CITY OF CORONA
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME, DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF PROJECT:

TTM 36634

A tentative tract map application to create one lot for residential condominium purposes on 2.32 acres to facilitate the development of 11 single family detached condominiums located on the east side of Hudson Avenue at Poppyseed Lane, generally west of Fullerton Avenue at Taber Street in the Medium Density Residential designation of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05).

PP15-004

A precise plan application to review the site design, architecture, and conceptual landscaping associated with the development of 11 single family detached condominiums on 2.32 acres located on the east side of Hudson Avenue at Poppyseed Lane, generally west of Fullerton Avenue at Taber Street in the Medium Density Residential designation of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05).

ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:

Melvin Aou, Poppybend LLC, 18340 Yorba Linda Blvd., Suite 107-200, Yorba Linda, CA 92886

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: _____

CITY OF CORONA
INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT TITLE:

TTM 36634

A tentative tract map application to create one lot for residential condominium purposes on 2.32 acres to facilitate the development of 11 single family detached condominiums located in the Medium Density Residential designation of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05).

PP15-004

A precise plan application to review the site design, architecture, and conceptual landscaping associated with the development of 11 single family detached condominiums on 2.32 acres located in the Medium Density Residential designation of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05).

PROJECT LOCATION:

East side of Hudson Avenue at Poppyseed Lane, generally west of Fullerton Avenue at Taber Street
City of Corona, County of Riverside
APN 120-340-018

PROJECT PROPONENT:

Melvin Aou
Poppybend, LLC
18340 Yorba Linda Blvd., Suite 107-200
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project entails the development of 11 detached single family residential condominium homes proposed on a vacant 2.3-acre parcel located on the east side of Hudson Avenue at Poppyseed Lane, generally west of Fullerton Avenue at Taber Street. The subject site is within the boundaries of the Corona Vista Specific Plan (SP90-05) and designated as Medium Density Residential (MDR). In order to develop the site as proposed, the applicant is processing two applications for approval, which are TTM 36634 and PP15-004. The purpose of each application is described above under the Project Title section of this document.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The area surrounding the project site consists primarily of single-family residential land uses. Immediately to the north and south are residential developments, and to the west and east are roadways with residential developments located beyond. The property was used for agricultural purposes from approximately 1938 through 1990 and was graded by 1995. Presently, the property is vacant and covered by annual grasses, flowering plants, and invasive weeds. The property is situated at an elevation of about 920 feet above mean sea level. Topographically, the property slopes very gently from the southwest. The soils found on the site are Garretson gravelly very fine sandy loam.

GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:

The property is designated as Medium Density Residential (MDR) on the city's General Plan map which permits residential developments to occur at a density from 6 to 15 du/ac (dwelling units per acre). The property is also designated as MDR on the South Corona Community Facilities Plan which has a maximum allowable density of 7.88 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is a residential condominium development which yields a density of 4.74 du/ac and therefore, does not exceed the maximum allowable densities established by the General Plan and South Corona Community Facilities Plan for the MDR designation.

The property is within the Corona Vista Specific Plan and designated as MDR within said specific plan. The property is also designated as Planning Area 15 within the specific plan. The MDR designation permits residential condominiums at a maximum density of 7.78 du/ac. The project's density of 4.89 dwelling units per acre is below 7.78 du/ac and therefore, complies with the MDR designation of the specific plan.

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.**

XX The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate the effects to below a level of significance. **Therefore, a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.**

___ The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. **Therefore, an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.**

__ The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, however, a previous EIR has addressed only a portion of the effects identified as described in the Environmental Checklist discussion. As there are potentially significant effects that have not been mitigated to below significant levels, a **FOCUSED EIR will be prepared to evaluate only these effects.**

___ There is no evidence that the proposed project will have the potential for adverse effect on fish and wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

Date Prepared: October 4, 2018 Prepared By: Sandra Yang, Senior Planner

Contact Person: Sandra Yang Phone: (951) 736-2434

AGENCY DISTRIBUTION
(check all that apply)

