December 2024 | Addendum to the Oak Valley and SCPGA Golf Course Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 2000051126

# Fairway Canyon TK-5 School

City of Beaumont

Prepared for:

Beaumont Unified School District Contact: Anazele Gonzalez, Director of Facilities Planning 350 West Brookside Avenue Beaumont, California 92223 951.797.5373

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks Contact: Jorge Estrada, Senior Associate 3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100 Santa Ana, California 92707 714.966.9220 info@placeworks.com www.placeworks.com



<u>Secti</u>	ion		Page		
1.	INTRODUCTION				
	1.1	BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SCOPE	1		
	1.2	ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES	1		
2.	ENVI	RONMENTAL SETTING	5		
	2.1	PROJECT LOCATION	5		
	2.2	EXISTING LAND USE	5		
	2.3	SURROUNDING LAND USE	5		
	2.4	GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATION	5		
3.	PRO	JECT DESCRIPTION	13		
	3.1	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	13		
	3.2	PROPOSED PROJECT	16		
4.	ENVI	RONMENTAL ANALYSIS	21		
	4.1	AESTHETICS	21		
	4.2	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	24		
	4.3	AIR QUALITY	27		
	4.4	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
	4.5	CULTURAL RESOURCES	41		
	4.6	ENERGY	43		
	4.7	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	49		
	4.8	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	56		
	4.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	60		
	4.10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	64		
	4.11	LAND USE AND PLANNING	73		
	4.12	MINERAL RESOURCES	75		
	4.13	NOISE	76		
	4.14	POPULATION AND HOUSING	83		
	4.15	PUBLIC SERVICES	84		
	4.16	RECREATION			
	4.17	TRANSPORTATION	89		
	4.18	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
	4.19	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	95		
	4.20	WILDFIRE			
	4.21	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
5.	FIND	INGS	105		

6.	LIST OF PREPARERS		
	6.1	BEAUMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	. 107
	6.2	PLACEWORKS	. 107
7.	REFER	RENCES	109

#### Appendices

Appendix A	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling Data
Appendix B	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

- Appendix C Geological and Environmental Hazards Assessment Report
- Appendix D Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment
- Appendix E Noise Modeling Data
- Appendix F Traffic Study

#### List of Figures

Figures		Page
Figure 1	Regional Location	7
Figure 2	Local Vicinity	9
Figure 3	Aerial Photograph	11
Figure 4	Conceptual School Campus Plan	19

#### List of Tables

Tables		Page
Table 1	Approved Project Planning Area Land Use Summary	14
Table 2	Proposed Project Site Development	16
Table 3	Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	
Table 4	Maximum Daily Regional Operation Emissions	
Table 5	Localized Construction Emissions	
Table 6	Operation-Related Electricity Consumption	45
Table 7	Operation-Related Natural Gas Consumption	
Table 8	Project-Related Operation GHG Emissions	57
Table 9	Street Flow	69
Table 10	Project-Related Construction Noise Levels	78
Table 11	Project-Related Increases in Traffic Noise, dBA CNEL at 50 Feet	
Table 12	Vibration Impact Levels for Typical Construction Equipment	

# 1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SCOPE

This document is an Addendum to the certified Oak Valley and Southern California Professional Golf Association (SCPGA) Golf Course Specific Plan No. 318/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) No. 418 (Certified EIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2000051126) for the proposed Fairway Canyon TK-5 School Project (Proposed Project). The Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 21166 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Sections 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Certified EIR analyzed the environmental impacts associated with buildout of the Oak Valley and SCPGA Specific Plan (now known as the Fairway Canyon Specific Plan [Specific Plan]) (Approved Project), which is a master-planned mixed-use community of single and multi-family residential, commercial, recreational, and community uses (e.g., schools) on 1,747.9 acres. The Approved Project included the development of three school sites within the service boundaries of the Beaumont Unified School District (District). Pursuant to the Approved Project, the school sites consisted of one 20-acre junior high school in Planning Area 6, one 10-acre elementary school in Planning Area 21A, and one 10-acre elementary school in Planning Area 31A. Development of the schools on these sites were determined to accommodate 1,600 elementary school students and 900 junior high school students. It should be noted that the elementary school (Tournament Hills Elementary School) in Planning Area 31A was developed and is currently operational. After the certification of the Certified EIR, the City of Beaumont in conjunction with the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD) prepared an Addendum to the Certified EIR in 2002 that evaluated the City of Beaumont and BCVWD's annexation of the 1,747.9-acre Specific Plan area and BCVWD's annexation of two parcels totaling 142 acres adjacent to the Specific Plan area (totaling 1,889.9 acres).

The project analyzed in this Addendum includes development of the Proposed Project on a 12.8-acre site in Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan. The proposed school campus consists of a two-story elementary school building (totaling 68,000 square feet on a 34,000 square-foot building footprint), two surface parking lots, hardcourts, an outdoor dining area, play fields, and other site improvements. While the Certified EIR did not address the school use at this exact location, the City of Beaumont indicated that the Development Agreement adopted as a part of the Specific Plan allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan.

The purpose of this Addendum is to evaluate whether the Proposed Project would modify the Approved Project in such a way as to result in new environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects or would otherwise trigger a need for subsequent environmental review under CEQA.

# 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

Pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum focuses on whether implementation of the Proposed Project would require major revisions to the Certified EIR due to the potential for new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, when an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared for the project unless the lead agency determines that one or more of the following conditions are met:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. (CEQA Guidelines § 15162[a])

A supplement to an EIR (supplemental EIR), which is narrower in scope than a subsequent EIR, may be prepared if any of the above criteria apply, but "only minor changes or additions would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation" (CEQA Guidelines § 15163(a)). In the absence of the need to prepare either a subsequent or supplemental EIR, an addendum to a previously Certified EIR may be prepared. Section 15164 states:

(a) The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

- (b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.
- (c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.
- (d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.
- (e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence. (CEQA Guidelines § 15164)

This Addendum to the Certified EIR has been prepared because the District's evaluation of the Proposed Project has not indicated any of the circumstances requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR is required. As demonstrated in Section 4 of this Addendum, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts that differ from the Approved Project, and it would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a). The Proposed Project is consistent with the Specific Plan and would not require changes to the Approved Project. This Addendum demonstrates that no substantial changes are proposed to the Approved Project or have occurred in the development area covered by the Specific Plan that would require major revisions to the Certified EIR or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects. Therefore, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts disclosed in the Certified EIR.

The Proposed Project would not change the buildout assumptions made under the Specific Plan. As substantiated in Section 4 of this Addendum, the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase impacts of the Approved Project. As a result, no substantial changes in circumstances under Section 15162(a)(2) have occurred since the certification of the EIR that would indicate new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of significant impacts previously identified.

In addition, no information that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the Certified EIR preparation has been revealed that shows new or substantially greater significant impacts would result (see CEQA Guidelines § 15162[a][3]). There are no new or different mitigation measures that would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of the Approved Project but that are not adopted. The Proposed Project does not identify or require adoption of any further mitigation measures beyond those provided in the Certified EIR.

Since this Addendum does not identify new or substantially greater significant impacts, circulation for public review and comment is not necessary (CEQA Guidelines § 15164[c]). However, the District will consider this Addendum at a Riverside County Board of Supervisors meeting together with the previously Certified EIR prior to approval of the Proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines § 15164[d].

# 2. Environmental Setting

# 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

At the regional level, the project site is within the City of Beaumont, Riverside County (see Figure 1, Regional Location). As shown in Figure 1, the City is bounded on the west by the City of Calimesa and unincorporated areas of Riverside County, on the north by unincorporated areas of Riverside County, on the south by unincorporated areas of the Riverside County and the City of San Jacinto, and on the east by the City of Banning.

At the local level, the project site is within the boundaries of the Specific Plan area (see Figure 2, *Local Vicinity*), which is in the northwestern portion of the City. The project site consists of one legal parcel, Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 413-790-010. The project site consists of a 12.8-acre development area within Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan. The project site is bounded to the south by Sorenstam Drive and to the north and east by future Oumet Way (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*).

# 2.2 EXISTING LAND USE

The 12.8-acre project site is graded, undeveloped, and disturbed (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*). There are no existing structures or improvements on-site.

# 2.3 SURROUNDING LAND USE

As previously discussed, the project site is in Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan area. Development associated with the Specific Plan is underway and surrounds the project site. The existing and future development surrounding the project site consists of residential land uses, a park, and roadways (see Figure 3).

# 2.4 GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATION

According to the City's General Plan Land Use Map, the project site is designated as Single Family Residential (R-SF). The Single Family Residential designation allows for single-family residential (attached or detached) and neighborhood commercial uses in specific locations. The maximum density permitted in the R-SF designation is 4 dwelling units (du) per acre (du/ac) and the maximum intensity permitted is a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.35 (Beaumont 2020).

According to the City's Zoning Map, the project site is zoned Specific Plan Zone (SP Zone). The Specific Plan Zone applies to those areas of the City that have an adopted specific plan (Beaumont 2023). The Fairway Canyon Specific Plan is the adopted specific plan for the project site. Pursuant to the Specific Plan, the project site is designated as medium-density residential, which permits the development of schools. Development standards and guidelines for the different specific plan land use designations are specified in the Specific Plan.

# 2. Environmental Setting



Figure 1 - Regional Location

# 2. Environmental Setting



Note: Unincorporated county areas are shown in white.

Source: Generated using ArcMap 2024.

Figure 2 - Local Vicinity

Scale (Feet)

# 2. Environmental Setting

erCV Len Residential Residential Future Park Residential 2 Cenyon Fk 60

Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph



# 2. Environmental Setting

# 3.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Following is a summary of the development background and history associated with the Proposed Project, as contained in the various environmental, City, and legal documents that have been prepared and adopted/approved over the past years for the Specific Plan.

#### 3.1.1 Oak Valley and Southern California Professional Golf Association Specific Plan No. 318 and Environmental Impact Report No. 418

In 2001, Riverside County prepared the Oak Valley and SCPGA Specific Plan No. 318 (Approved Project) and Environmental Impact Report No. 418 (Certified EIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2000051126) to address the environmental impacts (both construction and operation related) associated with development accommodated by the Approved Project and associated actions considered in 2001. The EIR was certified by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in August 2001. The Certified EIR identified the following potentially significant impacts that would be reduced with implementation of mitigation measures:

- Geology
- Hydrology
- Noise
- Open Space and Conservation
- Cultural Resources
- Paleontological Resources
- Utilities
- Fire Protection
- Sheriff Services
- Schools
- Parks
- Population/Housing

The Certified EIR identified the following significant and unavoidable impacts, for which findings and a statement of overriding considerations were adopted:

- Traffic
- Air Quality
- Vegetation/Wildlife (Biological Resources)
- Landform (Aesthetics)

A Notice of Determination (NOD) was posted by the Riverside County Clerk and submitted to the State Clearinghouse on August 16, 2001. No action or proceeding challenging the Certified EIR on CEQA grounds was filed during the time periods prescribed by Public Resources Code Section 21167(c).

The Approved Project consisted of a master-planned mixed-use community of single- and multifamily residential, commercial, recreational, and community uses on 1,747.9 acres. With respect to the Proposed Project, Planning Area 20 of the Approved Project included 79.0 acres and was designated as medium-density residential and would include a maximum of 316 dwelling units (2-5 du per acre [du/ac]), as shown in Table 1. The Approved Project's proposed school uses included a 20-acre junior high school in Planning Area 6, a 10-acre elementary school in Planning Area 21A, and a 10-acre elementary school in Planning Area 31A. According to the Certified EIR, the schools would be constructed by the District to their standards and the requirements of the county in addition to the Specific Plan standards. Development of the schools in these planning areas was determined to accommodate 1,600 elementary school students and 900 junior high school students. Per the Specific Plan, if the District should decline the sites for development with school uses, then the project proponent reserves the right to develop the sites with medium-density residential uses at a target density of 4 dwelling units per acre with minimum lot sizes of 5,000 square feet.

Planning Area	Land Use	Acreage	Dwelling Units
1	Medium High Density Residential	8.6	52
2	Medium Density Residential	11.8	47
3	Medium Density Residential	13.0	52
4	High Density Residential	12.9	129
5	Park	5.0	
6	Junior High School	20.0	
7A	Open Space	123.4	
7B	Low Density Residential	33.5	34
8	Medium Density Residential	48.7	195
9	Neighborhood Commercial	12.0	
10	High Density Residential	10.8	108
11	Medium Density Residential	56.3	225
12	Medium Density Residential	42.2	169
13	Park	5.0	
14	Mixed Use	25.0	500
15	Medium Density Residential	26.6	106
16	Medium Density Residential	54.2	217
17	Park	6.0	
18	Medium High Density Residential	21.7	130
19	Low Density Residential	26.5	53
20	Medium Density Residential	79.0	316
21A	Elementary School	10.0	
21B	Park	6.0	
22	Medium Density Residential	37.3	149
23A	Open Space	89.9	

Table 1 Approved Project Planning Area Land Use Summary

Planning Area	Land Use	Acreage	Dwelling Units
23B	Low Density Residential	60.0	60
24	Park	5.0	
25	High Density Residential	46.5	558
26	Medium Density Residential	59.0	236
27	Neighborhood Commercial	4.0	
28	Golf Course	500.0	
29	Community Commercial	17.9	
30	Medium Density Residential	55.1	220
31A	Elementary School	10.0	
31B	Park	5.0	
32	Medium High Density Residential	27.5	165
33A	Community Commercial	3.0	
33B	Community Commercial	4.5	
34	Open Space	5.0	
35	Community Commercial	5.0	
36	Medium High Density Residential	33.0	198
37	Park	6.0	
38	High Density Residential	22.7	272
39	Medium Density Residential	40.9	164
	Subtotal	1,695.5	
	Roads	52.4	
OTAL		1,747.9	4,355

#### Table 1 Approved Project Planning Area Land Use Summary

#### 3.1.2 Oak Valley Specific Plan No. 318/Environmental Impact Report No. 418 Amendment

In September 2002, the City of Beaumont in conjunction with BCVWD prepared an Addendum to the Certified EIR (2002 EIR Addendum) to evaluate the City's and BCVWD's annexation of the 1,747.9-acre Specific Plan area and annexation of two parcels totaling 142 acres adjacent to the Oak Valley Specific Plan area (totaling 1,889.9 acres). The portion of the Specific Plan area annexed into the City and BCVWD's service area included development of 852.8 acres of residential, 46.4 acres of commercial, 40 acres of schools, 38 acres of park, and 52.4 acres of roadways. Additionally, the proposed annexation included a total of 718.3 acres of golf course and open space use. The annexation by the City and BCVWD was in response to the need to provide services to the Specific Plan area and the ability of these agencies to provide required infrastructure and services to support approved development within the Specific Plan area. The 2002 EIR Addendum substantiated that the annexation would not result in new significant impacts as compared to the Approved Project analyzed in the Certified EIR.

# 3.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

Following is a detailed description of the proposed project and the various development features/elements and improvements that would be implemented as part of the proposed project.

## 3.2.1 Proposed Development

The District proposes to develop a new elementary school campus that would accommodate 850 students on a 12.8-acre site (Proposed Project) within the developing Specific Plan area. The new school campus would serve transitional kindergarten (TK) through 5th grade students. The project site, which is in Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan, is bounded by Sorenstam Drive and future street Oumet Way (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*) and was intentionally sited 1,500 feet from Oak Valley Parkway due to the presence of the high-pressure natural gas distribution pipeline that runs along the right-of-way of this roadway. While the Certified EIR did not address a school use at this specific site, the City of Beaumont indicated that the Development Agreement adopted as a part of the Specific Plan allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan.

The District and developer have a letter of intent signed by both for the District to receive the project site in a super pad condition, which entails mass grading of the entire site with a two percent slope in preparation for development of the site. The super pad condition also includes certification of the building pad by a registered soils engineer; completed frontage street improvements providing all necessary points of access to the site; and all wet and dry utilities are stubbed to the property line to allow for onsite connections.

#### 3.2.2 Campus Amenities and Facilities

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the Proposed Project's campus amenities and facilities. As shown in the table, the proposed elementary school would consist of a two-story building with a 34,000 square foot building footprint (68,000 square feet total), two surface parking lots, hardcourts, an outdoor dining area, play fields, and other site improvements. Figure 4, *Conceptual School Campus Plan*, illustrates some of these school features and improvements. The proposed school would include the use of natural gas and electricity.

Project Component		Square Footage
Building Footprint		34,000
Surface Parking Lot		45,000
Hardcourts		40,000
Outdoor Dining		10,000
Other Site Play Fields		368,114
Other Site Improvements		50,000
	Total	547,114

Table 2	Proposed	Project	Site	Develo	pment

# 3.2.3 Access, Circulation, and Parking

#### 3.2.3.1 VEHICULAR ACCESS, CIRCULATION AND PARKING

Regional access to the Specific Plan area, including the project site, is provided via State Route 60 (SR-60) and Interstate 10 (I-10) with local access provided via Oak Valley Parkway and Tukwet Canyon Parkway. Vehicular access to the project site would be provided by future street Oument Way, which forms the project site's northern and eastern site boundaries (see Figure 4). The Proposed Project would provide four driveways (Driveways 1 through 4) off of Oument Way. Driveways 1 and 3 would operate as inbound driveways only, facilitating traffic flow for student pick-up/drop off activities and access to staff and visitor parking areas. Driveways 2 and 4 would operate as outbound only, permitting vehicles exiting the project site but no entry. The proposed driveways lead to the internal parking lots and drive aisles of the project site, which are accessible to employees, parents, and visitors during normal school hours.

