



**CITY OF CORONA**  
**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

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

**PM 37152:** A Parcel Map application to subdivide 3.6 acres into two parcels for light industrial purposes located on the east side of Temescal Canyon Road, south of Cajalco Road in the Business Park (BP) designation of the Dos Lagos Specific Plan (SP99-03).

**PP16-011:** A Precise Plan application to review the site plan, architecture and landscaping associated with two light industrial buildings totaling 62,721 square feet on 3.6 acres located on the east side of Temescal Canyon Road, south of Cajalco Road in the Business Park (BP) designation of the Dos Lagos Specific Plan (SP99-03).

**ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:**

Pat Tritz  
Griffco Land, LLC  
2518 N. Santiago Blvd.  
Orange, CA 92867

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 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA 92882.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor  
City of Corona

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

# **CITY OF CORONA**

## **INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**PROJECT TITLE:** Planning Area 6 Industrial Park (PM 37152 and PP16-011)

**PROJECT LOCATION:** East side of Temescal Canyon Road, south of Cajalco Road (APN 279-470-009)

### **PROJECT PROPONENT:**

Pat Tritz  
Griffco Land, LLC  
2518 N. Santiago Blvd.  
Orange, CA 92867

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project entails the review of two development applications that include a parcel map and precise plan for the development of a new light industrial park on 3.6 acres in Planning Area 6 of the Dos Lagos Specific Plan (SP-99-03). The site is designated as Business Park (BP) on the specific plan land use map which permits light industrial developments. The parcel map, PM 37152, is a proposal to subdivide the project site into two parcels for the development of two light industrial buildings. Proposed Parcel 1 is 75,759 square feet and Parcel 2 is 80,872 square feet. The precise plan, PP16-011, is to review the site plan, architecture, and landscaping of the proposed project. Parcel 1 is to be developed with a 30,940 square foot light industrial building with 69 parking spaces. Parcel 2 is to be developed with a 31,781 square foot light industrial building with 71 parking spaces.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Presently, the site is an undeveloped previously graded dirt lot. The project site is part of the master planned Dos Lagos community in which a Specific Plan was approved and an EIR for the plan was certified in June 2000. In 2003, the Dos Lagos Specific Plan area was mass and rough graded by the master developer, including the project site known as PA 6 of the Specific Plan, to enable the construction of the necessary public infrastructure to support the development planned for the area. Abutting the west side is Temescal Canyon Road which is fully improved with roadway, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and parkway adjacent to the site.

Located across Temescal Canyon Road to the west of the site is a concrete manufacturing business. Abutting the north and east of the site is a City of Corona waste water treatment plant. Abutting the south is the Dos Lagos Golf Course. The nearest sensitive land uses are residential properties which are located approximately 160 feet south of the project site past the golf course.

### **GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:**

The subject property is located within the Dos Lagos Specific Plan and has a designation of Business Park which permits business park uses. If business park uses are not developed on the site, the site may be developed with light industrial uses including light industrial buildings under an alternate designation of Light Industrial (LI). Therefore, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the zoning of the project site.

The property has a General Plan designation of Light Industrial (LI) which accommodates the development of low-intensity, non-polluting types of manufacturing operations, research and development, wholesale

activities, distribution facilities, and industrial and business parks. The project is consistent with the site's General Plan designation as the project is a light industrial park consisting of two light industrial buildings. Furthermore, the LI designation establishes a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limit of 0.5. The project proposes an FAR of 0.4 which does not exceed the site's FAR limit.

## 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"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality         | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities                     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources                | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            |   |

Date Prepared: August 24, 2017 (Revised October 24, 2017) Prepared By: Sandra Yang, Associate Planner

Contact Person: Sandra Yang

Phone: (951)279-3553

**AGENCY DISTRIBUTION**

(check all that apply)

- ☐ Responsible Agencies
- ☐ Trustee Agencies (CDFG, SLC, CDPR, UC)
- ☐ State Clearinghouse (CDFG, USFWS, Redev. Projects)
- ☐ AQMD
- ☒ Pechanga
- ☒ Soboba
- ☐ WQCB
- ☐ Other:

**UTILITY DISTRIBUTION**

- ☒ Southern California Edison

Southern California Edison  
Adriana Mendoza-Ramos, Esq.  
Region Manager, Local Public Affairs  
1351 E. Francis St.  
Ontario, CA 91761

Southern California Edison  
Karen Cadavona  
Third Party Environmental Review  
2244 Walnut Grove Ave.  
Quad 4C 472A  
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 located within the Dos Lagos Specific Plan and has a designation of Business Park (BP) which permits the development of business park uses. The site may also be developed with light industrial uses under an alternate designation of Light Industrial (LI) if business park uses are not developed in PA 6 of the Dos Lagos Specific Plan. The proposed project consists of two light industrial buildings which is permitted under the site's alternative LI designation. Therefore, the project is consistent with the site's zoning.

