



CITY OF CORONA

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME, DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF PROJECT: BUENA VISTA ACTIVE SENIOR LIVING APARTMENT PROJECT

GPA17-001: An application to amend the General Plan Land Use Map on 2.14 acres from MDR (Medium Density Residential, 6-15 du/ac) to HDR (High Density Residential, 15-36 du/ac) located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

CZ17-002: Application to change the zoning designation of 1.9 acres from R-1-7.2 (Single Family Residential, Minimum Lot Size 7,200 square feet) and 0.24 acres from R-2 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) to R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

CUP17-004: Application for a conditional use permit to establish senior housing apartments consisting of 64 units on 2.14 acres in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) Zone being proposed by CZ17-002 located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:

Rowdy Williamson on behalf of Pete Nyiri, 2279 Eagle Glen Parkway, #112-155, Corona, CA 92883

The City Council, having reviewed the initial study of this proposed project and the written comments received prior to the public meeting of the City Council, and having heard, at a public meeting of the Council, 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 City Council hereby finds that the Mitigated 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 South Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA 92882.

Date: _____

Mayor
City of Corona

Date filed with County Clerk: _____

Date filed with State Clearinghouse: _____

CITY OF CORONA

INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT TITLE: Buena Vista Active Senior Living Project (GPA17-001, CZ17-002 and CUP17-004)

PROJECT LOCATION: East side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91 (APNs 118-290-025 and partial of 118-290-030). Please refer to the attached Locational Exhibit.

PROJECT PROPONENTS:

Rowdy Williamson on behalf of Pete Nyiri
2279 Eagle Glen Parkway, #112-155
Corona, CA 92883

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

GPA17-001: An application to amend the General Plan Land Use Map on 2.14 acres from MDR (Medium Density Residential, 6-15 du/ac) to HDR (High Density Residential, 15-36 du/ac) located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

CZ17-002: Application to change the zoning designation of 1.9 acres from R-1-7.2 (Single Family Residential, Minimum Lot Size 7,200 square feet) and 0.24 acres from R-2 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) to R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

CUP17-004: Application for a conditional use permit to establish senior housing apartments consisting of 64 units on 2.14 acres in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) Zone being proposed by CZ17-002 located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue approximately 480 feet north of Bollero Place and north of State Route 91.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Site Description: The 2.14-acre project site is an infill lot located on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue. The lot is primarily vacant except for a single-family home occupying 0.2 acres located at 159 N .Buena Vista Avenue. The home was built in 1955 and will be removed with the development of the 64-unit three story senior housing project.

Site Surroundings: The project site is bordered by multi-family residential development to the north and south, by single-family and multi-family residential development to the east, and by single-family residential development to the west beyond Buena Vista Avenue.

GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:

The project site is designated MDR, or Medium Density Residential (6-15 du/ac), on the City's General Plan map. Approval of the associated applications will establish a General Plan of HDR (High Density Residential) and a Zoning designation of R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) across the entire 2.21-acre project site. The HDR designation of the General Plan permits multi-family residential development at a density from 15 to 36 du/ac. The proposed development consists of 64 units and yields a density of 29 du/ac, which is within the allowable density range. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations of the project site proposed by GPA17-001 and CZ17-002.

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

Date Prepared: October 2, 2017 Prepared By: Lupita Garcia, Assistant Planner

Contact Person: Lupita Garcia, Assistant Planner (951) 736-2262

AGENCY DISTRIBUTION

(check all that apply)

- ☒ Responsible Agencies (RCALUC)
- ☐ Trustee Agencies (SLC, CDPR, UC)
- ☐ State Clearinghouse (CDFW, USACE, USFWS, PUC)
- ☐ AQMD
- ☒ RWQCB
- ☒ Other - **Riverside County Flood Control**

UTILITY DISTRIBUTION

- ☒ Southern California Edison

Southern California Edison
Karen Cadavona
Third Party Environmental Review
2244 Walnut Grove Ave.
Quad 4C 472A
Rosemead, CA 91770

Native American Tribes

- ☒ Pechanga Band of Luiseno
☒ Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
☒ Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
☒ Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

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)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with surrounding land uses	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Physically divide established community	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

The 2.14 acre project site is designated MDR, or Medium Density Residential (6-15 du/ac), on the City's General Plan map. The property is zoned R-2 or Low Density Multiple-Family Residential. The proposed development will necessitate a change of the project site's General Plan from MDR to HDR (High Density Residential, up to 36 du/ac) as well as a change of the project site's zoning from R-2 to R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential). The resulting change would accommodate the 64 apartments for senior citizen housing on the project site. The density of the project would be 29 du/ac, which is within the allowed density of the HDR designation of the General Plan being proposed by GPA17-001. The project would be compatible with surrounding land uses. The property to the south is an affordable housing multiple family community consisting of apartments in the R-3 zone. The properties to the east are zoned R-2 and R-1-7.2 (Single Family Residential). Multi-family units are located in the R-2 zone and single family residences in the R-1-7.2 zone. The property to the north is zoned R-2 and contains a single family residence. The three properties to the west and abutting the project site are zoned R-1-7.2 in addition to the properties located across Buena Vista Avenue. The properties contain single family homes.

The project is located in a residential neighborhood consisting of single family homes and multi-family projects. The project site is mostly vacant except for an existing single family residence located near Buena Vista Avenue. The site is considered infill to the neighborhood as it is completely surrounded by existing residential development. As such, the project will not physically divide an established community.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial growth	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

The project site is currently designated MDR on the General Plan allowing up to 15 du/ac. Under the current General Plan, the project site would allow up to 33 residential units. The proposed changed to HDR would allow up to 36 du/ac and 79 residential units on the project site. Therefore, the difference is an additional 46 residential units under the HDR designation. However, the project is proposing only 64 units for an additional difference of 31 residential units from the current MDR designation. This project is also intended for senior citizen housing which would accommodate no more than two persons per unit. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial growth and is considered no impact.