On-site parking would be provided in two surface parking lots in the northeastern portion of the project site (see Figure 4). The northernmost parking lot would provide approximately 57 parking stalls and the southernmost parking lot would provide 40 parking stalls, for a total of approximately 97 stalls.

#### 3.2.3.2 PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the project site would be provided via the future sidewalks along future street Oument Way, with street crossing opportunities (striped crosswalks) at the intersection of Oumet Way and Sorenstam Drive and Oumet Way and the proposed unnamed roadway that would border the northwest corner of the project site. Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Oumet Way. No striped bicycle lanes are proposed on Oumet Way or Sorenstam Drive. Low-speed streets where cyclists would be permitted to ride in the street or on the sidewalk will be provided surrounding the project site and throughout the Specific Plan area. School crossing guards would be stationed at the designated crossing locations along Oumet Way.

## 3.2.4 School Operation

#### 3.2.4.1 TRADITIONAL SCHOOL

The new school campus would operate on a traditional two-semester academic calendar, with students in session from August through June. School hours would be from approximately 7:30 am to 3:45 pm, and some teachers and students may be on campus after school hours to attend various afterschool programs and activities.

#### 3.2.4.2 SCHOOL-RELATED EVENTS

The proposed school would provide expanded learning programs and after-school programs for the students, such as special-interest clubs, and extracurricular activities that may end later than 3:25 pm. There may also be occasional nighttime and weekend events during the school year. Some of these events would be campus wide, such as school plays and open houses, and others would be grade specific, such as commencement.

# 3.2.5 **Project Phasing and Construction**

The Proposed Project is anticipated to be constructed in one phase in an approximately 24-month schedule; however, for purposes of the analysis conducted in this EIR Addendum an11-month schedule, was used with a start date of 2027. The project site is currently mass graded. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would include utility trenching, fine grading, building construction, architectural coating, asphalt paving, finishing, and landscaping. All construction staging and equipment storage would occur on the project site.

- Utility Trenching. Utility trenching would occur, which would entail the project site to be excavated and utility pipes, cables, and storm drainage systems would be laid in trenches and connected.
- **Construction.** Building, hardcourts, playfields, site improvements, and parking construction.
- Architectural Coating. Painting the new building.
- Asphalt. Paving within the project site.
- **Finishing and Landscaping.** Finishing and landscaping would be implemented in the final three months of construction.



# Figure 4 - Conceptual School Campus Plan

Source: Beaumont Unified School District 2024.

#### Conditions

The section briefly summarizes the conclusions of the Certified EIR and discusses three conditions pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 for impacts to each of the resource areas discussed herein:

**Condition 1.** Whether or not the proposed project represents a substantial change that will require major revisions to the Certified EIR due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Condition 2.** Whether or not substantial changes in the circumstances under which the proposed project is being undertaken will require major revisions to the Certified EIR due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Condition 3.** If new information shows that the proposed project would have one or more new significant effects; that significant effects would be substantially more severe than previously described; that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would be feasible and substantially reduce impacts, but project proponents decline to adopt them; or that new or previously rejected mitigation measures or alternatives would be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more project impacts, but project proponents decline to adopt them.

If none of the above conditions are met, the analysis identifies where impacts of the Proposed Project would not require major revisions to the Certified EIR or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects that would trigger the need to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR under Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.1 **AESTHETICS**

## 4.1.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to aesthetics identified in the Certified EIR.

Scenic Resources. Grading required for the Approved Project would permanently alter existing landforms. Grading and design guidelines are intended to minimize aesthetic impacts of landform modifications and mitigate potential impacts to a level of acceptability. However, the Certified EIR determined that the issue of aesthetics is subjective in nature and landform modifications and changes in the character of the Specific Plan area may be controversial. The Certified EIR identified impacts to landforms as significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although

the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to scenic resources would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

• Light and Glare. At the time the Certified EIR was prepared, the Specific Plan area was developed with a SCPGA golf facility, scattered with ranch structures and few existing light sources on-site. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would create light and glare impacts resulting from additional lighting required for urban development such as streetlights, residential and commercial lighting, and vehicular lighting. The Approved Project provides regulations and provisions to minimize light and glare that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Certified EIR would reduce impacts due to light and glare to a less than significant level. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to light and glare would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

#### 4.1.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Would the Proposed Project:

#### a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas. The project site is graded and surrounded by lots that are currently under development in accordance with the Approved Project. The development of the project site with the Proposed Project would not affect scenic vistas not already analyzed and identified in the Certified EIR. Development would be regulated by the District and Specific Plan.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR identified that San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway and Interstate 10 (I-10) are designated as a County Scenic Highway and Scenic State Highway, respectively and concluded that development accommodated by the Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. The Proposed Project would be developed within the boundaries of the Approved Project. According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the nearest officially designated State scenic highway is State Route

243 (SR 243), between Wesley Street and SR 74, approximately 10.5 miles southwest (Caltrans 2024). The project site is graded and does not contain any trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings. The Proposed Project would result in development of the project site with an elementary school campus.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. At the time the Certified EIR was prepared the Specific Plan area was vacant with scattered ranch facilities. The Certified EIR concluded that development accommodated by the Approved Project would result in unavoidable landform alterations and a change in the existing character of the Specific Plan area from rural to urban; impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The Proposed Project would occur within the Approved Project's boundaries and would include development the project site with a use permitted under the Approved Project, which were analyzed in the Certified EIR. Additionally, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the Specific Plan and District standards. Furthermore, and as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to adhere to the applicable Certified EIR mitigation measures to help mitigate any visual impacts resulting from the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that light and glare could be created by lights of parking lots, landscaped areas, interior building lights, and/or use of exterior building materials that could be reflective as a result of development accommodated by the Specific Plan. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with a use analyzed in the Certified EIR and allowed by the Approved Project, which would be a source of artificial light and would incorporate mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR that would reduce impacts to light and glare to a less than significant level.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.1.3 Aesthetic Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions.

- MM C.7.1A Development on hillside areas shall be designed to minimize visual impacts from the I-10 and San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway, through the use of contour grading to imitate the existing on-site variable slopes.
- MM C.7.2A The design review process for commercial establishments **and school facilities** shall ensure that no significant light or glare impacts shall result from the proposed project. Specific issues to be evaluated at the time of design review shall include the following:
  - Proposed exterior lighting and landscaping of parking areas to reduce visible lighting from outside these areas.
  - Use of shielding on exterior lights to focus light onto the ground.
  - Proposed architectural materials to ensure that reflective materials are minimized.
- MM C.7.2B The Beaumont Unified School District shall determine lighting and landscape standards on school property, but be encouraged to follow proposed design guidelines to mitigate effects of light and glare.

# 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

## 4.2.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources in the Certified EIR.

• **Farmland.** The Certified EIR determined that portions of the Specific Plan area have been in agricultural production and the Approved Project along with the existing SCPGA golf course would result in the gradual conversion of those portions of the Specific Plan area from agricultural production to urban and/or non-agricultural open space use. The Specific Plan area was previously removed from agricultural land use. The Certified EIR concluded that implementation of the Approved Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on farmland or existing agricultural operations. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to farmland would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

• Agricultural Use/Williamson Act. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area was removed from agricultural land use. The Certified EIR concluded that implementation of the Approved Project would not result in significant adverse impact on agricultural uses. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to agricultural uses would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

Impacts to forestry resources were not analyzed in the Certified EIR as the requirement to analyze forestry resources in environmental documents did not become effective until adoption of the Senate Bill 97 amendments (adopted December 31, 2009, effective March 18, 2010) to the CEQA Guidelines, which occurred after the adoption of the Approved Project and certification of the Certified EIR by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. Prior to the adoption of SB 97, forest resources were not generally recognized as an environmental issue. Therefore, the analysis of impacts on forestry resources is new in this Addendum.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

# 4.2.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area, including the project site, was removed from the agricultural land use. As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, the project site is graded, vacant, and disturbed. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to farmlands. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area, including the project site, was removed from the agricultural land use.

As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, the project site is graded, vacant, and disturbed. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract; no impacts would occur. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104[g])?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Forest land is defined as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits" (California Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]). Timberland is defined as "land…which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees" (California Public Resources Code Section 4526).

As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, the project site is graded and does not contain any forestland. Additionally, the project site is within the Specific Plan area and is zoned Specific Plan Zone by the City's zoning map. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### d) Result in the loss of forest land or conservation of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** See response to Section 4.2.c above. As substantiated in this section, the Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** See response to Section 4.2.a, b, and c above. As substantiated in these sections, the Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.2.3 Agriculture and Forestry Resources Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to agricultural resources were identified in the Certified EIR.

# 4.3 AIR QUALITY

## 4.3.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to air quality identified in the Certified EIR.

- Air Quality Management Plan. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would be consistent with population, housing, and employment projections for the San Gorgonio Pass area, and is within the population forecast in the County's General Plan and the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to conflicts with an air quality management plan would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Cumulative Air Quality Impacts. The Certified EIR identified that the construction and operational emissions associated with the Approved Project would result in a significant, cumulative air quality impact for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (AAQS). Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, cumulative air quality impacts would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Construction Emissions. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project's peak grading and construction emissions would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) thresholds for the criteria pollutants of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>. Emissions of other criteria pollutants would be below the standards. Even with incorporation of feasible mitigation measures C4.1A through C4.F to reduce construction emissions, construction activities would still exceed South Coast AQMD's PM<sub>10</sub> threshold and impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to construction emissions would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Operational Emissions. The Certified EIR evaluated long-term air pollutant emissions from area sources (on-site emission such as natural gas consumption and emissions associated with consumer products) and mobile source emissions associated with the Approved Project. The Certified EIR determined that buildout of the Approved Project would exceed South Coast AQMD's operational thresholds for CO, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. Incorporation of mitigation measures C4.2-A through C4.2-C would reduce the magnitude of impacts; however, operational emissions would still exceed South Coast AQMD's operational thresholds and remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although

the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to operational emissions would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.

- Sensitive Receptors. The Certified EIR completed a localized carbon monoxide (CO) hot spot analysis and determined that implementation of the Approved Project would not generate CO hot spots and no nearby sensitive receptors would be affected by project-related local air quality impacts. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to local air quality and sensitive receptors would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Odors. The Certified EIR also determined there would be no impact in regard to the creation of objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to odors would be similar as those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.3.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

#### Methodology

Methodology to evaluate air quality impacts under CEQA has been updated since the Certified EIR was adopted. South Coast AQMD has published updates on its web site to the Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook that provides local governments with guidance for analyzing and mitigating project-specific air quality impacts. South Coast AQMD's most recent air quality analysis model, CalEEMod Version 2022.1, was utilized to compare the impacts of the Approved Project to the Proposed Project. Resulting construction and operational emissions are compared to the significance thresholds adopted by South Coast AQMD. A background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the project site, and the air quality modeling can be found in Appendix A.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

#### a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project would be consistent with South Coast AQMD's 2016 AQMP since buildout would not exceed population, housing, and employment projections for the San Gorgonio Pass area. The Certified EIR evaluated consistency with the 2016 AQMP, since then South Coast AQMD adopted the 2022 AQMP in December 2022 and the 2022 AQMP will be used in the following analysis (South Coast AQMD 2022).

Regional growth projections are used by South Coast AQMD to forecast future emission levels in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). For southern California, these regional growth projections are provided by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and are partially based on land-use designations in City and county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect regional growth projections.

A consistency determination with the AQMP plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the AQMP. It fulfills the CEQA goal of informing decision makers of the environmental effects of the Proposed Project under consideration early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed. It also provides the local agency with ongoing information as to whether they are contributing to the clean air goals in the AQMP. The project site is within the SoCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of South Coast AQMD.

The regional emissions inventory for the SoCAB is compiled by South Coast AQMD and SCAG. Regional population, housing, and employment projections developed by SCAG are based in part on cities' general plan land use designations. These projections form the foundation for the emissions inventory of the AQMP. These demographic trends are incorporated into SCAG's 2024-2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), *Connect SoCal*, to determine priority transportation projects and vehicle miles traveled in the SCAG region (SCAG 2024). Because the AQMP strategy is based on projections from local general plans and SCAG's regional growth forecasts, projects that are consistent with the local general plan are considered consistent with the air-quality-related regional plan.

As discussed in Section 4.14, *Population and Housing*, of this EIR Addendum, the Proposed Project entails the construction of an elementary school campus and would not introduce additional housing units or additional infrastructure facilities to the Specific Plan area. The Proposed Project would support the planned population anticipated for the Specific Plan area and would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would result in short-term employment only and would end upon project completion. Impacts related to conflicts with an adopted air quality plan would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR identified that the future construction and operation of the Approved Project would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Consequently, the construction-related air quality impacts associated with development in accordance with the Approved Project were deemed significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Approved Project could contribute to an increase in health effects in SoCAB until the attainment standards are met. Mitigation measures C4.1A through C4.1F would reduce impacts to the extent feasible; however, air quality was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact in the Certified EIR.

Mitigation Measures C4.1A through C4.1F are listed below under Section 4.3.3, *Air Quality Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR.* 

#### Short-Term Regional Construction Impacts

Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources, such as on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, vehicles hauling materials to and from the site, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Construction of the Proposed Project would generate criteria air pollutants associated with construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust from site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Air pollutant emissions from construction emissions associated with the Proposed Project are provided in Table 3. Mitigation measures identified for the Approved Project and applicable to the Proposed Project were included in the modeling, including Certified EIR Mitigation Measures C4.1E and C4.1F.

		Pollutants (Ibs/day) <sup>1, 2</sup>				
Construction Phase	VOC	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Year 2027						
Site Preparation	3	29	29	<1	10	5
Grading	3	26	29	<1	6	3
Building Construction	1	10	15	<1	1	<1
Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coating	30	18	27	<1	1	1
Maximum Daily Emissions	30	29	29	<1	10	5
South Coast AQMD Regional Construction Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 3	Maximum Daily	y Regional Construct	ion Emissions
---------	---------------	----------------------	---------------

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1. South Coast AQMD 2023.

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day

<sup>1</sup> Based on the preliminary information provided by the District. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available,

construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by South Coast AQMD of construction equipment. Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by South Coast AQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 25 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant

sweepers. Includes dust control measures per Mitigation Measures C4.1E and low-VOC coating per Mitigation Measure C4.1F.

The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> under the State standards and nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and lead (Los Angeles County only) for Federal standards (CARB 2024). According to South Coast AQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values would not add significantly to a cumulative impact (South Coast AQMD 1993). As shown in Table 3, the maximum daily construction emissions for all criteria air pollutants would be less than their respective South Coast AQMD regional construction thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

Although the Proposed Project's use was not specifically considered for development in Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan, the City of Beaumont indicated that the Development Agreement adopted as a part of the Specific Plan allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan area. The Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with all applicable development and design standards identified in the Specific Plan and in accordance with the District's standards. Moreover, the Proposed Project would occur within the same
boundaries analyzed for the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. Since the Proposed Project would not exceed the thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction, the Proposed Project would not change the significance conclusion identified in the Certified EIR.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Long-Term Regional Operational Impacts

Typical long-term air pollutant emissions are generated by area sources (e.g., landscape fuel use, aerosols, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement), energy use (natural gas), and mobile sources (i.e., on-road vehicles). The Certified EIR determined that operation of the Approved Project would generate emissions that would exceed South Coast AQMD's operational thresholds even with mitigation incorporated.

As identified in the Fairway Elementary School Traffic Study (traffic study) provided by DJ&A (2024) (See Appendix D), the Proposed Project would generate an estimated 1,930 weekday vehicle trips. As shown in Table 4, it is anticipated that operation of the Proposed Project would result in emissions that would not exceed the South Coast AQMD regional operation-phase significance thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

Maximum Daily Emissions (Ibs/Day)					
VOC	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2</sub> .
7	4	76	<1	17	4
2	<1	3	<1	<1	<1
<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
9	5	80	<1	17	4
55	55	550	150	150	55
No	No	No	No	No	No
	VOC           7           2           <1	Maxin           VOC         NOx           7         4           2         <1	Maximum Daily Em           VOC         NOx         CO           7         4         76           2         <1	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/Da           VOC         NOx         CO         SO2           7         4         76         <1	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/Day)           VOC         NOx         CO         SO2         PM10           7         4         76         <1

Table 4 Maximum Daily Regional Operation Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1. South Coast AQMD 2023.

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day. Highest winter or summer emissions report.

Based on trip generation data provided by DJ&A (see Appendix D).

Moreover, the Proposed Project is well within what was evaluated under the approved land uses in the Certified EIR and would generate nominal operational criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the South Coast AQMD regional significance thresholds and the Approved Project. In addition, emissions from building energy use would be minimized because the new school building would meet the current California Building Energy Efficiency Standards-future iterations of the California Building Standards Code are assumed to achieve greater energy efficiency performance.

Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a). The Proposed Project is consistent with the Specific Plan and would not require changes to the Approved Project. No substantial changes are proposed

to the Approved Project or have occurred within the development area covered by the Specific Plan that would require major revisions to the Certified EIR or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects. Therefore, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Certified EIR.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As concluded in the Certified EIR, siting of residences or other sensitive receptors on-site is not anticipated to result in a significant exposure or impact to CO from local roadways. Impacts were deemed less than significant, and no mitigation measures were required.