The project site has a General Plan designation of Light Industrial (LI) which accommodates the development of low-intensity, non-polluting types of manufacturing operations, research and development, wholesale activities, distribution facilities, and industrial and business parks. The project is consistent with the site's General Plan designation as the project is a light industrial park consisting of two light industrial buildings. Furthermore, the LI designation establishes a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limit of 0.5. The project proposes an FAR of 0.4 which does not exceed the site's FAR limit. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the property's zoning and General Plan designation and no mitigation would be required.

The project is surrounded by a City of Corona waste water treatment plant to the north and east, Dos Lagos Golf Course to the south, and Temescal Canyon Road to the west with a concrete manufacturing business located farther west beyond the road. The nearest sensitive land use are residential properties which are located approximately 160 feet south past the golf course. Existing densely planted trees are located within the golf course between the project site and residential properties which provide a buffer between the two areas. The project site is to be developed for a light industrial park consisting of two light industrial buildings. The proposed use is compatible with the immediate surrounding developments. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the surrounding land uses or physically divide the established community and no mitigation is required.

**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 project will not induce substantial growth or displace existing housing or people because the zoning of the project site is intended for industrial uses. The site is undeveloped and the proposed project is for two industrial buildings; therefore, no mitigation pertaining to this issue would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS:</b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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

☐☐☐☒**Discussion:**

There are no known active faults crossing or projecting through the site. The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and thus, ground rupture due to faulting is considered unlikely at this site. The project will be subject to city and county local codes, the latest California Building Code (CBC), and the engineering recommendations recommended in the project's geotechnical investigation report prepared by South Shore Testing & Environmental (July 28, 2016). Therefore, any potential impacts related to fault/seismic failures would be reduced to a less than significant impact and no further mitigation would be necessary.

The site was previously mass graded in 2003 as part of the Dos Lagos development and is currently vacant and undeveloped. The site was graded again in August 2017 by the developer without City knowledge. The site was historically used for agricultural purposes and contained citrus trees prior to the mass grading in 2003. The site is relatively flat with no slopes; therefore, landslides and grading on over 10% slopes are not expected to be an issue. The site contains engineered fill which extended to a total depth of about eight feet below the ground surface and generally consists of yellowish brown gravelly silty sand. Expansion index testing was performed by South Shore Testing & Environmental on the soil samples taken from the site. The results indicated that the expansion index for the onsite soils was a nine which is considered to be non-expansive. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted with respect to landslides, slopes, liquefaction, and expansive soils.

The project would involve grading of more than 100 cubic yards. According to the project's conceptual precise grading plan, grading on the project site would cut approximately 3,035 cubic yards, while fill taking place would comprise approximately 5,002 cubic yards. Adherence to the city's grading regulations and the grading specifications identified in the geotechnical investigation report would ensure a less than significant impact would occur and no further 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

Development of the project site would 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 by Wilson Mikami Corporation (August 8, 2016) 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 maintain landscaping using minimum or no pesticides. Another BMP is to sweep sidewalks and parking areas regularly and to prevent accumulation of litter and debris. 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 to water quality and therefore, no further mitigation is required.

According to the California Department of Water Resources, the project site is located in the northwestern portion of the Temescal Groundwater Basin of the Upper Santa Ana River Valley ([http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/groundwater/bulletin\\_118/basindescriptions/8-2.09.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/groundwater/bulletin_118/basindescriptions/8-2.09.pdf)). The Temescal Groundwater Basin encompasses a surface area of 23,500 acres (37 square miles) with recharge predominantly occurring from percolation of precipitation on the valley floor and infiltration of stream flow within tributaries exiting the surrounding mountains and hills. The proposed project's ability to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge lies within the installation of impermeable surfaces, which would reduce the amount of land available for groundwater recharge. Although the development of the proposed project would result in the installation of impermeable surfaces and infrastructure, the amount of land rendered impermeable by implementation of the proposed project is less than one percent of the total area of 23,500 acres of the groundwater basin's total recharge area. Since the project presents a negligible loss of permeable surface area for the Temescal Groundwater Basin, impacts associated with this topic are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. Furthermore, the project does not propose construction of wells or direct pumping of groundwater.