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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Grading of more than 100 cubic yards	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Grading in areas over 10% slope	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Substantial erosion or loss of topsoil	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Unstable soil conditions from grading	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Expansive soils	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

Per the project's geotechnical report conducted by GeoTek (February 20, 2017) the project site is not located in a fault zone. The nearest fault zone is the Elsinore fault which is located approximately 2.5 miles to the west of the project site. Since the site is located in a region of generally high seismicity, as is all of Southern California, the site is expected to experience moderate to strong ground motions from earthquakes on regional and/or nearby causative faults. However, because the project will be subject to city codes, the latest California Building Code (CBC), and the engineering recommendations presented in the project's geotechnical report, any potential impacts related to fault/seismic failures would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

The preliminary soil investigation report also determined that the site has low liquefaction potential. Additionally, groundwater has been reported in excess of 100 feet deep in the area; therefore, liquefaction is not considered a hazard at the site due to the underlying dense nature of the subsurface soils and the great depth of groundwater (greater than 100 feet). Therefore, any impacts related to liquefaction or expansive soils would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Development of the project site would involve grading of more than 100 cubic yards. According to the project's Conceptual Grading Plan, grading within the project site would cut a total of 2,410 cubic yards, while fill taking place would comprise of 1,950 cubic yards. Adherence to City's grading regulations would ensure a less than significant impact would occur and no further mitigation would be required.

There would be no grading in areas with greater than 10 percent slopes on the site as the site is relatively flat. Therefore, no impacts from implementation of the proposed development would occur and no mitigation would be required.

Development of the project would require the movement of on-site soils. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant would be required to submit detailed grading plans for the project site, and would be required to comply with applicable City's grading regulations established in the Corona Municipal Code. Furthermore, development of the site would involve more than one acre; therefore, the proposed project is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would also be required to address erosion and discharge impacts associated with the proposed on-site grading. Additionally, the project is required to submit a final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) which would identify measures to treat and/or limit the entry of contaminants into the storm drain system. Since the project is required to adhere to the City's grading regulations, obtain an NPDES Permit, and prepare an SWPPP and WQMP, impacts associated with soil erosion hazards are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Deplete groundwater supplies	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Alter existing drainage pattern	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Increase flooding hazard	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Degrade surface or ground water quality	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Within 100-year flood hazard area	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Increase exposure to flooding	☐	☐	☐	☒
h. Exceed capacity of storm water drainage system	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

Development of the project site will increase the area of impermeable surface paving, which will result in an increase in surface runoff. The applicant has submitted a preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared for the project by NI Associates (May 2017) to ensure that the project addresses potential water quality impacts. The applicant will be required to implement on site the Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified in the preliminary WQMP to minimize pollutant runoff into the City's storm water drainage system. A BMP for the project is to mark all inlets with the words "Only Rain Down the Storm Drain" or similar. Another BMP is to design the landscaping to minimize irrigation and runoff to promote surface infiltration where appropriate and to minimize the use of fertilizer and pesticides that can contribute to stormwater pollution. One more BMP is to sweep plazas, sidewalks, parking lots and streets regularly to prevent accumulation of litter, debris and sediment. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant will be required to submit a final WQMP to be reviewed by the Corona Public Works Department. This will result in a less than significant impact and therefore, no further mitigation is required.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS), the project site is not within the 100-year flood hazard area. Development of the project site will not result in a flooding hazard nor will it expose the site and surrounding area to flooding. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to flooding 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Violate air quality standard	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Net increase of any criteria pollutant	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Create objectionable odors	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

Per the City of Corona General Plan EIR (March 17, 2004), the 1997 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and 1999 Amendment for Ozone were prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clear air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP.

The project would be subject to SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. These strategies

are developed, in part, based on regional population, housing and employment projections prepared by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

A project is consistent with the AQMP if it is consistent with the population, housing, and employment assumptions that were used in the development the AQMP. The most recent AQMP adopted by SCAQMD incorporates SCAG's 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) socioeconomic forecast projections of regional population and employment growth. The 2012-2035 RTP projects that population in the region will grow with the addition of approximately 4 million people by 2035. As the regional planning agency for Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties, SCAG addresses regional issues related to transportation, the economy, community development, and the environment. With regard to air quality planning, SCAG has prepared the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), which includes Growth Management and Regional Mobility chapters that form the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. These documents are utilized in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analysis included in the AQMP. Both the RCPG and AQMP are based, in part, on projections originating with county and city general plans.

Since the proposed project is required to be consistent with the City of Corona General Plan, all potential project-related emissions would be accounted for in the AQMP, which is crafted to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. Additionally, all construction activities would be in compliance with AQMP regulatory measures, including SCAQMD standard rules pertaining to fugitive dust (Rule 403), visibility of emissions (Rule 401), nuisance activities (Rule 402), and the limiting of VOC (volatile organic compound) content in both asphalt and architectural coatings (Rules 1108 and 1113). As discussed below, the project's operational emissions would fall below the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the proposed project would be consistent with the projections in the AQMP. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to AQMP implementation, and no mitigation measures would be required.

An air quality analysis (February 2017) was prepared for the proposed project by Vista Environmental to evaluate potential air quality impacts associated with the project. The air quality assessment for the proposed project includes estimating emissions associated with shorter-term construction, long-term operation and Localized Significance Threshold Methodology of the project. Emissions were calculated using the latest version of CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2), which is a computer model approved by the SCAQMD to calculate criteria pollutant emissions. The following discusses the project's short-term and long-term air impacts.

SHORT-TERM IMPACTS:

Construction

The proposed project consists of a three-story apartment building housing 64 units, active open space and surface parking on approximately 2.14 acres. The construction emissions have been analyzed for both regional and local air quality impacts as well as potential toxic air impacts. The worst-case summer or winter daily construction-related criteria pollutant emissions from the proposed project for each phase of construction activities are shown below in Table 5A and the CalEEMod daily printouts are shown in Appendix A. Since it is possible that building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities may occur concurrently, Table 5A also shows the combined criteria pollutant emissions from building construction, paving and architectural coating phases of construction.