#### Localized Construction Impacts

#### Localized Significance Thresholds

Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) are based on the California AAQS, which are the most stringent AAQS to provide a margin of safety in the protection of public health and welfare (South Coast AQMD 2008). They are designated to protect sensitive receptors most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and people engaged in strenuous work or exercise. The screening-level construction LSTs are based on the size of the project site, distance to the nearest sensitive receptor, and Source Receptor Area (SRA). The nearest off-site sensitive receptors are the single-family residences along Aaron Avenue and Stewart Street to the north.

Air pollutant emissions generated by construction activities would cause temporary increases in air pollutant concentrations. Table 5, *Localized Construction Emissions*, shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during on-site construction activities compared with the South Coast AQMD's screening-level LSTs, for sensitive receptors within 500 feet for NO<sub>X</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. As shown in Table 5, the construction of the Proposed Project would not generate construction-related on-site emissions that would exceed the screening-level LSTs. Thus, project-related construction activities would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

	Pollutants(lbs/day) <sup>1</sup>			
Construction Activity	NOx	CO	PM <sub>10</sub> <sup>2</sup>	PM <sub>2.5</sub> <sup>2</sup>
South Coast AQMD 1.31 Acre LST	260	4,801	101.04	26.79
Building Construction	9	13	0.34	0.31
Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coating	17	24	0.66	0.60
South Coast AQMD 3.50 Acre LST	338	6,798	130.42	35.15
Site Preparation	28	28	9.37	5.07
South Coast AQMD 3.88 Acre LST	350	7,117	133.77	36.54
Grading	26	27	5.22	2.44
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No

#### Table 5 Localized Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1. South Coast AQMD 2008 and 2011.

Notes: In accordance with South Coast AQMD methodology, only on-site stationary sources and mobile equipment are included in the analysis. Screening level LSTs are based on a 500 ft receptor for NOx, CO, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> in SRA 29.

<sup>1</sup> Where specific information for project-related construction activities or processes was not available, modeling was based on CalEEMod defaults. These defaults are based on construction surveys conducted by the South Coast AQMD.

<sup>2</sup> Includes fugitive dust control measures required by South Coast AQMD under Rule 403, such as watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 25 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers. Includes dust control measures per Mitigation Measures C4.1E and low-VOC coating per Mitigation Measure C4.1F.

Development under the Proposed Project would not introduce new types of construction processes or activities compared to what was previously considered in the Certified EIR. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not result in developing a new area because the project site was considered under the Specific Plan area. Thus, it is not anticipated that development of the land uses accommodated under the Proposed Project would result in new or increase the severity of construction-related LST impacts compared to the land uses considered for the project site in the Certified EIR.

#### Construction Health Risk

Emissions from construction equipment primarily consist of diesel particulate matter (DPM). In 2015, the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA) adopted guidance for preparation of health risk assessments, which included the development of a cancer risk factor and non-cancer chronic reference exposure level for DPM over a 30-year time frame (OEHHA 2015). Currently, South Coast AQMD does not require the evaluation of long-term excess cancer risk or chronic health impacts for a short-term project. The Proposed Project is anticipated to be completed in approximately 11 months, which would limit the exposure to off-site receptors. Furthermore, construction activities would not generate on-site exhaust emissions that would exceed the screening-level construction LSTs.

As mentioned previously, the Proposed Project would develop an elementary school within the Specific Plan area to serve transitional kindergarten (TK) through 5th grade students and would not introduce new types of construction processes or activities compared to what was previously considered in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a). The Proposed Project is consistent with the Specific Plan and would not require changes to the Approved Project. No substantial changes are proposed to the Approved Project or have occurred within the development area covered by the Specific Plan that would

require major revisions to the Certified EIR or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects. Therefore, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Certified EIR.

#### Localized Operational Impacts

#### **Operational LSTs**

The types of land uses that typically generate substantial quantities of criteria air pollutants and TACs include industrial (stationary sources) and warehousing (truck idling) land uses. The Proposed Project would involve the operation of an elementary school within the Specific Plan area. Thus, the type of land use proposed under the Proposed Project would not be expected to generate substantial quantities of criteria air pollutants and TACs. Overall, it is not anticipated that development of the land uses accommodated under the Proposed Project would result in new or increased severity of operation-related localized air quality impacts compared to the land uses considered in the Certified EIR.

#### CO Hotspot

Vehicle congestion has the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles are backed up and idle for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds. These pockets could exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations.

The Certified EIR identified that project traffic would add up to 0.1 ppm to the 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations. Thus, implementation of the Approved Project would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hotspot. Currently, the SoCAB is designated attainment under the California AAQS and National AAQS for CO. The South Coast AQMD does not currently have an adopted screening criteria to determine whether a project may have the potential to generate a CO hotspot; therefore, the screening criteria recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) was utilized instead. According to BAAQMD, under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2023).

The Proposed Project would result in a maximum of 629 AM peak hour vehicle trips at buildout (DJ&A 2024). As identified in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) in Appendix F, Sorenstam Drive currently experiences up to 360 daily vehicle trips (DJ&A 2024). Utilizing the industry standard practice of dividing average daily vehicle trips by 10 to approximate peak hour trips, Sorenstam Drive currently experiences an estimated 36 peak hour trips. Based on the Certified EIR, the Approved Project would generate 72,844 average daily trips or approximately 7,284 peak hour trips. Combined with trips generated by the Proposed Project, Sorenstam Drive could experience up to 7,949 AM peak hour trips. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not introduce new vehicle trips which may result in a CO hotspot when combined with existing traffic volumes.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that odor impacts from the Approved Project would be less than significant. Similarly, the Proposed Project would not result in objectionable odors. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to South Coast AQMD Rule 402, *Nuisance*, which states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The Proposed Project involves construction of an elementary school in the Specific Plan area and would not constitute one of the above land uses that are known sources of objectionable odors. Emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust and VOCs from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate odors. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, and would not affect a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

### 4.3.3 Air Quality Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. It should be noted that Certified EIR mitigation measures C.4.2B and C.4.2C are not applicable to the Proposed Project because the Proposed Project is not a commercial or residential use.

MM C.4.1A The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used onsite based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

- MM C.4.1B The construction contractor shall utilize electric or diesel-powered equipment in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where such vehicles are available and their use is economically feasible.
- MM C.4.1C The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use over extended periods during the work day. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period should be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- MM C.4.1D The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- MM C.4.1E Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below.
  - During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to minimize dust leaving the site, and to create a crust after each day's activities cease
  - During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to minimize dust leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
  - After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the on-site areas where dust has collected (e.g., streets, staging areas, etc.) shall be kept clean by picking up accumulated soils until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.
  - Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to minimize dust generation.
  - Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be covered.
- MM C.4.1F The construction contractor shall utilize, as much as feasible, precoated/natural colored building materials, water-based or low-VOC coating, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray method, or manual coatings application such as paint brush, hand roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge

MM C.4.2A The project shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations established by the Energy Commission regarding energy conservation standards.

### 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 4.4.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to biological resources identified in the Certified EIR.

- Habitat. According to the Certified EIR, there would be no impacts to open space/conservation resulting from the Approved Project. The Approved Project committed 218.3 acres to remain as natural open space, along with 38 acres of developed parkland and 500 acres of golf course. The existing SCPGA golf facility incorporates existing native habitat for the slope surrounding the greenways and fairways. The Approved Project met the County's standard for natural open space by incorporating into the development enhanced recreational opportunities and project aesthetics and would meet all standards of the City of Beaumont. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not conflict with the open space policies of the Riverside County General Plan or the Beaumont General Plan and impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to open space/conservation would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.
- Special Status Species. The Certified EIR determined that implementation of the Approved Project would not result in significant impacts to vegetation/wildlife on-site. The Specific Plan was designed to recognize and avoid or minimize potential significant environmental resources. Such resources are discussed thoroughly in the Certified EIR and in the associated technical studies prepared for the project. The control and management of natural resources including soil, water, vegetation/wildlife, air, and historic and prehistoric resources have also been incorporated into the Approved Project and is addressed in detail in the Certified EIR. Implementation of mitigation measures described in the Certified EIR will reduce impacts to wetlands and riparian woodland to a less than significant level. However, although impacts resulting from habitat loss are partially reduced through on-site preservation of 134 acres of habitat, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, vegetation/wildlife impacts would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Wildlife Movement Corridors. The Certified EIR determined that although the Approved Project would alter onsite wildlife movement patterns as a result of habitat loss, the Approved Project would not interfere with regional wildlife movement in the project vicinity. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, wildlife movement impacts would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

- **Conflict with Policies.** The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Oak woodlands would be impacted by the Approved Project; however, the Riverside County Oak Tree Management guidelines would be applied where feasible. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, conflicts with policies would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Habitat Conservation Plans. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, conflicts with an adopted habitat conservation plan would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.4.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Would the Proposed Project:

a) Have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that construction of the Approved Project would result in the loss of habitat that is potentially suitable for, but not occupied by, species listed as threatened or endangered. However, these species may never occupy the area. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts related to habitat modification would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would occur within the same boundaries analyzed for the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. It should be noted that the project site is graded and disturbed. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to habitat modification.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that several significant impacts related to riparian habitats and mitigation measures were identified to mitigate these losses. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project and is graded and disturbed. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community within the confines of the project site or its surroundings. The Proposed Project would not result in any substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in several significant impacts related to wetland habitats and mitigation measures were identified to mitigate these losses. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project and is graded and disturbed. The project site does not contain any wetland habitat within the confines of the project site or its surroundings. The Proposed Project would not result in any substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not interfere with the movement of wildlife and impacts were determined to be less than significant. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance and impacts were determined to be less than significant. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project. Additionally, the project site is graded and disturbed; no trees are within the boundaries of the project site. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan as no such plans encompassing the site existed at the time the Certified EIR was prepared and impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project. The project site is within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Conservation Plan boundaries; however, the project site is not within a criteria cell (RCA 2024). A criteria cell is a series of grids utilized by the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) Western Riverside County to organize and track development and conservation areas within western Riverside County in which land can be acquired for the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Because the project site is located outside the boundaries of a criteria cell, the project site is not in an area described for conservation (RCA 2024). As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not result in conflicts with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan; no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

### 4.4.3 Biological Resources Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

It should be noted that Certified EIR mitigation measures C.6.1A and C.6.2A are not applicable to the Proposed Project as they have already been implemented for the project site by the master developer.

### 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 4.5.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to cultural resources identified in the Certified EIR.

- Historic Resources. The Certified EIR determined that the Haskell Ranch is within the Specific Plan area and is a point of local interest. Although the individual buildings, structures, and objects within the Haskell Ranch complex do not appear eligible for inclusion in the California or National Registers, the entire complex may be potentially eligible for listing as an historic district. The Certified EIR determined that the Haskell Ranch buildings may be restored and reused under the Approved Project, where possible. The Certified EIR concluded that with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on historical resources would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts on historical resources would be less than significant.
- Archaeological Resources. The Certified EIR determined that implementation of the Approved Project could encounter archeological resources. The Certified EIR identified mitigation in the form of avoidance of archaeological sites, or if that is not possible, further evaluation of the site that may be potentially impacts and development of a treatment plan, if necessary. With additional investigations and detailed mitigation measures implemented, the impacts would be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts on archaeological resources would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.
- Human Remains. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project could encounter human remains. The Certified EIR identified mitigation measures that would mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts on human remains would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.5.2 Impacts Associated with the proposed Project

a) Cause as substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The Certified EIR determined that the Haskell Ranch Complex could be eligible for listing and identified mitigation measures to mitigate impacts on the complex. It should be noted that the Haskell Ranch complex is not located on or near

the project site; also, the project site is vacant, disturbed, and graded. The Proposed Project would occur on soils that has been previously disturbed. The Proposed Project would result in no impacts on historical resources.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project could encounter archaeological resources and with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project. Additionally, the project site is graded and disturbed. Thus, although further grading (fine grading only) and excavation (e.g., utility trenching) would be part of the Proposed Project, they would disturb soils that were previously disturbed as a part of the mass grading completed for the project site by the master developer; therefore, the potential for encountering archeological resources during ground-disturbing activities are negligible. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project could encounter human remains and with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project. Additionally, the project site is graded and disturbed. Thus, although grading (fine grading only) and excavation (e.g., utility trenching) would be part of the Proposed Project, they would disturb soils that were previously disturbed as a part of the mass grading completed for the project site by the master developer; therefore, the potential for encountering human remains would be negligible. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### 4.5.3 Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

It should be noted that Certified EIR mitigation measures C.8.1A through C.8.1J and C.82b are not applicable to the Proposed Project as they have already been implemented for the project site by the master developer. It

should be noted that Certified EIR mitigation measure C.8.2A is not applicable to the Proposed Project as the project site does not within the Haskell Ranch Historic District and mitigation measure C.8.2C is not applicable to the project as the project site is not within Planning Area 9.

### 4.6 ENERGY

### 4.6.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts related to energy were not analyzed specifically in the Certified EIR because the topic was not officially part of the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G checklist until January 1, 2019, when the Natural Resources Agency updated Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The Certified EIR acknowledged that the Approved Project would create a demand for more energy resources and must comply with the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (CCR Title 24). The 2002 EIR Addendum identified that the annexation would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans and impacts due to wasteful and inefficient energy use would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Because environmental and regulatory settings were not addressed specifically with respect to energy in the Approved Project, and because the environmental and regulatory settings for the Proposed Project have changed since the certification of the EIR, the following discussion is provided to update conditions relative to development of the Proposed Project.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.6.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR did not specifically analyze energy because it was approved prior to the 2019 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to incorporate subdivision (b) to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.2.

Following is a discussion of the Proposed Project's construction and operation impacts on energy sources.

#### Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction of the Proposed Project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions and would result in short-term transportation-related energy use.

#### Electrical Energy

As with the Approved Project, construction of the Proposed Project would require electricity use to power the construction equipment. The majority of construction equipment would be gas- or diesel-powered, and

electricity would not be used to power most of the construction equipment. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction. Later construction phases could result in the use of electricity-powered equipment for interior construction and architectural coatings. It is anticipated that the majority of electric-powered construction equipment would be hand tools (e.g., power drills, table saws) and lighting, which would result in minimal electricity usage during construction activities. Therefore, Proposed Project-related construction activities would not result in wasteful or unnecessary electricity demands. Overall, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Certified EIR.

#### Natural Gas Energy

It is not anticipated that construction equipment would be powered by natural gas for either the Approved Project or the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with respect to natural gas usage. Overall, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Certified EIR.

#### Transportation Energy

Transportation energy use during construction of the Approved Project and Proposed Project would come from delivery vehicles, haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles. In addition, transportation energy demand would come from use of off-road construction equipment. It is anticipated that the majority of offroad construction equipment, such as those used during demolition and grading, would be gas or diesel powered.

The use of energy resources by vehicles and equipment would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary. In addition, all construction equipment would cease operating upon completion of project construction. Fuel efficiency of vehicles has also improved since preparation of the Certified EIR due to statewide fuel reduction strategies and regulatory compliances (e.g., Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards), thus fuel usage during construction is anticipated to be more fuel efficient under the Proposed Project in comparison to the Approved Project. Therefore, impacts related to transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure.

Furthermore, to limit wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption, the construction contractors are anticipated to minimize nonessential idling of construction equipment during construction, in accordance with Section 2449 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9. Construction trips would also not result in unnecessary use of energy since the project site is centrally located and is served by numerous regional freeway systems (e.g., I-10 and SR-60) that provide the most direct routes from various areas of the region. Thus, energy use during construction of the Proposed Project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Overall, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the levels and types of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Certified EIR.

#### Conclusion

As demonstrated above, the Proposed Project's construction phase would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Long-Term Operation Impacts

Operation of the Proposed Project, similar to the Approved Project, would generate demand for electricity and natural gas and would result in transportation energy use. Operational use of energy would include heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems; use of on-site equipment and appliances; indoor, outdoor, and perimeter lighting; and plug loads associated with monitors, speakers, and other small electronics.

#### Electrical Energy

Electrical service to the project site would be provided by Southern California Edison (SCE) through connections to existing off-site electrical lines as needed. As shown in Table 6, the new electricity demand from the Proposed Project would total 481,969 kilowatt-hours per year.

Land Use <sup>1</sup>	Electricity (kWh/year)
Proposed Classroom Building	442,549
Parking Lot	39,420
Total Electricity Consumption	481,969
Source: Appendix A	

 Table 6
 Operation-Related Electricity Consumption

Source: Appendix A. Note: kWh=kilowatt-hour

<sup>1</sup> The electricity use per year is based on the proposed square footage of the school building and parking lot.

The Certified EIR stated that the Approved Project would comply with the energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. Similarly, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the requirements of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). The 2022 Title 24 standards became effective in January 2023 and would be more stringent than the standards that applied to the Approved Project. Compliance with these requirements would support the energy conservation goals outlined in Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines because the Proposed Project would incorporate the use of renewable energy such as photovoltaic (PV) systems and battery energy storage (BES) systems.

In addition to the proposed building energy efficiency, SCE is required to comply with the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), which mandates utilities to procure a certain proportion of electricity from eligible renewable and carbon-free sources and increasing the proportion through the coming years with an ultimate procurement requirement of 100 percent by 2045. The RPS requirements would support use of electricity by the Proposed Project that is generated from renewable or carbon-free sources. Therefore, the Proposed Project

would generally be consistent with the goals outlined in Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines regarding increasing energy efficiency, decreasing reliance on fossil fuels, and increasing renewable energy sources. Overall, operation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to electricity.

#### Natural Gas Energy

As seen in Table 7, the total natural gas demand by the new classroom building would total 1,627,950 kilo-British thermal units per year.

