



CITY OF CORONA

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME, DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF PROJECT:

CZ2018-0002: An application to change the zone on 1.46 acres located at 1215 E. Ontario Avenue from C-2 (Restricted Commercial) to C-3 (General Commercial) to facilitate the development of a 4,462-square foot restaurant with drive-through services.

PPM2018-0011: An application to construct a 4,462 square foot restaurant with drive-through services and an outdoor dining patio for Raising Cane's on 1.46 acres in the proposed C-3 (General Commercial) Zone located at 1215 E. Ontario Avenue.

ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:

Ruben Gonzalez
PM Design Group, Inc.
38 Executive Park, Suite 310
Irvine, CA 92614

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 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:

CZ2018-0002: An application to change the zone on 1.46 acres located at 1215 E. Ontario Avenue from C-2 (Restricted Commercial) to C-3 (General Commercial) to facilitate the development of a 4,462-square foot restaurant with drive-through services.

PPM2018-0011: An application to construct a 4,462 square foot restaurant with drive-through services and an outdoor dining patio for Raising Cane's on 1.46 acres in the proposed C-3 (General Commercial) Zone located at 1215 E. Ontario Avenue.

PROJECT LOCATION:

1215 E. Ontario Avenue
City of Corona, County of Riverside
APN 170-180-052

PROJECT PROPONENT:

Ruben Gonzalez
PM Design Group, Inc.
38 Executive Park, Suite 310
Irvine, CA 92614

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is a 1.46-acre parcel located within an existing 2.17-acre commercial center constructed in 2008. The parcel contains a vacant 13,969 square foot commercial building formerly occupied by Fresh & Easy which will be demolished to accommodate a new 4,462 square foot restaurant with drive-through services to be occupied by Raising Cane's. The proposal warrants a modification to the original entitlement which is being reviewed under PPM2018-011. The project also includes a change of zone, CZ2018-0002, which is a proposal to change the parcel's current zoning of C-2 (Restricted Commercial) to C-3 (General Commercial) to allow for the drive-through restaurant as this type of use is currently not permitted under the existing C-2 zone. The change of zone will not impact the remaining portion of the commercial center which is already zoned C-3 and developed with a 2,220 square foot Del Taco drive-through restaurant.

The commercial center was previously analyzed for potential environmental impacts at the time the retail center was constructed. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the City on November 21, 2007.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The commercial center is a fully developed site that contains two commercial buildings, a shared parking lot, and a single shared driveway located at the center's south perimeter that provides access from Ontario Avenue. The pad that is being developed for a drive-through restaurant is bordered by Rimpau Park to the west and north. Beyond the park to the north are residential developments. To the east of the subject pad is the Del Taco restaurant with light industrial

buildings located beyond Del Taco to the east. To the south is Ontario Avenue with commercial buildings located farther south.

GENERAL PLAN \ ZONING:

The General Plan designation of the subject parcel is GC (General Commercial). No changes are proposed to the General Plan designation of the parcel as the GC designation is intended for a broad range of commercial uses. Therefore, the C-3 zone maintains consistency with the General Plan.

The current C-2 zoning of the subject parcel permits a limited range of commercial uses including restaurants, but does not permit drive-through establishments. Thus, the applicant is proposing to change the zoning of the parcel to C-3 which permits drive-through establishments by right.