Table 5A – Construction - Related Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Demolition¹						
Onsite	2.72	26.59	20.87	0.02	1.70	1.52
Offsite	0.12	0.82	1.60	0.00	0.21	0.07
Total	2.84	27.41	22.47	0.02	1.91	1.59
Site Preparation¹						
Onsite	2.31	24.23	15.93	0.02	3.57	2.35
Offsite	0.08	0.53	1.11	0.00	0.14	0.04
Total	2.39	24.76	17.04	0.02	3.71	2.39
Grading¹						
Onsite	1.88	19.79	13.18	0.01	3.00	1.97
Offsite	0.72	10.40	9.18	0.03	0.94	0.36
Total	2.61	30.19	22.36	0.04	3.93	2.32
Building Construction						
Onsite	2.95	19.11	14.31	0.02	1.23	1.18
Offsite	0.31	1.26	4.33	0.01	0.71	0.20
Total	3.26	20.37	18.64	0.03	1.94	1.39
Paving						
Onsite	1.23	10.31	8.87	0.01	0.60	0.56
Offsite	0.04	0.06	0.69	0.00	0.15	0.04
Total	1.28	10.37	9.56	0.01	0.75	0.60
Architectural Coatings						
Onsite	23.38	2.01	1.85	0.00	0.15	0.15
Offsite	0.04	0.05	0.59	0.00	0.12	0.03
Total	23.42	2.06	2.44	0.00	0.27	0.18
Combined Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coatings	27.96	32.79	30.64	0.05	2.96	2.16
SCQAMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes:

¹ Demolition, Site Preparation, and Grading based on adherence to fugitive dust suppression requirements from SCAQMD Rule 403.² Onsite emissions from equipment not operated on public roads.³ Offsite emissions from vehicles operating on public roads.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1.

Table 5A shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the regional emissions thresholds during each phase of construction. Therefore, a less than significant regional air quality impact would occur from construction of the proposed project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Construction-Related Local Impacts

Construction-related air emissions may have the potential to exceed the State and Federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the Air Basin.

The local air quality emissions from construction were analyzed through utilizing the methodology described in Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (LST Methodology), prepared by SCAQMD, revised October 2009. The LST Methodology found the primary criteria pollutant emissions of concern are NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. In order to determine if any of these pollutants require a detailed analysis of the local air quality impacts, each phase of construction was screened using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate LST Look-up Tables. The Look-up Tables were developed by the SCAQMD in order to readily determine if the daily onsite emissions of CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from the proposed project could result in a significant impact to the local air quality. Table 5B shows the onsite emissions from the CalEEMod model for the different construction phases and the calculated emissions thresholds that have been detailed in the air quality analysis. Since it is possible that building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities may occur concurrently, Table 5B also shows the combined local criteria pollutant emissions from building construction, paving and architectural coating phases of construction.

Table 5B – Construction – Related Local Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Phase	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)			
	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Demolition ¹	26.59	20.87	1.70	1.52
Site Preparation ¹	24.23	15.93	3.57	2.35
Grading ¹	19.79	13.18	3.00	1.97
Combined Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coatings	31.42	25.04	1.98	1.89
- Building Construction	19.11	14.31	1.23	1.18
- Paving	10.31	8.87	0.60	0.56
- Architectural Coatings	2.01	1.85	0.15	0.15
SCAQMD Thresholds for 25 meters (82 feet) ²	170	1,007	6	5
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Notes:

¹ Demolition, Site Preparation and Grading based on adherence to fugitive dust suppression requirements from SCAQMD Rule 403.² The nearest sensitive receptors are single-family homes located as near as 5 feet west of the project site. According to LST Methodology, any receptor located closer than 25 meters (82 feet) shall be based on the 25 meter thresholds.

Source: Calculated from CalEEMod and SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-up Tables for two acres in Air Monitoring Area 22, Corona/Norco Area.

The data provide in Table 5B shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds for any phase of construction. Therefore, a less than significant local air quality impact would occur from construction of the proposed project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Operational

The on-going operation of the proposed project would result in a long-term increase in air quality emissions. This increase would be due to emissions from the project-generated vehicle trips and through operational emissions from the on-going use of the proposed project. The following provides an analysis of potential long-term air quality impacts due to regional air quality and local air quality impacts with the on-going operations of the proposed project. The potential operations-related air emissions have been analyzed below for the regional and local criteria pollutant emissions and cumulative impacts.

The operations-related criteria air quality impacts created by the proposed project have been analyzed through use of the CalEEMod model and the input parameters utilized in this analysis have been detailed in Section 5.2 of the air quality analysis. The worst-case summer or winter VOC, NOx, CO, SO₂, PM10, and PM2.5 daily emissions created from the proposed project's long-term operations have been calculated and are summarized below in Table 5C.

Table 5C – Operational Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources ¹	2.33	0.06	5.33	0.00	0.03	0.03
Energy Usage ²	0.03	0.26	0.11	0.00	0.02	0.02
Mobile Sources ³	0.61	1.81	6.96	0.02	1.33	0.37
Total Emissions	2.96	2.12	12.39	0.02	1.38	0.42
SCQAMD Operational Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes:

¹ Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment.² Energy usage consist of emissions from natural gas usage (excluding hearths).³ Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust.

Source: Calculated from CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1.

The data provided in Table 5C above shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the regional daily emissions thresholds. Therefore, a less than significant regional air quality impact would occur from operation of the proposed project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

CO Hot-Spot Analysis

CO is the pollutant of major concern along roadways because the most notable source of CO is motor vehicles. For this reason, CO concentrations are usually indicative of the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator of potential local air quality impacts. Local air quality impacts can be assessed by comparing future without and with project CO levels to the State and Federal CO standards of 20 ppm over one hour or 9 ppm over eight hours.

At the time of the 1993 Handbook, the Air Basin was designated nonattainment under the CAAQS and NAAQS for CO. With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the Air Basin and in the state have steadily declined. In 2007, the Air Basin was designated in attainment for CO under both the CAAQS and NAAQS. SCAQMD conducted a CO hot spot analysis for attainment at the busiest intersections in Los Angeles during the peak morning and afternoon periods and did not predict a violation of CO standards¹. Since the nearby intersections to the proposed project are much smaller with less traffic than what was analyzed by the SCAQMD, no local CO Hotspot are anticipated to be created from the proposed project and no CO Hotspot modeling was performed. Therefore, a less than significant long-term air quality impact is anticipated to local air quality with the on-going use of the proposed project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the application of materials such as asphalt pavement, paints and solvents and from emissions from diesel equipment. The objectionable odors that may be produced during the construction process would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project site's boundaries. Due to the transitory nature of construction odors, a less than significant odor impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

The proposed project would consist of the development of 64 apartments for senior living with surface parking for 98 spaces. Potential sources that may emit odors during the on-going operations of the proposed project would primarily occur from odor emissions from the trash storage areas. Pursuant to City regulations, permanent trash enclosures that protect trash bins from rain as well as limit air circulation would be required for the trash storage areas. Due to the distance of the nearest sensitive receptors from the proposed trash storage areas and through compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 402, no significant impact related to odors would occur during the on-going operations of the proposed project. Therefore, a less than significant odor impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

Adherence to the "Standard Conditions" as set forth in the Air Quality Analysis, prepared by Vista Environmental dated February 2017, will result in a less than significant impact as it pertains to Air Quality and the respective topical areas within this section, and no mitigation is required.