Table 7	Operation-Related Natural Gas Consumption
---------	---

Land Use	Natural Gas (kBTU/year) <sup>1</sup>	
Proposed Classroom Building	1,627,950	
Total Natural Gas Consumption	1,627,950	
Source: Appendix A.		
Note: kBTU = kilo-British thermal units.		
<sup>1</sup> The natural gas use per year is based on the proposed square footage of the school building.		

While the Proposed Project would result in an increase in natural gas demand, the new classroom building would be constructed and operated consistent with the requirements of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. As a result, the Proposed Project would generally result in a decrease in per capita natural gas consumption from what would have occurred for the Approved Project due to the improvements in the Building Energy Efficiency Standards since the preparation of the Certified EIR. Compliance with these codes would decrease overall reliance on fossil fuels and increase reliance on renewable energy sources for electricity generation. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project, similar to development pursuant to the Certified EIR, would result in less than significant impacts with respect to natural gas usage.

#### Transportation Energy

Both the Approved Project and Proposed Project would consume fuel and other forms of transportation energy during operations from the use of motor vehicles. Based on the traffic study, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate an estimated 1,930 average daily vehicle trips (see Appendix D). While the fuel type and efficiency of vehicles used by the Proposed Project, such as the average miles per gallon of gasoline, is unknown, subsequent transportation energy consumption would be necessary to transport students and staff to and from the proposed campus. However, the Proposed Project is a local-serving land use and would draw attendance from nearby residential areas that, without the Proposed Project, would need to travel elsewhere to attend comparable schools.

Fuel efficiency of vehicles after buildout would on average improve compared to vehicle fuel efficiencies experienced under existing conditions, thereby resulting in a lower per capita fuel consumption assuming travel distances, travel modes, and trip rates remain the same. The improvement in fuel efficiency would be attributable to the statewide fuel reduction strategies and regulatory compliances (e.g., CAFE standards), resulting in new cars that are more fuel efficient and the attrition of older, less fuel-efficient vehicles. The CAFE standards are not directly applicable to land use development projects, but to car manufacturers. Thus, the District does not have direct control in determining the fuel efficiency of vehicles manufactured and that are made available to

staff and students. However, compliance with the CAFE standards by car manufacturers would ensure that vehicles produced in future years have greater fuel efficiency and would generally result in an overall benefit of reducing fuel usage by providing the population of the project site's region more fuel-efficient vehicle options. Lastly, as electricity consumed in California is required to meet the increasing renewable energy mix requirements under the State's RPS and accelerated by SB 1020, greater and greater proportions of electricity consumed for transportation energy demand envisioned under the Proposed Project would be generated from renewable energy sources rather than fossil fuels through 2045.

While the Proposed Project would generate an increase in vehicle trips to the project site, the Proposed Project would serve the local population and may provide a closer option as a school campus for the nearby student population. The Proposed Project would also provide four driveways to efficiently facilitate traffic flow for pick-up/drop off activities on campus, which would help to decrease transportation-related energy and reduce excessive idling. Furthermore, since vehicle fuel efficiencies would improve year over year through buildout, the Proposed Project is expected to result in a decrease in overall per capita transportation energy consumption when compared to that of the Approved Project. As such, impacts would be less than significant with respect to operation-related fuel usage for the Proposed Project as compared to the Approved Project.

#### Conclusion

As demonstrated above, the Proposed Project's operation phase would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The following evaluates consistency of the Proposed Project with California's Renewables Portfolio Standard program and SCAG's 2024-2050 RTP/SCS.

#### California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program

The state's electricity grid is transitioning to renewable energy under California's RPS Program. Eligible renewable sources under the RPS include wind, small hydropower, solar, geothermal, biomass, and biogas. The RPS goals have been updated since the adoption of SB 1078 in 2002. In general, California has RPS requirements of 33 percent renewable energy by 2020 (SB X1-2), 40 percent by 2024 (SB 350), 50 percent by 2026 (SB 100), 60 percent by 2030 (SB 100), 90 percent by 2035 (SB 1020), and 100 percent carbon free by 2045 (SB 100 and SB 1020). The statewide RPS goal is not directly applicable to individual development projects but to utilities and energy providers such as SCE, which is the utility that would provide all of the electricity needs for the Proposed Project. SCE's compliance with the RPS goals would support the State in meeting its objective in transitioning to renewable energy.

The Certified EIR did not specifically analyze energy because the topic was not officially part of the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G checklist until January 1, 2019, when the Natural Resources Agency updated Appendix

G of the CEQA Guidelines. However, as shown in Section C4, *Air Quality*, of the Certified EIR, the Approved Project would comply with applicable design standards such as the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Similarly, the Proposed Project would be subject to the standards mentioned in the Approved Project, including the Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen. Because the Proposed Project would comply with the latest 2022 energy standards, it would offer an improvement over the energy standards of the Approved Project. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict or obstruct plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency and no impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy

Since the certification of the EIR, SCAG adopted the 2024-2050 RTP/SCS, *Connect SoCal*, in April 2024. Connect SoCal is a long-term plan for Southern California region that details the development, integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities that will function as an intermodal transportation network for the SCAG metropolitan planning area. This plan outlines a forecasted development pattern that demonstrates how the region can sustainably accommodate needed housing and job centers with multimodal mobility options. The overarching vision is to expand alternatives to driving, advance the transition to clean-transportation technologies, promote integrated and safe transit networks, and foster transit-oriented development in compact and mixed-use developments (SCAG 2024).

As described in Section 4.14, *Population and Housing*, of this EIR Addendum, construction of the elementary school campus would support the planned population anticipated for the Specific Plan area and would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Furthermore, the new elementary school would be a local serving land use and impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) were found to be less than significant in Section 4.17, *Transportation*, of this EIR Addendum. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not interfere with implementation of Connect SoCal. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

### 4.6.3 Energy Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The Certified EIR did not evaluate energy impacts, and therefore no mitigation measures were identified in the Certified EIR.

### 4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

### 4.7.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to geology and soils identified in the Certified EIR.

- Seismic Safety. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project has the potential to be impacted by seismic events through the life of the Approved Project, but that project impacts would be fully mitigated to the extent feasible and to acceptable levels of risks through mitigation measures and compliance with City required building and grading requirements. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to seismic safety would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Liquefaction. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area contains areas that are underlain by younger alluvium, which increases the potential for liquefaction hazards during seismic events. Implementation of the requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and mitigation measures include designing foundations to limit the effects of liquefaction, placement of engineered filled with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures in areas with lower liquefaction risk would reduce potential liquefaction hazards. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to liquefaction hazards would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Unstable Soils. The Certified EIR determined that grading required for the Approved Project would interact with stope stability and potentially increase erosion during construction. The Approved Project includes grading guidelines intended to minimize grading impacts, ensure slope stability, and reduce the potential for erosion. The Approved Project would be implemented in accordance with the design recommendations provided in the Approved Project's geotechnical study and more detailed studies and would implement specific slope stability, erosion control and soil control measures to mitigate potential slope, erosion, and expansive soil/subsidence impacts to below a significant level. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to unstable soils would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Paleontological Resources. The Certified EIR determined that development of the Approved Project could encounter paleontological resources. Potential impacts to paleontological resources would be mitigated by the presence of qualified paleontological personnel during grading operations in highly sensitive fossiliferous sediments. With additional investigations and detailed mitigation measures implemented, the impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. The 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to paleontological resource would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.7.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area, including the project site, is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or within the vicinity of active faults or fault zones. However, as with the Approved Project, there is a potential for damage to occur under Proposed Project conditions from local fault rupture. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate mitigation measures from the Certified EIR to mitigate impacts to less than significant levels; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be subject to seismic ground shaking. However, the project site is not at a greater risk of seismic activity or impacts than other sites in Southern California. Additionally, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the applicable design standards in the most recent California Building Code to reduce the potential for ground shaking impacts and would incorporate applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR. The CBC contains provisions to safeguard against major structural failures or loss of life caused by earthquakes or other geologic hazards. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC for structural safety during a seismic event would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR found liquefaction to be a potential impact for the Approved Project but concluded that adherence to the requirements of the geotechnical study and the UBC would serve to mitigate any potential impacts related to liquefaction within the Specific Plan area. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the most recent CBC (including building standards that have been adopted and adapted from national model codes, such as the UBC) and the geotechnical investigation prepared for the Approved Project. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that development of the Approved Project's structures and facilities on or adjacent to areas prone to landslides represents a potential hazard to persons and property. However, impacts related to landslides would be mitigated to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR in conjunction with incorporation of recommendations from the geotechnical study. The Proposed Project would not result in greater landslide impacts than the Approved Project. Additionally, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable mitigation measures from the Certified EIR and implement the recommendations from the geotechnical study. Further, since the certification of the Certified EIR, the project site has been rough graded and has little variation in topography. No major slopes or bluffs are on or adjacent to the project site.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Erosion is the movement of rock and soil from place to place and is a natural process. Comment agents of erosion in the project region include wind and flowing water. Significant erosion typically occurs on steep slopes where stormwater and high winds can carry topsoil down hillsides. Erosion can be increased greatly by earthmoving activities if erosion-control measures are not used. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and control construction-related erosion through preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies best management practices (BMPs) for temporary erosion controls. Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities. Therefore, soil erosion impacts from project-related grading and construction than significant.

Since the certification of the Certified EIR, the project site has been rough graded and has little variation in topography. No major slopes or bluffs are on or adjacent to the project site. After project completion, the project site would be developed with an elementary school campus and would not contain exposed or bare soil. Soil erosion from Proposed Project operation would not occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

**Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Hazards from liquefaction and lateral spreading are addressed above in Section 4.7.2(a)(iii), and landslide hazards are addressed above in Section 4.7.2(a)(iv). As concluded in these sections, no significant impact would occur.

According to the geotechnical study conducted for the project site under the Approved Project, there is a potential for subsidence within the Specific Plan area. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the design recommendations of the geotechnical study and incorporate the necessary grading permits into the grading operations, which would mitigate any issues related to compressible soils. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the design recommendations of the geotechnical investigation prepared for the Approved Project. Additionally, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate mitigation measures from the Certified EIR to mitigate impacts related to expansive soils. These measures and requirements would be incorporated into the grading operations as required to obtain the necessary grading permits. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential expansive soils impacts to below a level of significance.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would not involve the construction or use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal system. Therefore, no impact would occur. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not significantly impact geologic features within the Specific Plan area. Additionally, the geotechnical study that was prepared for the Approved Project did not identify any unique geologic or physical features nor are there any changed geologic circumstances in the project area related to geologic structures or seismic activity.

The Certified EIR identified that the Specific Plan area has the potential to contain paleontological resources. These conditions have not changed since the certification of the Certified EIR. The paleontological filed survey performed as part of the Approved Project determined that paleontological resources exist within the Specific Plan area. As with the Approved Project, known resource sites would be required to be avoided in formulating more detailed plans for Approved Project development and if avoidance is not possible, a more detailed evaluation program will be implemented to identify mitigation measures specific to the subject resources. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to implement the mitigation measures, which would reduce impacts to paleontological resource to a less than significant level. Although grading (fine grading only) and excavation (e.g., utility trenching) would be part of the Proposed Project, they would disturb soils that were previously disturbed as a part of the mass grading completed for the project site by the master developer; therefore, the potential for encountering paleontological resources is very unlikely and the Certified EIR mitigation measures related to paleontological resources do not apply to the Prospect Project. Impacts would be less than significant

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

### 4.7.3 Geology and Soils Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions. Certified EIR Mitigation Measure C.1.3D is not applicable to the Proposed Project as the project site is not in proximity to slopes. Mitigation Measures C.1.3C, C.1.4A, and C.8.3.A through 8.3.I are not

applicable to the Proposed Project as these mitigation measures have been implemented by the master developer. Mitigation Measures C.1.6A is also not applicable to the Proposed Project as the Proposed Project does not include a water-holding structure/facility.

- MM C.1.1A Structures and facilities within the project site shall be designed and constructed to standards mandated by the Uniform Building Code (UBC) (1997) in effect at the time of construction for Seismic Zone 4, and/or professional engineering standards appropriate for the level of potential seismic hazard which may occur on site. Conformance with these design standards shall be enforced through building plan review and approval by the Riverside County Division of State Architect.
- MM C.1.1B Geotechnical investigations and additional seismic analysis shall be conducted in areas where multi-story "Normal-High Risk" and "Essential" land uses are proposed (as identified in the Riverside <u>Beaumont</u> General Plan). The findings and results of this analysis shall be incorporated into the design of any such structure or facilities. Any such analysis shall be completed prior to the <u>Beaumont Unified School District's</u> approval of <u>a school campus</u> <u>plan</u> tentative tract maps creating lots of construction of residential dwelling units, as well as prior to the approval of commercial plot plans for the area in question.
- MM C.1.2A The potential for a liquefaction hazard on portions of the proposed project site underlain by alluvium (as designated Qya and Qoa in Figure C.1.3 of **EIR No. 418**) shall be assessed by a site-specific geotechnical investigation conducted by a registered engineering geologist or registered geotechnical engineer prior to submittal of a tentative tract map the commencement of construction.
- MM C.1.2B If a liquefaction hazard is identified, adequate and appropriate measures such as (but not limited to); design foundations in a manner which limits the effects of liquefaction, the placement of an engineered fill with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures in areas with a lower liquefaction risk, shall be implemented to reduce liquefaction hazards. Any such measures shall be submitted to the Riverside County Geologist and the County Department of Building and Safety for review and approval.
- MM C.1.3A All areas underlain by the San Timoteo Formation or older alluvium, north-facing slopes, steep topography (in excess of 25 percent), and existing landslides shall require a detailed slope stability analysis prior to the issuance of grading permits, demonstrating that manufactured slopes will be stable in post grading conditions and that proposed development will not be at risk of damage due to slope instabilities within natural open space areas.
- MM C1.4B Construction erosion and sediment control plans for minimizing erosion shall be submitted to the Riverside County Geologist and/or Department of Building and Safety for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits implemented by the Beaumont Unified School District during any ground disturbing activities. Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

- Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which minimizes the amount of terrain modification.
- Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes.
- Structure shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are stabilized.
- The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils.
- To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced.
- The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited though the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.
- MM C.1.4C Drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects on site. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to:
  - Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.
  - Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages.
  - Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses.
  - Disturbed- areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be (re)vegetated.
  - Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff.
  - The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought tolerant plants.
  - Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized In gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion.
- MM C.1.5A An evaluation of settlement, hydrocompaction and expansion potential of soils shall be conducted prior to the issuance of grading permits for individual projects within the proposed project site commencement of grading activities.

- MM C.1.5B The developer/construction contractor shall implement measures to mitigate potential impacts related to expansive soils and/or subsidence. Such measures shall be submitted to the Riverside County Geologist for review and approval reviewed and approved by the Beaumont Unified School District. Mitigation measures may include, but shall not be limited to, the following:
  - Compressible soils or suitable import soils shall be over excavated and recompacted.
  - Soils susceptible to hydrocompaction shall be removed or presoaked.
  - Granular engineered fill shall be placed over in place of expansive soils.

### 4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

### 4.8.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The Certified EIR did not analyze greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because the Certified EIR was certified prior to the adoption of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and Senate Bill 97(SB 97) amendments (adopted December 30, 2009, effective March 18, 2010) to the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the analysis of GHG impact is new in this Addendum. The 2002 EIR Addendum did not analyze GHG emissions for the same reasons given above for the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.8.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHGs is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHG identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.<sup>1</sup>

Information on manufacturing of cement, steel, and other "life cycle" emissions that would occur as a result of the project are not applicable and are not included in the analysis.<sup>2</sup> Black carbon emissions are not included

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Water vapor ( $H_2O$ ) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Life cycle emissions include indirect emissions associated with materials manufacture. However, these indirect emissions involve numerous parties, each of which is responsible for GHG emissions of their particular activity. The California Resources Agency, in adopting the CEQA Guidelines Amendments on GHG emissions found that lifecycle analyses was not warranted for project-specific

in the GHG analysis because the California Air Resources Board (CARB) does not include this pollutant in the state's Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) and Assembly Bill 1279 (AB 1279) inventory and treats this short-lived climate pollutant separately.<sup>1</sup> A background discussion on the GHG regulatory setting and GHG modeling can be found in Appendix A to this EIR Addendum.

# a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough GHG emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact.

Project-related construction and operation-phase GHG emissions are shown in Table 8. Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the construction of an elementary school campus, which would generate GHG emissions. Consistent South Coast AQMD guidance, the annual average construction emissions were amortized over 30 years and included in the emissions inventory to account for one-time GHG emissions from the construction phase of the Proposed Project.

Source	GHG (MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Year)	Percentage
Mobile <sup>1</sup>	1,778	89%
Area	1	<1%
Energy	163	8%
Water	8	<1%
Solid Waste	28	1%
Refrigerants	<1	<1%
Amortized Construction Emissions <sup>2</sup>	14	1%
Total	1,992	100%
South Coast AQMD Bright-Line Threshold	3,000 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Yr	NA
Exceeds Bright-Line Threshold?		

#### Table 8 Project-Related Operation GHG Emissions

Source: CalEEMod, Version 2022.1. Appendix A.

Notes: MTCO<sub>2</sub>e = metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent

<sup>1</sup> Vehicle trips provided by DJ&A (Appendix D).

<sup>2</sup> Total construction emission are amortized over 30 years per South Coast AQMD Working Group methodology (South Coast AQMD 2008).

CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources, and the possibility of doublecounting emissions (CNRA 2018). Because the amount of materials consumed during the operation or construction of the Proposed Project is not known, the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, and manufacturing information for those raw materials are also not known, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. A life-cycle analysis is not warranted (OPR 2008).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Particulate matter emissions, which include black carbon, are analyzed in Section 3.3, Air Quality. Black carbon emissions have sharply declined due to efforts to reduce on-road and off-road vehicle emissions, especially diesel particulate matter. The state's existing air quality policies will virtually eliminate black carbon emissions from on-road diesel engines within 10 years (CARB 2017a.).

Water demand, wastewater generation, solid waste generation, and energy demand for the project site would incrementally increase due to the introduction of elementary school campus. As shown in Table 8, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not generate annual emissions that exceed the South Coast AQMD Working Group bright-line threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) per year (South Coast AQMD 2010). Therefore, the Proposed Project's cumulative contribution to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Operational GHG emissions from building energy use would also be minimized because the school building shall be constructed to meet the latest Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.3(b), it is anticipated that the construction activities and construction-related emissions under the Proposed Project would be similar to what was previously considered in the Certified EIR. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to what was previously considered in the Certified EIR. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The following evaluates consistency of the Proposed Project to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Scoping Plan and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

#### CARB Scoping Plan

Since certification of the EIR, CARB has adopted the 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan. The latest 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan outlines the State's strategies to reduce GHG emissions in accordance with the targets established under AB 32, SB 32, and AB 1279 (CARB 2022). The Scoping Plan is applicable to State agencies and is not directly applicable to cities/counties and individual projects. However, new regulations adopted by the state agencies outlined in the Scoping Plan result in GHG emissions reductions at the local level. As a result, local jurisdictions benefit from reductions in transportation emissions rates, increases in water efficiency in the building and landscape codes, and other statewide actions that affect a local jurisdiction's emissions inventory from the top down. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) and changes in the corporate average fuel economy standards (e.g., Pavley I and Pavley California Advanced Clean Cars program).

The Proposed Project's GHG emissions would be reduced through compliance with the programs and regulations identified by the Scoping Plan and implemented by state, regional, and local agencies to achieve the statewide GHG reduction goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Senate Bill (SB) 32, and AB 1279. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the above statewide strategies identified to implement the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, there are no changes or new significant information which would require preparation of an EIR.

#### SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Since the certification of the EIR, SCAG adopted the 2024-2050 RTP/SCS, Connect SoCal, in April 2024. Connect SoCal is a long-term plan for Southern California region that details the development, integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities that will function as an intermodal transportation network for the SCAG metropolitan planning area (SCAG 2024). This plan outlines a forecasted development pattern that demonstrates how the region can sustainably accommodate needed housing and job centers with multimodal mobility options. The overarching vision is to expand alternatives to driving, advance the transition to clean-transportation technologies, promote integrated and safe transit networks, and foster transit-oriented development in compact and mixed-use developments (SCAG 2024).

In addition, Connect SoCal is supported by a combination of transportation and land use strategies that outline how the region can achieve California's GHG-emission-reduction goals and federal Clean Air Act requirements. The projected regional development, when integrated with the proposed regional transportation network in Connect SoCal, would reduce per-capita GHG emissions related to vehicular travel and achieve the GHG reduction per capita targets for the SCAG region. The Connect SoCal Plan does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency to governments and developers.

Although the project site was not specifically analyzed in the Certified EIR to be developed with a school use, the Development Agreement allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project would serve 850 elementary school students within the Specific Plan area, which is within the projected student population identified in the Certified EIR. Construction of a new school campus may also reduce VMT and fuel usage by providing a closer option for students to attend. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies in Connect SoCal.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.8.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The Certified EIR did not evaluate GHG impacts, and therefore no mitigation measures were identified in the Certified EIR.

### 4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### 4.9.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials identified in the Certified EIR.

- Toxic Substances. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project has the potential to expose residents to an accidental release of hazardous materials along I-10. Residential use of the Specific Plan area would be subject to applicable requirements of the Riverside County and applicable development codes. Adherence to the requirements of applicable county agencies would reduce the potential impacts related to the explosion and/or release of hazardous substances to below a level of significance. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to hazardous materials would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.
- Hazardous Materials Sites. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area is not included on a federal, state, or local list of hazardous materials sites. The Certified EIR stated that any land use has some utilization of and/or association with toxic and/or hazardous substances. The Certified EIR anticipated that the nature and quantity of materials utilized within the Specific Plan area would be typical of those common in commercial operations and residential uses. The generation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are regulated by various federal, state, and local authorities. Adherence to the policies, standards, and regulations of responsible entities would reduce the risk of impacts associated with hazardous materials to a less than significant level. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to hazards would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.
- Wildfire. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is within a high fire hazard severity zone and is in a region that is dominated by native vegetation that is considered to be fire fuel. The Certified EIR identified mitigation measures to mitigate wildfire hazards to a less than significant level. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to wildfire hazards would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.9.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical studies, which are included as Appendix B and C, respectively, to this EIR Addendum.

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Fairway Canyon New School Site, Ninyo & Moore Geotechnical & Environmental Sciences Consultants, May 21, 2024
- Geological and Environmental Hazards Assessment Report Fairway Canyon Elementary School, PlaceWorks, February 2024
- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would include land uses that would have some utilization of and/or association with toxic and/or hazardous substances. The anticipated nature and quantity of materials utilized in the Specific Plan area would be typical of those common in commercial operations and residential uses. The Certified EIR determined that adherence to the policies, standards, and regulations of responsible entities would reduce the risk of impacts associated with hazardous materials to a less than significant level. The Proposed Project would result in the development of an elementary school campus within the boundaries of the Approved Project. All activities performed pursuant to the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the existing federal, state, and local regulations governing hazardous materials storage, handing, and management as with the Approved Project, including those associated with existing permits issued for development accommodated by the Specific Plan.

Furthermore, the project site is within the boundaries of the Approved Project and is in an area that has been previously graded and disturbed during development of the Approved Project. Therefore, the risk of encountering contaminated soils during the construction phase of the Proposed Project is very low. However, if contaminated soils are encountered during the Proposed Project's construction activities, health and safety procedures per the requirements of federal and state regulations, would be implemented. Because no demolition is proposed, workers would not be exposed to risks of asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) prepared for the project site, no evidence of asbestos containing material or lead based paint was observed during the property reconnaissance or during the review of the aerial photographs. Moreover, the Phase I ESA concluded that recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical RECs and controlled RECs were not observed in connection to the project site (Ninyo & Moore 2024). Also, the Proposed Project would not involve construction materials or practices that would create a greater hazard to the public or the environment compared to the Approved Project.

The Geological and Environmental Hazards Assessment Report (GEHA) prepared for the project site, did not identify significant hazards on-site apart from 10 large volume water pipelines located within 1,500 feet of the project site (PlaceWorks 2024a). The GEHA recommended a Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment be prepared to evaluate the potential flooding impacts to the project site. The findings of the Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment are discussed in Section 4.10 of this EIR Addendum.

During operation of the Proposed Project, activities that use or store hazardous materials are required to maintain records regarding the storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would adhere to all applicable federal and state regulations that govern hazardous materials and waste management would help to minimize reasonably foreseeable upsets or accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project entails the development of an elementary school campus within the boundaries of the Approved Project. It should be noted that two other school campuses were proposed within the boundaries of the Approved Project. The nearest school to the project site is Tournament Hills Elementary School located approximately 1.8 miles to the east within the boundaries of the Specific Plan area (within Planning Area 31A). The Proposed Project does not include elements or aspects that would create or otherwise result in hazardous emissions. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project.. The Phase I ESA prepared for the project site (Appendix B) included an environmental records review of the project site. According to the Phase I ESA, the project site is not listed on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government code Section 65962.5 (Ninyo & Moore 2024). No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The nearest airport to the project site is the Redlands Municipal Airport located approximately 11.0 miles north (Ninyo & Moore 2024). The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project. The Specific Plan area does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. The Proposed Project would not interfere with the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would comply with the design requirements of these plans. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ); however, the Approved Project would incorporate applicable fuel modifications and mitigation measures to decrease the risk of wildfires. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable fuel modifications and applicable Certified EIR mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts relate to wildfires; impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.9.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions.

- MM D.3.2A The project applicant shall design and implement a fuel modification program for the interface between developed and natural areas within and adjacent to the proposed project area. Such fuel modification plan shall be subject to approval by the **Riverside County City of Beaumont** Fire Department. The fuel modification program shall be achieved through graduated transition from native vegetation to irrigated landscape. The program shall also establish parameters for the percent, age, extent, and nature of native plant removal necessary to achieve the **County City of Beaumont Fire Department** fire prevention standards to protect human lives and property, while preserving as much natural habitat as practicable.
- MM D.3.2B All structures constructed within the Oak Valley SP #318 shall comply with the construction requirements of Riverside County <u>City of Beaumont</u> Ordinance 7871042, and shall be provided with fire-retardant roofing material as described in the Uniform Building Code.

### 4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### 4.10.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to hydrology and water quality identified in the Certified EIR.

- Flood Inundation. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is not within an identified flood hazard zone or dam inundation area. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in no impacts related to flooding. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to flooding would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.
- Drainage. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project was designed to adequately handle storm water flows generated by the 100-year storm, while respecting the existing on-site drainage patterns. The drainage plan for the Approved Project was designed, wherever possible to direct storm flows into managed channels or through corridors of open space. The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures, the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than that analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to drainage would be similar to those analyzed in the Certified EIR.

- Erosion. The Certified EIR determined that the soils within the Specific Plan area are highly erosive. Grading and earth disturbance during construction would expose soils and create erosion hazards. The Approved Project's construction impacts would be mitigated with erosion control measures and would be alleviated after construction and landscaping of the development is completed. Erosion control measures are a standard condition of grading operations within Riverside County. The Certified EIR determined that long-term impacts would be reduced by the replacement of existing land uses with urban uses, managed landscaping, and drainage improvements. Additionally, mitigation of existing erosion hazard at each development site within the Specific Plan area would involve control of runoff entering and generated within the Specific Plan area. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than that analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to erosion would be similar to the Certified EIR.
- Stormwater Runoff. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in an increased stormwater runoff rate due to terrain modification and the introduction of impermeable surfaces to the Specific Plan area. The Certified EIR stated that the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan was approved in concept by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures, impacts related to increased stormwater runoff rates would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than that analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to stormwater runoff rates would be similar to the Certified EIR.
- Water Quality. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces compared to existing conditions at that time. Storm runoff from the impermeable surfaces would contain pollutants typically associated with urban uses. The Certified EIR concluded that adherence to mitigation measures and incorporation of any standard conditions would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a less than significant level. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than that analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to water quality would be similar to the Certified EIR.
- **Groundwater Supply and Quality.** The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would decrease the amount of permeable surface area within the Specific Plan area, limiting the potential for infiltration, and affecting the amount of water entering underground water basins. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in a decrease in groundwater infiltration and may impact the quantity of local groundwater supplies. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts related to groundwater would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Additionally, although the 2022 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than that analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to groundwater would be similar to the Certified EIR.
- Groundwater Management. The Certified EIR identified that the San Gorgonia Pass Water Agency, Beaumont Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD) and the City of Beaumont entered into an agreement in 1993 to ensure cooperation in developing a long-term program to maintain safe groundwater management through the importation, use, and recharge, of supplemental water from the State Water Project and a 1994 agreement between BCVWD and the Yucaipa Valley Water District. The Certified EIR

concluded that the Approved Project with implementation of mitigation would not conflict with groundwater management.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

### 4.10.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix D to this EIR Addendum.

- Fairway Canyon TK-5 School Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment, PlaceWorks, August 2024
- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project is required to comply with the applicable federal, State, and local stormwater regulations. The Proposed Project's construction activities would be required to be implemented in accordance with the NPDES Construction General Permit for Storm Water Order No. 2022-057-DWQ. Compliance entails filing a Notice of Intent and preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifying BMPs that would be implemented as part of the project's construction phase to minimize pollution of stormwater prior to and during grading and construction. The Proposed Project would also be required to prepare an erosion and sediment control plan and implement BMPs to control erosion debris, and construction-related pollutants. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR and any standard conditions to reduce water quality impacts associated with erosive soils to a less than significant impact. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR.

The District is not regulated under the City municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit, and the Phase II Small MS4 permit for K-12 school districts and community colleges has not yet been issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). In the interim and as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project is required to comply with the post-construction performance standards under the Construction General Permit. Impacts would be less than significant.

Increasing the amount of on-site impervious surfaces would increase surface water runoff by reducing natural absorption into the soil. The Proposed Project would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project and would develop a use analyzed in the Certified EIR and allowed under the Specific Plan. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate mitigation measured identified in the Certified EIR to reduce impacts to groundwater quality to a less than significant level.
The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that development of the Approved Project would add impervious surfaces to a site that has the capability to recharge some runoff into the groundwater table. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project. Both the Approved Project and the Proposed Project are within the service area of the Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District (BCVWD), which has historically relied on groundwater resources for its sources of supply; however, this supply is supplemented with imported water from the State Water Project. The Proposed Project does not include a new use not analyzed in the Certified EIR. Additionally, the Proposed Project's development is within the scope of development identified in the Certified EIR. As with the Approved Project, BCVWD is anticipated to have sufficient water supplies for normal, single-dry, and multiple dry years to support the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable mitigation measures from the Certified EIR to ensure impacts on groundwater are reduced to less than significant levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project is within the Upper Santa Ana Valley – San Timoteo Groundwater Basin, which is identified as a low-priority basin (DWR 2024). According to the United States Geological Survey, most of the natural recharge for the basin occurs in the unlined streams and creeks within the San Bernardino Valley. Recharge also occurs in the flood control detention basins along the foothills. Both the Approved Project and the Proposed Project are not within a recharge area. The Proposed Project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
  - i. Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan would respect the existing onsite drainage pattern. The Proposed Project would not modify the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan. With respect to erosion and siltation on- or off-site, the Proposed Project, as with the Approved Project, would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit to control erosion and siltation impacts during the construction phase. Impacts would be less than significant.

It should be noted that the project site is currently graded and contains exposed dirt. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project is required to comply with the post-construction performance standards under the Construction General Permit. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would introduce impermeable surface on the project site and there would be no bare or disturbed soil that would be vulnerable to erosion or siltation. Areas within the project site would either be paved or landscaped or be developed with buildings or structures. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan would respect the existing onsite drainage pattern and would adequately handle the storm water flow generated by a 100-year storm. The Proposed Project does not include any modifications to the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to substantially alter the project site drainage pattern in a manner that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Nonetheless, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would implement the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to reduce impacts related to on- or off-site flooding. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impact than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project does not include any modifications to the Approved Project's Master Drainage Plan. The Approved Project's drainage system was designed to adequately handle storm water flows generated by the 100-uear storm, while respecting the Specific Plan area's drainage pattern. As identified in the Certified EIR, the drainage system for the Approved Project was designed to direct storm flows, where possible, into managed channels through corridors of open space. As with the Approved Project, storm water flows from the project site, would be directed into managed channels or through corridors. Flows from storm drains would outlet to grass lined channels, which were construction with the existing golf facilities, and would be conveyed to detention basins. It should be noted that a riparian channel adjacent to San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway would convey flows along the Specific Plan area's southern boundary. Additionally, large flows would spread into the riparian channel between San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway and the existing golf facility. The Proposed Project would not alter the Approved Project's storm drainage facilities. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable

mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to reduce impacts related to increased stormwater runoff rates.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project, including the project site, is not located within a flood hazard zone; this fact remains unchanged. As with the Approved Project, no impacts would occur under the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project, including the project site, is not within a flood hazard zone or dam inundation area; this fact remains unchanged. As discussed in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this EIR Addendum, PlaceWorks prepared the Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment, which included a pipeline flooding analysis. The results of the analysis are provided in Table 9, Street Flow.

Pipeline Diameter	Pipeline Location	Release Rate (cfs)	Street Width (ft)	Depth of Flow in Street (in)	Exceeds Street Carrying Capacity?1
12-inch (2)	Sorenstam Drive (2)	3.93	44	4.0	No
12-inch	Oumet Way	3.93	50	4.0	No
12-inch	Lyle Lane	3.93	33	3.9	No
12-inch	Stewart Street	3.93	33	4.0	No
12-inch	Brewer Drive	3.93	50	3.9	No
12-inch	Aaron Avenue	3.93	34	2.6	No
16-inch	Brewer Drive	6.98	50	3.3	No
16-inch	Aaron Avenue	6.98	34	3.1	No
18-inch	Brewer Avenue	8.84	50	3.6	No
18-inch	Aaron Avenue	8.84	34	3.4	No

Tabla 0	Stroot	FLOW

Assuming 6-inch curbing for residential and collector streets

Assuming a standard 6-inch curb for residential and collector streets, the water released from a full-flow rupture of any of the water mains would be entirely contained within the confines of the curbing and would not result in flooding at the project site. In summary, a potential break in any of the planned water pipelines located within 1,500 feet of the project site would not result in significant flooding at the project site. (PlaceWorks 2024b)

Additionally, the project site is not adjacent to coastal water or near any water storage facilities and is not located in proximity to water storage facilities. The Proposed Project would not be subject to inundation due to a tsunami or seiche.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Section 13000 [Water Quality] et seq., of the California Water Quality), and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act) require that comprehensive water quality control plans be developed for all waters within the State of California. The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Water quality information for the Santa Ana River watershed is contained in the Santa Ana Basin Plan (Basin Plan), most recently updated in June 2019.

