



**CITY OF CORONA  
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**NAME, DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF PROJECT:**

**CUP2018-0009:** A conditional use permit application to establish an 80-foot high wireless telecommunications facility designed as a monopine located at 809 E. Parkridge Avenue in the MSI (Medium Service Industry) designation of the Birtcher Business Center Specific Plan (SP82-2).

**ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:**

Frank Ortega  
Coastal Business Group  
24310 Moulton Parkway, Suite O #1009  
Laguna Hills, CA 92637

T-Mobile West LLC  
16441 Scientific, Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92618

Robert Pernice  
809 E. Parkridge Avenue, Suite 102  
Corona, CA 92879

The Planning and Housing Commission, having reviewed the initial study of this proposed project and the written comments received prior to the public meeting of the Planning and Housing Commission, and having heard, at a public meeting of the Commission, the comments of any and all concerned persons or entities, including the recommendation of the City's staff, does hereby find that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment, but mitigation measures or revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects will occur. **Therefore, the Planning and Housing Commission hereby finds that the Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment and shall be adopted.**

The Initial Study and other materials which constitute the records of proceedings, are available at the office of the City Clerk, City of Corona City Hall, 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA 92882.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair  
City of Corona

Date filed with County Clerk: \_\_\_\_\_



## CITY OF CORONA INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### PROJECT TITLE:

CUP2018-0009

### PROJECT LOCATION:

809 E. Parkridge Avenue in the City of Corona, County of Riverside (APN: 115-310-041).

### PROJECT PROPONENT:

Frank Ortega  
Coastal Business Group  
24310 Moulton Pkwy, Suite O #1009  
Laguna Hills, CA 92637

T-Mobile West LLC  
16441 Scientific, Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92618

Robert Pernice  
809 E. Parkridge Ave, Suite 102  
Corona, CA 92879

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

CUP2018-0009 is a conditional use permit application submitted by Coastal Business Group on behalf of T-Mobile to construct an 80-foot high wireless telecommunications facility on an industrial property located at 809 E. Parkridge Avenue. The subject site is in the MSI (Medium Service Industry) designation of the Birtcher Business Center Specific Plan (SP82-2). The proposed telecommunications facility is designed to resemble a pine tree, also known as a monopine. Nine antennas will be mounted on the monopine at 70 feet high and a microwave antenna mounted at 56 feet high. The project includes the installation of approximately two equipment cabinets within a 16' x 3' equipment lease area located at the base of the monopine. Equipment cabinets, utility cabinets, baseband unit, GPS antenna and other equipment associated with the facility will be housed within the equipment lease area.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The 0.74-acre property is currently developed with a single-story industrial building. The area is predominantly industrial. The property is bounded by vacant property to the north, industrial developments to the west, Parkridge Avenue to the south with industrial developments located beyond, and a vacant lot with I-15 beyond to the east. The monopine and equipment lease area will be constructed along the property's southeasterly perimeter.

### GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:

The subject property has a zoning of MSI (Medium Service Industry) of the Birtcher Business Center Specific Plan (SP82-2) and a General Plan designation of LI (Light Industry). The vacant properties to the north are zoned A-14.4 (Single Family Residential) and have a General Plan designation of LDR (Low Density Residential). The properties to the south and west are zoned MSI (Medium Service Industry) of the Birtcher Business Center Specific Plan (SP82-2) and have a General Plan designation of LI (Light Industry). The property to the east is zoned A-14.4 (Single Family Residential) and has a General Plan designation of LDR (Low Density Residential). Wireless telecommunications facilities are permitted in any zone in the City of Corona with a conditional use permit. As such, the present zoning and General Plan designation of the subject property will remain unaffected by the proposed wireless telecommunications facility.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The City's Staff, having undertaken and completed an initial study of this project in accordance with the City's "Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)", has concluded and recommends the following:

- The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment. **Therefore, a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.**
  
- The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, however, the potentially significant effects have been analyzed and mitigated to below a level of significance pursuant to a previous EIR as identified in the Environmental Checklist attached. **Therefore, a NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
  
- The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate the effects to below a level of significance. **Therefore, a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.**
  
- The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. **Therefore, an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.**
  
- The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, however, a previous EIR has addressed only a portion of the effects identified as described in the Environmental Checklist discussion. As there are potentially significant effects that have not been mitigated to below significant levels, a **FOCUSED EIR will be prepared to evaluate only these effects.**
  
- There is no evidence that the proposed project will have the potential for adverse effect on fish and wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The following indicates the areas of concern that have been identified as "Potentially Significant Impact" or for which mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impact to less than significant.