_____ Responsible Agencies

_____ Trustee Agencies (CDFG, SLC, CDPR, UC)

_____ State Clearinghouse (CDFG, USFWS, Redev. Projects)

_____ SCAQMD (Includes technical studies)

__XX__ Pechanga

__XX__ Soboba

_____ WQCB

_____ Other:_____

UTILITY DISTRIBUTION

__XX__ **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

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 project site is designated as Medium Density Residential (MDR) on the General Plan land use map which permits residential development to occur at a density from 6 to 15 du/ac. The site is also designated as MDR on the South Corona Community Facilities Plan which has a maximum allowable density of 7.88 du/ac. The proposed project yields a density of 4.74 du/ac which is within the allowable density range of 6 to15 du/ac established by the General Plan for the MDR designation. The project's density is also below the maximum allowable density of 7.88 du/ac established by the South Corona Community Facilities Plan for the MDR designation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the General Plan or South Corona Community Facilities Plan and no mitigation is warranted.

The project site is designated as MDR within the Corona Vista Specific Plan. The MDR designation permits residential condominium developments at a maximum allowable density of 7.78 du/ac. Since the project's density is 4.89 du/ac, the project would not conflict with the MDR designation of the specific plan and therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

The project site is an infill property located in a predominantly residential area. Bordering the project site to the north and south are residential properties. To the west and east are roadways with residential properties beyond. The surrounding properties are within the same specific plan and share the same MDR designation as the project site. Thus, they are also developed at a similar density as the proposed project. Therefore, development of the proposed project on the project site would not conflict with the surrounding land uses or physically divide the established community. The project would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not physically divide the community. As such, mitigation would not be required.

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:

Medium density residential development is proposed on the 2.32-acre project site. The MDR designation of the General Plan enables 6 to 15 du/ac which this project proposal does not exceed. The project proposes only 11 dwelling units which yields a density of 4.74 du/ac. The project will not induce substantial growth or exceed the city's population projections established in the 2004 General Plan for build-out Year 2025. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

Development of the proposed project will not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people because the project site is vacant. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

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:

A geotechnical investigation report was prepared for the project by Coleman Geotechnical (November 30, 2005). Per the report, 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 in the project's geotechnical investigation report. 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 is underlain by a thin layer of loose fill, which is underlain by a thick deposit of older alluvium that was found to be generally dense. Ground water was not encountered in test pits conducted by Coleman Geotechnical for the geotechnical investigation report. The potential for liquefaction to occur at the site is negligible based on the lack of ground water and relatively dense nature of the underlying older alluvium below the site. The potential for landsliding is also negligible based on the lack of topographic relief on or near the site. The soils at the site have a very low to low expansion potential thereby requiring no special construction requirements other than those as recommended in the geotechnical investigation report. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Development of the site would involve grading of more than 100 cubic yards. There would also be grading in areas with greater than 10 percent slopes. 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 investigation 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 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 A&E Consultants (August 2018) 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. These include maintaining a repairing the on-site storm drain inlets periodically, providing regular maintenance of the landscaping, and sweeping sidewalks and parking areas regularly and to prevent accumulation of litter and debris. Three bio-retention areas will also be constructed on the site to treat potential pollutants in runoff. 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). 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, buildings, and a private street, and would alter the site's existing drainage patterns. As such, the project is designed so that surface runoff will be collected within three bio-retention areas that will be incorporated into landscaped areas on the site. 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Violate air quality standard	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Net increase of any criteria pollutant	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Create objectionable odors	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

An air quality impact analysis was prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants (April 2015) to analyze potential air impacts associated with the proposed project. Emissions were calculated using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2, which was the latest version available at the time of the preparation of the report. The CalEEMod 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 (Construction) Impacts

Short-term air impacts include construction related activities associated with the proposed project. These activities would result in emissions of ROG, NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ 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 11 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
Estimated Construction Maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions Without Mitigation (lbs/day)