Development of the proposed project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in the form of walkways, parking lots, and buildings, and would alter the site's existing drainage patterns. As such, the project is designed so that surface runoff will be collected within five bio-retention basins that will be incorporated into landscaped areas on the west side of the buildings. Surface runoff will also be collected within two underground infiltration systems which will be constructed in the parking lot on the east side of the buildings. Appropriate collection and conveyance of storm water includes ensuring proposed flows and capacities generated by the new development do not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water system and do not increase the potential for onsite or offsite flooding. Therefore, impacts related to drainage would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

According the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate maps (FIRMS), the project site is not located 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	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

An air quality impact analysis was prepared for the project by Ldn Consulting (August 30, 2016) to analyze potential air impacts associated with the proposed project. Emissions were calculated using the latest version of CalEEMod (v2013.2), which is a computer model approved by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to calculate criteria pollutant emissions. The following discusses the project's compliance to air quality plans and potential short-term and long-term air quality impacts.

The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin, an area covering approximately 6,745 square miles and bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and south and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes all of Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Air quality within the Basin is regulated by the SCAQMD which is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. 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. The AQMP is based 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, the project would be consistent with the AQMP. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to AQMP implementation, and no mitigation measures are required.

Short-term air impacts include construction related activities associated with the proposed project. These activities would result in emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> which have regional significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. Any project with daily regional emissions that exceed any of the regulated thresholds should be considered as having an individually and cumulatively significant air quality impact. It is anticipated that construction of the project would be completed in approximately 12 months. During construction, the project is expected to comply with the regulatory construction requirements

under the SCAQMD Rules which include but are not limited to Rule 1403 (Asbestos), Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings), and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). The project's estimated maximum daily construction emissions are summarized below in Table 5-A. As shown, emissions resulting from project construction would not exceed the SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance for regulated pollutants. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

**TABLE 5-A**  
**Expected Daily Construction Emissions**

Year	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2017 (lb/day)	19.95	36.04	26.15	0.04	14.60	8.28
Significance Threshold (lb/day)	75	100	550	150	150	55
SCAQMD Impact?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Long-term operational activities associated with the proposed project will result in emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Operational emissions would be expected from electricity consumption (energy sources), vehicle trips (mobile sources), and area sources including natural gas fire places, landscape equipment and architectural coating emissions as the structures are repainted over the life of the project. As shown in Table 5-B, the project's expected daily long-term emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Therefore, this would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**TABLE 5-B**  
**Expected Daily Operational Emissions**

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub> /PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Summer Scenario</b>					
Operational Emission Estimates (lb/day)	2.54	3.35	11.12	0.03	2.31
Significance Threshold (lb/day)	55	55	550	150	150/55
SCAQMD Impact?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>Winter Scenario</b>					
Operational Emission Estimates (lb/day)	2.52	3.49	10.24	0.03	2.25
Significance Threshold (lb/day)	55	55	550	150	150/55
SCAQMD Impact?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

A Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) analysis was conducted for the project. LST analyses are applicable to project sites that are five acres or less per SCAQMD. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest residence or sensitive receptor. Based on the analysis, no LST impacts are expected.

Land uses generally associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, landfills, dairies, fiberglass molding facilities. The project does not contain land uses associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the proposed project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities. However, these activities would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the project's construction phase. Other potential odor sources associated with the project include the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the project's long-term operational uses. However, it is expected that project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City's solid waste regulations. The project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with the project's construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation would be 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

Temescal Canyon Road is classified as a major arterial per the General Plan and is required to have an overall right-of-way width that ranges from 106 feet to 120 feet. The portion of Temescal Canyon Road adjacent to the project site is fully improved with roadway, curb and gutter, parkway, and sidewalk. No additional widening is required for Temescal Canyon Road, and the developer is only responsible for the construction of the project's drive approach and on-site improvements, such as drainage, water, and sewer systems. Temescal Canyon Road also contains a raised center median and thus, the project is driveway is restricted to right-in and right-out only turn movements.

