



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

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

**PP2018-0005:** A precise plan application to develop a 37,000 square foot LA Fitness health club and a 9,300 square foot future commercial pad on five acres located north of west Sixth Street, and east of Smith Avenue (1415 and 1435 W. Sixth Street) in the C-3 (General Community Commercial) Zone.

**ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:**

Greg Gill  
Fitness International, LLC  
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 600  
Irvine, CA 92612

Hehr International Inc.  
360 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street #76  
Tustin, CA 92780

The Planning and Housing Commission, having reviewed the initial study of this proposed project and the written comments received prior to the public meeting of the Planning and Housing Commission, and having heard, at a public meeting of the Commission, the comments of any and all concerned persons or entities, including the recommendation of the City's staff, does hereby find that the proposed project may have potentially significant effects on the environment, but mitigation measures or revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects will occur. **Therefore, the Planning and Housing Commission hereby finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment and shall be adopted.**

The Initial Study and other materials which constitute the records of proceedings, are available at the office of the City Clerk, City of Corona City Hall, 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA 92882.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair  
City of Corona

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



## **CITY OF CORONA INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

### **PROJECT TITLE:**

PP2018-0005

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

North side of West Sixth Street, east of Smith Avenue (1415 and 1435 W. Sixth Street) in the City of Corona, County of Riverside (APN: 118-130-008 and 118-130-027).

### **PROJECT PROPONENT:**

Greg Gill  
Fitness International, LLC  
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 600  
Irvine, CA 92612

Hehr International Inc.  
360 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street #76  
Tustin, CA 92780

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed project entails the development of a 37,000 square foot LA Fitness health club on five acres of land located north of west Sixth Street and east of Smith Avenue (1415 and 1435 W. Sixth Street) in the C-3 (General Commercial) Zone. The project also includes a 9,300 square foot pad which will remain undeveloped at this time. PP2018-0005 is an application to review the site plan, architecture, landscaping, and fence/wall design for the proposed LA Fitness health club. The project site is an infill lot which has been vacant for the past 34 years.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Presently, the subject site is an undeveloped dirt lot with sparse seasonal vegetation. The site contains a mixture of block wall and wood fencing on the north perimeter adjacent to existing single family homes, and chain link fencing on the east perimeter adjacent to a carwash and a vacant lot. Abutting the property to south is west Sixth Street. The portion of Sixth Street adjacent to the site is improved with roadway, curb and gutter, and sidewalk. To the west is existing commercial development with a primary focus on automobile repair businesses.

Located to the north of the project site are single family homes in the R1-7.2 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 7,200 square feet). To the southeast is a carwash in the C-3 (General Community Commercial) Zone. To the northeast is a vacant lot in the R1-7.2 Zone. To the south is Sixth Street with commercial developments beyond. To the west are automobile repair businesses located in the C-3 Zone.

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

The subject property has a zoning of C-3 (General Community Commercial) and a General Plan designation of GC (General Commercial). The project is consistent with the site's zoning and General Plan designation as the project is to develop a 37,000 square foot LA Fitness health club. The future use of the 9,300 square foot pad has not been determined yet, but will be analyzed separately for conformance with the C-3 Zone and General Commercial designation at the time of its development.

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

Date Prepared: July 17, 2019

Prepared By: Lupita Garcia, Assistant Planner

Contact Person: Lupita Garcia

Phone: (951) 736-2262

### AGENCY DISTRIBUTION

(check all that apply)

- ☐ Responsible Agencies
- ☐ Trustee Agencies (CDFG, SLC, CDPR, UC)
- ☐ State Clearinghouse (CDFG, USFWS, Redevelopment Projects)
- ☐ AQMD
- ☐ WQCB
- ☒ Other: Pechanga Band of Luiseno, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Joseph and Luebben, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians.

### AGENCY DISTRIBUTION

☒ Southern California Edison

Southern California Edison Co.  
Local Governmental Affairs  
Land Use / Environmental Coord.  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770

*Note: This form represents an abbreviation of the complete Environmental Checklist found in the City of Corona CEQA Guidelines. Sources of reference information used to produce this checklist may be found in the City of Corona Community Development Department, 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, CA.*

**1. LAND USE AND PLANNING:**

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

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with any land use plan/policy or agency regulation (general plan, specific plan, zoning) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with surrounding land uses   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Physically divide established community   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

The project site is zoned C-3 (General Community Commercial) and designated as GC (General Commercial) on the city's General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed project does not conflict with the project site's zoning and General Plan designation as the proposed health club is a permitted use and any future development on the second pad will be required to comply with the C-3 Zone and GC designation in terms of land use. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

The project is bounded by single family homes to the north, a carwash and vacant land to the east, Sixth Street to the south with commercial development located beyond, and an automobile repair development to the west. Since the project is for a commercial development, it would not conflict with the surrounding land uses or physically divide the area which is predominantly commercial. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

**2. POPULATION AND HOUSING:**

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial growth                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

Commercial development is proposed on the five-acre project site. The General Plan designation is GC (General Commercial), therefore, 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.