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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Change in air traffic patterns	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Traffic hazards from design features	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Emergency access	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Conflict with alternative transportation policies (adopted policies, plans or programs for public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

A Focused Site Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared for the project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers (July 11, 2017) to analyze potential traffic impacts associated with the project on the area traffic circulation. The 64 senior apartments are expected to generate 220 daily trips, with 13 trip (4 inbound, 9 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 16 trips (9 inbound, 7 outbound) produced in the PM peak hours. A summary of the analysis and recommendations is provided below.

Traffic conditions at three street intersections located in proximity to the project site were studied:

- 1) Buena Vista Avenue at Railroad Street
- 2) Buena Vista Avenue at 2nd Street
- 3) Buena Vista Avenue at 6th Street

Traffic conditions at one roadway segment located near the project site was studied:

- 1) Buena Vista Avenue, south of Railroad Street (along project frontage)

The intersection at Buena Vista Avenue and Railroad Street operates at a LOS (level of service) of C during the AM and PM peak hours, which is considered to be acceptable. The intersection at Buena Vista Avenue and Second Street also operates at a LOS of C during the AM and PM peak hours. However, the intersection at Buena Vista Avenue and Sixth Street operates at a LOS of D during the AM peak hours and a LOS of C during the PM peak hours, both of which are considered to be acceptable levels of service.

For the Year 2018 With Project traffic conditions, all of the three key study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak hours when compared to the LOS standards defined in the report. None of the key study intersections will be cumulatively impacted based on the LOS criteria defined in this report for Year 2018 With Project traffic conditions. The one key study roadway segment is forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service for the Year 2018 With Project traffic conditions, and will not be significantly impacted based on the LOS criteria defined in this report for the Year 2018 With Project traffic conditions. The proposed project will not significantly impact any of the key study intersections or the roadway segment under the "Existing With Project" or "Year 2017 With Project" traffic scenarios. As such, no improvements are recommended.

The non-signalized intersection of Buena Vista Avenue and Second Street is not forecast to exceed the volume thresholds for the AM and PM peak hours under Existing With Project and Year 2018 With Project traffic conditions. Additionally, based on the forecast acceptable operational level of service characteristics of the intersection with the addition of Project traffic, the installation of a traffic signal is not justified and therefore not recommended.

The project site is located in an area that is served by the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) and "Corona Cruiser," a Fixed Route service by the City of Corona. The RTA's Route 3 is the nearest bus line to the project site. Route 3 extends from the City of Eastvale along North Main Street to the Corona Regional Medical Center located on south Main Street and Eighth Street. Route 3 also has a transfer point near the North Main Corona Metrolink Station located on Blaine Street and North Main Street, which is the closest train station to the project site. Corona Cruiser runs along pre-designated Blue Line and Red Line fixed routes. The Corona Cruiser's Blue Line bus stop located near the intersection of Cota Street and River Road is the closest Blue Line bus stop to the project site. The closest Red Line bus stop is located near the North Main Corona Metrolink Station. Through the City's project review process, policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, including bus turnouts and bicycle racks, would be reviewed and incorporated as applicable. Thus, the project would not be in conflict with any programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Endangered or threatened species/habitat	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Riparian habitat or sensitive natural community	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Adversely affects federally protected wetlands	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Interferes with wildlife corridors or migratory species	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflicts with local biological resource policies or ordinances	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Conflicts with any habitat conservation plan	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

The City of Corona participates in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), which is a habitat conservation plan for Western Riverside County that identifies land to be preserved for habitat for threatened, endangered or key sensitive populations of plant and wildlife species. To ensure MSHCP compliance, a site-specific General Habitat Assessment Report was prepared by Ecological Sciences, Inc., dated October 25, 2017 and updated March 10, 2017. A summary of the findings and recommendations made in the report are provided in this section.

No direct burrowing owl observations or sign (pellets, fecal material, or prey remains) were recorded during the October 2016 or March 2017 habitat assessments. Birds observed generally included those species that are accustomed to nearby human presence such as common raven (*Corvus corax*), European starling (*Sturnella vulgaris*), mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*). No nesting refugia (e.g., small mammal burrows) were recorded on site, possibly as a result of recurring discing activities and other long-standing

anthropogenic disturbances that occlude/collapse ground squirrel burrows or other refugia. Accordingly, no suitable habitat for BUOW is currently present. Therefore, the project would have no impact in this regard, and no mitigation is warranted.

A general surface soils analysis was conducted during the survey effort due to the close association of certain special-status plant species to particular soil types. Based on review of the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) website, the site is located in an area mapped as Garretson gravelly, very fine sandy loam (GdC), 2-8 percent slopes. This soil type is not associated with special status plant species.

The site occurs within the overall Plan Area of the MSHCP. Accordingly, the project is subject to any applicable survey and/or conservation requirements. The site does not occur within a MSHCP Cell Criteria Area. Therefore, the project is not required to set aside conservation lands pursuant to the MSHCP, and is not subject to the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process, or Joint Project Review (JPR). The project is consistent with the biological requirements of the MSHCP; specifically pertaining to the Project's relationship to reserve assembly; Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures- BUOW habitat survey completed in 2016 in this report), Section 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species-Focused NEPS/Criteria Area habitat assessment completed in 2016 in this report); Section 6.1.2 (Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools-Habitat Assessment completed in 2016 in this report); Section 6.1.4 (Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface-project is not located adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area); and Section 6.3.1 (individual project-level vegetation mapping-completed in 2016 on Plate 3 of this report).