A focused traffic impact analysis (TIA) was prepared for the project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (August 23, 2017) to analyze the potential traffic impacts of the proposed project on the surrounding area of the project site. Since the development is industrial and truck activity associated with the development is expected, the TIA assumed that truck trips made up 12%, 14%, and 9% of the daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour, respectively. A Passenger Car Equivalency (PCE) factor of 2.5 was applied to the truck trips. The project is forecast to generate 283 daily trips, with 56 trips produced in the AM peak hour and 52 trips produced in the PM peak hour.

The TIA also analyzed seven existing nearby street intersections and the project's driveway entrance on Temescal Canyon Road. The study intersections included the following:

1. Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road
2. Temescal Canyon Road at Blue Springs Drive
3. Temescal Canyon Road at Pronio Circle
4. Temescal Canyon Road at Lakeshore Drive
5. Temescal Canyon Road at Cabot Drive
6. Temescal Canyon Road at Fashion Drive
7. Temescal Canyon Road at Dos Lagos Drive
8. Temescal Canyon Road at Project Driveway

Different scenarios were analyzed with the study intersections. The following summarizes the scenarios.

Existing Traffic Conditions

For the existing traffic conditions, all seven study intersections currently operate at a Level of Service D or above during the AM and PM peak hours. Per the General Plan, LOS D or above is considered acceptable. The eighth intersection, Temescal Canyon Road/Project Driveway, was not included in this analysis as the project does not exist yet.

Existing With Project Traffic Conditions

For the existing traffic conditions with project traffic conditions, all seven of the study intersections will continue to operate at LOS D or above during the AM and PM peak hours.

Year 2018 With Project Traffic Conditions

Year 2018 is when the project is anticipated to be completed and in operation. All seven study intersections are forecast to operate at LOS D or above during the AM and PM peak hours.

Project Driveway With Project Traffic Conditions

The project driveway is forecast to operate at LOS C or above. The project driveway will be stop-controlled and permit right-in and right-out only. Furthermore, the on-site circulation was evaluated. The proposed layout of the project is not expected to create significant vehicle-pedestrian conflict points. The project traffic is also not anticipated to cause significant internal queuing/stacking at the project driveway.

Site Distance Analysis

A sight distance analysis was prepared for the project driveway. The TIA determined that the project driveway has adequate sight distance with insignificant impact to the proposed adjacent landscaped areas.

Intersection Queue Length Analysis

To address Public Works staff concerns regarding left-turn stacking/storage lengths at several locations, a queuing evaluation was prepared for the following movements:

1. Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road: Northbound Left-turn (2 lanes)
2. Temescal Canyon Road at Blue Springs Drive: Southbound Left-turn (1 lane)

The dual left-turn lanes at the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road/Cajalco Road have an existing storage length of 160 feet. The single left-turn lane at the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road/Blue Springs Drive has an existing storage length of 105 feet. In Year 2018 With Project Traffic Conditions, only the dual left-turn lanes on Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road will be impacted as the lanes' 160-foot storage length was determined to be insufficient in terms of storage capacity. The TIA determined that a minimum storage length 511 feet and 160 feet would be needed during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively to adequately accommodate vehicles. However, due to the existing roadway conditions, the No. 1 left-turn lane can only be feasibly extended by approximately 100 feet. Therefore, the TIA recommended that the No.1 left-turn lane be lengthened by 100 feet for a total storage length of 260 feet.

Furthermore, the center median on Temescal Canyon Road contains an existing outbound left-turn accelerator lane for the Quikrete industrial site located on the west side of Temescal Canyon Road directly opposite of the project site. The accelerator lane is located in front of the proposed project driveway which restricts outbound left-turn movements from the proposed project driveway. In order to ensure that the project driveway does not create conflicts with the accelerator lane, the TIA recommended that delineators be installed along the white striped line for the accelerator lane to restrict left turn movements from the project driveway. Compliance with this mitigation measure and the mitigation measure pertaining to the extension of the No. 1 left-turn lane on Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. **(Mitigation Measure 1)**

The project design does not include the construction of any sharp curves and the new project driveway to be constructed on Temescal Canyon Road is designed to comply with the Public Works Department standards for industrial development. The project's on-site internal circulation is also reviewed for approval by the Public Works Department. As the project does not include the construction of any structure or feature that would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, no impact associated with this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

The project site is located approximately 7.5 miles southeast of the Corona Municipal Airport and the proposed industrial buildings are no more than 34 feet in height. Because of the project site's distance from the airport and the proposed height of the buildings, the project would not impact air operations, nor would it cause change to air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

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 206 is the nearest bus line to the project site. Route 206 extends from East Grand Boulevard in the City of Corona to Lake Elsinore. Route 206 has a bus stop at the corner of Temescal Canyon Road and Pronio Road which is the nearest bus stop to the project site. Corona Cruiser runs along pre-designated Blue Line and Red Line fixed routes. The Corona Cruiser has a Red Line bus stop located at the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road and Pronio. 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.