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

Date Prepared: February 8, 2019 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)	<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 subject property is 1.46 acres and currently developed with approximately 14,000 square foot vacant commercial building that was formerly occupied by a Fresh & Easy neighborhood market. The property is one of two properties that make up a 2.17-acre commercial center located on Ontario Avenue, east of Rimpau Avenue. The applicant's proposed 4,462 square foot drive-through restaurant on the project site complies with the site's General Plan designation of General Commercial because the General Commercial designation is intended for a broad range of commercial uses including restaurants. However, the property requires a zone change from C-2 (Restricted Commercial) to C-3 (General Commercial) because the C-2 zone does not permit drive-through establishments while the C-3 zone does. The zone change would enable the development of a restaurant with drive-through services on the property by right. The proposed C-3 zone and drive-through restaurant do not conflict with the surrounding land uses nor will it physically divide established communities because the site is located in an area with similar and compatible land uses and shares the area with another restaurant having drive-through services. To the east are industrial properties zoned M-4 (Light Industrial). To the north is Rimpau Park. Single-family homes are located beyond the park to the north and have a distance and separation of 163 feet from the project site. Therefore, the park provides an adequate buffer between the homes and the project site. To the south is Ontario Avenue with a commercial retail center located farther south. There are no land use incompatibilities, and therefore, 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 proposed project will not induce substantial growth or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people because the site is already zoned for commercial purposes under the C-2 zone. Furthermore, the subject pad is located within an existing commercial center which contains no residential dwellings. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted as the proposed project will not impact population and housing within the city.

3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fault /seismic failures (Alquist-Priolo zone) /Landslide/Liquefaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Grading of more than 100 cubic yards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

A geotechnical investigation report was prepared for the project by Terracon Consultants (July 6, 2018). 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.

Ground water was not encountered in borings conducted by Terracon Consultants for the geotechnical investigation report. The potential for liquefaction to occur at the site is low. The site is relatively flat and has no rock or landslide hazards, and the expansion potential for on-site soils is considered low. Development of the site would involve grading of more than 100 cubic yards. Per the applicant's conceptual grading plan, construction of the project would involve cutting 300 cubic yards while there would be 310 cubic yards of fill. Changes to the grade of the project site will be minimal as the applicant is proposing to match the finish floor of the new building to the existing building. There would be no grading in areas with greater than 10 percent slopes as the site is relatively flat. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Deplete groundwater supplies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Alter existing drainage pattern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Within 100-year flood hazard area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Increase exposure to flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Exceed capacity of storm water drainage system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project proposes a smaller building compared to the existing building, and the project will increase the amount of landscaped areas on the project site. Therefore, development of the project site would decrease the area of impermeable surface paving which will result in a decrease in surface runoff. The applicant has submitted a preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared by Kimley Horn (January 2019) 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. 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.

Development of the proposed project would result in impervious surfaces in the form of walkways, buildings, and a parking lot, and would alter the site's existing drainage patterns. As such, the project is designed so that surface runoff will be managed in three drainage management areas (DMAs). Two of the DMAs are designed to direct the flow of storm water into two drywells that are designed with an infiltration system. One drywell is located in the parking lot and the other is located at the northerly perimeter of the site. The third DMA is proposed as a self-treating landscaped area located at the north perimeter of the site. Appropriate collection and conveyance of storm water will ensure that the proposed flows and capacities generated by the new development will not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water system and will 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.

The site to be occupied by Raising Cane's restaurant is fully developed with pavement, landscaping, and a commercial building which will be demolished for the reconstruction of a new restaurant. There will be no grading in areas with greater than 10 percent slopes. Therefore, no impacts from implementation of the proposed development would occur and no mitigation would be 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

An air quality assessment was prepared for the project by Kimley Horn (November 2018) to analyze potential air impacts associated with the proposed project. Emissions were calculated using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.2, 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 with 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, SO_x, PM₁₀, 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 five 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
Construction Related Emissions (lbs/day)

Construction Year	Maximum Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂
2019	4.40	23.57	16.61	1.76	2.78	0.03
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	55	150
Threshold Exceeded?	No	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. For the project, sensitive receptors would include the users of Rimpau Park located

approximately 50 feet northwest of the project site. 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, PM₁₀, 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 (82 feet) from the project site. Based on the LSTs analysis, none of the pollutants' emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for LSTs. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

Long-Term (Operational) Impacts

Long-term operational activities associated with the proposed project will result in emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, 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-B, the project's expected daily long-term emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, this would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**TABLE 5-B
Project Operational Emissions**