- Land Use Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geologic Problems
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Transportation / Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards / Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Public Services
- Utilities
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gases
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Date Prepared: December 04, 2018

Prepared By: Lupita Garcia, Assistant Planner

Contact Person: Lupita Garcia

Phone: (951) 736-2262

**AGENCY DISTRIBUTION**

(check all that apply)

- Responsible Agencies
- Trustee Agencies (CDFG, SLC, CDPR, UC)
- State Clearinghouse (CDFG, USFWS, Redevelopment Projects)
- AQMD
- WQCB
- Other: Pechanga Band of Luiseno, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Joseph and Luebben, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians.

**AGENCY DISTRIBUTION**

Southern California Edison

Southern California Edison Co.  
Local Governmental Affairs  
Land Use / Environmental Coord.  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770

Note: This form represents an abbreviation of the complete Environmental Checklist found in the City of Corona CEQA Guidelines. Sources of reference information used to produce this checklist may be found in the City of Corona Community Development Department, 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA.

1. LAND USE AND PLANNING:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with any land use plan/policy or agency regulation (general plan, specific plan, zoning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with surrounding land uses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Physically divide established community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project site is zoned MSI (Medium Service Industry) of the Birtcher Business Center Specific Plan (SP82-2) and designated Light Industry (LI) on the City’s General Plan Land Use Map. The wireless telecommunications facility does not conflict with either zoning or General Plan designation because wireless telecommunications facilities are allowed in any zone in the city by a conditional use permit. Furthermore, the site will remain unaffected by the wireless telecommunications facility as it will be designed to resemble an 80-foot high pine tree. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The project does not conflict or physically divide the surrounding land uses or community. The monopine and all associated equipment will be contained entirely within the project site. Also, the monopine will be constructed along the property’s southeasterly perimeter approximately 36 feet from the south property line and 350 feet from the nearest residence to the northwest. The proposed faux tree design will help the structure blend into the environment. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:** The proposed project will not induce substantial growth or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people as the project site is fully developed with an industrial building and the project involves constructing an 80-foot high wireless telecommunications facility designed to resemble a pine tree. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted as the proposed project will not impact population and housing within the city.

3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fault /seismic failures (Alquist-Priolo zone) /Landslide/Liquefaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Grading of more than 100 cubic yards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Grading in areas over 10% slope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantial erosion or loss of topsoil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Unstable soil conditions from grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Expansive soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo fault zone. The telecommunications facility is proposed on relatively flat land where landslides or other forms of natural slope instability are not expected to be a significant hazard to the project site and

no mitigation is warranted.

4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate water quality standards/waste discharge requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Deplete groundwater supplies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Alter existing drainage pattern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Increase flooding hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Degrade surface or ground water quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Within 100-year flood hazard area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Increase exposure to flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Exceed capacity of storm water drainage system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposal to establish a telecommunications facility on a developed property will not result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality, and the project site is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area. Construction of the monopine will not result in a flooding hazard nor will it expose the site and surrounding area to flooding. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

5. AIR QUALITY:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with air quality plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate air quality standard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Net increase of any criteria pollutant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed telecommunications facility will not generate smoke, dust, fumes, or gas into the air. Additionally, the project will not produce dust as the site is fully developed with an industrial building, parking lot and landscaping. Therefore, there is no impact to air quality and mitigation is not warranted.

6. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Change in air traffic patterns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Traffic hazards from design features	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- e. Emergency access
- f. Conflict with alternative transportation policies (adopted policies, plans or programs for public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities)

**Discussion:**

The telecommunications facility likely requires maintenance approximately once a month with vehicular access obtained from Parkridge Avenue. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to impact the roadways and intersections surrounding the project site, and mitigation is not warranted.

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Endangered or threatened species/habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Riparian habitat or sensitive natural community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Adversely affects federally protected wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interferes with wildlife corridors or migratory species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflicts with local biological resource policies or ordinances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflicts with any habitat conservation plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

CUP2018-0009 proposes to establish a wireless telecommunications facility on property that is developed with an industrial building, parking lot and landscaping. As such, the site is unsuitable for harboring or sustaining any endangered or threatened species or habitat. Additionally, the site does not contain any wetlands as it is fully developed. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts to biological resources and no mitigation measures are warranted.

8. MINERAL RESOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Loss of mineral resource or recovery site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Per Figure 4.5-7 of the General Plan Technical Background Report, the project site is not located in an oil, gas or mineral resource site. Therefore, mitigation is not required.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Risk of accidental release of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Hazardous materials/emissions within ¼ mile of existing or proposed school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Located on hazardous materials site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport land use plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair emergency response plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

g. Increase risk of wildland fires

**Discussion:**

Radio frequency (RF) is one form of electromagnetic energy that is used in many types of wireless technologies, such as cordless phones, radar, ham radio, GPS devices, cell phones, and radio and television broadcasts. At a cell site, RF radiation emanates from the antennas on the cell tower and is generated by the movement of electrical charges in the antenna. The total RF power that can be transmitted from each antenna depends on the number of radio channels (transmitters) that have been authorized by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the power of each transmitter.

The FCC is the government agency responsible for the authorization and licensing of facilities that generate RF radiation, such as cell towers. The FCC has adopted guidelines for evaluating human exposure to RF radiation using exposure limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP), the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), and the Institute of Electrical and Radiation Engineers (IEEE). According to the FCC, the exposure guidelines are based on thresholds for known adverse effects, and they incorporate wide safety margins. When an application is submitted to the FCC for a telecommunication facility, the FCC evaluates it for compliance with the FCC's RF exposure guidelines. Failure to demonstrate compliance with the FCC's RF exposure guidelines in the application process could lead to additional environmental review and/or rejection of the application.

The FCC's environmental rules regarding RF exposure identify particular categories of telecommunication facilities that the FCC has determined will have little potential for causing RF exposure in excess of the FCC's guidelines. Therefore, the FCC has "categorically excluded" such facilities from the requirement to prepare routine, initial environmental evaluations to demonstrate compliance with the FCC's guidelines. The FCC's categorical exclusion criteria are based on such factors as type of service, antenna height, and operating power. The FCC still retains the authority to request that an applicant conduct an environmental evaluation and, if appropriate, file environmental information pertaining to an otherwise categorically excluded facility if it is determined that there is a possibility for significant environmental impact due to RF exposure. It is important to emphasize that the categorical exclusions are not exclusions from compliance but, rather, exclusions from performing routine evaluations to demonstrate compliance.

The FCC has determined that tower-mounted installations (i.e., not mounted on a building) are categorically excluded if the antennas are mounted higher than 10 meters (about 33 feet) above ground and the total power of all channels being used is less than 1000 watts effective radiated power (ERP), or 2000 W ERP for broadband Personal Communications Services. In addition, a cellular facility is categorically excluded, regardless of its power if it is not mounted on a building and the lowest point of the antenna is at least 10 meters above ground level. The FCC's rationale for this categorical exclusion is that the measurement data for cellular facilities with antennas mounted higher than 10 meters have indicated that ground-level power densities are typically hundreds to thousands of times below the FCC's Maximum Permissible Exposure limits.

The proposed project consists of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility with antennas to be installed at a height of 56 feet (microwave antenna) and 70 feet (panel antennas) measured from ground level to the center of the antennas. The lowest points of the microwave and panel antennas are at 55 and 68 feet, respectively. Since the proposed facility is not mounted on a building and the lowest points of the antennas are mounted above 10 meters (about 33 feet), the facility is considered to be categorically excluded by the FCC, which means that further environmental evaluation to demonstrate compliance with the FCC's RF exposure guidelines is not warranted. However, the conditions of approval for the proposed project will require that the applicant maintain compliance with all FCC standards, including those pertaining to human exposure to RF emissions.

Finally, it should be noted that Section 704 of the Telecommunication Act of 1996 states that "No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions." Because the proposed facility is presumed to operate within the FCC's limits for RF radiation exposure and is regulated by the FCC in this respect, the City may not regulate the placement or construction of this facility based on the RF emissions. The proposal is capable of complying with the criteria and are therefore excluded from environmental review per the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). Based on the information above, no impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials are anticipated with the development of the project and, therefore, no mitigation measures would be required.

10. NOISE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed noise level standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure to excessive noise levels/vibrations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Permanent increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Temporary increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport Land Use Plan noise contours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

There may be short-term noise impacts in the immediate area during the construction phase of the project. This may temporarily affect the existing residential developments located to the northwest of the project site, and the industrial developments located to the south and west of the project site, but the impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant by compliance with City regulations prohibiting construction noise between the hours of 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., Monday through Saturday and 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m., Sundays and Federal holidays. This will prevent nuisance noise impacts during sensitive time periods of early morning and nighttime.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks & recreation facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities or services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The telecommunications facility will have minimal impact on existing City services, such as water, sewer and streets, as the infrastructure is already constructed. Also, the applicant is only constructing a new wireless telecommunications facility designed as a pine tree which is not subject to school fees. Therefore, the impacts will be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

12. UTILITIES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Involve construction/expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve construction/expansion of storm drains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sufficient water supplies/compliance with Urban Water Management Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- f. Adequate landfill capacity
- g. Comply with solid waste regulations

**Discussion:**

Southern California Edison will provide power for the wireless telecommunications facility. Utility services such as gas and waste collection and disposal services are not necessary. The amount of power generated by the wireless telecommunications facility is not expected to impact these services; therefore, mitigation is not warranted.