#### **Mitigation Measure**

1. **Prior to map recordation or issuance of a building permit, whichever occurs first, the developer shall construct or guarantee the construction of the recommendations in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, including improvements to the outbound left-turn lane acceleration lane and the No. 1 northbound left-turn lane on Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road, unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Director.**

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:**

The proposed project will not impact biological resources as the project site in which the proposed development will occur was analyzed under the Dos Lagos Specific Plan EIR, which was a cumulative environmental analysis of the 543 acres within the plan boundary. Per the EIR, the project site for PA 6 of the Specific Plan was used for agricultural purposes and contained citrus trees. The site was not identified as having native and riparian habitat at the time the biological surveys were done for the Specific Plan area. In 2003, the master developer mass and rough graded the Dos Lagos project area in order to begin the construction on the public infrastructure for the entire Specific Plan. The project site was included as part of the mass and rough grading at which time the citrus trees were removed from the property. The project site has remained undeveloped since the initial grading from 2003.

In accordance with the mitigation measures in the Dos Lagos EIR, the master developer obtained all the required regulatory permits from the responsible agencies prior to the initial grading within the Specific Plan boundary. The master developer also mitigated the impacts to biological resources accordingly. As such, the development of the project site will not impact biological resources.

The applicant is required to pay applicable fees related to Riverside County's Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, or MSHCP. This MSHCP 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. The applicant is subject to the MSHCP mitigation fee for development. This fee will be used to acquire and preserve vegetation communities and natural areas, which are known to support these sensitive species.

The project site is not located within a MSHCP criteria cell; however, it is located in an area for which a habitat assessment for burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia hypungaea*) is required. The project site is also within Survey Area 7 for narrow endemic plant species. Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) 7 includes San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), Brand's phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris*), and San Miguel savory (*Satureja chandleri*). The MSHCP requires habitat assessments for relevant species and focused surveys within areas of potentially suitable habitat. However, because the project site was previously mass graded during the development of the Dos Lagos community and graded a second time by the developer in August 2017 without City knowledge, it is highly unlikely that the project would contain habitat suitable for the burrowing owl or narrow endemic plant species due to the historical use of the property. Furthermore, per the Summary of Phase I Findings letter dated August 25, 2017 and issued by South Shore Testing & Environmental which conducted the project's Phase I ESA (April 14, 2016), the site contained no vegetation at the time the site reconnaissance was conducted for the Phase I. This further confirms that disturbance to habitat suitable to the burrowing owl or narrow endemic plant species during project grading would be unlikely. However, to ensure development of the project site will not impact the burrowing owl, the project is conditioned to have a pre-construction survey conducted for the burrowing owl prior issuance of a grading permit.

As already verified in the Dos Lagos EIR prior to project grading in 2003, the project site never contained riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, development of the project would not impact riparian habitat or any sensitive natural communities and no mitigation would be required. There are also no wetlands on the project site. Therefore, development of the project would not impact federally protected wetlands and no mitigation would be required.

The project site is located in a developed area surrounded by a roadway, freeway, and residential and commercial developments. Therefore, developing the project site would not interfere with wildlife movement and no mitigation would be required.

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, 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	<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:**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) was conducted for the project site by South Shore Testing & Environmental (April 14, 2016) 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. Based on the Phase I ESA, the property was historically utilized for agricultural purposes from 1938 until 1994. Environmentally persistent pesticides commonly applied prior to the 1980s can linger in the soil for many years. It is not known if environmentally persistent pesticides have been applied to the property in the past. Based on the apparent length of time that has elapsed since agricultural usage occurred on the site, the fact that significant surface grading has previously occurred with the placement of four to 10 feet of engineered fill across the site (diluting/aerating/mixing potential surficial pesticide residues), and the current undeveloped use of the property, it is unlikely that the potential former usage of pesticides has significantly environmentally impaired the subject property or would require remedial actions. Based upon the above factors, the Phase I ESA stated that pesticide testing is not warranted.