Emissions Source	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summer Emissions						
Area Source Emissions	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Emissions	0.03	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.02	0.02
Mobile Emissions	2.43	15.21	15.99	15.99	0.91	3.29
Total	2.58	15.21	16.25	16.25	0.94	3.31
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Winter Emissions						
Area Source Emissions	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile Emissions	0.03	0.30	0.25	0.00	0.02	0.02
Energy Emissions	2.01	14.93	15.27	0.05	0.91	3.29
Total	2.15	15.23	15.53	0.05	0.94	3.31
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. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Emergency access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with alternative transportation policies (adopted policies, plans or programs for public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Trip Generation Comparison Analysis

A trip generation comparison analysis was prepared by Kimley Horn (November 9, 2018) to determine the net amount of

traffic that would be generated with the removal of the pre-existing Fresh & Easy market and the addition of traffic from the proposed Raising Cane's restaurant. The project trip generation takes into consideration trip credit for the pre-existing land use, as well as pass-by trip reductions. Pass-by trips are those motorists who are already traveling on the surrounding roadways from one place to another and are not necessarily adding "new" trips on the roadway system. An example of a pass-by trip would be an individual who stops at the project site on the way to or from work/school. A pass-by reduction factor of 25% was applied to the daily and PM peak hour trips for both the pre-existing Fresh & Easy market and the proposed Raising Cane's restaurant. A pass-by reduction factor was not applied to the AM peak hour trips since Raising Cane's will not be operating during the morning peak hours. Table 6-A summarizes the daily AM and PM peak hour trip generation estimates.

Table 6-A
Summary of Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Trip Generation Estimates						
	Daily	AM Peak Hour ¹			PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
EXISTING							
Fresh & Easy market	1,563	34	22	56	69	66	135
Pass-by Trips (25% Daily, 25% PM)	-391	-	-	-	-17	-17	-34
Total Net Trips for Existing Conditions	1,172	34	22	56	52	49	101
PROPOSED							
Raising Cane's Restaurant w/Drive-Through	1,924	N/A	N/A	N/A	69	64	133
Pass-by Trips (25% Daily, 25% PM)	-481	-	-	-	-17	-16	-33
Total Net Trips for Existing Conditions	1,443	N/A	N/A	N/A	52	48	100
NET DIFFERENCE (Proposed Minus Existing)	271	-34	-22	-56	0	-1	-1

1. Raising Cane's is not open during the morning peak hour.
2. A pass-by reduction factor of 25% for daily and PM peak hour trips is applied for both uses.

As shown in Table 6-A, the Fresh & Easy market was estimated to generate approximately 1,172 daily trips, with 56 trips in the morning peak hour and 101 trips in the evening peak hour. The proposed Raising Cane's restaurant is estimated to generate approximately 1,443 daily trips, with 100 trips in the evening peak hour after pass-by reductions. There is no AM peak hour analysis for Raising Cane's since the restaurant will be closed during the morning peak hours. It should be noted that the trip generation estimates for Fresh & Easy are based on current trip generation rates provided by the Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers), whereas the original trip generation estimates originally analyzed for the Fresh & Easy building were based on the Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition Manual. For reference, the original trip generation estimates which were conducted by Linscott, Law and Greenspan (May 2007) resulted in 1,171 daily trips, with 41 trips in the morning peak hour and 109 trips in the evening peak hour. While the original morning and evening peak hour trip estimates are different from the current morning and evening peak hour trip estimates, the overall daily trip estimates are only different by one daily trip. As such, the slight discrepancy between the original and current trip generate estimates is considered negligible.

In summary, the proposed Raising Cane's restaurant is estimated to add 271 more trips to the roadway on a daily basis compared to the prior use (Fresh & Easy market). However, this is considered to be a relatively minor increase in the daily traffic, plus the Raising Cane's will not be open during the morning peak hours. For the PM peak hour, there would actually be a reduction of one fewer trip in the evening peak hour traffic compared to the prior use. This is considered a less than significant impact and, therefore, no traffic mitigation is warranted.