The project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people as the project site is currently vacant; therefore, no mitigation would be required.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Discussion:**

Per the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report prepared for the project site by Salem Engineering Group, Inc. (March 23, 2018), there are no known active fault traces in the project vicinity. The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo

Earthquake Fault Zone and thus, ground rupture due to faulting is considered unlikely at this site. The project will be subject to city and county local codes, the latest California Building Code (CBC), and the engineering recommendations recommended in the project's geotechnical investigation report. 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 relatively flat as it has a gentle less than 5% sloping grade. As such landslide/slope instability/ rock fall issues pose a very low risk. Soils liquefaction is a state of soil particles suspension caused by a complete loss of strength when the effective stress drops to zero. Liquefaction normally occurs under saturated conditions in soils such as sand in which the strength is purely frictional. Primary factors that trigger liquefaction are: moderate to strong ground shaking, relatively clean, loose granular soils, and saturated soil conditions. The Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report shows the subject site is in a low liquefaction potential area. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

The project involves grading of more than 100 cubic yards. To minimize post-construction soil movement and provide uniform support for the proposed building, overexcavation and recompaction within the proposed building areas should be performed to a minimum depth of three feet below existing grade or two feet below proposed footing bottom, whichever is deeper. The overexcavation and recompaction should also extend laterally to minimum of five feet beyond the outer edges of the proposed footings. A representative from Salem Engineering Group Inc. should be present during all site clearing and grading operations to test and observe earthwork construction. The Geotechnical Engineer may reject any material that does not meet compaction and stability requirements. A preconstruction conference shall be held at the site prior to the beginning of grading operations with the owner, contractor, civil engineer and geotechnical engineer in attendance. Adherence to the city's grading regulations and the grading specifications identified in the geotechnical investigation report would ensure a less than significant impact would occur and no further mitigation would be required.

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

#### 4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate water quality standards/waste discharge requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Deplete groundwater supplies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Alter existing drainage pattern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Increase flooding hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Degrade surface or ground water quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Within 100-year flood hazard area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Increase exposure to flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Exceed capacity of storm water drainage system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

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 Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, Inc. (February 21, 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. A BMP for the project is to maintain landscaping using minimum or no pesticides. A BMP for the project is to maintain and periodically repaint or replace inlet markings. Another BMP is to sweep sidewalks and parking areas regularly and to prevent accumulation of litter and debris. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant will be required to submit a final WQMP to be reviewed by the Corona Public

Works Department. This will result in a less than significant impact to water quality and therefore, no further mitigation is required.

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

Per the Hydrology Study prepared for the project site by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, Inc. (February 21, 2019), the proposed development will not alter the existing drainage patterns. Therefore, any potential impacts to altering existing drainage patterns would be reduced to a less than significant impact and no further mitigation would be necessary.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS), the project site is not within the 100-year flood hazard area. Development of the project site will not result in a flooding hazard nor will it expose the site and surrounding area to flooding. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with respect to flooding and no mitigation is required.

#### 5. AIR QUALITY:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with air quality plan	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Impact Analysis was prepared for the project by First Carbon Solutions (June 6, 2019), to analyze potential air impacts associated with the proposed project. Emissions were calculated using the latest version of CalEEMod (v2016.3.2), which is a computer model approved by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to calculate criteria pollutant emissions. The following discusses the project's compliance to air quality plans and potential short-term construction and long-term operational air quality impacts.

The project site is located within the City of Corona and is within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). To the west of the SoCAB is the Pacific Ocean. To the north and east of the SoCAB are the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains, while the southern limit of the SoCAB is the San Diego County Line. The SoCAB includes all of Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. The air quality in the basin is impacted by dominant airflows, topography, atmospheric inversions, location, season, and time of day and is regulated by the SCAQMD which is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. The project would be subject to SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. The AQMP is based on projections originating with county and city general plans. Since the proposed project is required to be consistent with the City of Corona General Plan, the project would be consistent with the AQMP. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to AQMP implementation, and no mitigation measures are required.