The site is not listed in any federal or state-reported environmental databases related to underground storage tanks, hazardous waste generation, or hazardous material releases. A field visit of the site was conducted by South Shore Testing & Environmental. No pits, ponds, lagoons, swales, or surface impoundments potentially containing hazardous materials were observed on the property. No above or underground storage tanks were observed during the site visit. No other potential issues of concern such as asbestos, PCB-containing materials, solid waste, or hazardous materials were observed. Therefore, impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials is not expected and no mitigation is required.

The nearest schools to the project site are El Cerrito Intermediate and Wilson Elementary School. El Cerrito Intermediate is located approximately 1.4 miles north of the project site. Wilson Elementary School is located approximately 1.8 miles west of the project site. The schools are separated from the project site by existing residential and commercial developments, highways, and roadways. 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 is required.

The nearest airport to the project site is the Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately 7.5 miles northwest of the project site. Based on the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), the project site is not within any identified safety or compatibility zone and therefore, does not conflict with the ALUCP and no mitigation is warranted.

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 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 of Corona 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure to excessive noise levels/vibrations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Permanent increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Temporary increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport Land Use Plan noise contours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Long-term noise impacts will be minimal given that the proposed use is industrial. 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.

A noise analysis (Lnd Consulting, October 24, 2017) was prepared for the project to analyze potential noise sources related to the operations of the proposed development. The primary concern with regard to noise is the delivery trucks "reverse signals" and waste hauling activities associated with the development. For delivery truck noise, the "reverse signals" or back-up beepers are anticipated to have a noise level of 46.9 dBA measured at the south property line which is the nearest part of the project site to the existing residential area to the south. This measurement includes all six loading bays being utilized at the same time as a worst case scenario. For waste hauling activities, the noise level from this type of activity measured at the south property line is anticipated to be 38.1 dBA. Cumulatively, the noise level from both sources is anticipated to be 47.4 dBA. The noise analysis states that noise from the development will drop off as the noise radiates outward. Therefore, the cumulative noise level from both sources is expected to be lower than 47.4 dBA once it crosses over the golf course green belt to the residential units to the south and would be well below the city's maximum allowable exterior noise levels for residential land uses which are 55 dBA for the daytime hours (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and 50 dBA for the nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). Therefore, mitigation pertaining to noise was not recommended as noise impacts would be less than significant.

Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), the project site is not located in the vicinity of an airport; therefore, no impact associated within this issue would occur and mitigation is not required.

#### 11. PUBLIC SERVICES:

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

#### Discussion:

The development of the project site does not require the construction of new public facilities. The developer however is required to pay the city's Development Impact Fees prior to the issuance of building permits. This is enforced by city ordinance (CMC Chapter 16.23); therefore, no 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Involve construction/expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve construction/expansion of storm drains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sufficient water supplies/compliance with Urban Water Management Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Adequate wastewater treatment capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Adequate landfill capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with solid waste regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

As required for all projects by the City's Department of Water and Power (DWP), the project is required to construct or guarantee the construction of all necessary public water and sewer facilities needed to serve the project. All water and sewer facilities are required to be designed per the standards of the DWP and Riverside County Department of Health Services and will be reviewed by the DWP during the plan check process. This would reduce the impacts to less than a significant level and therefore, no further mitigation would be required.

The installation of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and pavement, generally increases the velocity and volume of surface runoff. As runoff flows over lawns, gardens, sidewalks, and streets, it carries off pollutants such as automobile oil and antifreeze, pesticides, pet waste, and litter into the storm drain system. The storm drain system collects water from the streets and transports it directly or indirectly to local water supplies and nearby waterways where it is typically not filtered or treated. The project will be designed to include retention areas for additional runoff created by the proposed project. The project is required to adhere to storm drainage requirements found within the NPDES permit process as well as provisions required by the Public Works Department. Since the proposed project would be required to adhere to NPDES permit requirements and City of Corona storm water provisions, impacts associated with this issue are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Waste Management (WM) is contracted by the City of Corona as the sole hauler of solid waste and provider of recycling services. WM provides refuse collection to residential, commercial, and industrial customers. Based on the solid waste generation identified in Table 12-A, the proposed project with two industrial buildings totaling 62,737 square feet would generate approximately 1.85 tons/day of solid waste. Solid waste from the project would be transported to the El Sobrante landfill located at 10910 Dawson Canyon in Corona. The El Sobrante landfill accepts a maximum 16,054 tons of waste per day and has a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons and an estimated closure date of 2045 (<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Detail/>).