Queuing Analysis

A queuing analysis was conducted by Kimley Horn (April 5, 2019) to evaluate the adequacy of the project's drive-through lane queuing capacity. The analysis analyzed three different Raising Cane's restaurant located in the cities of Laguna Hills, Orange, and Riverside.

None of the sites have dual drive-through lanes, but they were selected for the analysis because they have similar site characteristics as the proposed project which are the following:

- A Raising Cane's restaurant with a drive-through lane;
- Located in Southern California; and
- Located adjacent to or within a larger commercial center.

The analysis observed the number of vehicles in the drive-through lane every 15 minutes within the lunch and dinner peak periods at each site on a typical weekday and Saturday. The following are the peak lunch and dinner periods for each site:

- Laguna Hills Site:
 - 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM (lunch-time)

- 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM (dinner-time)
- Orange Site:
 - 12:00 PM to 2:30 PM (lunch-time)
 - 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM (dinner-time)
- Riverside Site:
 - 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM (lunch-time)
 - 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM (dinner-time)

Tables 6B and 6C below summarize the average and peak number of vehicles in the drive-through lane at each site. The *Average Queue* number represents the average number of vehicles that were observed in the drive-through lane within each 15-minute interval during the lunch-time and dinner-time periods. The *Peak Queue* number represents the most number of vehicles that were observed in the drive-through lane within each 15-minute interval during the lunch-time and dinner-time periods.

**Table 6B
Summary of Queueing Analysis – Typical Weekday**

Time Period	Laguna Hills		Orange		Riverside	
	Average Queue	Peak Queue	Average Queue	Peak Queue	Average Queue	Peak Queue
Lunch-Time	11	15	10	16	8	12
Dinner-Time	13	14	12	14	7	11

**Table 6C
Summary of Queueing Analysis – Saturday**

Time Period	Laguna Hills		Orange		Riverside	
	Average Queue	Peak Queue	Average Queue	Peak Queue	Average Queue	Peak Queue
Lunch-Time	9	10	10	13	10	12
Dinner-Time	10	13	15	17	8	11

The drive-through queueing capacity for the Laguna Hills and Orange sites is 7 to 9 vehicles. The drive-through queueing capacity for the Riverside site is 10 to 13 vehicles. As shown by the data collected in Tables 1 and 2, the average number of vehicles that utilize the Laguna Hills drive-through slightly exceeds the site's drive-through queueing capacity (7 to 9 vehicles). The average number of vehicles utilizing the Orange drive-through also slightly exceeds the site's drive-through queueing capacity (7 to 9 vehicles). As for the Riverside site, the average number of vehicles utilizing the site's drive-through does not exceed the site's drive-through queueing capacity (10 to 13 vehicles).

The analysis noted the following general observations at the sites:

- Spillovers outside the drive-through lanes occurred occasionally and lasted briefly.
- On occasion, the spillover was due to a delay at the order board rather than a lack of capacity in the drive-through lane. The delay was typically due to a large order or indecisiveness on the part of the customer. Once a customer finished ordering at the menu and pulled forward, the remaining cars in the queue would move through the drive-through lane at a normal pace.
- Some customers were observed evaluating the wait time and queue lines and chose to park and go into the building.

Raising Cane's typical service time in the drive-through lane is 2.5 minutes from the menu board to the pick-up window, with a vehicle being processed and processing through the order board, pay window and pick-up window every 35 to 40 seconds during the peak periods. Based on this information and queueing formulas taken from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Transportation Planning Handbook, 3rd Edition, the analysis indicates that the average number of vehicles in the drive-through queue for the Raising Cane's in Corona is estimated to be 9 vehicles during the peak times. The current site plan proposes a queueing capacity for 34 total vehicles. The probability of exceeding 34 vehicles is estimated to be unlikely at 3.1 percent. The ITE queueing analysis is based on a single-lane drive-through for a more conservative approach. The dual-lane design for the Raising Cane's in Corona will allow orders to be processed more efficiently and lower the number of vehicles in the queue. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is warranted.