Results of the habitat assessment and MSHCP consistency analysis conducted in October 2016 and March 2017 indicate that habitats currently present within the 2.20-acre project site represent low biological resource constraints based on the degree in which expected impacts to on-site resources would meet MSHCP and CEQA conservation criteria and the context in which they occur (e.g., highly disturbed site conditions present in a predominantly degraded environment). The existing degraded condition of the site has resulted in low biological diversity (e.g., dominance of non-native species), absence of special-status plant communities, and low potential for special-status species to utilize or occur on the site. Construction activities would not be expected to directly impact federal or state listed threatened or endangered species, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species (or special-status species), nor directly impact designated critical habitat. Development of the site would not be expected to substantially affect special status resources, jeopardize the continued existence of listed species (or special-status species), nor directly impact designated critical habitat. Site development would also not be expected to substantially alter the diversity of plants or wildlife in the area or cause a population of plant or wildlife species to drop below self-sustaining levels.

Although no listed species (currently protected by state or federal endangered species acts) are expected to occur due to absence of suitable habitat, the potential presence of certain special-status species (e.g., common nesting birds) may impose some degree of constraint to development depending upon the nature of both direct and indirect impacts on these resources, as well as on the particular species and seasonal timing of construction activities. During permitting procedures, certain measures (e.g., nesting bird preconstruction survey) to avoid or further reduce project-related impacts to potentially occurring sensitive biological resources may be necessary pursuant to CEQA and/or MSHCP guidelines. Results of the October 2016 surveys indicate that no significant impacts to special-status biological resources are expected as a result of project-related activities. Upon completion of all recommendations by reviewing agencies, the proposed project could be deemed consistent with procedures, policies, and guidelines of the MSHCP. Therefore, the project would have no impact in this regard, and no mitigation is 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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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 resources site. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard, and no mitigation is warranted.

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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Risk of accidental release of hazardous materials	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Hazardous materials/emissions within ¼ mile of existing or proposed school	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Located on hazardous materials site	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with Airport land use plan	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Impair emergency response plans	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Increase risk of wildland fires	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared by GEOTEK, Inc (February 20, 2017) to evaluate the physical conditions of the project site and to uncover any hazardous wastes that may have previously been used, treated, stored, or disposed on the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment has not revealed evidence of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject site.

The property is situated in the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province. The Peninsular Ranges province is one of the largest geomorphic units in western North America. Basically, it extends from the point of contact with the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province, southerly to the tip of Baja California. This province varies in width from about 30 to 100 miles. It is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the south by the Gulf of California and on the east by the Colorado Desert Province. The Peninsular Ranges are essentially a series of northwest-southeast oriented fault blocks. Several major fault zones are found in this province. The Elsinore Fault zone and the San Jacinto Fault zone trend northwest-southeast and are found near the middle of the province. The San Andreas Fault zone borders the northeasterly margin of the province.

The Site and Site area are understood to be underlain by older fan deposits. The Site and Site area can be considered as having relatively flat terrain. Based on the USGS topographic map for the area and other documents reviewed, the elevation of the subject Site ranges from approximately 612 to 616 feet above mean sea level. Natural drainage at the Site is interpreted to be dominantly directed toward the northeast, conforming to the natural topography in the area. Storm water runoff will most likely not drain towards the Site from the adjacent properties due to the presence of existing streets and/or improvements.

According to a review of historical groundwater data (California Department of Water Resources and California State Water Resources Control Board groundwater well data [<http://wdl.water.ca.gov> and <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>]) and in-house information, depth to groundwater is greater than 50 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the general site area, with a flow direction to the northeast.

In order to construct the history of the Site and the surrounding area, GEOTEK reviewed reasonably ascertainable public documents, including aerial photographs, topographic maps, building records, city directories, fire insurance maps, and county assessor history records. The site appears to be vacant land in the 1938 aerial photographs. The site appears to be utilized for agriculture in the 1948 aerial photographs. In the 1953 aerial photographs the site appears to be vacant. The existing residence can be observed in the 1961, 1967, 1975, 1985, 1989, 1994, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010 and 2012 aerial photographs.

Six shallow soil samples were obtained from the Site and submitted to a state certified laboratory for analysis of organochlorinated pesticides (OCP) in accordance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Method 8081A. Analysis of the soil samples detected measureable quantities of the OCP constituents 4,4'-DDE, dieldrin, 4,4'-DDT, endrin aldehyde, and endrin in four (4) of the samples. The results of the laboratory analysis are summarized in the following table:

SAMPLE NO.	4,4'-DDE (mg/kg)	4,4'-DDT (mg.kg)	Dieldrin (mg/kg)	Endrin Aldehyde (mg/kg)	Endrin (mg/kg)
1	ND (0.005)	ND (0.010)	ND (0.002)	ND (0.01)	ND (0.01)
2	0.0075	ND (0.010)	0.0055	ND (0.01)	ND (0.01)
3	ND (0.005)	0.023	ND (0.002)	0.027	ND (0.01)
4	ND (0.005)	ND (0.010)	ND (0.002)	ND (0.01)	ND (0.01)
5	0.0088	ND (0.010)	ND (0.002)	ND (0.01)	0.011
6	0.0076	ND (0.010)	ND (0.002)	ND (0.01)	ND (0.01)
Maximum allowable	1.6 ¹	1.6 ¹	0.034 ²	*	1.9 ²

mg/kg = milligram per kilogram

ND = not detected (detection limit)

1 = California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs)

2 = EPA Regional Screening Level (RSL) for residential soil, May 2016

* = Not Established

The OCP constituents 4,4'-DDE, dieldrin, 4,4'-DDT, endrin aldehyde, and endrin detected in sample numbers 2, 3, 5 and 6 are in a concentration below the maximum allowable concentration for residential soils, as determined by the CHHSLs and the EPA RSLs. GEOTEK is of the opinion that additional investigation is not necessary at the Site with respect to this issue. Therefore, the project would have no impact in this regard and no mitigation is warranted.

In addition, per Figure 4.5-7 and Table 5.4-1 & 5.4-2 of the General Plan Technological Background Report, the project site does not contain hazardous materials nor is it identified as a hazardous materials site.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of any existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Orange Grove High School, which is located approximately 0.26 miles southwest of the project site. The school is separated from the project site by residential developments. Also, development of the proposed project would not include any activities that would result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a manner that could result in toxic emissions. Therefore, this would be a non-issue and no mitigation would be required.