Construction Phase	**Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)**				
	ROG	**NO_X**	**CO**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Maximum lbs/day	10.8	30.9	20.3	8.2	4.9
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Localized Significance Thresholds Impacts

The project's air quality study also included a localized impacts analysis. The SCAQMD established Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) to show whether a proposed project would cause or contribute to localized air quality impacts at the nearest sensitive receptor. Sensitive receptors include residences, schools, hospitals, and similar uses that are sensitive to adverse air quality. For this project, the nearest sensitive receptors include residential properties directly to the north,

west, south, and east. LSTs take into account the size of the project and a project's distance to the sensitive receptor, and apply only to NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Table 5-B shows that the project's construction emission rates would not exceed the SCAQMD's Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) established for sensitive receptors located 25 meters from the project site. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

TABLE 5-B
Construction LST Impacts

Construction Phase	Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)			
	NO_X	**CO**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Maximum On-site lbs/day	30.8	19.6	4.6	3.0
Local Significance Thresholds (LSTs) (On-site only)	181	1,083	7	5
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Long-Term (Operational) Impacts

Long-term operational activities associated with the proposed project will result in emissions of VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Operational emissions would be expected from energy sources (electricity consumption), mobile sources (vehicle trips), and area sources (landscape equipment and architectural coating emissions). As shown in Table 5-C, the project's expected daily long-term emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, this would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

TABLE 5-C
Project Operational Emissions

Emissions Source	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Maximum lbs/day	0.6	0.9	4.2	<0.1	0.6	0.2
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Odors

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	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 traffic impact analysis (TIA) was prepared for the project by Albert A. Webb Associates (December 3, 2015). The project is forecast to generate 105 daily trips, with 8 trips produced in the AM peak hour and 11 trips produced in the PM peak hour. Three study intersections were analyzed.

1. Fullerton Avenue/Autumn Lane
2. Hudson Avenue/Santana Way
3. Hudson Avenue/Poppyseed Lane

As shown in Table 6-A under the *Existing Traffic Conditions* scenario, the first two study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) B or above. The City of Corona considers LOS D and above to be acceptable for all intersections consisting of collector and arterial roadways and LOS C and above for all local intersections in residential/industrial areas. The intersection at Hudson Avenue and Poppyseed Lane was not evaluated for its level of service since this intersection is currently not signalized or controlled by stop signs. However, as part of the project requirements, the developer is required to modify this intersection into a one-way stop controlled intersection which is reflected under the *Future Traffic Conditions With Project Traffic* scenario. Under the future scenario, all three intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS B or above. Therefore, mitigation pertaining to traffic was not warranted.

Table 6-A
Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary[1]

Key Intersection	Time Period	Existing Traffic Conditions (LOS)	Future Traffic Conditions With Project Traffic (LOS)	Significant Impact?
1. Fullerton Ave @ Autumn Ln	AM PM	A B	**A** **B**	NO **NO**
2. Hudson Ave @ Santana Wy	AM PM	A A	B A	
3. Hudson Ave @ Poppyseed Ln	AM PM	Not Applicable	A A	

1. Includes a two percent ambient growth rate per year plus cumulative traffic from two residential projects located within the study area.

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. The site is located within the boundaries of the MSCHP; however, it is not located within a cell group or criteria cell of the MSCHP. It is also not located within an amphibian survey area, criteria area species survey area, mammal survey area, or narrow endemic plants survey area. The site is, however, located in a burrowing owl survey area. The burrowing owl is a California Department of Fish and Wildlife species of concern. They are typically found in open, dry grasslands, agricultural and range lands, and desert habitats. They nest in abandoned burrows or ground squirrels or the animals, in pipes, under piles of rock or debris, and in other similar features. Nesting occurs from March through August. A burrowing owl study was prepared by Rincon Consultants (April 2015) for the project site. A field visit