Short-term air impacts include construction related activities associated with the proposed project. These activities would result in emissions of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from construction activities such as site preparation, grading, building construction, asphalt paving, and architectural coating, 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. 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: Maximum Daily Construction Air Pollutant Emissions**

Construction Activity	Regional Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) <sup>1</sup>					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation—2019	1.93	19.15	11.99	0.02	8.31	4.90
Grading—2019	2.49	28.75	14.91	0.04	4.04	2.55

**Table 5-A (cont.): Maximum Daily Construction Air Pollutant Emissions**

Construction Activity	Regional Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) <sup>1</sup>					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Building Construction—2019	1.97	16.19	12.42	0.03	1.98	1.01
Paving—2019	1.38	7.67	7.87	0.01	0.58	0.42
Paving—2020	1.33	7.08	7.82	0.01	0.55	0.39
Architectural Coating—2020	68.56	1.74	2.42	0.00	0.16	0.17
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions</b>	<b>68.56</b>	<b>28.75</b>	<b>14.91</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>8.31</b>	<b>4.90</b>
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>Notes:</b> VOC = volatile organic compounds; NO <sub>x</sub> = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO <sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides; PM <sub>10</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 microns; PM <sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns <sup>1</sup> Assumes compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403. Source of emissions: CalEEMod Output (Appendix A) Source of thresholds: SCAQMD 2015						

Operational sources for land use development projects are typically distinguished as mobile, area, and energy emissions. Operations were analyzed assuming full-buildout of the proposed project in 2020. Table 5-B presents the project's maximum daily operational emissions between summer and winter seasons. As shown below in Table 5-B, the project would not exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance, indicating that ongoing project operations would not be considered to have the potential to generate a significant quantity of air pollutants. Therefore, long-term operational impacts associated with criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant.



**Table 5-B: Maximum Daily Operation Air Pollutant Emission**

Operational Activity	Regional Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) <sup>1</sup>					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area	1.11	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.08	0.69	0.58	0.00	0.05	0.05
Mobile	4.16	27.63	37.00	0.14	9.16	2.53
<b>Total Operational Emissions</b>	<b>5.35</b>	<b>28.32</b>	<b>37.62</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>9.21</b>	<b>2.58</b>
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55

**Table 5-B (cont.): Maximum Daily Operational Air Pollutant Emissions**

Operational Activity	Regional Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) <sup>1</sup>					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes:  
VOC = volatile organic compounds; NO<sub>x</sub> = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides;  
PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 microns;  
PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns  
<sup>1</sup> Emissions shown represent the maximum daily emissions from summer and winter seasons for each operational emission source and pollutant. The highest daily project emissions occurred in the winter run for NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The highest VOC emissions occurred in the summer run.  
Source of emissions: FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS) and CalEEMod 2018 (see Appendix A).  
Source of thresholds: SCAQMD 2015.

As shown on Table 5-C, the proposed project would not exceed the applicable LSTs (Localized Significance Threshold) for localized construction emissions. Therefore, the project's construction activities would not cause or contribute substantially to an existing or future ambient air quality standard violation. Accordingly, the project's construction-related criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor concentrations would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Table 5-C: Comparison of Construction LSTs and Project Construction Emissions**

Activity	Maximum On-site Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation	19.09	11.19	8.10	4.85
Grading	26.01	13.99	3.68	2.44
Localized Significance Thresholds	270	1,700	12	8
<b>Exceed Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Notes:  
MF = Microfiltration  
NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides      CO = carbon monoxide      PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter  
Phases are assumed to not overlap; therefore, the maximum daily emissions are from the highest representative phase.  
PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are from the mitigated output to reflect compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust.  
Source of emissions: CalEEMod Output (Appendix A).  
Source of thresholds: SCAQMD 2009, for SRA 22, 5-acre site, 25 meters.



As shown in Table 5-D, the project's maximum daily on-site operational emissions would not exceed any of the applicable SCAQMD LSTs. Therefore, the project's operational activities would not cause or contribute substantially to an existing or future ambient air quality standard violation. Accordingly, the project's operational criteria air pollutant and ozone precursor concentrations would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Table 5-D: Comparison of Operational LSTs and Project Operational Emissions**

Activity	Maximum On-site Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.69	0.58	0.05	0.05
Mobile	1.66	2.22	0.55	0.15
Total Project Localized Operational Emissions	2.35	2.84	0.60	0.20
Localized Significance Thresholds	270	1700	3	2
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Notes: MF = Microfiltration NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides CO = carbon monoxide PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter Phases are assumed to not overlap; therefore, the maximum daily emissions are from the highest representative phase. PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> emissions are from the mitigated output to reflect compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust. Source of emissions: CalEEMod Output (Appendix A). Source of thresholds: SCAQMD 2009, for SRA 22, 5-acre site, 25 meters.				

#### Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Construction in areas of rock formations that contain naturally occurring asbestos could release asbestos into the air and pose a health hazard. A review of the map containing areas more likely to have rock formations containing naturally occurring asbestos in California indicates that there are no areas likely containing naturally occurring asbestos in the immediate project area (California Department of Conservation 2000). Therefore, it can be reasonably concluded that the project would not expose sensitive receptors to naturally occurring asbestos during project construction and impacts would be less than significant.

#### TACs – On-site Workers

The State of California has determined that DPM (diesel particulate matter) from diesel-fueled engines poses a chronic health risk with chronic (long-term) inhalation exposure. A variety of state and national programs protect workers from safety hazards, including high air pollutant concentrations (California OSHA and CDC 2012). On-site workers are not required to be addressed through this health risk assessment process. A document published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA 2009), Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects, indicates that on-site receptors are included in risk assessments if they are persons not employed by the project. Persons not employed by the project would not remain on-site for any significant period. Therefore, a health risk assessment for on-site workers is not required or recommended.

#### TACs – Construction

DPM has been identified by the ARB as a carcinogenic substance. Major sources of DPM include off road construction equipment and heavy-duty delivery truck activities. A health risk assessment (HRA) was prepared to determine if construction of the project would result in an exceedance of the applicable health risk thresholds. The methodology and results of the HRA are summarized below. For purposes of this analysis, DPM is represented as exhaust emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>.

#### TACs – Operations

The project would not have on-site TAC emission sources during operation. As shown in Table 5-E, the proposed project would be expected to result in an average of approximately 2,232 new daily weekday trips. The proposed commercial development project would primarily generate passenger vehicle trips for employees and customers traveling to and from the project site. Because nearly all passenger vehicles are gasoline-combusted, the project would not generate significant amount of DPM emissions during operation. Therefore, the project would not result in significant health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors during operation.

**Table 5-E: Trip Generation Rates**

Land Use	Daily Trip Generation Rate (trips/unit/day)
	Weekday
LA Fitness	1,277
<i>Internal Capture</i>	-64
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,213</b>
Commercial Building	1,196
<i>Internal Capture</i>	-64
<i>Pass-By</i>	-113
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,019</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,232</b>
Notes: Source: LLG 2018	

**Cancer Health Risk Assessment for Construction**

Cancer risks during construction were estimated for the duration of construction from January 2019 to January 2020 using the construction DPM (represented as PM10 exhaust emissions). The results of the HRA prepared for project construction, for cancer risk and long-term chronic cancer risk, are summarized below. Air dispersion modeling was utilized to assess the project's potential health risks using the current version of AERMOD (version 9.6.1) air dispersion model, which is the air dispersion model accepted by the EPA and the SCAQMD for preparing HRAs. Exhaust emissions of DPM were estimated using CalEEMod. Table 5-F summarizes the emission rates of PM10 during unmitigated construction and PM10 with Tier IV Interim mitigated construction.

**Table 5-F: Project DPM Construction Emissions – Unmitigated and Tier IV Interim Mitigation**

Year	On-site DPM (grams/m <sup>2</sup> /sec)	Off-site DPM (grams/sec)
<b>Annual Construction Emissions—Unmitigated</b>		
2019	5.415E-07	3.429E-05
2020	2.232E-07	3.318E-07
<b>Annual Construction Emissions—Tier IV Interim Mitigation</b>		
2019	7.947E-08	3.429E-05
2020	1.069E-08	3.318E-07
Source: CalEEMod Output and Construction HRA Calculations (see Appendix A and Appendix B).		

**Table 5-G: Estimated Health Risks and Hazards – Unmitigated Project Construction**

Source	Cancer Risk (risk per million)	Chronic Non-Cancer Hazard Index <sup>1</sup>
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Infants <sup>2</sup>	18.9	0.026
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Child <sup>2</sup>	2.5	0.026
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Adult <sup>2</sup>	0.4	0.026
<b>Significance Threshold</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Exceeds Individual Source Threshold?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Chronic non-cancer hazard index was estimated by dividing the maximum annual DPM concentration (as PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust) by the REL of 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The maximum impacted sensitive receptor for the infant, child, and adult scenarios is an existing single-family home located adjacent to the project site, off of Pleasant View Avenue.

Source: AERMOD and FCS 2018 (see Appendix B).

The sensitive receptor that has the highest cancer risks during the infant, child, and adult scenarios is an existing single-family home located adjacent to the project site, off of Pleasant View Avenue. As noted in Table 5-G, the project's construction DPM emissions would not exceed the non-cancer hazard index significance threshold; however, the project's construction DPM emissions would exceed the cancer risk significance threshold prior to the application of mitigation. Therefore, the project is required to implement Mitigation Measure #1. Table 5-H, below, summarizes the health and hazard impacts at the maximum impacted sensitive receptor from construction of the project after the implementation of Mitigation Measure #1, which would require the use of off-road construction equipment that meet emissions standards for Tier IV Interim engines.