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

Discussion:

The project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) area, within the Temescal Canyon Area Plan. The site is not located within an MSHCP criteria cell. It is also not located within a survey area that requires habitat assessment for sensitive or threatened species. There is no evidence that the project site contains habitat for any listed threatened or endangered species as the project site already contains an existing commercial center. Per CMC Section 16.33.140, the project is exempted from the MSHCP mitigation fees since the project involves development within a project area that is already improved. Therefore, no impact associated with endangered or threatened species or habitat would occur and no mitigation would be required.

As previously stated, the site is an existing commercial development and contains no riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, or wetlands. Therefore, reconstruction of the 1.46-acre pad for a drive-through restaurant would not impact riparian habitat, any sensitive natural communities, or federally protected wetlands and no mitigation would be required.

The project site is located in a developed area bounded by existing developments to the north, east, south, and west. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Per Figure 4.5-7 of the General Plan Technical Background Report, the project site 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Risk of accidental release of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Hazardous materials/emissions within ¼ mile of existing or proposed school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Located on hazardous materials site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport land use plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair emergency response plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Increase risk of wildland fires	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project by Terracon Consultants (June 29, 2018). Based on Terracon's review of historic information on the project site, the site consisted of agricultural land and/or vacant land from as early as 1902 until 2008 when the site was developed with the current commercial center. Selected federal and state environmental regulatory databases were also reviewed in addition to a site reconnaissance which was conducted by Terracon staff. No recognized environmental conditions were found. Therefore, a Phase II ESA was not recommended and no further mitigation was required.

There is no school located within a ¼ mile of the project site. The nearest school is Anthony Elementary School, which is located approximately 1.0 mile southwest of the project site. Located between the project site and school are a commercial center and residential neighborhoods. Development of the proposed project is for a restaurant and is expected to 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. As such, no impact associated with this issue is anticipated to occur and no mitigation would be required.

The nearest airport to the project site is the Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately 5.4 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 close 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 is required to comply with all fire code requirements associated with adequate fire access, fire flows, and number of hydrants. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated 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:

A noise analysis was prepared for the project by Kimley Horn (November 2018) to evaluate the potential noise impacts

associated with the project. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is Rimpau Park which borders the project site to the north and west. The activity area within the park that is nearest to the project site is a sidewalk which is approximately 50 feet northwest from the project property line. Additional sensitive receptors are existing single-family residences that are located across the park to the north. The nearest residences are approximately 170 feet from the project property line. The following discusses the project's short-term and long-term potential noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

Short-term Construction Noise

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. Some of the highest noise levels that are anticipated to occur during project construction would be from pavers which can generate noise around 89 dBA measured at a distance of 25 feet. Rimpau Park visitors and the nearest residential uses that are 170 feet to the north of the project site may be exposed to elevated noise levels during project construction. However, construction noise would be acoustically dispersed throughout the project site and not concentrated in one area near surrounding sensitive uses. Construction noise would also be sporadic and variable in nature. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with the City's construction noise hours in the Corona Municipal Code which prohibits construction noise from between the hours of 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., Monday through Saturday, and 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m. Sundays and federal holidays. This would reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level and therefore, no mitigation would be required.

Long-term Operational Noise

Long-term noise sources associated with the Raising Cane's restaurant would be the drive-through operations (ordering intercom and announcements from the public address system), vehicles idling/queuing. Additional noise sources include mechanical equipment, parking lot noise, and people dining in the outdoor patio proposed on the south side of the building.