was conducted by a biologist from Rincon Consultants on March 27, 2015. The site was found to be significantly disturbed due to evident previous grading. The site was covered by annual grasses, flowering plants, and invasive weeds, interspersed with patches of bare ground and rocks. No burrowing owls or signs of the specie were found during the field visit. Although ground squirrel borrows were found on the site, the project site is considered too small and fragmented to be able to support one pair of burrowing owl, or an individual. Burrowing owls are known to require at a minimum of 6.5 acres of suitable foraging habitat per the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines (Burrowing Owl Consortium, 1992). The study area is surrounded by developed residential areas and therefore, is not suitable habitat. The burrowing owl study further indicated that development of the proposed project on the site is not expected to impact burrowing owl and did not recommend additional surveys to be conducted. However, since it has been over two years since the burrowing owl survey was conducted on the site, a 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey would be necessary if grading is to occur within the nesting season to ensure that development on the site would not result in adverse impacts to the burrowing owl. This would reduce impacts to less than significant. (**Mitigation Measure 1**)

The project site does not contain jurisdictional drainage features, ponded areas, or riparian habitat subject to the regulatory authority of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As previously stated, a field visit conducted by the project biologist found the site to be significantly disturbed due to evident previous grading and covered by annual grasses, flowering plants, and invasive weeds, interspersed with patches of bare ground and rocks.

The applicant is required to pay applicable fees related to Riverside County's Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, or MSHCP. The MSHCP is a habitat conservation plan implemented by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authoity (RCA) 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. Therefore, no further mitigation pertaining to biological resources is required.

Mitigation Measures

1. If grading is to occur within the burrowing owl nesting season (March through August), the applicant shall submit a pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl to the Community Development Department for review. The survey shall be conducted and submitted for review within 30 days prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

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 does not contain mineral resources. Therefore, the project does not impact mineral resources, 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 conducted for the project by Rincon Consultants (April 3, 2015) 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 assessment included a site reconnaissance held on March 27, 2015. The use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials on the subject property was not observed during the site reconnaissance. Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) was contracted to provided a database search of public lists of sites that generate, store, treat or dispose of hazardous materials or sites for which a release or incident has occurred. The subject property and adjacent properties were not listed in any of the databases searched by EDR. Historic sources reviewed by Rincon Consultants included aerial photographs and topographic maps. The photos and maps reviewed indicated that the subject property was used for agricultural purposes from at least 1938 through 1990. By 1995, the property was graded. Presently, the property remains undeveloped. Based on the site's prior use, Rincon Consultants conducted a Phase II ESA (September 26, 2017) to test and evaluate the soils onsite. Eight soil samples were taken from the site on September 14, 2017. The soils were analyzed by enthalpy Analytical, LLC, a state-certified laboratory, for organochlorine pesticides. The results were compared to the Calfiorna environmental Protection agency's Office of environmental Health Hazard Assessment California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) for residential soil. The following summarizes the results of the soil testings:

- DDD was detected in two of the soil samples analyzed, but the levels were below its respective residential CHHSL of 2.3 mg/kg.
- DDE was detected in four of the soil samples analyzed, but the levels were below its respective residential CHHSL of 1.6 mg/kg.
- DDT was detected in four of the soil samples analyzed, but the levels were below its respective residential CHHSL of 1.6 mg/kg.

No other organochlorine pesticides were detected in any of the soil samples analyzed. Based on the results of the testings, none of the organochlorine pesticides detected exceeded their respective residential CHHSLs. Therefore, no additional assessment was recommended and no mitigation is warranted.

The nearest school to the project site is Crossroads Christian School which is located approximately 330 feet north of the project site. Also located near the project site are Susan B. Anthony Elementary, Stallings Elementary, Lee Pollard High School, and Centennial High School which are all less than one mile from the site. Crossroads Christian School is separated from the site by developed residential properties. The other schools are separated from the site by various existing developments including residential neighborhoods, commercial developments, parks, and roadways. Development of the proposed project on the site would not include any activities that would result in hazardous emissions. It also does not include the handling of 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 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.

The nearest airport to the project site is the Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately 4.11 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.

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:

A noise analysis was prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants (April 22, 2015) to evaluate the potential noise impacts associated with the project. The following discusses the project's short-term and long-term potential noise impacts.

Short-term Noise Exposure

Short-term noise exposure would include noise during construction. This would come from using heavy machinery during grading and clearing of the site as well as during construction and paving of the project. The average noise levels associated with the use of heavy equipment at construction sites can range from about 70 to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source, depending upon the types of equipment in operation at any given time and phase of construction.

Noise-sensitive uses near the project site are existing single family residences located immediately 25 feet south, 35 feet west, and 25 feet north of the project site, as well as single-family residential units located to the west across Hudson Avenue (85 feet from the project site boundary) and to the east across Fullerton Avenue (120 feet from the project site boundary). Classrooms at Crossroads Christian School are located approximately 600 feet northwest of the project site. These noise-sensitive uses may be exposed to temporary noise levels during construction activity on the project site. However, per Chapter 17.84 of the Corona Municipal Code, construction noise is allowed between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and federal holidays. Assuming all construction will occur within this window, no mitigation would be required to reduce noise levels.

Long-term Exterior Noise Exposure

Long-term operation of the proposed project was evaluated for potential exterior traffic related impacts caused by increased traffic volumes associated with the project as well as interior noise levels caused by traffic. Existing noise levels do not exceed the City's residential exterior noise standard of 65 dBA; thus, whether a traffic-related noise impact would occur is based on whether project traffic, when added to the existing traffic, would cause noise to noticeably increase over ambient conditions and/or exceed the 65 dBA standard.

The primary existing sources of noise in the project vicinity are motor vehicles along Fullerton Avenue. Additionally, vehicle traffic is present on adjacent residential roadways (Hudson Avenue and Poppyseed Lane), but is substantially lower than traffic along Fullerton Avenue. Noise-sensitive receptors would include the new dwelling units proposed on the project site. Noise levels associated with the project were derived from traffic counts performed by Rincon Consultants during noise measurements taken in March 2015. Noise levels were measured at eight different locations within the project site. Peak hour noise at the eight noise receptors would range from 43 dBA Leq to 56 dBA Leq. Project traffic will cause an increase of 1 dBA or less over baseline conditions. This is not a perceptible change and noise levels would not exceed the 65 dBA standard. Therefore, no mitigation would be required as long-term exterior 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:

Development of the project site will potentially impact existing schools and city services, such as streets, police and fire services, parks and library services. Therefore, in order to upgrade and finance existing and proposed public facilities, the developer is required to pay the applicable adopted development impact fees that are in effect at the time of issuance of building permits, and construct necessary facilities, if any. 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:

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 commercial project would generate approximately 0.03 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)
Residential	11	0.41 tons/sf/year[1]	4.51
		TOTAL (tons/year)	**4.51**
		TOTAL (tons/day)	**0.01**

1. 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Degrade visual character of site & surroundings	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Light or glare	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Scenic resources (forest land, historic buildings within state scenic highway	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

Per Figure 4.4.2 of the City of Corona General Plan Technical Background Report, none of the streets adjacent to the project site are designated as scenic vistas or highways. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to a scenic vista or highway.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of residential use on the project site which would be consistent with the residential uses that already exist in the surrounding area. The Corona Vista Specific Plan which the project site is located within prescribes a Spanish architectural style for residential buildings proposed within the specific plan area. Variation is permitted in the architecture to include influences from other Mediterranean countries such as Spain, Italy, and France. The project proposes two architectural styles, Spanish and Craftsman, which vary in materials and colors among the four different types of floor plans proposed. The Craftsman architecture has stucco walls, flat concrete roof tiles, siding, window trims, and decorative stone or elements. The Spanish architecture has stucco walls, S-shaped roof tiles, window shutters, and decorative metal or tile elements. The styles and materials are consistent and compatible with the architectural themes prescribed by the specific plan. The buildings are also designed to comply with the development standards established by the specific plan for the site with respect to building setbacks and building height. The project is also required to comply with all other applicable development standards such as landscaping and fencing to ensure that the project is well designed and compatible with the existing nearby residential developments and not degrade the visual character of the site and surroundings. Therefore, impacts related to this issue are expected to be less than significant and no mitigation is 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 buildout and a significant amount of ambient light from urban uses already exists. The project site is located in 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 mitigation is required.

The project site is not located immediately adjacent to any forest lands. 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	☐	☒	☐	☐
e. Disturb human remains	☐	☒	☐	☐

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 the city's Letter of Transmittal dated August 7, 2015. The Department received written a request from the Pechanga tribe in September of 2017 requesting consultation on the project. Consultation with Pechanga was held on September 29, 2015. Mitigation measures were agreed upon

between the City and Pechanga to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level. (**Mitigation Measures 2-10)**

Mitigation Measures:

2. At least 30 days prior to issuance of the grading permits, site clearance and ground disturbance, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe to notify the Tribe of grading, excavation and the monitoring program, and to coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement, which shall be executed and copies supplied to the City prior to site clearance and issuance of grading permits. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site. Tribal monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities in consultation with the project archaeologist, when appropriate.

3. Prior to site clearance and grading, the Project Applicant shall retain a Riverside County qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation, in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe. Archaeological monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe, when appropriate.

4. Prior to site clearance or grading for project construction, the Project Archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation. At a minimum, the report will document the proposed methodology for inadvertent finds, the state law process should human remains be identified, the grading activity observation process, roles and responsibilities of the monitors, and the mitigation measures and conditions of approval for the Project.

   The Project Archeologist and a designated Pechanga Tribe representative shall attend a pre-grading meeting with the Project Construction Manager and any Project contractors. At the pre-grading meeting, the Project Archeologist and Pechanga Tribe representative shall conduct a Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training ("Training") for those in attendance. The Training shall include the following: a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the Project and the surrounding area; the resources that could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; the protocols applicable to inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures during cultural resource evaluation; and, any other appropriate protocols. All new construction personnel that begin work on the Project shall take the Training prior to beginning work, and the Project Archaeologist and Pechanga Tribe representative shall make themselves available to provide the Training on an as-needed basis.

5. 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 and the Treatment Agreement described in Mitigation Measure 1.

6. The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods and all archaeological artifacts that are found on the project area to the appropriate Tribe for proper treatment and disposition.

7. All sacred sites, should they be encountered within the project area, shall be avoided and preserved as the preferred mitigation, if feasible.

8. If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the Developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources. Once consultation has occurred, the project archaeologist shall provide the final determination for the cultural resource(s) and mitigation for such resources. The archeologist shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources and the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Pechanga Tribe.

9. The Project Archeologist shall prepare a final archaeological report within 60 days of completion of the Project. The report shall follow ARMR Guidelines and City requirements and shall include at a minimum: a discussion of the monitoring methods and techniques used; the results of the monitoring program including any artifacts recovered; an inventory of any resources recovered; updated DPR forms for site(s) identified; final disposition of the resources; and any additional recommendations. A final copy shall be submitted to the City, Project Applicant, the Eastern Information Center (EIC) and the Pechanga Tribe.

10. In the event fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for the project, the applicant shall cease operation and retain a qualified and trained paleontologist. The following procedures shall be carried out:

    a. 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.

    c. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities and the significance of the fossils shall be prepared.

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 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	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with a plan, policy or regulation	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 $MtCO_2e$ (metric tons of CO_2e 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 Rincon Consultants (April 22, 2015). The annual greenhouse gas emissions associated with the construction of the project is estimated to be approximately 267 $MTCO_2e$. Amortized over 30 years (the anticipated lifetime of residential projects), the project would generate approximately nine $MTCO_2e$. These emissions would not exceed the threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
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:

The project site is not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or on the City's register of historic resources.

See 14 above for a detailed discussion and mitigation measures that apply to Tribal Cultural Resources.

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

Discussion:

Based on the Initial study, the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to the following environmental topic:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources

However, appropriate mitigation measures have been developed. Mitigation Measures 1-10 successfully mitigate 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, March 17, 2004
2. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Rincon Consultants, April 3, 2015
3. Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Rincon Consultants, September 6, 2017
4. Focused Traffic Analysis, prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates, December 3, 2015
5. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by A&E Consultants, May 2018
6. Hydrology and Hydraulic Study, prepared by A&E Consultants, November 2017
7. Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by November 30, 2005
8. Noise Study, prepared by Rincon Consultants, April 22, 2015
9. Burrowing Owl Study, prepared by Rincon Consultants, April 2015
10. Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study, prepared by Rincon Consultants, April 22, 2015

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
CITY OF CORONA

No	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
1	If grading is to occur within the burrowing owl nesting season (March through August), the applicant shall submit a pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl to the Community Development Department for review. The survey shall be conducted and submitted for review within 30 days prior to the issuance of a grading permit.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of pre-construction survey	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning Division	
	CULTURAL RESOURCES					
2	At least 30 days prior to issuance of the grading permits, site clearance and ground disturbance, the Project Applicant shall contact the Pechanga Tribe to notify the Tribe of grading, excavation and the monitoring program, and to coordinate with the Tribe to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement, which shall be executed and copies supplied to the City prior to site clearance and issuance of grading permits. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	30 days prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning Division	

	grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site. Tribal monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities in consultation with the project archaeologist, when appropriate.					
3	Prior to site clearance and grading, the Project Applicant shall retain a Riverside County qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation, in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe. Archaeological monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe, when appropriate.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of contract	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning Division	
4	Prior to site clearance or grading for project construction, the Project Archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation. At a minimum, the report will document the proposed methodology for inadvertent finds, the state law process should human remains be identified, the grading activity observation process, roles and responsibilities of the monitors, and the mitigation measures and conditions of approval for the Project. The Project Archeologist and a designated Pechanga Tribe representative shall attend a pre-grading meeting with the Project Construction Manager and any Project contractors. At the pre-grading meeting, the Project Archeologist and Pechanga Tribe	Condition of Approval	Submittal of pre-grading report	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning Division	

	representative shall conduct a Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training ("Training") for those in attendance. The Training shall include the following: a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the Project and the surrounding area; the resources that could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; the protocols applicable to inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures during cultural resource evaluation; and, any other appropriate protocols. All new construction personnel that begin work on the Project shall take the Training prior to beginning work, and the Project Archaeologist and Pechanga Tribe representative shall make themselves available to provide the Training on an as-needed basis.					
5	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 and the Treatment Agreement described in Mitigation Measure 1.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Planning Division	

6	The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods and all archaeological artifacts that are found on the project area to the appropriate Tribe for proper treatment and disposition.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Planning Division	
7	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	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Planning Division	
8	If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the Developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources. Once consultation has occurred, the project archaeologist shall provide the final determination for the cultural resource(s) and mitigation for such resources. The archeologist shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources and the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Pechanga Tribe.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Planning Division	
9	The Project Archeologist shall prepare a final archaeological report within 60 days of completion of the Project. The report shall follow ARMR Guidelines and City requirements and shall include at a minimum: a discussion of the monitoring methods and techniques used; the results of the monitoring program including any artifacts recovered; an inventory of any	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of	Planning Division	

	resources recovered; updated DPR forms for site(s) identified; final disposition of the resources; and any additional recommendations. A final copy shall be submitted to the City, Project Applicant, the Eastern Information Center (EIC) and the Pechanga Tribe.			Occupancy.		
10	In the event fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for the project, the applicant shall cease operation and retain a qualified and trained paleontologist. The following procedures shall be carried out: a. 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. c. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities and the significance of the fossils shall be prepared.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or documentation	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Planning Division	