**TABLE 12-A**  
**Project Solid Waste Projections**

Proposed use	Square foot or dwelling unit	Solid Waste Generation Factor	Project Solid Waste Generated (tons/year)
Industrial	62,737 sf	0.0108 tons/sf/year <sup>1</sup>	678
<b>TOTAL (tons/year)</b>			<b>678</b>
<b>TOTAL (tons/day)</b>			<b>1.85</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: Table 4.5-5 Generation of Solid Waste at General Plan buildout within the City, City of Corona General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, March 2004

Development of the proposed project would not significantly impact current operation of or the expected lifetime of the El Sobrante Landfill because solid waste generated by the proposed project represents substantially less than one percent of the landfill's maximum allowable daily capacity. Additionally, solid waste service fees would be charged to individual property owners when services is initiated to offset operation costs associated with solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project is anticipated to create a less than significant impact to landfill capacity and no mitigation would be required.

### 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, Temescal Canyon Road is not a scenic vista or highway. Development of the site will be subject to the development standards and architectural guidelines of the Dos Lagos Specific Plan which permit industrial buildings up to a maximum height of 75 feet. The two buildings proposed on the project site would have a building height of 34 feet and will be constructed of painted concrete tilt-up walls enhanced with glazed windows, stone, and decorative metal canopies. Rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened from street view by parapet walls. The buildings overall are aesthetically pleasing and attractive and would not cause degradation to the area. Therefore, no mitigation with respect to the aesthetics of the development is required.

A photometric analysis was prepared by NLS Manufacturing to analyze the project's on-site lighting for compliance with the city's performance standard for glare and to ensure that the on-site lighting will not be a nuisance to the existing residential dwellings to the south of the project site. The exterior lighting proposed for the development consists of LED wall lights and 20-foot high parking lot light poles. Per the photometric analysis, the light poles will be installed primarily in the parking lot at the front of the property adjacent to Temescal Canyon Road, and only one light pole will be installed in the parking at the rear of the property. The wall lights will be mounted on the sides of the buildings that face one another and at the rear of the buildings. No lights will be mounted on the south side of the building which faces the golf course and residential units. The analysis demonstrate the project's compliance with the city's regulations pertaining to glare per Section 17.84.070 of the Corona Municipal Code which

states that "all areas of exterior lighting shall be designed to direct light downward with minimal spillover onto adjacent residences, sensitive land uses, and open space." The analysis showed that the exterior lighting would result in minimal to no glare spillover onto the adjacent properties surrounding the project site. Furthermore, the LED lamps are positioned two to three inches deep within the cover to eliminate glare spillover. The lights are also subject to California's Energy Code Title 24 lighting requirements which require the lights to dim down to minimum lighting when the motion sensors do not detect movement in the area. The residential dwellings are also distanced from the project site by an open space area which will act as a buffer. Therefore, mitigation pertaining to lighting and glare was not recommended as impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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	<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"/>
e. Disturb human remains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

The project is subject to tribal consultation under 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 July 25, 2016. The Community Development Department received written requests dated August 25, 2016 from the Soboba Tribe requesting consultation on the project.

Consultation between Community Development Department staff and the Soboba Tribe was held on October 27, 2016. Joseph Ontiveros, representative for the Soboba Tribe, requested tribal monitoring during project grading and would only monitor depths that go from six to eight feet below the surface. On August 17, 2017, the Community Development Department learned that the developer had begun grading the site without City approval. Staff immediately notified Mr. Ontiveros of the site's grading via email as it is assumed that tribal monitoring would no longer be necessary. As of the preparation of this document, Staff has not received a response from Mr. Ontiveros.

Since the site was previously mass graded during the development of the Dos Lagos community, it is highly unlikely that the site would contain tribal cultural resources. Also, per the cultural resources study conducted for the project site by Cogstone (March 2016), no cultural resources were observed on the site during Cogstone's field survey. Furthermore, because the site was previously excavated and filled to depths of up to 14 feet, the potential for the site to contain prehistoric and historic archaeological resources is low.