Drive-Through Noise

The proposed restaurant would be open from Sunday through Thursday between 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., and Friday and Saturday between 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. The drive-through will have two menu boards and intercoms which would be located on the north side of the proposed building. The measured noise level associated with active drive-through operations is 64 dBA measured at a distance of 20 feet. As previously discussed, the nearest sensitive noise receptors are park visitors and the residences located approximately 170 feet north of the project site's north property line. The closest menu board/intercom is located approximately 30 feet south from the same property line. The project site has an existing six-foot high block wall that will remain at the site's north property line. This wall separates the sensitive receptors from the project site and would attenuate noise by 8 dBA. Attenuation over distance and from the wall would reduce noise levels at the park and the closest residences to 48 and 37 dBA, respectively. Therefore, the drive-through noise levels would be below the city's exterior noise standards for residential and sensitive land uses, which permits a maximum allowable exterior noise level of 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., and 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. This is considered a less than significant and, as such, no mitigation would be required.

Mechanical Equipment

Mechanical equipment typically generate noise levels of approximately 50 to 60 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. HVAC equipment is expected to be mounted on the rooftop of the new Raising Cane's building at a minimum distance of approximately 100 feet away from park visitors and 360 feet away from the nearest residences to the north. Typical noise levels from HVAC equipment at 100 feet are approximately 54 dBA, which is below the city's 55 dBA daytime noise standard. Since Rimpau Park is open from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., the city's 50 dBA nighttime noise standard would not apply. HVAC noise levels at the nearest residences would be 43 dBA, which is below the city's 55 dBA daytime and 50 dBA nighttime noise standards. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be required.

Parking Lot Noise

Parking lot activities like car door slamming, engine starting up, and car pass-bys are expected on the project site. The noise levels from these types of activities typically range from 60 to 63 dBA. Conversations in the parking lot typically range from 33 dBA at 50 feet for normal speech to 50 dBA at 50 feet for very loud speech. Parking lot noise on the project site would be consistent with the existing noise in the vicinity and would be partially masked by background noise from vehicular traffic in the area. Therefore, noise impacts from the project's parking lot would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

Implementation of the project would generate increased traffic volumes along the nearby roadways. According to the

project's traffic analysis prepared by Kimley Horn, the project would result in 271 daily trips more than what was generated by the Fresh & Easy market. The project's increase in traffic would result in noise increases on project area roadways. In general, a traffic noise increase of 3 dBA is barely perceptible to people, while a 5-dBA increase is readily noticeable. Generally, traffic volumes on project area roadways would have to double for the resulting traffic noise levels to increase by 3 dBA. The city's General Plan classifies Ontario Avenue as a major arterial (6-lane) with an average daily traffic capacity of 53,900 vehicles. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate enough traffic to result in a permanent 3-dBA increase in the ambient noise levels. This would be a less than significant impact and no mitigation would be required.

Vibration

Per the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operations that would be used during project construction range from 0.0003 to 0.089 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet from the source of activity. The FTA establishes that a vibration level of up to 0.20 inches per second is considered safe and would not result in any construction vibration damage. The nearest residential land use to the north is approximately 180 feet from the project site. Since values at 25 feet from a vibration source are shown to be well below the FTA's 0.20 PPV threshold, it can be assumed that at a greater distance this vibration velocity would be even less. Therefore, vibration impacts from development of the project site would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

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

Discussion:

Development of the project site does not warrant the construction of new public service facilities such as police and fire stations, parks or other similar facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact on public services.

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

Discussion:

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 drainage management areas that will direct the flow of storm water into drywells designed with infiltration systems to capture 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)
Commercial	4,462 sf	0.0024 tons/sf/year ¹	10.70
TOTAL (tons/year)			10.70
TOTAL (tons/day)			0.02