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan establishes airport policies and compatibility and noise contour maps for airports located within Riverside County. Because the project site is located approximately 1.5 miles from the Corona Municipal Airport which is located at 1900 Aviation Way, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan considers the site as being within an airport influence area known as Zone D. Zone D requires that any structure exceeding 70 feet in height be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission. The site's HDR designation has an established maximum building height limit of 40 feet, thus, any future building constructed on the project site will not exceed the maximum height established for Zone D. Therefore, the project does not pose a hazard to the area and is not considered an impact. No mitigation would be required.

The project site is located within an airport influence area (Zone D), the applicant would be required to provide a disclosure notice to all future owners and/or tenants of the site. The disclosure notice shall include the following language:

NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY: This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

Providing disclosure notices would help notify owners or renters about the presence of overflights near airports so that they can make more informed decisions regarding acquisition or lease of property in the affected areas. The applicant's compliance with this condition of approval would make the project consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and reduce impacts related to this issue to less than significant. No mitigation would be required.

Growth in the City's population resulting from implementation of the proposed project would increase traffic conditions and congestion. In the event of an accident or natural disaster, the increases in traffic in the City would impede the rate of

evacuation for the residents. Concurrently, the response times for emergency medical or containment services may also be adversely affected by the increased traffic conditions in the City. As discussed in Section 5.4 of the City of Corona General Plan Technical Background Report, the Corona Fire Department and Office of Emergency Services published the City of Corona Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) in 1999. This plan addresses the planned response to various emergency situations, including natural or human-caused disasters and technological incidents, in the City. This plan is reviewed annually by the Corona Fire Department to coordinate and update necessary revisions. The goal of the plan is to provide emergency response during disasters within the City to limit the loss of life, property damage, and social dislocation. Additionally, the developer of the proposed project would be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities to comply with applicable local, regional, state and/or federal requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Adherence to these standard conditions would ensure no impacts and no mitigation is required.

As defined in Chapter 3.36 of the Corona Municipal Code, "High Fire Risk Area" applies to any property currently within the City or subsequently annexed into the City, which is also located within or immediately adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest, as well as the urban/wildland interface area approximately 1.5 miles in width running parallel to the boundary of the Cleveland National Forest from the Orange County line to the Indian Truck Trail turnoff on Interstate 15. The project site is not located in proximity to the Cleveland National Forest nor is it considered an area that can be described as a wildland area. The project site is an infill site located within an urbanized residential area. Due to the urbanized nature of the surrounding area, the proposed development would not be considered at high risk for fire hazards. Furthermore, all development within the City is required to comply with all fire code requirements associated with adequate fire access, fire flows, and number of hydrants. Therefore, the project would have no impact and no mitigation is required.

10. NOISE:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed noise level standards	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Exposure to excessive noise levels/vibrations	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Permanent increase in ambient noise levels	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Temporary increase in ambient noise levels	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with Airport Land Use Plan noise contours	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

Long-term noise impacts will be minimal given that the proposed use is senior housing. Short-term impacts, however, are associated with future grading and project construction, but are reduced to a less than significant level by the City's Municipal Code. Per CMC Chapter 17.84, construction activities are prohibited 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. on Sundays and Federal holidays. This will prevent nuisance noise impacts during sensitive time periods of early morning and nighttime for the residences located east of the project site.

Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), the project site is located within the Corona Municipal Airport Influence Area Zone D. Per the Noise Compatibility Contours Map established by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan for the Corona Municipal Airport, the project site is not located within one of the noise contours depicted on the map where special noise level criteria would be applicable to the project. Therefore, the project does not conflict with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and no mitigation would be required. Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, California state statutes (Business and Professional Code Section 11010 and Civil Code Sections 1102.6, 1103.4, and 1353) require as part of residential real estate transactions that information be disclosed whether a property is situated within an airport influence area. These state requirements apply both to the sale or lease of newly subdivided land and to the sale of existing residential property. Since the subject site is within an airport influence area (Zone D), the applicant would be required to provide a disclosure notice to all future owners and/or tenants that the site is within this zone. Providing the standard disclosure notices would ensure potential owners or renters are informed about the presence of overflights near airports so that they can make more informed decisions regarding acquisition or lease of property in the area. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

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 project does not warrant the construction of new public services facilities, such as fire and police stations, schools and parks. The new development however, will be subject to the city's Development Impact Fees, which are paid by the applicant prior to the issuance of a building permit. The fees help pay for master planned public services due to growth associated with new development. This is enforced by city ordinance (CMC Chapter 16.23); therefore, no additional mitigation is warranted with respect to impacts on city and public services.

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 electric services while Southern California Gas will provide natural gas services to the project site. At the time of project grading, necessary gas and power lines will be extended to the project site by the developer. City water and sewer services are also currently provided to the project site, and Waste Management will continue to provide waste collection and disposal services. The amount of commercial gas, power and waste generated by the development is not expected to impact these services. Therefore, no further mitigation measures are required of the applicant.

13 AESTHETICS:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒
☐	☐	☐	☒
☐	☐	☐	☒
☐	☐	☐	☒

a. Scenic vista or highway

b. Degrade visual character of site & surroundings

c. Light or glare

d. Scenic resources (forest land, historic buildings within state scenic highway)

Discussion:

Buena Vista Avenue is not considered a scenic vista or highway, as shown in Figure 4.4.2 of the city's General Plan Technical Background Report (March 2004). The nearest scenic Highway is State Route 91, which is approximately 0.20 mile to the south. Additionally, the project will not negatively impact views from the roadways because residential developments is already established along this roadway.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of 64 senior apartments in a three story building, which would be consistent with the residential uses that already exist in the immediate area. The architectural style of the building is Spanish Mediterranean. The style consists of tile roofs and stucco walls with decorative wall trims with corbels, windows are enhanced with stucco window trims and fabric awnings, the doors are enhanced with decorative Spanish tile, the balconies are enhanced with wrought iron guard rails and wood trellis. The R-3 Zone establishes building setbacks and a maximum building height limit of 40 feet. The proposed project is designed to comply with the required building setbacks, as the building is set back approximately 60 feet from the south property line, 61 feet from the east property line, 62 feet from the north property line and 185 feet from the west property line. The building does not exceed a height of 39 feet and provides on-site parking to support the development. The project is well designed and compatible with the existing nearby residential uses as the area includes a mix of single family and multiple family residential. Therefore, impacts related to this issue are expected be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Development of the proposed use would necessitate the installation of outdoor lighting necessary for the maintenance of public safety and security. The City of Corona is nearing build out and a significant amount of ambient light from urban uses already exists. The project site's vicinity is a developed area with existing ambient lighting, thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant change in the existing ambient lighting. Furthermore, the Corona Municipal Code requires exterior lighting to be directed downward with minimal spillover onto adjacent properties. As such, impacts associated with light and glare effects resulting from the project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. The project site is not located immediately adjacent to any forest lands. There are no historic buildings located in the vicinity of the project site. No State-designated scenic highway is located within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not impact scenic resources and no mitigation is required.