**Table 5-H: Estimated Health Risks and Hazards – Mitigated Project Construction**

Source	Cancer Risk (risk per million)	Chronic Non-Cancer Hazard Index <sup>1</sup>
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Infants <sup>2</sup>	2.3	0.004
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Child <sup>2</sup>	0.4	0.004
Risks and Hazards at the Maximum Impacted Sensitive Receptor: Adult <sup>2</sup>	0.1	0.004
<b>Significance Threshold</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Exceeds Individual Source Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Chronic non-cancer hazard index was estimated by dividing the maximum annual DPM concentration (as PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust) by the REL of 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The maximum impacted sensitive receptor for the infant, child, and adult scenarios is an existing single-family home located adjacent to the project site, off of Pleasant View Avenue.

Source: AERMOD and FCS 2018 (see Appendix B).

As noted in Table 5-H, construction of the project would not exceed the cancer risk and non-cancer hazard index significance thresholds with mitigation. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact on nearby sensitive receptors from toxic air contaminants during construction after the implementation of **mitigation measure 1. (MM 1)**

**Mitigation Measures:**

1. During construction activities, all off-road equipment with engines greater than 50 horsepower shall meet either EPA or ARB Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with this requirement, including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number. If engines that comply with Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards are not commercially available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment (e.g., Tier III) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, "commercially available" shall mean the availability of Tier IV Interim engines taking into consideration factors such as critical-path timing of construction; and geographic proximity to the project site of equipment. The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercially available by providing letters from at least two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV Interim engine is not available.

**Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Analysis**

Project trips would contribute to vehicle volumes at existing and future local intersections. Local mobile-source CO emissions and concentrations near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed, and delay. Transport of CO is extremely limited because it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. However, under specific meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near roadways and/or intersections may reach unhealthy levels with respect to local sensitive land uses, such as residential units, hospitals, schools, and childcare facilities. According to the project traffic study, the maximum peak PM volume at the busiest intersection of the project is 4,416 vehicles at Lincoln Avenue and Sixth Street. Assuming that the proposed project would generate the maximum traffic volumes for 20 hours, the total traffic volume at the project's busiest intersection would still be below the 100,000 vehicles per day from the CO hotspot study. Since the maximum traffic volumes generated at the nearby intersections are fewer than what was analyzed by the SCAQMD, no local CO Hotspot are anticipated to be created from the proposed project and no CO Hotspot modeling was performed. Therefore, the operational CO impact would be less than significant, and mitigation is not 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 or be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Increase the total daily vehicle miles traveled per service population (population plus employment) (VMT/SP) above the baseline level for the jurisdiction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Cause total daily VMT within the study area to be higher than the <i>No Project</i> alternative under cumulative conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Change in air traffic patterns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Traffic hazards from design features	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Emergency access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Conflict with alternative transportation policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:****Site Access and Internal Circulation**

As shown on the project's site plan, project access will be obtained via two (2) full access driveways on Sixth Street. The on-site circulation was evaluated in terms of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Based on the city's Traffic Engineer's review of the preliminary site plan, the overall layout does not create any unsafe vehicle-pedestrian conflict points and the driveway throating is sufficient such that access to parking spaces is not impacted by internal vehicle queuing/stacking. Curb return radii have been confirmed and are adequate for service/delivery trucks and trash trucks. The on-site circulation is very good based on the Traffic Engineer's review of the proposed site plan, whereas the alignment, spacing, and throating of the Project driveways is adequate. The circulation around the buildings is adequate with sufficient sight distance along the drive aisles.

**State Bill (SB) 743 Compliance Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis pursuant to CEQA will shift from driver delay, or level of service (LOS), to reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and creation of multimodal networks and promotion of mixed-use developments. In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines implementing SB743 with a target implementation date of July 1, 2020.

The City of Corona recently adopted thresholds of significance for determining significant transportation impacts consistent with the requirements of SB 743. A significant impact would occur if either of the listed conditions below is met:

- Project Level Impact: The total daily VMT per service population (VMT/SP) of the project is higher than the existing VMT/SP for the City (30.0 VMT per SP).
- Cumulative Effect on VMT: The buildout of the project causes total daily VMT/SP within the City to be higher than the No Project alternative under cumulative conditions (year 2040).

In addition, projects can be screened from doing a VMT analysis if the project is located within a Transportation Priority Area (TPA) or a low VMT-generating traffic analysis zone (TAZ). The following summarizes the project screening developed for WRCOG's SB 743 Implementation Study, and is consistent with Table 1 (VMT Impact Thresholds) and Section 2.1.1 (Project Screening) of the City's VMT Analysis Guidelines.