Although the developer has already commenced grading, additional precise grading is still expected to occur. Therefore, the following condition of approval is being applied to the project in the event of inadvertent discoveries of human remains during the precise grading process of the project:

If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately identify the "most likely descendant(s)" of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code 5097.98.

The above condition of approval would reduce any potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level and therefore, no further mitigation would be required.

**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 California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The purpose of the Act is to encourage property owners to continue to farm their land, and to prevent the premature conversion of farmland to urban uses. The project site is not located within a Williamson Act contract area. Therefore, no impact to Williamson Act lands will result from the proposed development and no mitigation is required.

The project site is not a designated farmland per the farmland maps compiled by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). For this reason, development of the project site would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses; therefore, there would be no impacts and no mitigation would be required.

**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:**

The City of Corona adopted the City of Corona Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2012 which utilizes the *Greenhouse Gas Emissions CEQA Thresholds and Screening Tables* to determine whether or not a project would have a significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions. The screening tables are to provide guidance in measuring GHG reductions attributable to certain design and construction measures incorporated into development projects. Projects that garner at least 100 points will be consistent with the reduction quantities anticipated in the City's CAP and would thus be considered less than significant. Utilizing the screening tables would also allow the City to meet its GHG emissions target for year 2020.

Per the CAP, small projects that are expected to emit GHG emissions that are less than 3,000 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e (metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e equivalent) are not required to utilize the screening tables as they would be expected to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. To demonstrate that the applicant's project is a "small project" a greenhouse gas analysis was prepared for the project by Ldn Consulting (August 29, 2016). The annual greenhouse gas emissions associated with the construction and operation of the project are estimated to be 1,041.24 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e and 1,869.93 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, respectively. These would not exceed the threshold of significance of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e for small land use projects and thus, the project was not required to use the screening tables which demonstrates the project's compliance with the CAP. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact and 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.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
**Discussion:**

It is highly unlikely that development of the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of a tribal cultural resource since the site is not known to contain tribal cultural resources. It is not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or on the City's register of historic resources. Therefore, there would be no impacts to tribal cultural resources and no mitigation is required.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Substantial adverse effects on humans                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Short-term vs. long-term goals                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Discussion:**

Based on the analysis of this Initial Study checklist, development of the proposed project would have either no impact, or potential effects of the proposal are substantiated at or mitigated to levels below thresholds of significance. Based on the analysis presented in the preceding checklist, the project has the potential to result in significant impacts under the following environmental topics:

- Transportation/Traffic

In response, appropriate mitigation has been developed. Mitigation Measure 1, complied subsequently within the project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, successfully mitigates all identified potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, project impacts to fish/wildlife population or habitat, important historical sites, cumulatively considerable impacts, substantial adverse effects on humans, or short-term vs. long-term goals are considered less-than-significant.

**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 and Technical Background Report, March 17, 2004.
2. City of Corona Environmental Information Form, completed for the project by Kinsinger Environmental Consulting, February 15, 2015.
3. Preliminary Project Specific WQMP, prepared by Wilson Mikami Corporation, August 8, 2016
4. Air Quality Screening Letter, prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc., August 30, 2016
5. Greenhouse Gas Letter, prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc., August 29, 2016
6. Geotechnical Update, prepared by South Shore Testing & Environmental, July 28, 2016
7. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by South Shore Testing & Environmental, April 14, 2016
8. Summary of Phase I Findings, prepared by South Shore Testing & Environmental, August 25, 2017
9. Focused Traffic Impact Analysis Report, prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, August 23, 2017
10. Cultural Resources Technical Report For The Rexco Properties, prepared by Cogstone, March 2016
11. Paleontological Resources Technical Report For The Rexco Properties, prepared by Cogstone, March 2016
12. Noise Analysis, prepared by Ldn Consulting, October 24, 2017



## MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

### Planning Area 6 Industrial Park PM 37152 and PP16-011

No.	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Party	Verification Date
	<b>Transportation/Traffic</b>					
1	Prior to map recordation or issuance of a building permit, whichever occurs first, the developer shall construct or guarantee the construction of the recommendations in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, including improvements to the outbound left-turn lane acceleration lane and the No. 1 northbound left-turn lane on Temescal Canyon Road at Cajalco Road, unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Director.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of Street Improvement Plan	Prior to approval of Street Improvement Plan	Public Works	

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK