



CITY OF CORONA NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME, DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF PROJECT:

CUP2017-0106: A conditional use permit application to establish a 75-foot high wireless telecommunications facility designed as a mono-eucalyptus at the city's Lester Water Treatment Facility located at 2970 Rimpau Avenue in the A (Agricultural) Zone.

ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:

JD Fox
Wireless Development Resources, LLC
PO Box 8823
Newport Beach, CA 92660

AT&T Mobility
PO Box 8823
Newport Beach, CA 92660

City of Corona Department of Water and Power
755 Public Safety Way
Corona, CA 92880

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:

CUP2017-0106

PROJECT LOCATION:

2970 Rimpau Avenue in the City of Corona, County of Riverside (APN: 108-050-013).

PROJECT PROPONENT:

JD Fox
WDR, LLC
PO Box 8823
Newport Beach, CA 92660

AT&T Mobility
PO Box 8823
Newport Beach, CA 92660

City of Corona Department of
Water and Power
755 Public Safety Way
Corona, CA 92880

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

CUP2017-0106 is a conditional use permit application submitted by Wireless Development Resources on behalf of AT&T to construct a 75-foot high wireless telecommunications facility at the City's Lester Water Treatment Facility located at 2970 Rimpau Avenue. The subject site is in the A (Agricultural) Zone. The proposed telecommunications facility is designed to resemble a eucalyptus tree, also known as a mono-eucalyptus. Twelve antennas will be mounted on the mono-eucalyptus at 68 feet high. The project includes the installation of a 12'x11'5" equipment shelter and a diesel generator within a 36' x16' equipment lease area located at the base of the mono-eucalyptus. Equipment cabinets and other equipment associated with the facility will be housed within the equipment shelter. Two GPS antennas will be mounted on the equipment shelter.

A previous proposal to construct a 75-foot high mono-eucalyptus on the project site was approved by the City on November 12, 2013 as CUP13-001; however, the project was never constructed and expired on November 12, 2015. AT&T still has a current lease in place with the City of Corona for the mono-eucalyptus at the site and has been paying the City rent as part of the lease agreement. Therefore, CUP2017-0106 is intended to re-entitle the previous entitlement and CUP2017-0106 will replace the previously approved CUP (CUP13-001).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The 5.14-acre property is currently developed with the City's Lester Water Treatment Facility. The area is predominantly residential. The property is bounded by E. Chase Drive to the north with residential developments located beyond, Rimpau Avenue to the east with residential developments located beyond, and residential developments to the south and west. The mono-eucalyptus and equipment shelter will be centrally located on the property. A second wireless telecommunications facility designed as an 80-foot high palm tree is located on the property approximately 91 feet south of the proposed location for the mono-eucalyptus. The monopalm was built in 2007 and is city-owned and operated.

GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:

The subject property has a zoning of A (Agricultural) and a General Plan designation of U (Utility). The residential properties to the north are zoned L (Low Density Residential) of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05) and have a General Plan designation of LMDR (Low Medium Density Residential). The residential properties to the east are zoned Agricultural and R1-9.6 (Single Family Residential) and have a General Plan Designation of LMDR. The residential properties to the south are zoned R1-7.2 (Single Family Residential) and have a General Plan Designation of LMDR. The residential properties to the west are zoned L (Low Density Residential) of SP90-05 and have 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.

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

Date Prepared: December 07, 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 A (Agricultural) and designated U (Utility) 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. Additionally, the project site is fully developed as a water treatment facility operated by the city's Department of Water and Power. Therefore, the mono-eucalyptus will operate in conjunction with the exiting treatment plant and the site will remain unaffected by the wireless telecommunications facility. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The project does not conflict or physically divide the surrounding land uses or community. The mono-eucalyptus and all associated equipment will be contained entirely within the project site. Also, the mono-eucalyptus will be centrally constructed on the property approximately 245 feet from the north property line adjacent to E. Chase Drive, 259 feet from the east property line adjacent to Rimapu Avenue, 358 feet to the nearest residence to the south, and 104 feet to the nearest residence to the west. 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 the City's Lester Water Treatment Facility, and the project involves constructing a 75-foot high wireless telecommunications facility designed to resemble a eucalyptus 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 mono-eucalyptus 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 the City's Lester Water Treatment Facility. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with alternative transportation policies (adopted policies, plans or programs for public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The telecommunications facility likely requires maintenance approximately once a month with vehicular access obtained from E. Chase Drive. 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:

CUP2017-0106 proposes to establish a wireless telecommunications facility on property that is developed with a city water treatment facility that contains existing buildings, structures, pavement, and landscaping. As such, the site is unsuitable for 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 68 feet (panel antennas) measured from ground level to the center of the antennas. The lowest point of the panel antennas is 64 feet. Since the proposed facility is not mounted on a building and the lowest point of the antennas is 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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 north, east, 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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Police protection

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Schools

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. Parks & recreation facilities

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e. Other public facilities or services

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 eucalyptus 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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Involve construction/expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c. Involve construction/expansion of storm drains

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d. Sufficient water supplies/compliance with Urban Water Management Plan.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 Figure 4.4.2 of the City of Corona General Plan Technical Background Report, Chase Drive is a designated scenic highway from Manglar Avenue to State Street. The portion of Chase Drive adjacent to the project site is part of this scenic highway stretch. The wireless telecommunications facility will be designed to resemble a eucalyptus tree, which will blend with the existing trees on site. The mono-eucalyptus will be located approximately 245 feet north of E. Chase Drive, 259 feet east of Rimpau Avenue, 358 feet from the nearest residence to the south, and 104 feet from the nearest residence to the west. The project is subject to the applicable development standards of the Corona Municipal Code and being reviewed through the conditional use permit process (CUP2017-0106) to ensure the project is designed and constructed to be aesthetically pleasing and attractive to its surrounding areas so that there is no degradation to this scenic corridor. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Furthermore, the mono-eucalyptus will not produce any light or glare. The structure is a stealth tree designed to resemble a eucalyptus tree which will blend in with the existing trees in the area, including existing mature eucalyptus trees that are located on the project site. Although the overall height of the mono-eucalyptus is 75 feet from grade to the highest tip of the tree, the antennas will be installed at 72 feet high and painted green to match the mono-eucalyptus to help the antennas blend into the branches and foliage of the tree. The applicant is also required to have the antennas covered by "socks" that are textured to mimic tree's foliage. This condition of approval is placed on CUP2017-0106. 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 a city water treatment facility, which contains buildings, structures, paving, 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 six local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the City's Letter of Transmittal dated December 7, 2017. To date, staff only received a response via email on December 11, 2017 from Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians stating consultation is not needed for the project at this time. Staff has not received any other response from other tribes requesting 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 a city water treatment facility. 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 (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (CFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). 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 tCO₂e (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 tCO₂e 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 the City's Lester Water Treatment Facility, which contains buildings, structures paving, 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 six local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the City's Letter of Transmittal dated December 7, 2017. To date, staff only received a response via email on December 11, 2017 from Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians stating consultation is not needed for the project at this time. Staff has not received any other response from other tribes requesting 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

☐☐☐☒

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 a city water treatment facility, 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