the risks of wildfire through planning and design of structures in accordance with the California Building Code Chapter 7A. Ensure adequate</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i>, the Project site is designated within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and High Fire Hazard Severity Zone within an SRA by the Riverside County General Plan and CalFire. The Project would implement on-site defensible space (fuel modification area [FMA] and fuel maintenance zone), which would consist of asphalt roadways, parking stalls, loading zones, irrigated landscaping, and irrigated slope protecting</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
provisions for vegetation management, emergency access, and firefighting.	landscaping to preclude wildfire impacts. Building materials will comply with any state building code requirements for buildings located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Additionally, the Project would be required by the CBC and Beaumont Building Code to comply with the recommendations identified in the Project's Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.6.3.
Policy 9.6.4: Require new development in the High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones to develop a fire protection and evacuation plan and ensure that the plan includes adequate fire access to new development.	No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i> , the Project Fire Protection Plan was prepared that includes evacuation routes. The Project will provide a proactive educational component disclosing the potential wildfire risk and the requirements identified in the Project's Fire Protection Plan for Project businesses and occupants. This educational information must include maintaining the landscape and structural component according to the appropriate standards and embracing a "Ready, Set, Go!" stance on evacuation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.6.4.
Policy 9.6.6: Require property owners to clear brush and high fuel vegetation and maintain fire-safe zones (a minimum distance of 30 feet from the structure of to the property line, whichever is closer) to reduce the risk of fires. For structures located within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the required brush distance is up to 200 feet from structures up to their property line.	No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i> , the Project would provide a fuel maintenance zone with 20 feet of irrigated vegetation around the perimeter of the Project site and a 100-foot FMA of paved surface and/or irrigated landscape. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.6.6.
Policy 9.6.7: Continue to enforce the weed abatement ordinance to mitigate potential fire hazard risks.	No Conflict. The Project would be required to comply with the weed abatement ordinance to reduce wildfire impacts. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.6.7.
Policy 9.6.8: Require that developments located in wildland interface areas incorporate and enforce standards for construction, including a fuel modification program (i.e., brush clearance, planting of fire-retardant vegetation) to reduce the threat of wildfires.	No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.20, <i>Wildfire</i> , the Project would incorporate FMA and fuel maintenance zone, which would consist of asphalt roadways, parking stalls, loading zones, irrigated landscaping, and irrigated slope protecting landscaping. Vegetation management would also be implemented as interim fuel management area throughout the construction phases for each structure as there may be a period if one or more years where developing phases are exposed on multiple sides to wildland fuels. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.6.8.

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p><i>Goal 9.7: A City that protects safety of human life, land, and property from the effects of earthquakes and geotechnical hazards.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.7.1: As new versions of the California Building Code (CCR Title 24, published triennially) are released, adopt and enforce the most recent codes that contain the most recent seismic requirements for structural design of new development and redevelopment to minimize damage from earthquakes and other geologic activity.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As required in Regulatory Requirement RR 7-1, the Project shall comply with CBSC (Chapter 18) (adopted by the City of Beaumont as Municipal Code Section Chapter 15.04.010) and Municipal Code Section 17.11.040, which requires development projects to evaluate and identify site-specific geologic and seismic conditions, and seismic requirements for structural design. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.7.1.</p>
<p>Policy 9.7.5: Ensure that Building and Safety agencies include thorough plan checks and inspections of structures vulnerable to seismic activity, fire risk, and flood hazards. Additionally, recommend the periodic observation of construction by design professionals.</p>	<p>No Conflict. According to RCIT and FEMA, the Project site is within an area of minimal flooding (RCIT, 2021; FEMA, 2014). As further discussed under Threshold c of EIR Section 4.10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, the Project would maintain a similar drainage pattern as compared to existing conditions. It should be noted that the overall development pad would be elevated by the proposed design grading to be situated above local drainage courses. As such, the risk of flooding is low. As discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, grading plan review is required to verify that the geotechnical requirements are updated specific to the detailed rough grading plans. Future development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be required to have site-specific geotechnical investigation reports prepared by the Project applicant's/developer's geotechnical consultant, in accordance with the CBC and Beaumont Municipal Code Section 17.1.040. The geotechnical investigations would determine seismic design parameters for the site and the proposed building type per CBC requirements. mandatory compliance with the recommendations contained within the Project site's Geotechnical Report (as required by the CBSC, Beaumont Building Code, and conditions of approval) would ensure that the Project is engineered and constructed to minimize seismic activity, fire risk, and flood hazards. Moreover, all structures would be protected by an automatic, internal fire sprinkler system. Fire sprinkler systems shall be in accordance with RCFD and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 13. Fire sprinkler plans for each structure would be submitted and reviewed by RCFD for compliance with the applicable fire and life safety regulations, codes, and ordinances as well as the RCFD Fire Prevention Standards for fire protection systems. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.7.5.</p>
<p><i>Goal 9.9: A City that promotes preparedness related to the adverse effects of high winds common in the Pass area.</i></p>	

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>Policy 9.9.2: Require implementation of best practices for dust control at all excavation and grading projects.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would be required to comply with South Coast AQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which requires the implementation of best available dust control measures. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.9.2.</p>
<p><i>Goal 9.10: A City that is prepared for the potential impacts of climate change.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 9.10.2: Encourage new development and redesign of existing buildings to take steps to reduce the impacts of extreme heat events, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design buildings to use less mechanical heating and cooling through use of passive solar techniques.</i> • <i>Support and incentivize, as feasible, energy efficiency and weatherization programs.</i> • <i>Protect and expand the City's urban tree canopy to provide shade, increase carbon sequestration, and purify the air.</i> • <i>Provide shade structures in public parks, outdoor playgrounds, and bus shelters.</i> 	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i>, of this EIR, the Project shall implement the County of Riverside's 2019 Climate Action Plan (CAP) Screening Table Measures which include cool roofs, enhanced insulation, and energy efficient heating/cooling equipment, and on-site solar to provide 20% of the Project's energy requirements. Additionally, as shown on Figure 3-14, <i>Master Landscape Plan</i>, streetscape landscaping presents a combination of evergreen and deciduous trees, low shrubs, and masses of groundcovers. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.10.2.</p>
<p>Policy 9.10.3: Require enhanced water conservation measures in new development and redesign of existing buildings to address the possibility of constrained future water supplies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Compliance with existing landscape water conservation ordinance (Chapter 17.06 of the Municipal Code).</i> • <i>Use of water conservation measures in new development beyond current requirements.</i> • <i>Installation of recycled water use and graywater systems.</i> 	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.19, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, the Project would construct an on-site recycled water system. The Project would connect a proposed 14-inch recycled water line that would connect to the existing 14-inch recycled water line within the adjacent Hidden Canyon development at 4th Street. The Project will comply with CAP points for increased efficient use of water both inside the building and for landscaping irrigation. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with Chapter 17.06 of the Municipal Code. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.10.3.</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<i>Goal 9.11: A City with minimized risk associated with hazardous materials.</i>	
<p>Policy 9.11.2: Require an assessment of hazardous materials use as part of environmental review and/or include approval of the development of a hazardous management and disposal as a condition of a project, subject to review by the County Environmental Health Department.</p>	<p>No Conflict. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Project by McAlister GeoScience (GeoScience), which identified the Project site’s potential to contain hazardous materials. The results of the Phase I ESA are provided in EIR Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>. Additionally, heavy equipment (e.g., dozers, excavators, tractors) would be operated on the Project site during construction. This heavy equipment likely would be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which are considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, adhesives, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the Project site during construction. These materials would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard to on-site construction workers or the general public</p> <p>Based on the facilities and uses that would be allowed at the Project site, hazardous materials (e.g., diesel fuel, lubricants, solvents, corrosives, toxic substances hazardous materials, etc.) could be used during the course of daily operations at the Project site. As concluded in Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, of this EIR, with mandatory regulatory compliance, the Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident conditions which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.11.2.</p>
<p>Policy 9.11.5: Prohibit placement of proposed new facilities that will be involved in the production, use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials near existing sensitive land uses (such as homes, schools, child-care centers, nursing homes, senior housing, etc.), that may be adversely affected by such activities.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As concluded in Section 4.9, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, of this EIR, with mandatory regulatory compliance, the Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the Project increase the potential for accident conditions which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 9.11.5.</p>
Noise (Chapter 10)	
<i>Goal 10.1: A City where noise exposure is minimized for those living and working in the community.</i>	
<p>Policy 10.1.4: Incorporate noise considerations into land use planning</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.13, <i>Noise</i>, Project traffic noise would exceed the City’s applicable significance</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>decisions. Require the inclusion of noise mitigation measures, as may be necessary to meet standards, in the design of new development projects in the City.</p>	<p>threshold. The Project would result in a significant impact from traffic noise during Existing (2020) plus Project conditions, Opening Year (2023 and 2027) plus Project Conditions, and Horizon Year (2045) Plus Project Conditions for three roadway segments (#4, #5, and #6). Under Opening Year (2025) plus Project Conditions, the Project would result in a significant impact for one roadway segment (segment #6). Therefore, the Project-related off-site traffic noise level increases at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses are considered a significant impact.</p> <p>Segments #4, #5, and #6 are located in industrial areas and are not located immediately adjacent to any noise sensitive land uses. This is consistent with the City’s General Plan EIR that determined that buildout of the City’s General Plan could result in new vehicular traffic which could exceed the FHWA thresholds, and could substantially increase the ambient noise levels in the City and its SOI. The City’s General Plan recognizes that an increase in noise levels will occur in industrial areas due to truck traffic. The City’s General Plan goals and policies, therefore, are focused on protecting noise sensitive receptors from road noise, while encouraging timely and efficient goods movement that does not significantly contribute to noise in the City.</p> <p>The Project’s construction and operational (stationary) noise impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 10.1.4.</p>
<p>Policy 10.1.5: Require project involving new development or modifications to existing development to implement measures, where necessary, to reduce noise levels to at least the normally compatible range. Design measures should focus on architectural features and building design and construction, rather than site design features, such as excessive setbacks, berms, and sound walls, to maintain compatibility with adjacent and surrounding uses.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.13, <i>Noise</i>, the Project’s construction and operational (stationary) noise impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 10.1.5.</p>
<p>Policy 10.1.6: Encourage reduction of stationary noise impacts from commercial and industrial land uses, activities, events, and businesses on noise-sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As discussed in Section 4.13, <i>Noise</i>, the Project’s operational (stationary) noise impacts would be less than significant. Project stationary noise would not expose nearby receivers to unacceptable daytime or nighttime noise levels during Project buildout. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 10.1.6.</p>
<p><i>Goal 10.2: A City with minimal mobile source-generated noise levels.</i></p>	

General Plan Policy	Applicability
<p>Policy 10.2.3: Prohibit truck routes through neighborhoods with sensitive receptors, where feasible.</p>	<p>No Conflict. See Project Consistency response to General Plan Policy 3.10.4. Due to the Project site's proximity to SR-60, trucks accessing the Project site would efficiently reach the State highway system to facilitate the movement of goods throughout the region. The Project does not propose any truck routes in proximity to sensitive receptors. As such, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 10.2.3.</p>
	<p>Land Use (Chapter 11)</p>
<p><i>Goal 11.12: Encourage development to be efficient in the use of non-renewable resources, including water, energy, and air quality.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 11.12.1: Promote the use of energy and water conservation technologies and practices.</p> <p>Policy 11.12.3: Consider sustainable development practices that reduce energy and water demand.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project proposes conventional industrial uses reflecting contemporary energy efficient/energy conserving designs and operational programs. Energy efficiency/energy conservation attributes of the Project would be complemented by increasingly stringent State and federal regulatory actions addressing vehicle fuel economies and vehicle emissions standards; and enhanced building/utilities energy efficiencies mandated under California building codes (e.g., Title 24, California Green Building Standards Code). The Project would comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and proposes conventional industrial uses reflecting contemporary energy efficient/energy conserving designs and operational programs. Uses proposed by the Project are not inherently energy intensive, and the Project energy demands in total would be comparable to, or less than, other industrial projects of similar scale and configuration.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, the Project would construct an on-site recycled water system. The Project would connect a proposed 14-inch recycled water line that would connect to the existing 14-inch recycled water line within the adjacent Hidden Canyon development at 4th Street.</p> <p>Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policies 1.12.1 and 11.12.3.</p>
<p>Policy 11.12.4: Ensure that new development does not result in wind and solar access impacts.</p>	<p>No Conflict. As shown in Table 4.8-6, 20% of the Project's energy consumption would be from solar consistent with the CAP requirement. Furthermore, the Project's architecture would include skylights and clerestory windows to allow for increased use of passive solar design and day-lighted in new structures. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 11.12.4.</p>
<p>Policy 11.12.6: Improve air quality through improved walkability, reduced</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project includes installation of sidewalks along the Project site's frontage with Jack Rabbit Trail and 4th</p>

General Plan Policy	Applicability
vehicular use and enhanced non- vehicular travel.	Street and along Industrial Way, a proposed private road located along the north side of the proposed industrial buildings. The Project Applicant proposes curb adjacent sidewalks and pedestrian paths to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity throughout the Project site. Additionally, the Project would include the installation of bicycle racks and lockers at each of the proposed light industrial buildings. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with General Plan Policy 11.12.6.