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Degrade visual character of site & surroundings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Light or glare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Scenic resources (forest land, historic buildings within state scenic highway)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Per Figure 4.4.2 of the City of Corona General Plan Technical Background Report, Ontario Avenue is considered a scenic highway from Oak Avenue to State Street, which provides views of the Santa Ana Mountains to the west and the low foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains to the east. The section of Ontario Avenue that fronts the project site is part of this scenic highway stretch. The proposed project is not so large in scale as to obstruct any scenic vistas. Furthermore, the Corona Municipal Code implements development and landscape standards for commercial projects in the C-3 zone to ensure the project is designed, constructed, and landscaped to be aesthetically pleasing and attractive to its surrounding areas and to ensure there is no degradation to this scenic corridor. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The project site is not located adjacent to any sensitive land uses. The nearest sensitive land use is a residential neighborhood which is located approximately 170 feet north of the project site on the other side of Rimpau Park. As such, light or glare from the project is not expected to be an issue. Nevertheless, the project is required to comply with CMC 17.84.070 which requires all areas of exterior lighting to be designed to direct light downward with minimal spillover onto adjacent sensitive land uses. Therefore, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Archaeological resource	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Paleontological resource or unique geologic feature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Disturb human remains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 the city's Letter of Transmittal dated December 5, 2018. The Department received a request dated December 31, 2018 from Mr. Joseph Ontiveros, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requesting consultation on the project. Staff reached out to Mr. Ontiveros via email on January 8, 2019 followed by a second email sent on January 22, 2019; however, no response was received from Mr. Ontiveros. As such, staff ended the consultation process on January 25, 2019. However, in order to address inadvertent findings of cultural resources and/or human remains during project construction, the applicant is required to comply with the following condition which has been added to the conditions of approval for PPM2018-001:

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.

Compliance with the above condition of approval would reduce any potential impacted related to cultural resources to a less than significant impact. Therefore, no further mitigation is 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with a plan, policy or regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 MtCO₂e (metric tons of CO₂e 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 Kimley Horn (November 2018) analyzing the project's anticipated construction and operational emissions. As it pertains to construction emissions, the SCAQMD does not have specific thresholds for construction emissions; rather, SCAQMD recommends amortization of construction emissions over the life of the project which is defined as 30 years, and adding the amortized construction emissions to operational emissions to estimate the yearly emissions from the project. Based on the project's GHG study, the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the construction of the project is estimated to be approximately 135 MTCO₂e. Amortized over 30 years, the project emissions would be approximately 5 MTCO₂e per year. As it pertains to operational emissions, the project is anticipated to emit 7 MTCO₂e annually from various direct and indirect sources including project generated vehicular traffic, on-site consumption of natural gas, operation of landscaping equipment, off-site use of electrical power and water, generation of solid waste, and refrigerators. Table 16-A shows that the combine amount of construction and operational GHG emissions that the project would generate annually is 12 MTCO₂e. These emissions would not exceed the threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e 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.

**Table 16-A
Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Emissions Source	Annually
Construction Emissions (135 MTCO ₂ e Amortized Over 30 Years)	5
Operational Emissions (energy, mobile, waste, waste, and refrigeration)	7
Total	12
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>3,000</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

See 14 above for additional discussions 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cumulatively considerable impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantial adverse effects on humans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Short-term vs. long-term goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is located within an existing commercial center surrounded by development. Based on the site's existing improved condition, there are no riverines, vernal pools, ponded areas, depressions or areas where water pools on the site. There are also no streams or wetlands. Therefore, there is no evidence before the City that the project will have an adverse effect on fish or wildlife resources, cumulatively considerable impacts, or substantial adverse effects on humans, and no mitigation is required.

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. Air Quality Assessment for Raising Cane's Restaurant, Kimley Horn, November 2018
3. Acoustic Assessment for Raising Cane's Restaurant, Kimley Horn, November 2018
4. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Terracon Consultants, June 29, 2018
5. Drainage Study For Raising Cane's, John Pollock, P.E., October 31, 2018
6. Geotechnical Engineering Report, Terracon Consultants, July 6, 2018
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment for Raising Cane's, Kimley Horn, November 2018
8. Trip Generation Comparison Memorandum for Raising Cane's, Kimley Horn, November 9, 2018
9. Queueing Analysis, prepared by Kimley Horn, April 5, 2019