The Basin Plan describes actions by RWQCB and others that are necessary to achieve and maintain the water quality standards. RWQCB regulates waste discharges to minimize and control their effects on the quality of the region's groundwater and surface water. Permits are issued under several programs and authorities. The terms and conditions of these discharge permits are enforced through a variety of technical, administrative, and legal means. RWQCB ensures compliance with the Basin Plan through its issuance of NPDES Permits, issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), and Water Quality Certifications pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA. With adherence to state and local water quality regulations, the proposed project's potential to generate pollutants and impact water quality during construction and operation would be less than significant. Development within the project site would not degrade water quality, cause the receiving waters to exceed the water quality objectives, or impair the beneficial use of receiving waters. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in water quality impacts that would conflict with the Santa Ana Basin Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Sustainable Ground Water Management Act requires local agencies to form groundwater sustainability agencies (GSA) for high and medium priority basins. GSAs develop and implement groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) to avoid undesirable results and mitigate overdraft within 20 years. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is within the Upper Santa Ana Valley San Timoteo Basin, which is identified as a low-priority basin by the DWR (DWR 2024). Preparation of a GSP is not required; therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not result in a conflict with the implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.10.3 Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions. Mitigation measure C.2.2D is not applicable as it has already been implemented by the master developer.

- MM C.2.1A The peak discharge of storm water from the Oak Valley SP #318 shall not exceed that which existed prior to project development unless flows are conveyed to an approved flood control facility which has capacity to accept such increased flows.
- MM C.2.2A Project grading shall implement erosion control measures. Drainage design measures incorporated into the final project design which would minimize long-term erosion impacts include (but are not limited to) the following:
  - Collection of runoff entering developing areas into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainage courses.
  - Capture of runoff above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas and conveyance to nearby drainage courses.
  - Conveyance of runoff generated on paved or covered areas via drains and swales to natural drainage courses.
  - Revegetation of disturbed areas and vegetation of non-disturbed but highly erosive areas.
  - Use of drought tolerant plants and irrigation systems which minimize runoff.
  - Use of other erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, concrete lining, small check dams, etc. to reduce erosion in gullies and active stream channels.
- MM C.2.2B Erosion control measures during the construction phase shall include (but are not limited to) the following:
  - Limit grading disturbance to essential project area.
  - Limit the extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rainfall, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rain on exposed soils.
  - Balance, to the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill.

- Divert water entering and existing the stie through the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.
- Spray water on disturbed areas to limit dust generation.
- MM C.2.2C Slopes exposed during grading and/or construction activities shall be revegetated or otherwise stabilized in a timely manner to prevent unnecessary siltation of streambeds and/or drainage facilities. Grading and/or construction contractors shall utilize silt fencing or other erosion control devices/equipment to limit the erosion of on-site soils.
- MM C.2.2E Construction and/or grading contractor(s) shall establish and implement a construction Storm
   Water Pollution Discharge Elimination System issue by the Regional Water Quality Control
   Board, Santa Ana Region. The NPDES permit will require the implementation of "Best
   Management Practices" (BMP) to minimize erosion during construction.
- MM C.2.3A Development within the Oak Valley SP #318 shall comply with applicable provisions of any NPDES permit and the applicable standards and regulation of other responsible agencies.
- MM C.2.4A Prior to final map approval, detailed drainage/hydrologic studies shall be prepared for review and approval by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District by the Beaumont Unified School District, demonstrating that each of the areas designated for residential, commercial, and the school development will be provided with adequate protection from storm water drainage per the <u>adopted</u> standards of the <u>County Flood</u> <u>Control District Division of State Architect</u>. Such studies shall also demonstrate that peak, post-development storm flows will be no greater than pre-development levels.
- MM C.2.4B All on-site flood control and drainage features shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner to prevent flooding hazards associated with a 100-year storm. Plans for all on-site flood control features shall be submitted to the Riverside Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review and approval.
- MM C.2.4C Drainage features such as grass lined channels and detention basins shall be maintained in a manner which maximizes the efficiency of these drainage facilities. Maintenance may include the control of vegetation and/or the installation of siltation control devices/equipment.
- MM C.2.4E On-site irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner as to avoid watering of impermeable surfaces.
- MM D.2.2C The following water conservation measures are recommended by the State Department of Water Resources for new development to be implemented where feasible in addition to the use of required water-efficient plumbing fixtures.
  - Interior

- Supply line pressure: Maintain interior water pressure no greater than 50 pounds per square inch (psi)
- Drinking fountains: Equip drinking fountains with self-closing valves.
- Hotel rooms: Post conservation reminders in rooms and restrooms. Install thermostatically controlled mixing valves in baths/showers.
- Restaurants: Use water-conserving models of dishwashers or spray emitters that have been designed for water conservation.
- Ultra-low-flush toilets: Install 1.5-gallon per flush toilets in new construction.
- Exterior
  - Landscape with low water-using plants, where feasible.
  - Limit use of lawn to lawn-dependent uses, such as playing fields. When lawn is used, use drought tolerant grasses.
  - Group plants of similar water use together to reduce over-irrigation of low-waterusing plants.
  - Use mulch extensively in landscaped areas to improve the water-holding capacity of the soil, reducing evaporation and soil compaction.
  - Install efficient irrigation systems that minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water that will reach the plant roots (e.g., drip irrigation, soil moisture sensors, and automatic irrigation systems) within parks, schools, and commercial area landscaping.
  - Grade slopes that runoff or surface water is minimized.

## 4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

## 4.11.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to land use and planning identified in the Certified EIR.

Divide an Established Community. The Certified EIR stated that the Specific Plan area is undeveloped and vacant, with scattered ranch structures and land uses surrounding the Specific Plan area, which include vacant lots to the north and west and scattered rural residential to the south. The Certified EIR determined that implementation of the Approved Project would not result in a physical division of an established community. Impacts were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to an established community would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

• Land Use Compatibility. The Certified EIR stated that the Approved Project was designed to be responsive to the land use categories specified in the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan and is consistent with the Beaumont General Plan. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to conflicts with an adopted land use plan, policy, or regulation would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.11.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

#### a) Physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not result in the physical division of an established community. The Proposed Project consists of the development of a 12.8-acre portion of the Specific Plan area with an elementary school campus. All improvements would occur within the confines of project site. The area surrounding the project site is part of the Specific Plan area, which is under construction. The Proposed Project would implement an anticipated and planned school use of the Approved Project and would facilitate the creation of a community through the provision of an elementary school for residents of the Specific Plan area. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would implement the Specific Plan within the boundaries of the Specific Plan area. Specifically, the Proposed Project consists of the development of an elementary school campus, which was a use that was analyzed in the Certified EIR and permitted and planned for in the Specific Plan. Although the Proposed Project's use was not specifically considered for development in Planning Area 20B of the Specific Plan, the City of Beaumont indicated that the Development Agreement adopted as a part of the Specific Plan allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan area.

Development of the Proposed Project would be implemented in a manner that is not detrimental to the Specific Plan area or its surrounding area. The Proposed Project has been designed and would be developed in accordance with all applicable development and design standards identified in the Specific Plan and in accordance with the District's standards. Compliance with the applicable development and design standards would be ensured through the District's development review process. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not result in a conflict with an adopted land use plan, policy, or regulation; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.11.3 Land Use and Planning Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to land use were identified in the Certified EIR.

## 4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

## 4.12.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to mineral resources identified in the Certified EIR.

Mineral Resources. A discussion of mineral resources was not required to be analyzed in the Certified EIR. Nevertheless, the Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is not located in an area with known mineral resources. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would have no impact on mineral resources. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to mineral resources would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.12.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

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

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The project site, as with the Approved Project, does not contain any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. As with the Approved Project, no impact would occur under the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The Proposed Project is designated and zoned as SP. As with the Approved Project, development of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.12.3 Mineral Resources Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to mineral resources were identified in the Certified EIR.

## 4.13 NOISE

## 4.13.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to noise identified in the Certified EIR.

- Construction Transportation Noise. The Certified EIR determined that during construction of the Approved Project, there would be a need to transport construction equipment and materials to the project site. Additionally, construction workers would commute on area roads to the project site. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not result in significant noise impacts due to transportation to construction site; impacts were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to construction traffic noise would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- On-Site Construction Noise. The Certified EIR determined that noise levels from grading and other construction activities for the Approved Project could range from up to 74 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at the closest unit within the adjacent mobile home community when construction occurs near the. Other than the mobile home community, the nearest residential uses are located more than 200 feet from I-10 and would not be affected. Development accommodated by the Approved Project would be required to comply with the County's noise ordinance construction hour restrictions. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although

the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to on-site construction noise would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

- Long-Term On-Site Stationary Noise. The long-term non-transportation noise impacts are primarily associated with stationary sources at the proposed commercial uses, which would generate noise from loading/unloading activities and other activities in the parking lot. These activities are point sources of noise that could affect noise sensitive receptors adjacent to the commercial areas. The Certified EIR concluded that no significant long-term noise impacts would occur from on-site stationary sources; impacts were determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to stationary noise would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Long-Term Off-Site Noise. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate 72,844 average daily trips, which would increase noise levels along area roadways. At buildout, project-related increase in noise levels would generally be less than 3 dBA, except along Cherry Valley Boulevard south of Desert Lawn Drive and along Champions Drive west of Desert Lawn. The Certified EIR concluded that no long-term significant impacts would occur off-site; impacts were determined be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to long-term off-site noise would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Ambient Noise. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would increase ambient noise levels in and around the project site and has the potential to expose sensitive land uses to traffic noise along I-10 and train noise adjacent to San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway. Additionally, the Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project could expose noise sensitive uses to high noise levels. The Certified EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce ambient noise impacts to less than significant levels. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of the annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to ambient noise levels would be the same as those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.13.2 Impact Associated with the Proposed Project

A background discussion on the noise regulatory setting and the noise modeling can be found in Appendix E.

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Following is a discussion of the Proposed Project's noise impacts form the construction and operational phases.

#### **Construction Noise Impacts**

Noise generated by on-site construction equipment is based on the type of equipment used, its location relative to sensitive receptors, and the timing and duration of noise-generating activities. Each phase of construction involves different types of equipment and has distinct noise characteristics. Noise levels from construction activities are typically dominated by the loudest three pieces of equipment. The dominant equipment noise source is typically the engine, although work-piece noise (such as dropping of materials) can also be noticeable.

The expected construction equipment mix was estimated and categorized by construction activity using the Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM). Average noise levels from project-related construction activities are calculated by modeling the three loudest pieces of equipment per activity phase. Equipment for grading and site preparation is modeled at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the acoustical center of the general construction site to the property line of the nearest receptors) because the area around the center of construction activities best represents the potential average construction-related noise levels at the various sensitive receptors for mobile equipment. Similarly, construction noise from demolition is modeled from the center of the project site. Building construction and architectural coating are measured from the edge of the proposed buildings to the nearest sensitive receptors. Additionally, paving is measured from the edge of the nearest noise receptors are summarized in Table 10, *Project-Related Construction Noise Levels.* As shown in the table, construction noise levels at a reference distance of 50 feet would range between 74 dBA and 85 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> throughout the construction period.

		Noise Levels in dBA L <sub>eq</sub>
Construction Activity Phase	RCNM Reference Noise Level	Residential Receptors to Northeast along Aaron Avenue
Distance in feet	50	<b>795</b> <sup>1</sup>
Site Preparation	85	61
Grading	85	61
Distance in feet	50	<b>680</b> <sup>1</sup>
Building Construction	80	57
Architectural Coating	74	51
Distance in feet	50	<b>470</b> <sup>1</sup>
Paving	80	61
Source: FHWA's RCNM software. Notes: dBA Leq = Energy-Average (Leq) Sour <sup>1</sup> Distances measured using Google Earth (2	nd Levels. 024) from the acoustical center of the pro	oject site.

Table 10 Project-Related Construction Noise Levels

The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site include single-family homes approximately 470 feet northeast of the project site boundary. Construction equipment mix is anticipated to be similar to that of the Approved Project and include concrete saws, dozers, excavators, tractors, loaders, backhoes, excavators, graders, forklifts, generators, welders, and air compressors, pavers and paving equipment, and rollers. The anticipated equipment was modeled using RCNM. Proposed Project construction noise levels would range between 51 dBA to 61 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> at the nearest sensitive receptors throughout the construction phase. Assuming a 15 dBA reduction

due to residential building facades with windows open condition, Proposed Project construction noise would be reduced to a range of 36 dBA to 46 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> at the interior spaces of the nearest noise sensitive uses.

Proposed Project construction activities would comply with the provisions of the City of Beaumont Code of Ordinances, Section 9.02.110(F)(1) and would not cause sound levels to exceed 55 dBA at any time in the interior of the nearest occupied residence. Additionally, Proposed Project construction would comply with the provisions of Section 9.02.110(F)(2) as no construction activities would be undertaken between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not exceed City noise standards for construction noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Mobile-Source Noise Impacts

The Proposed Project would generate an increase in total daily trips compared to existing daily trips along Sorenstam Drive. A project will normally have a significant effect on the environment related to traffic noise if it substantially increases the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. Most people can detect changes in sound levels of approximately 3 dBA under normal, quiet conditions, and changes of 1 to 3 dBA under quiet, controlled conditions. Changes of less than 1 dBA are usually indiscernible. A change of 5 dBA is readily discernible to most people in an outdoor environment. Noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL are normally unacceptable at sensitive receptor locations such as residences, schools, and noise environments in these areas would be considered degraded. Based on this, a significant impact would occur if the following traffic noise increases occur relative to the existing noise environment or exceed 65 dBA CNEL.

Traffic noise increases are calculated using a version of the FHWA RD-77-108 Traffic Noise Prediction Model. The traffic noise prediction model takes into account the following inputs: average daily traffic (ADT) volumes; vehicle mix; speeds; number of lanes; and day, evening, and night traffic splits. Model inputs associated with transportation noise were provided by the traffic analysis conducted by DJ&A for the Proposed Project (see Appendix F). Table 11 shows that with the addition of the Proposed Project, vehicle trips would result in an increase of up to 6 dBA over existing conditions. Existing land uses surrounding the project site include undeveloped land or land under construction. There are no existing noise sensitive receptors that would be exposed to project traffic noise level increases. Furthermore, with the addition of Proposed Project traffic, traffic noise levels along Sorenstam Drive would be up to 52 dBA CNEL at 50 feet from the centerline and would not exceed the land use compatibility threshold of 65 dBA CNEL for residential uses. Therefore, traffic noise impacts would be less than significant.

	Segment		Traffic Noise Increase in dBA CNEL		
Roadway	From	То	Existing No Project	Existing with Proposed Project	Increase
Sorenstam Drive	East of Lopez Lane	West of Lopez Lane	46	52	6
Sorenstam Drive	Lopez Lane	East of Lopez Lane	46	50	5

 Table 11
 Project-Related Increases in Traffic Noise, dBA CNEL at 50 Feet

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Parking Lot Noise Impacts

The residences located north of the project site at approximately 580 feet, along Aaron Avenue, could be exposed to noise due to vehicles idling, doors opening and closing, and voices in the driveways and parking areas of the project site. However, these activities would occur during the daytime for short periods of approximately 10 to 20 minutes during student drop-off in the morning and student pick-up midafternoon. Based on measurements conducted from a previous school project by PlaceWorks, during student drop-off at an elementary school for a similar project, the average noise level measured 55 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> at 40 feet. Accounting for the distance from the nearest school drop-off area to the nearest noise sensitive receptor (500 feet), school drop-off noise would be 33 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> at the nearest residential property line to the north and northeast of the project site. The Proposed Project's parking lot noise would be required to comply with the City of Beaumont Code of Ordinances Section 9.02.050, Noise Standards, and would not exceed daytime base ambient noise level standards of 55 dBA L<sub>eq</sub>. Therefore, parking lot noise impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Stationary Noise

The Proposed Project' would include rooftop heating, ventilation, and cooling (HVAC) equipment for the proposed school buildings. Rooftop HVAC units would generate noise levels of up to 74 dBA at 5 feet and due to distance attenuation would be reduced to 45 dBA at 135 feet (York 2006). The nearest residential receptors would be approximately 700 feet to the northeast from the nearest proposed school building. HVAC noise levels at the residential receptors to the northeast would be approximately 31 dBA for a single unit and approximately 40 dBA for up to eight units combined. Proposed Project HVAC noise would be required to comply with the City of Beaumont Code of Ordinances Section 9.02.050, Noise Standards, and would not exceed daytime or nighttime base ambient noise level standards of 55 dBA and 45  $L_{eq}$ , respectively. Therefore, no significant stationary noise changes to existing uses would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Exterior Noise Compatibility

The City's exterior noise compatibility standard for school uses is assumed to be up to 65 dBA CNEL (considered as 'normally acceptable'). The Proposed Project would primarily be affected by traffic on Sorenstam Drive, which borders the project site to the southeast. As shown in Table 10, traffic noise levels along Sorenstam Drive would be 52 dBA CNEL at a distance of 50 feet. The nearest play area (soccer field) would be as close as 80 feet to the Sorenstam Drive centerline and the nearest school building would be over 300 feet to the centerline. At these distances, Sorenstam Drive traffic noise levels would be 49 dBA CNEL at the nearest proposed playfield and less than 40 dBA CNEL at the nearest school building. The exterior noise levels at the proposed play area and school buildings would not exceed the normally acceptable land use compatibility standard of 65 dBA CNEL for school uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Potential vibration impacts associated with development projects are usually related to the use of heavy construction equipment during the demolition phase of construction. Construction can generate varying degrees of ground vibration depending on the construction procedures and equipment. Construction equipment generates vibration that spreads through the ground and diminishes with distance from the source. The effect on buildings in the vicinity of the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The effects from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches levels that can damage structures.