- Projects which serve the local community and have the potential to reduce VMT, such as K- 12 schools and local-serving retail less than 50,000 sq. ft.
- Projects located within Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) or High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) as determined by the most recent Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) RTP/SCS should also be exempt from VMT analysis. TPAs are defined in the technical advisor as a ½ mile radius around an existing or planned major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor. HQTAs are defined in the technical advisory as a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.

Given that the proposed Project consists of 46,300 SF of local-serving retail (37,000 SF Fitness/Health Club and a 9,300 SF retail/food use building), which is less than the 50,000 SF retail threshold for project screening, the proposed Project will result in a less-than-significant transportation impact based on the City of Corona VMT Analysis Guidelines. Furthermore, the proposed land use is consistent with the existing land use in the surrounding area, which satisfies the secondary screening steps. In addition, this project is located in the City's transit priority area. As a result, the proposed Project will result in a less-than-significant transportation impact based on the City of Corona VMT Analysis Guidelines.

The nearest airport to the project site is the Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.19 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.

**Traffic Impact Analysis**

A traffic Impact analysis was prepared for the project by Linscott Law & Greenspan, dated June 6, 2019, to analyze existing traffic conditions, future traffic conditions and future traffic conditions with the proposed project. The project is anticipated to be completed by the year 2020 and is estimated to generate a total of 2,232 average daily trips on a typical weekday with approximately 185 AM peak hour trips, and 180 PM peak hours trips.

Although the city's CEQA checklist no longer considers level of service or LOS as a means of determining a significant effect on the environment, the city still uses LOS to determine if an applicant's project needs to construct certain circulation improvements or participate in the fair share cost toward the construction of future circulation improvements. Circulation improvements, if required, would be added as a condition of approval for the project.

Twelve key study intersections located in proximity to the project site were analyzed. The key study intersections are the following:

1. Maple Street at SR-91 Ramps/Sixth Street
2. SR-91 EB On-Ramp/Paseo Grande at Sixth Street
3. Paseo Grande at Frontage Road
4. Avenida Del Vista at Sixth Street
5. Smith Avenue at Pomona Road
6. Smith Avenue at Sixth Street
7. Sherman Avenue at Pomona Road
8. Sherman Avenue/Border Avenue at Smith Avenue/Tenth Street
9. Lincoln Avenue at SR-91 WB Ramps
10. Lincoln Avenue at D Street/Second Street
11. Lincoln Avenue at Sixth Street
12. SR-91 EB Ramps at Second Street.

Seven existing roadway segments located nearby the project site were analyzed. The study roadway segments are the following:

1. Smith Avenue, between Pomona Road and Sixth Street
2. Lincoln Avenue, between Second Street and Sixth Street
3. Sixth Street, between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista
4. Sixth Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue
5. Sixth Street, between Smith Avenue and Sherman Avenue
6. Sixth Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue
7. Smith Avenue, between Sixth Street and Sherman Avenue/Border Avenue

#### Existing with Project Traffic:

The City of Corona considers a level of service (LOS) D or above to be an acceptable level of service for all intersections that consist of collector and arterial roadways. As shown in Table 6-A, all twelve key study intersections currently operate at acceptable LOS C or above during the AM and PM peak hours in existing traffic conditions and in existing conditions with project traffic.

**Table 6-A**  
EXISTING CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>19</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Existing With Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Significant Impact	(4) Existing With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
1. Maple Street at SR-91 Ramps/6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	22.3	C	22.2	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.2	C	20.2	C	No	--	--
2. SR-91 EB On-Ramp/Paseo Grande at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	23.0	C	22.9	C	No	--	--
		PM	18.6	B	19.1	B	No	--	--
3. Paseo Grande at Frontage Road	D	AM	10.2	B	10.3	B	No	--	--
		PM	11.1	B	11.4	B	No	--	--
4. Avenida Del Vista at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	13.9	B	13.7	B	No	--	--
		PM	14.2	B	14.3	B	No	--	--
5. Smith Avenue at Pomona Road	D	AM	25.1	C	25.0	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.3	C	20.2	C	No	--	--
6. Smith Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.8	C	29.1	C	No	--	--
		PM	30.4	C	31.0	C	No	--	--

EXISTING CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>20</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Existing With Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Significant Impact	(4) Existing With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
7. Sherman Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	19.8	B	19.6	B	No	--	--
		PM	23.3	C	23.3	C	No	--	--
8. Sherman Avenue/Border Avenue at Smith Avenue/10 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.0	C	28.0	C	No	--	--
		PM	28.2	C	28.4	C	No	--	--
9. Lincoln Avenue at SR-91 WB Ramps	D	AM	22.9	C	22.9	C	No	--	--
		PM	21.3	C	21.4	C	No	--	--
10. Lincoln Avenue at D Street/2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	23.9	C	23.8	C	No	--	--
		PM	29.2	C	29.2	C	No	--	--
11. Lincoln Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	25.2	C	25.5	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.4	C	31.6	C	No	--	--
12. SR-91 EB Ramps at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	30.1	C	30.1	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.5	C	31.5	C	No	--	--