13. AESTHETICS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Scenic vista or highway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Degrade visual character of site & surroundings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Light or glare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Scenic resources (forest land, historic buildings within state scenic highway)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Per the City's General Plan (2004), the project site does not border any scenic highways or corridors. The monopine will be located approximately 36 feet north of Parkridge Avenue and 350 feet from the nearest residence to the northwest.

The monopine will not produce any light or glare. The structure is a stealth tree designed to resemble a pine tree which will blend in with the existing trees in the area. There are currently existing trees of various species with varying heights including palm trees over 100 feet tall in the surrounding area. Therefore, having an 80-foot high faux pine tree on the property would not be inconsistent with or degrade the visual character of the project site and surrounding area. Although the overall height of the monopine is 80 feet from grade to the highest tip of the tree, the antennas will be installed at 70 feet high and painted green to match the monopine needles to help the antennas blend into the branches and foliage of the tree. A microwave antenna will be installed at a height of 56 feet high. The conditions of approval for CUP2018-009 require the applicant to cover the antennas with "socks" that are textured to mimic pine foliage. Therefore, no additional mitigation is required.

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Historical resource	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Archaeological resource	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Paleontological resource or unique geologic feature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Disturb human remains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project site is currently developed with an industrial building, parking lot and landscaping; therefore, it is unlikely that the site would contain historical, cultural or paleontological resources.

The project is subject to tribal consultation under AB 52. The Community Development Department initiated the process by notifying seven local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the City's Letter of Transmittal dated August 31, 2018. To date, staff has not received any specific request for consultation. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

15. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Williamson Act contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project site is not designated as an Agricultural Preserve under the Williamson Act. Additionally, the site is fully developed, as it contains an industrial building. As such, the project will not result in adverse impacts to agricultural operations in the city. Therefore, no mitigation is required pertaining to agricultural resources.

16. GREENHOUSE GAS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with a plan, policy or regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Gases that trap heat in the Earth’s atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHGs) believed to lead to global warming or climate change. These gases include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (CFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). Emissions of these gases are attributable to human activities associated with industrial/manufacturing, utilities, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Per the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), if a project generates GHG emissions below 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent), it could be concluded that the project’s GHG contribution is not “cumulatively considerable” and is therefore less than significant under CEQA. If the project generates GHG emissions above the threshold, the analysis must identify mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions. A greenhouse gas analysis was not required for this project as the project’s total potential GHG emissions are below the threshold. Based on consistent historic data the City has on record for these types of installations the emission amount is below the GHG threshold of 3,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e established by the SCAQMD, and the project’s potential GHG emissions would be considered a less than significant impact. Furthermore, given that the project’s long-term operational GHG emissions would be minimal and the construction GHG emissions would be short-term, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 that is 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), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The project site is currently developed with an industrial building, parking lot and landscaping; therefore, it is unlikely that the site would contain tribal cultural resources.

The project is subject to tribal consultation under AB 52. The Community Development Department initiated the process by notifying seven local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the city’s Letter of Transmittal dated August 31, 2018. To date, staff has not received any specific request for consultation. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

18. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fish/ wildlife population or habitat or important historical sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cumulatively considerable impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantial adverse effects on humans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Short-term vs. long-term goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed project will not have a negative impact on fish or wildlife as the property contains no bodies of water or known wildlife habitat and is surrounded by streets and developed properties to the north, east, south and west. Also, since the property is developed with an industrial building, it can be determined that the property does not contain important historical resources. Therefore, there is no evidence before the City that the project will have an adverse effect on fish and wildlife, historical sites, or cumulative considerable impacts.

**19. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

Earlier analysis may be used when one or more of the environmental effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (Section 15063).

**DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE:**

1. City of Corona General Plan, March 17, 2004
2. [http://wireless.fcc.gov/siting/FCC\\_LSGAC\\_RF\\_Guide.pdf](http://wireless.fcc.gov/siting/FCC_LSGAC_RF_Guide.pdf)