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Historical resource	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Archaeological resource	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Paleontological resource or unique geologic feature	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074.	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Disturb human remains	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion:

A site-specific Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by BCR Consulting LLC, dated May 10, 2017. BCR Consulting conducted a records search, reconnaissance pedestrian field survey, tribal scoping, and paleontological overview were conducted for the project in partial fulfillment with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cultural resources records search revealed that 28 cultural resource studies have taken place resulting in 12 cultural resources recorded within one mile of the project site. Of the 28 previous studies, none has previously assessed the project site and no cultural resources have been previously recorded within its boundaries.

Cultural Resources and Studies within One Mile of the Project Site

USGS 7.5 Min. Quadrangle	Cultural Resources Within One Mile of Project Site	Reports Within One Mile of Project Site
Corona North, California (1981)	CA-RIV-675: Prehistoric Lithic Scatter (3/4 Mile NE) CA-RIV-5521H: Unspecified H. Period Arch. site (3/4 Mi. NW) P-33-14754: Historic-Period Water Conveyance (1/2 Mile SSE) P-33-20208: Historic-Period Residence (1/4 Mile NE) P-33-20209: Historic-Period Residence (1/4 Mile E) P-33-20210: Historic-Period Residence (1/4 Mile N) P-33-24184: Historic-Period Residence (3/4 Mile SSE) P-33-24188: Historic-Period Residence (1 Mile SE) P-33-24190: Historic-Period Residence (3/4 Mile SSE) P-33-24191: Historic-Period Residence (3/4 Mile SSE) P-33-24192: Historic-Period Residence (1 Mile SE) P-33-24207: Historic-Period Rural Property (1 Mile E)	RI-0060, 2174, 2429, 2929, 3598, 3629, 3768, 3769, 4357, 4358, 4678, 4891, 5395, 5753, 5764, 6109, 6911, 7451, 8047, 8763, 8768, 8905, 8988, 9337, 9338, 9339, 9360, 9480

The records search failed to indicate significant cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site. During the field survey, BCR Consulting archaeologists did not discover any cultural resources (including prehistoric or historic-period archaeological sites or historic-period buildings) within the project site. Furthermore, the sediments, rocks, and topography of the project site did not exhibit any potential for significant cultural utility or sensitivity. As a result, BCR Consulting recommends a finding of no impacts to historical resources under CEQA for the current project. BCR Consulting also recommends that no additional cultural resources work or monitoring is necessary during proposed activities associated with the development of the project site. However, if previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist should be contacted to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction excavation if necessary.

The project is subject to tribal consultation under SB 18 and AB 52. The Community Development Department initiated the process by notifying five local Native American tribes of the proposed project through a letter of transmittal dated June 21, 2017. The Community Development Department received written requests dated June 23, 2017 and dated June 27, 2017 from the Pechanga Tribe and the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, respectively, requesting consultation on the project.

On July 6, 2017 staff emailed the cultural resources assessment to the Native American Heritage Commission for review. On several occasions staff contacted Ebru Ozdil, representative for the Pechanga Tribe, both via email and telephone to inquire if additional consultation from Pechanga was requested. During a telephone conversation Ms. Ozdil stated if the city was providing standard mitigation measures for Tribal Monitoring more than likely no additional consultation would be required by Pechanga. On September 28, 2017, staff emailed Ms. Ozdil the standard mitigation measures for Tribal Monitoring. Staff made multiple attempts to confirm with Ms. Ozdil via email and telephone if additional consultation would be necessary. Staff was not able to obtain a response from Ms. Ozdil; therefore, staff chose to end consultation with Pechanga in October 2017 as Staff believes that a good faith and reasonable effort was made by staff to consult on the project.

Additionally, on several occasions staff contacted Erica Martinez and Destiny Colocho, representatives for the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, both via email and telephone to confirm if additional consultation would be necessary. On October 2, 2017, Ms. Martinez sent an email stating she had not forgotten to get back to staff; however, her colleague Ms. Colocho had been out of the office and stated she would confirm with Ms. Colocho upon her return and inform staff if additional consultation would be necessary. Staff was not able to obtain a response from either Mr. Martinez or Ms. Colocho; therefore, staff chose to end consultation with Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians in October 2017 as staff believes that a good faith and reasonable effort was made by staff to consult on the project.

The project is unlikely to contain cultural resources due to its infill location and as evidenced by the results of the research conducted by BCR Consulting LLC. However, in the event of inadvertent discoveries of human remains during the grading process of the project, the following mitigation measures have been added to the project: Therefore, implementations of **Mitigation Measures 1-5** are necessary in order to reduce cultural and paleontological impacts to a less than a significant level.

Mitigation Measures:

Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources: *In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:*

1. **Temporary Curation and Storage:** During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location onsite or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process; and
2. **Treatment and Final Disposition:** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Corona Community Development Department with evidence of same:
 - a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed;
 - b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;
 - c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default; and.
 - d. At the completion of grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project Archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Corona, Eastern Information Center and interested tribes.
3. **Sacred Sites:** All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the project area, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.
4. **Fossil Specimens:** In the event that fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out:
 - a. The applicant shall immediately cease operation and retain a qualified and trained paleontologist. The paleontologist shall salvage all fossils in the area and provide additional field staff in accordance with modern paleontological techniques.
 - b. All fossils collected during the project will be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix will be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of all material collected and identified will be provided to the museum repository along with the specimens.
5. **Discovery of Human Remains:** In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors, project archaeologist, and/or designated Native American Monitor shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Corona Community and Development Department immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b). Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If human remains are determined as those of Native American origin, the applicant shall comply with the state relating to the disposition of Native American burials that fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC Section 5097). The coroner shall contact the NAHC to determine the most likely descendant(s). The MLD shall

complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The Disposition of the remains shall be overseen by the most likely descendant(s) to determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts.