#### Notes:

- s/v = seconds per vehicle (delay)
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to Tables 3-1 and 3-2 for the LOS definitions
- **Bold Delay/LOS values** indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report



A roadway segment analysis provides guidance as to when a roadway may require capacity improvements for traffic impacts. Roadway capacity based on roadway classification provides a theoretical limit to the amount of vehicles that can conceivable travel on a roadway segment each day. As shown in Table 6-B, six of the roadway segments studied have acceptable levels of service in existing conditions. However, the roadway segment on Lincoln Avenue, between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> streets currently operates at an unacceptable Level of Service F. The roadway segment analysis in Table 6-B was done using average daily trips and not peak hour trips. With the project the roadway segment will continue to operate at LOS F. Therefore, the existing LOS F is cumulative in nature and not a project specific impact.

**Table 6-B**  
**EXISTING CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>21</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Existing With Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/ No
A. Smith Avenue, between Pomona Road and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,397	0.517	A	13,620	0.526	A	0.009	No
B. Lincoln Avenue, between 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	29,682	1.146	F	30,017	1.159	F	0.013	Yes
C. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	23,782	0.697	B	24,340	0.714	C	0.017	No
D. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	28,068	0.823	D	28,693	0.841	D	0.018	No

**Table 6-B (Continued)**  
**EXISTING CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>22</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Existing With Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/ No
E. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Smith Avenue and Sherman Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	21,258	0.623	B	23,490	0.689	B	0.066	No
F. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	28,607	0.839	D	29,388	0.862	D	0.023	No
G. Smith Avenue, between 6 <sup>th</sup> Street and Sherman Ave/Border Ave	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,020	0.503	A	13,466	0.520	A	0.017	No

**Notes:**

- VPD = Vehicles Per Day
- D = Divided; U = Undivided
- V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to Table 3-3 for the LOS definitions
- Bold "V/C"/LOS values indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report



**Year 2020 with Project Traffic**

As shown in Table 6-C, in the year 2020 all twelve key study intersections are anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS C or above during the AM and PM peak hours for all scenarios. The results of the roadway segment analyses for Year 2020 With Project traffic conditions indicate that the proposed Project is not forecast to have a significant impact at any of the twelve key study intersections. As there are no significant impacts, no traffic mitigation measures are required under this traffic scenario.

**Table 6-C**  
YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>23</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Year 2020 Without Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Year 2020 With Project Traffic Conditions		(4) Significant Impact	(5) Year 2020 With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
1. Maple Street at SR-91 Ramps/6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	22.3	C	23.4	C	23.3	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.2	C	21.1	C	21.0	C	No	--	--
2. SR-91 EB On-Ramp/Paseo Grande at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	23.0	C	23.4	C	23.3	C	No	--	--
		PM	18.6	B	21.1	C	21.7	C	No	--	--
3. Paseo Grande at Frontage Road	D	AM	10.2	B	11.1	B	11.3	B	No	--	--
		PM	11.1	B	13.9	B	14.3	B	No	--	--
4. Avenida Del Vista at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	13.9	B	13.9	B	13.8	B	No	--	--
		PM	14.2	B	15.0	B	15.1	B	No	--	--
5. Smith Avenue at Pomona Road	D	AM	25.1	C	25.5	C	25.5	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.3	C	20.7	C	20.6	C	No	--	--
6. Smith Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.8	C	29.0	C	29.4	C	No	--	--
		PM	30.4	C	31.7	C	32.5	C	No	--	--

YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>24</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Year 2020 Without Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Year 2020 With Project Traffic Conditions		(4) Significant Impact	(5) Year 2020 With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
7. Sherman Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	19.8	B	20.1	C	20.0	B	No	--	--
		PM	23.3	C	24.5	C	24.6	C	No	--	--
8. Sherman Avenue/Border Avenue at Smith Avenue/10 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.0	C	28.2	C	31.2	C	No	--	--
		PM	28.2	C	29.2	C	29.4	C	No	--	--
9. Lincoln Avenue at SR-91 WB Ramps	D	AM	22.9	C	28.8	C	28.8	C	No	--	--
		PM	21.3	C	22.8	C	22.9	C	No	--	--
10. Lincoln Avenue at D Street/2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	23.9	C	27.0	C	27.0	C	No	--	--
		PM	29.2	C	34.0	C	34.0	C	No	--	--
11. Lincoln Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	25.2	C	26.0	C	26.3	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.4	C	32.8	C	34.0	C	No	--	--
12. SR-91 EB Ramps at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	30.1	C	29.9	C	29.8	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.5	C	30.8	C	30.8	C	No	--	--