For reference, a peak particle velocity of 0.20 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) is used as the limit for nonengineered timber and masonry buildings (which would apply to the off-site surrounding residential structures) (FTA 2018). Table 12 shows typical construction equipment vibration levels and reference vibration levels at a distance of 25 feet. of the project site. The closest residential buildings to the project site are approximately 470 feet northeast. At 25 feet, as shown in Table 12, construction vibration levels would be up to 0.002 in/sec PPV or less.

Equipment	Reference Levels at 25 Feet	Residential Receptors to Northeast at 500 feet	
Vibratory Roller	0.21	0.002	
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.001	
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.001	
Small Bulldozer	0.003	<0.001	

 Table 12
 Vibration Impact Levels for Typical Construction Equipment

Note: PPV in/sec = peak particle velocity in seconds

As shown in Table 12, typical construction equipment, aside from vibratory rollers, produce vibration levels of less than 0.2 in/sec PPV at 25 feet. Assuming construction would occur along the project site boundary, the nearest structure to the proposed construction activities would be approximately 500 feet northeast of the project site. Vibration levels attributable to a vibratory roller would attenuate to approximately 0.003 in/sec PPV at a distance of 500 feet. The City of Beaumont does not have an established threshold for assessing construction vibration impacts. The Federal Transportation Administration's (FTA) maximum acceptable vibration impacts from project construction-related activities. Due to the distance to the nearest structure to the project site, construction vibration levels would not exceed the FTA threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV at uses near the project site. Therefore, vibration impacts from construction would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

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

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The nearest airport to the Approved Project was Redlands Municipal Airport approximately 11.0 miles northwest of the project site. This fact remains under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.13.3 Noise Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

There were no noise mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR that are applicable to the Proposed Project.

## 4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

## 4.14.1 Summary of Impact Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to population and housing identified in the Certified EIR.

- Population Growth. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate 11,311 persons and was determined to be within the population projections identified for the Western Riverside County Subregion. The Approved Project would include the construction and installation of infrastructure and public facilities including local and residential streets, utility infrastructure, neighborhood parks, and schools (two elementary schools and one junior high school). The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts on official regional or local population projections. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to population growth would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Housing. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area is vacant and undeveloped with remnants of past ranching activities including ranch facilities. The Approved Project would result in the development of 4,355 residential units within the Specific Plan area. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Approved Project would contain residential development with lot sizes and densities that are similar to or compatible with land uses in the surrounding planned, approved, or built projects. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not displace housing; impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum concluded that although the area of annexation is larger than what was analyzed in the Certified EIR, impacts related to housing would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.14.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

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

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project entails the construction of an elementary school campus and would not introduce additional housing units or additional infrastructure facilities to the Specific Plan area. The Proposed Project would support the planned population anticipated for the Specific Plan area. As with the Approved Project, the

Proposed Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area either directly or indirectly; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Certified EIR did not identify any housing within the Specific Plan area, including the project site, other than scattered ranch facilities. The project site is undeveloped and graded and does not contain any housing. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would not displace any existing people or housing, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the Proposed Project no impacts would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.14.3 Population and Housing Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to population and housing were identified in the Certified EIR.

## 4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

## 4.15.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to public services identified in the Certified EIR.

- Fire Protection. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would create an urban planned community that is located beyond the desired maximum distance of three miles from the nearest fire facility. The Certified EIR identified that the Riverside County Fire Department would provide fire protection services to the Approved Project. The Certified EIR concluded that with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on fire protection services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Police Protection. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate a population (12,970 persons) that would result in a substantial effect on the ability of police protection services. The Certified EIR identified that the Riverside County Sheriff's Department would provide police protection

services to the Approved Project. The Certified EIR concluded that with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts on police protection services would be less than significant. Additionally, the 2002 EIR Addendum identified that following annexation of the Approved Project, the area would be served by the City of Beaumont Police department. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on police protection services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

- Schools. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate an estimated 1,441 elementary school students, 371 junior high school students, and 590 high school students based on the District's generation factors. The Approved Project identified three school sites within the Specific Plan area. The Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project's proponent entered into an agreement with the District and that implementation of the agreement is considered to be mitigation in full for impacts on school facilities. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts on schools would be less than significant. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on schools would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR
- Parks and Recreation. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate a population of approximately 9,718 people and generate an incremental need for local and regional parkland. The Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project would provide park and recreational facilities within the Specific Plan area, which would be used by the Approved Project's residents and others in the project vicinity. The Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project would incorporate regional multi-purpose trail in its design. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Libraries. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in an increase in the area's population and community demand for library services. The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures impacts would be less than significant. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts on library services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.15.2 Impact Associated with the Proposed Project

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

#### a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project would occur within the Specific Plan area boundaries analyzed in the Certified EIR. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school use, which is a use that was analyzed in the Certified EIR and allowed by and planned for in the Specific Plan. The Proposed Project is anticipated to serve 850 elementary school students, which is within the project site was not specifically analyzed in the Certified EIR for elementary school students. Although the project site was not specifically analyzed in the Certified EIR to be developed with the school use, the Development Agreement allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would implement applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to reduce the need for fire protection services. Specifically, the District would be required to pay applicable fire protection mitigation fees. Additionally, development of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction and building design. As with the Approved Project, with implementation of mitigation measures impacts under the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus. Although the project site was not identified as a school site in the Certified EIR, the Development Agreement allows for the transfer of land uses within the Specific Plan. The Proposed Project would serve 850 elementary school students, which is within the projected student population identified in the Certified EIR. The Proposed Project would not result in the need for new or additional police services or facilities. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would implement applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to reduce the need for police protection services. Specifically, the District would pay appliable police protection mitigation fees. As with the Approved Project, with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts under Proposed Project conditions would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### c) Schools?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project does not include a use that would generate a population. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus that would serve the projected student population within the Specific Plan area. Although the project site was not specifically analyzed in the Certified EIR to be developed with a school use, the Development Agreement allows for the transfer of land uses within

the Specific Plan. Additionally, the Approved Project's proponent for the Specific Plan has an existing agreement with the District (dated December 19, 1989), which is still valid and is grandfathered as a result of State law. As with the Approved Project, implementation of this agreement is considered to be mitigation in full for impacts on school facilities; impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### d) Parks?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The Proposed Project does not include a use that would directly generate a population. The Proposed Project would serve the educational needs of the residential population within and surrounding the Specific Plan area. See response to Section 4.16.a below. As substantiated in this section, the Proposed Project would not result in any impact on parks.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### e) Other public facilities?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Demand for library services is generated by the population within a library's service area. The Proposed Project would not directly increase population in the project site and would not create a demand for library services. The Proposed Project would serve the projected student population for the Approved Project. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.15.3 Public Services Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions.

MM D.3.1.A The project applicant shall be required to pay established fire protection mitigation fees that are used by the <u>City of Beaumont</u> Fire Department to construct new fire protection facilities or provide facilities in lieu of the fee as approved by the <u>County of Riverside</u> <u>City of Beaumont</u> Fire Department.

- MM D.3.2.B All structures constructed within the Oak Valley SP #318 shall comply with the construction requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 787City of Beaumont Ordinance No. 1154, and shall be provided with fire-retardant roofing materials as described in the Uniform Building Code.
- MM D.4.1A The project applicant shall be required to pay the County Sheriff's <u>City of Beaumont</u> established development mitigation fee prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy on any structure for each Phase as they are developed. The fees are for the acquisition and construction of public facilities.

## 4.16 RECREATION

## 4.16.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to recreation identified in the Certified EIR.

Parks. The Certified EIR determined that the residential portion of the Approved Project would increase the demand for parkland. The Certified EIR identified that the Approved Project would be required to provide 31.4 acres of parkland. The Approved Project proposed 38.0 acres of parkland resulting in a surplus of 6.6 acres. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to parks would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.16.2 Impact Associated with the Proposed Project

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

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project does not include a use that would directly result in population growth, which would increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. The Proposed Project's elementary school use is anticipated to serve the residents of the Approved Project. The Proposed Project is anticipated to serve approximately 850 students, which is within the projected elementary school student population analyzed in the Certified EIR. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project would feature a number of onsite amenities that would serve the school's student population, which include playfields, hardcourts, and play structures. The Proposed Project would not involve any construction of recreational facilities beyond what is proposed to serve the school's student population. The Proposed Project's implementation does to propose or require construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities in the City and would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project boundaries. The physical impacts associated with construction of the Approved Project was analyzed in the Certified EIR. Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in no impacts.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.16.3 Recreation Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

There are no mitigation measures related to recreation identified in the Certified EIR that are applicable to the Proposed Project.

## 4.17 TRANSPORTATION

## 4.17.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to transportation identified in the Certified EIR.

- Level of Service (LOS) Without Project Conditions. The Certified EIR examined 35 intersections and the Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would have less than significant impacts at 7 intersections. A total of 28 intersections were forecasted to fall below the minimum LOS standards under build-out plus project conditions in one or both peak hours. The Certified EIR determined that implementation of the recommended intersection improvements would result in the minimum LOS standards being maintained at 22 of the 35 study area intersections. Feasible mitigation measures were not available to improve operations to applicable LOS standards at the following intersections:
  - Singleton Road/Woodhouse Road
  - Singleton Road/I-10 Westbound Ramps
  - Singleton Road/Calimesa Boulevard
  - Cherry Valley Boulevard/Desert Lawn Drive
  - Cherry Valley Boulevard/Calimesa Boulevard
  - Beaumont Avenue/Brookside Avenue
  - Champions Drive/San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway

- 14th Street/I-10 Eastbound Ramps
- Beaumont Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps
- Beaumont Avenue/6<sup>th</sup> Street
- Potrero Boulevard/San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway
- Singleton Road/San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway

The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to LOS without project conditions would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

- Level of Service (LOS) With Project Conditions. The Certified EIR determined that a total of two roadway segments were determined to fall below the minimum LOS standards under build out plus project conditions in the evening peak hour. These intersections include Singleton Road between the I-10 Ramps and Potrero Boulevard between San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway and Champions Drive. The Certified EIR determined that to achieve applicable LOS standards for these roadway segments, intersection geometrics would need to be constructed over and above what would normally be provided as part of General Plan implementation. The Certified EIR concluded that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to LOS under Approved Project conditions would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- **Circulation System.** The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project proposes to delete the extension of Potrero Boulevard between San Timoteo Canyon Road/Oak Valley Parkway and Champions Drive from the future circulation system. In the absence of that road link, traffic would be diverted to other routes and intersections. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would implement recommended intersection improvements that would reduce traffic impacts. However, the Certified EIR identified that due to potentially problematic mitigation measures, full mitigation to improve operations would not be provided. The Certified EIR concluded that impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Additionally, although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.17.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix F to this EIR Addendum.

Fairway Elementary School Traffic Study, DJ&A, P.C., June 17, 2024

## a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus, which is a use that was analyzed in the Certified EIR and allowed under the Approved Project. The Proposed Project would serve the residents of the Approved Project. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate 72,844 average daily trips. The Proposed Project would not increase the number of residents projected for the Approved Project and would not increase the student population generated by the Approved Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to increase the average daily trips for the Approved Project than what was projected in the Certified EIR.

According to the traffic study prepared by DJ&A for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would generate a total of 1,930 weekday trips with 629 peak morning trips at the project site (Appendix D). Because the Proposed Project is within the boundaries of the Approved Project and includes a use that was analyzed in the Certified EIR, the Proposed Project's trips are encapsulated in the average daily trips calculated for the Approved Project.

It should be noted that the Proposed Project includes a long on-site pick-up and drop-off that extends the full length between the four proposed driveways. This pick-up/drop-off area is proposed to accommodate these activities on the school site and to minimize vehicle queuing onto future Oumet Way. Additionally, the Proposed Project would comply with the City's roadway design standards, which are published by the County of Riverside, which requires that any non-residential driveway be located at least 150 feet from the flowline of an intersecting street. All four project driveways are proposed to be located beyond the 150-foot minimum distance from intersecting street located to the west and southeast of the project site. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this standard.

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the project site would be permitted via future Oumet Way, with street crossing opportunities at the intersection of future Oumet Way and Sorenstam Drive and Oumet Way and the future unnamed roadway that borders the northwest corner of the project site. Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Oumet Way. No striped bicycle lanes are proposed on Oumet Way or Sorenstam Drive. Designated crossing locations at both intersections would include striped crosswalks and signage indicating crossing locations, consistent with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 11<sup>th</sup> Edition. Moreover, no existing or planned public transit services provide connections to the project site.

In summary, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision(b)?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Natural Resources Agency revised Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to include a checklist item relating to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in December 2018. The Certified EIR was certified before the VMT checklist topic was added to the CEQA Guidelines and therefore does not include a discussion related to VMT.

The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate 72,844 trips. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in an increase in the number of vehicles or truck trips compared to the Approved Project because the Proposed Project does not include a use not analyzed in the Certified EIR and is within the intensity of development analyzed in the Certified EIR. Moreover, as part of the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Guidelines, local serving schools, such as the Proposed Project, are identified as not creating significant impacts related to VMT and can be excluded from VMT Analysis. The Proposed Project would not result in an increase in VMT compared to the Approved Project. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Approved Project includes a circulation plan that would reduce the potential for circulation conflicts both on- and off-site. Development of the project site has been factored into the traffic analysis for the Certified EIR. Additionally, according to the traffic study prepared for the Proposed Project, all four proposed driveways would provide sufficient driveway sight distance. There are no significant horizontal curves proposed along future Oumet Way in the vicinity of the Proposed Project driveway locations. Impacts related to traffic hazards due to a geometric design feature would not occur. The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR.

The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus. Although the Certified EIR did not specifically analyze the project site, the Development Agreement allows for the transfer of uses within the Specific Plan area. Moreover, the Proposed Project would not introduce an incompatible use to the area as the surrounding area is planned for residential uses; the Proposed Project would introduce a use that would serve the Approved Project's residents. No impact related to incompatible uses would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Approved Project's circulation plan provides emergency access and access to nearby uses. The Approved Project's circulation plan was designed to be responsive to the needs of the community to provide unimpeded access for emergency vehicles to and within the Specific Plan area. Development of the project site with the Proposed Project would not result in changes to the circulation plan that would result in inadequate emergency access and would meet the standards of the City for access points and roadway design.

Additionally, the Proposed Project would be subject to review by the Division of the State Architect (DSA), who oversee design and construction for K-12 schools. Specifically, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with all design standards established by DSA including Policy 07-03, "Fire Department and Emergency Access Roadways and School Drop-Off Areas." The purpose of this policy is to establish requirements based on State Fire Marshal Regulations contained in Titles 19 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the California Vehicle Code for fire and emergency access roadways on public school or community college campuses, including fire and emergency access roadways combined with student drop-off and pick-up areas.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety requirements from the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City. Adherence to these codes and standards is ensured through DSA's development review process; thereby ensuring the proposed access and circulation improvements meet all applicable regulations and standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## 4.17.3 Transportation Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

There are no mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR that are applicable to the Proposed Project.

## 4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

## 4.18.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts related to tribal cultural resources were not analyzed in the Certified EIR because the topic was not officially part of the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G checklist until January 1, 2019, when the Natural Resources Agency updated Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the analysis of tribal cultural resources impact is new in this Addendum. However, the Certified EIR indicated that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.18.2 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

## a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), requires the lead agency to consult with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project prior to the release of negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project. This requirement applies to all projects on or after July 1, 2015. Because this is an Addendum to the Certified EIR, the notification and consultation for tribal cultural resources (TCR) requirements pursuant to PRC Code Section 21080.3.1 does not apply to the Proposed Project and no tribal consultation was required or performed.

Additionally, the Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area has the potential to contain culturally significant resources. The Certified EIR concluded that with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, impacts to these resources would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would occur within the boundaries of the Approved Project and the project site is mass graded for development. Although the project site is mass graded, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable mitigation measures related to cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

**No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** As stated in Section 4.18.a.i above, the notification and consultation requirements pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1 do not apply to the Proposed Project because this is an Addendum to the Certified EIR. Additionally, the project site has been mass graded for development. The Proposed Project would not adversely impact any of the resources criteria outlined in PRC Section 5024.1. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.18.3 Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to tribal cultural resources were outlined in the Certified EIR.

## 4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

## 4.19.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

The following summarizes the Approved Project's environmental impacts related to utilities and service systems identified in the Certified EIR.