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings will be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC).

According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052) determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that the project proponent and the MLD are in disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and the median and decision process will occur with the NAHC (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).

15. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Williamson Act contract | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Discussion:

The project area is not a designated Agricultural Preserve under the Williamson Act. The area is not currently being used for agricultural purposes; therefore, future development of the vacant portion of the project site will not result in impacts to agricultural operations. Therefore, the project will not result in impacts in this regard, and no mitigation is warranted.

16. GREENHOUSE GASES:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Contribute to Greenhouse Gases | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The City of Corona adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2012. The purpose of the CAP is to provide guidance on analyzing GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development projects within the City. To address the state's requirement to reduce GHG emissions, the City of Corona prepared its CAP with the goal of reducing GHG emissions within the City by 15% below "existing" 2008 levels or 25% below a "forecasted" 2020 BAU scenario by the year 2020. The City's target is consistent with the AB 32 target and ensures that Corona will be providing GHG reductions locally that will complement state efforts to reduce GHG emissions. Because the City's CAP addresses GHG emissions reductions and is consistent with the requirements of AB 32 and international efforts to reduce GHG emissions, compliance with the CAP fulfills the description of mitigation found in the State CEQA Guidelines.

Per the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis prepared by Vista Environmental (February 27, 2017) for the project, the annual greenhouse gas emissions associated with the operation of the project are estimated to be 447.66 MTCO₂e per year. According to the SCAQMD draft threshold of significance detailed above in Section 6.5, a cumulative global climate change impact would occur if the GHG emissions created from the on-going operations would exceed 3,500 MTCO₂e per year. Therefore, a less than significant generation of greenhouse gas emissions would occur from development of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Proposed Project Greenhouse Gas Annual Emissions

Category	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Area Sources ¹	1.08	0.00	0.00	1.10
Energy Usage ²	143.02	0.01	0.00	143.70
Mobile Sources ³	255.32	0.01	0.00	255.52
Solid Waste ⁴	5.23	0.31	0.00	11.72
Water and Wastewater ⁵	22.07	0.12	0.00	25.51
Construction ⁶	10.07	0.00	0.00	10.10
Total Emissions	436.78	0.45	0.00	447.66
SCAQMD Draft Residential Threshold of Significance				3,500

Notes:

¹ Area sources consist of GHG emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment.

² Energy usage consists of GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas usage.

³ Mobile sources consist of GHG emissions from vehicles.

⁴ Waste includes the CO₂ and CH₄ emissions created from the solid waste placed in landfills.

⁵ Water includes GHG emissions from electricity used for transport of water and processing of wastewater.

⁶ Construction emissions amortized over 30 years as recommended in the SCAQMD GHG Working Group on November 19, 2009.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.1.

17. 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cumulatively considerable impacts	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Substantial adverse effects on humans	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Short-term vs. long-term goals	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

The proposed project is not anticipated to impact any threatened or endangered species or habitat as the project site contains no bodies of waters. There is no evidence before the City that the project will have an adverse effect fish or wildlife resources or cumulatively considerable impacts. Furthermore, the project site is not identified with any known paleontological, archaeological, or historic features. Measures have been identified to mitigate impacts associated with the discovery of as-yet undetected subsurface cultural and/or paleontological resources during excavation operations. Adherence to these measures would reduce cultural, historic, or paleontological impacts to a less than significant level.

18. 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. Geotechnical Investigation Report, prepared by GeoTek, Inc., dated February 20, 2017.
3. City of Corona General Plan EIR, March 2004
4. Air Quality Analysis, prepared by Vista Environmental, February 2017.
5. Focused Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by LLG, dated July 11, 2017.
6. General Habitat Assessment, prepared by Ecological Sciences, dated October 25, 2016.
7. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by GeoTek, dated February 20, 2017.
8. Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by BCR Consulting LLC, May 10, 2017.
9. Green House Gasses Analysis, prepared by Vista Environmental, February 2017.
10. GIS Aerial Map.

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

Buena Vista Active Senior Living Project: GPA17-001, CZ17-002 and CUP17-004

No	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
1	<i>During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location onsite or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process.</i>	Condition of Approval	Field Inspection	Grading Permit and Grading Operations	Community Development and Public Works Departments	
2	<i>The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Corona Community Development Department with evidence of same:</i> <i>a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed;</i> <i>b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;</i> <i>c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default; and.</i>	Condition of Approval	Field Inspection	Grading Permit and Grading Operations	Community Development and Public Works Departments	

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

Buena Vista Active Senior Living Project: GPA17-001, CZ17-002 and CUP17-004

	d. At the completion of grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project Archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Corona, Eastern Information Center and interested tribes.				
3	All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the project area, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.	Condition of Approval	Field Inspection	Grading Permit and Grading Operations	Community Development and Public Works Departments
4	In the event that fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out: a. The applicant shall immediately cease operation and retain a qualified and trained paleontologist. The paleontologist shall salvage all fossils in the area and provide additional field staff in accordance with modern paleontological techniques. b. All fossils collected during the project will be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix will be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of all material collected and identified will be provided to the museum repository along with the specimens.	Condition of Approval	Field Inspection	Grading Permit and Grading Operations	Community Development and Public Works Departments
5	In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors, project archaeologist, and/or designated Native American Monitor shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Corona Community and Development Department immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the	Condition of Approval	Field Inspection	Grading Permit and Grading Operations	Community Development and Public Works Departments

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

Buena Vista Active Senior Living Project: GPA17-001, CZ17-002 and CUP17-004

	remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b). Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If human remains are determined as those of Native American origin, the applicant shall comply with the state relating to the disposition of Native American burials that fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC Section 5097). The coroner shall contact the NAHC to determine the most likely descendant(s). The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The Disposition of the remains shall be overseen by the most likely descendant(s) to determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts. The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings will be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC). According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052) determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that the project proponent and the MLD are in disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and the median and decision process will occur with the NAHC (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).				
--	--	--	--	--	--