- Water. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project is partially within the sphere of influence of BCVWD and would include installation of off-site water and sewer distribution system improvements within existing roadways and other low impact rights-of-way in compliance with applicable policies of the responsible water/sewer agency and the city or county agency within which the improvement is located. Project implementation would increase water demand and would require the provision of a water system capable of delivering 1,643 gallons per minute to meet Average Daily Demand and up to a Peak Hourly Demand of 5,257 gallons per minute. The Approved Project, at build out, would demand approximately 2,652 acre-feet per year of water within a groundwater basin that was in a state of overdraft at the time the Certified EIR was prepared. Specific to the proposed school uses, the Certified EIR determined that the 40.0 acres of school use would demand an average of 57 gallons per minute, maximum day demand of 129 gallons per minute, a peak demand of 183 gallons per minute, and average daily demand of 92 acrefeet per year (1.43 gallon per min per acre). The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to water services would be less than significant. The 2002 EIR Addendum indicated that the annexation of the Specific Plan area into the BCVWD service area would be adequately served by BCVWD and the State Water Project. The ultimate water service to the Approved Project would be a combination of imported water from the State Water Project and locally derived groundwater sources. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, the 2002 EIR Addendum indicated that impacts on water services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Sewer. The Certified EIR determined that the Specific Plan area is not served by a sewer system and would require the addition of infrastructure to the City of Beaumont sewer trunk line system and increase wastewater disposal needs. The Approved Project would require the addition of sewer lines and associated facilities capable of conveying an additional 2.412 cubic feet per second Average Daily Flow and a Peak Flow of 5,363 cubic feet per second. The flow created by the Approved Project would require the City to expand the wastewater treatment plant that would serve the Approved Project from its capacity of 1.5 million gallons per day to just under 3.0 million gallons per day. The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to wastewater services would be less than significant. The 2002 EIR Addendum indicated that the Specific Plan area would be annexed into the City of Beaumont, which would provide sewer services to the Approved Project. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, the

2002 EIR Addendum indicated that impacts on sewer services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

- Solid Waste. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would generate 64.0 tons of solid waste per year at build out. Solid waste generated by the Approved Project would be transported to the Lamb Canyon Landfill, which is operated by Riverside County. The Certified EIR concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant. The 2002 EIR Addendum determined that the Specific Plan area would be removed from the Riverside County Waste Management District and would be annexed into the City of Beaumont; solid waste refuse collection and hauling services would be provided by Waste Management, Inc. as a part of a franchise agreement with the City and would continue to be hauled to the Lamb Canyon Landfill. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, the 2002 EIR Addendum indicated that impacts related to solid waste would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.
- Energy Resources, Natural Gas, and Telecommunication. The Certified EIR determined that the Approved Project would result in the conversion of agricultural lands to urban land uses resulting in an increased demand for energy resources. The projected energy demand levels were not anticipated to exceed the requirements for similar urban development. The Approved Project would be served by Southern California Edison for electricity services, Southern California Gas Company for natural gas services, and General Telephone for phone services. These utilities are available to the Specific Plan area and these services at the time contractual agreements are made. The Approved Project would be implemented, through conditions applied to the Approved Project, in accordance with the building standards set forth in Title 20 and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The Certified EIR determined that service providers have indicated an ability to serve the Approved Project without significantly affecting the provision of energy resources. The 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a larger area as a result of the proposed annexation; however, Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas Company, and General Telephone would continue to provide services to the Approved Project. Although the 2002 EIR Addendum analyzed a slightly larger area than identified in the Certified EIR, the 2002 EIR Addendum indicated that impacts related to energy, natural gas, and telephone services would be similar to those identified in the Certified EIR.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.19.2 Impact Associated with the Proposed Project

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Following is a discussion of the Proposed Project's potential impacts on water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities.

#### Water

The Proposed Project includes development of the approximately 12.8-acre project site with an elementary school campus. The Proposed Project would not introduce a new land use not analyzed in the Certified EIR and would not exceed the anticipated total school acreage analyzed in the Certified EIR. The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the Approved Project's utility plan including the Approved Project's potable water plan. The Certified EIR determined that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, there is adequate capacity within the planned and existing water facilities to serve the Approved Project and Proposed Project. Additionally, the Proposed Project would incorporate applicable mitigation measures from the Certified EIR to ensure impacts remain less than significant.

No changes to proposed construction activities would occur under the Proposed Project; the project site was previously mass graded in anticipation of future development under the Specific Plan. As such, no changes to the temporary demand for water and the associated demand for water infrastructure during construction would occur under the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Wastewater

The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the Approved Project's utility plan, including the Approved Project's master sewer plan. The Certified EIR and 2002 EIR Addendum determined that with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR, there is adequate capacity within the planned and existing wastewater facilities to serve the Approved Project and Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would incorporate applicable mitigation measures from the Certified EIR to ensure impacts remain less than significant.

No changes to proposed construction activities would occur under the Proposed Project; the project site was previously mass graded in anticipation of future development under the Specific Plan. As such, no changes to wastewater flows and the demand for wastewater infrastructure during construction would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Stormwater Infrastructure

The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the Approved project's utility plan, including the Approved Project's master storm drainage plan. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the standard conditions and applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR. The Approved Project's storm water system was designed to adequately handle storm water flows generated by the 100-year storm. The Proposed Project's storm water system would be designed and constructed in accordance with the Approved Project's master storm drainage plan. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Specific Plan and would not require changes to the Approved Project. No substantial changes are proposed to the Approved Project or have occurred within the development area covered by the Specific Plan

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

#### Energy, Natural Gas, and Telecommunication

The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus with a similar intensity and density analyzed in the Certified EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be served by Southern California Edison for electricity services, Southern California Gas Company for natural gas services, and either Frontier Communications or Spectrum (Charter Communications) for phone services. The Proposed Project would not introduce a new use not analyzed in the Certified EIR. Further, as with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with energy efficiency standards set forth by Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and Appliance Efficiency Regulations. The Proposed Project would also comply with CALGreen requirements related to energy and water conservations; these measures would decrease electricity and gas consumption. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to operate less efficiently than the Approved Project.

The Certified EIR assumed the Approved Project's land uses (residential, commercial, schools, and parks) would consume natural gas. The Proposed Project may require Southern California Gas Company connections. The utility infrastructure improvements to be implemented with the Proposed Project area assessed as part of the Proposed Project and analyzed throughout this Addendum. Furthermore, construction activities associated with this infrastructure would be required to comply with the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Since the certification of the Certified EIR, the Specific Plan area was annexed into the BCVWD service are and the City of Beaumont. BCVWD would provide water services to the Approved Project and Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes development of the approximately 12.8-acre project site with an elementary school campus. The Proposed Project would not introduce a new land use not analyzed in the Certified EIR and would not exceed the anticipated total school acreage analyzed in the Certified EIR. The Proposed Project would not result in an increase in water demand that would require the construction or relocation of new or expanded water systems. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the City's Landscape Standards (Chapter 17.06, *Landscape Standards*), which includes water-efficient landscape requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus; the Proposed Project would be consistent with the development assumptions in the Certified EIR. As with the Approved Project, wastewater generated by the Proposed Project would be treated at the Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant would have adequate capacity to receive and treat wastewater generated by the Proposed Project, and existing commitments. The Proposed Project would implement the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to ensure impacts related to sewer service/wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the development assumptions in the Certified EIR. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would generate solid waste during construction and operation from the proposed elementary school campus. Waste Management Inc. would provide waste hauling services to the Approved Project and Proposed Project. As with the Approved Project, the primary landfill serving the disposal needs for the City of Beaumont is Lamb Canyon Landfill that currently has a remaining capacity to accept

waste through the year 2032 (CalRecycle 2024). Based on available capacities of the existing landfill, adequate capacity is available to serve the solid waste needs of the Proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

## e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Similar to the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), and CALGreen standards. Additionally, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 1989) primarily guides solid waste management in the State and emphasizes resource conservation through reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste. AB 939 establishes an integrated waste management hierarchy consisting of (in order of priority): 1) source reduction; 2) recycling and composting; and 3) environmentally safe transformation and land disposal. In addition to AB 939, Senate Bill 1374 requires that the Proposed Project implement a construction waste management plan to recycle and/or salvage a minimum of 75 percent of non-hazardous construction debris. The Proposed Project would comply with the applicable regulations associated with solid waste, including AB 939 and SB 1374. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 4.19.3 Utilities and Service Systems Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

The following mitigation measures are taken directly from the Certified EIR and apply to and will be implemented for the Proposed Project. Where necessary, mitigation measures have been updated, refined, and/or supplemented to ensure mitigation is implemented as intended for the Proposed Project. Any changes to mitigation measures are identified here in strikeout text to indicate deletions and <u>underline bold</u> text to signify additions.

Certified EIR MM D.2.2A, MM D.2.2.B, MM D.2.2.C, and MM C.4.2.A shall apply

- MM D.7.1.A The developer shall coordinate solid waste disposal requirements with <u>County City of</u> <u>Beaumont</u> agencies and area waste haulers to ensure that adequate landfill capacity is available within a reasonable distance of the proposed project.
- MM D.7.1.B The project applicant shall coordinate with a certified waste hauler to develop curbside collection of recyclable materials within the proposed project on a common schedule as set

forth in <u>County</u> <u>City of Beaumont</u> Resolution. The applicant shall coordinate with the permitted refuse hauler to identify which materials may be collected for recycling and on what schedule.

MM D.7.1.C All future commercial, school and multi-family residential development within the project site shall comply with AB 1327. Chapter 18, California Solid Waste Resue and Recycling Access Act of 1991. The law requires the provision of adequate area for collecting and loading recyclable materials. Prior to the issuance of building permits commencement of construction, the applicant Beaumont Unified School District shall submit prepared a site plan which includes the final design for recyclable collection and storage area to the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District for review and approval. The storage area for recyclable materials shall comply with County City of Beaumont standards.

## 4.20 WILDFIRE

## 4.20.1 Summary of Impacts Identified in the Certified EIR

Impacts related to wildfire were not analyzed in the Certified EIR because the topic of wildfire was not officially part of the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G until January 1, 2019, when the Natural Resources Agency updated Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the analysis of wildfire impact is new in this Addendum.

There have been neither changes in the project nor circumstances, nor has there been any new information that has arisen since the certification of the Certified EIR that would require additional environmental review or preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

## 4.20.2 Impact Associated with the Proposed Project

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

Since the certification of the Certified EIR, the Specific Plan area is no longer identified as being within a hazardous high fire area. A State Responsibility Area (SRA) is an area where the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire) is the primary emergency response agency responsible for fire suppression and prevention (Cal Fire 2024a). The project site is not within an SRA nor is the project site identified in an area classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) by Cal Fire (Cal Fire 2024b, Beaumont 2020). The nearest lands within an SRA and classified as a VHFHSZ are located approximately 0.4-mile south of the project site on the opposite side of Oak Valley Parkway. (Cal Fire 2024, Beaumont 2020).

#### a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries analyzed for the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. The Approved Project was not identified as an emergency facility nor was the Approved Project identified as an emergency evacuation route by the City's General Plan Safety Element (Beaumont 2020). The primary emergency operation center

(EOC) for the City is at the Albert A Chatigny Recreation Center located at 1310 Oak Valley Parkway and the alternate EOC location is Beaumont City Call located at 550 E 6<sup>th</sup> Street (Beaumont 2019). The primary and alternate EOCs are located 5.0 miles east and 4.5 miles southeast, respectively, of the project site. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus. The proposed school use is not anticipated to substantially impair the City's adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries analyzed for the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. The project site is not located in proximity to steep slopes where high winds can exacerbate winds. The areas immediately surrounding the project site are proposed to be developed with residential uses in accordance with the Approved Project. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with an elementary school campus. Additionally, no wildlands exist within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks, thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

c) Require the installation of maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The Proposed Project is within the boundaries analyzed for the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. The Certified EIR determined that the installation of associated infrastructure to support the Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation. The Proposed Project would result in the development of the project site with an elementary school campus. As with the Approved Project, the Proposed Project would be served by Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas Company, Frontier Communications or Spectrum (Charter Communications) (telecommunication), BCVWD for potable water services, and the City of Beaumont for wastewater services. The Proposed Project would connect to the Approved Project's planned utility lines. The Proposed Project does not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure including roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or utilities that may exacerbate fire risk or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
#### 4. Environmental Analysis

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The project site is within Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard, as identified by the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) (FEMA 2008). The project site is fully graded and relatively flat. Additionally, the project site is not located in proximity to steep slopes or natural drainage courses. The project site and surrounding area is graded and relatively flat. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to significant risks including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

### 4.20.3 Wildfire Mitigation Measures Identified in the Certified EIR

No mitigation measures related to wildfire were identified in the Certified EIR as the evaluation of wildfire impacts was not required at the time the Certified EIR was prepared.

## 4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

### 4.21.1 Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. All applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to avoid and reduce impacts have been integrated into the Proposed Project and with these mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment. The Proposed Project would not significantly affect fish or wildlife habitat or species. The project site is disturbed, graded and mostly devoid of sensitive biological resources.

Additionally, with respect to cultural resources, all applicable mitigation measures identified in the Certified EIR to avoid and reduce impacts have been integrated into the Proposed Project and with these mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project site is disturbed, graded, and mostly devoid of cultural resources.

#### 4. Environmental Analysis

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project.)

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. A cumulative impact would occur if the Proposed Project would result in an incrementally considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact in consideration of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future project for each resource area. As demonstrated in this Addendum, any construction or operational-related impacts would either be less than significant or mitigated to a less than significant level and there would be no long-term significant operational impacts.

The Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As demonstrated in this Addendum, the Proposed Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than those identified in the Certified EIR. Consequently, the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under the criteria in Sections 15162(a) and 15163(a).

# 5. Findings

As indicated in this Addendum, the impacts of the Proposed Project have already been adequately identified and addressed in the Certified EIR, and no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require major revisions to the Certified EIR. Analysis of the Proposed Project shows that there are no new significant environmental effects and no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Impacts beyond those identified in the Certified EIR would not be expected to occur as a result of the Proposed Project, which would still be subject to all applicable, previously required mitigation measures from the Certified EIR. The proposed project would not result in any new information of substantial importance that would have new, more severe impacts, new mitigation measures, or new or revised alternatives from what was identified in the Certified EIR.

Based on the record as a whole, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts not previously studied in the Certified EIR, and accordingly, the project changes would not result in any conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162. Thus, a subsequent EIR is not required for the changes to the project, and the District adopts this Addendum to the Oak Valley and SCPGA Specific Plan No.318/EIR No. 418 in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164.

### 5. Findings

This page intentionally left blank.

# 6. List of Preparers

## 6.1 BEAUMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ana Gonzalez, Director of Facilities Planning

## 6.2 PLACEWORKS

Malia Durand, Associate Principal (Principal in Charge) Jorge Estrada, Senior Associate (Project Manager) Christhi Mrosla, Associate Chris Shields, Senior Associate, Noise Emily Parka, Associate, Air Quality and GHG Cary Nakama, Graphic Artist

### 6. List of Preparers

This page intentionally left blank.

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2023, May. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmentalquality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines.
- City of Beaumont (Beaumont). 2019. City of Beaumont Emergency Operations Plan. https://bof.fire.ca.gov/media/bq1ff4hw/rpc-3-l-iv-city-of-beaumont-emergency-operations-plansupplemental.docx.

——. 2020. City of Beaumont General Plan Update. https://beaumontca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/36923/Beaumont-GPU\_Final-rev-22521.

—. 2023. Zoning Map. https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/c69bfd56413c4168a9d3945b000899cc#data\_s=id%3Adat aSource\_1-18f30225350-layer-10%3A16831.

—. 2024. Code of Ordinances City of Beaumont, CA. https://library.municode.com/CA/beaumont/codes/code\_of\_ordinances.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). 2024a State Responsibility Area. https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/.

 2024b. State Responsibility Area Viewer. https://calfireforestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=468717e399fa4238ad86861638765ce1.

- California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA). 2022, April. CalEEMod, California Emissions Estimator Model User Guide, Version 2022.1. Prepared by: ICF in collaboration with Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. https://www.caleemod.com/user-guide.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005, April. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/california-air-resources-board-air-quality-and-land-use-handbook-a-community-health-perspective.pdf.

—. 2022, December. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2023-04/2022-sp.pdf.

—. 2024. Area Designations Maps/State and National. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations.

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013, September. Technical Noise Supplement ("TeNS"). https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmentalanalysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf.
- ------. 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf
- ———. 2024. California State Scenic Highway System Map. https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f 1aacaa.

DJ&A, P.C. (DJ&A). 2024. Fairway Elementary School Traffic Study. June 17, 2024. (Appendix F)

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2006, January. FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) User's Guide. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction\_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2018, September. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noiseand-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123\_0.pdf.
- Ninyo & Moore Geotechnical & Environmental Sciences Consultants. 2024. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Fairway Canyon New School Site. May 21, 2024. (Appendix B)
- PlaceWorks. 2024a. Geotechnical and Environmental Hazards Assessment Report Fairway Canyon School. February 2024. (Appendix C)
- ———. 2024b. Water Pipeline Safety Hazard Assessment Fairway Canyon TK-5 School. August 2024. (Appendix D)
- Riverside County. 2001. Oak Valley Specific Plan NO. 318/Environmental Impact Report No. 418.
- . 2002. Oak Valley Specific Plan No. 318/Environmental Impact Report No. 418 Amendment.
- ———. 2018. Riverside County General Plan 2025 Noise Element. https://riversideca.gov/cedd/sites/riversideca.gov.cedd/files/pdf/planning/generalplan/10\_Noise\_Element\_with%20maps.pdf.
- Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). 2024. RCA Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Information Map.

https://wrcrca.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2b9d4520bd5f4d35add35fb588 08c1b7.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015, February. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot\_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf.

- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2024, April 14. Connect SoCal Plan: The 2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy of the Southern California Association of Governments. https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/Connect-SoCal-Final-Plan.aspx.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD). 1993. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Handbook.
  - ——. 2008, July. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significancethresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf.
  - ——. 2011. Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/caleemod-guidance.pdf.
- ———. 2022, December. Final 2022 Air Quality Management Plan. https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/final-2022-aqmp/final-2022-aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=16.
  - —. 2023, March (revised). South Coast AQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/south-coast-aqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=25.
- York Packaged Equipment (York). 2006. Heating and Cooling Outdoor Units. https://www.york.com/residential-equipmenUheating-and-cooling/residential-packaged-equipment.

This page intentionally left blank.