Notes:

- s/v = seconds per vehicle (delay)
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to Tables 3-1 and 3-2 for the LOS definitions
- Bold Delay/LOS values indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report

Table 6-D shows the level of service for the studied roadway segments in year 2020 using average daily trips. The roadway segments except for the segment on Lincoln Avenue between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> streets and 6<sup>th</sup> street between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue will operate at LOS F and LOS E respectively in year 2020 without the project. The roadway segments will continue to exceed the city's acceptable level of service thresholds at LOS F and LOS E in year 2020 with the project. Therefore, the level of service on these two roadway segments are cumulative in nature and not a project specific impact.

The roadway segment on 6<sup>th</sup> street between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue will operate at LOS D in year 2020 without the project but will operate at LOS E in year 2020 with the project. In order to determine the true deficiency of this roadway segment in year 2020 an analysis was also done using peak hours in lieu of average daily trips. Table 6-H shows the peak hour trips on this roadway segment operating at LOS A. Therefore, the project is not considered to have an impact on the roadway segment on 6<sup>th</sup> street between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue.

**Table 6-D****YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>25</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Year 2020 Without Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Year 2020 With Project Traffic Conditions			(6) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/ No
A. Smith Avenue, between Pomona Road and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,397	0.517	A	13,991	0.540	A	14,214	0.549	A	0.009	No
B. Lincoln Avenue, between 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	29,682	1.146	F	31,104	1.201	F	31,439	1.214	F	0.013	Yes
C. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	23,782	0.697	B	25,472	0.747	C	26,030	0.763	C	0.016	No
D. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	28,068	0.823	D	30,172	0.885	D	30,797	0.903	E	0.018	Yes

**YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>26</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Year 2020 Without Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Year 2020 With Project Traffic Conditions			(6) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/ No
E. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Smith Avenue and Sherman Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	21,258	0.623	B	22,916	0.672	B	25,148	0.737	C	0.065	No
F. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	28,607	0.839	D	30,801	0.903	E	31,582	0.926	E	0.023	Yes
G. Smith Avenue, between 6 <sup>th</sup> Street and Sherman Ave/Border Ave	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,020	0.503	A	13,656	0.527	A	14,102	0.544	A	0.017	No

Notes:

- VPD = Vehicles Per Day
- D = Divided; U = Undivided
- V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to Table 3-3 for the LOS definitions
- Bold "V/C"/LOS values indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report

**Year 2040 with Project Traffic**

Table 6-F shows in year 2040 all twelve key study intersections are anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS D or above during the AM and PM peak hours for all scenarios. As there are no significant impacts, no traffic mitigation measures are required under this traffic scenario.

Table 6-F

YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>27</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Year 2040 Without Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions		(4) Significant Impact	(5) Year 2040 With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
1. Maple Street at SR-91 Ramps/6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	22.3	C	26.6	C	26.6	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.2	C	23.5	C	23.5	C	No	--	--
2. SR-91 EB On-Ramp/Paseo Grande at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	23.0	C	20.8	C	20.9	C	No	--	--
		PM	18.6	B	24.9	C	26.9	C	No	--	--
3. Paseo Grande at Frontage Road	D	AM	10.2	B	11.3	B	11.5	B	No	--	--
		PM	11.1	B	20.0	C	21.2	C	No	--	--
4. Avenida Del Vista at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	13.9	B	14.6	B	14.6	B	No	--	--
		PM	14.2	B	25.8	C	25.8	C	No	--	--
5. Smith Avenue at Pomona Road	D	AM	25.1	C	26.2	C	26.1	C	No	--	--
		PM	20.3	C	28.5	C	28.5	C	No	--	--
6. Smith Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.8	C	37.2	D	37.7	D	No	--	--
		PM	30.4	C	46.0	D	49.2	D	No	--	--

YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>28</sup>

Key Intersection	Minimum Acceptable LOS	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions		(2) Year 2040 Without Project Traffic Conditions		(3) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions		(4) Significant Impact	(5) Year 2040 With Project With Mitigation	
			Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Delay (s/v)	LOS	Yes/No	Delay (s/v)	LOS
7. Sherman Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	19.8	B	20.8	C	20.8	C	No	--	--
		PM	23.3	C	27.4	C	27.8	C	No	--	--
8. Sherman Avenue/Border Avenue at Smith Avenue/10 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	28.0	C	30.6	C	30.7	C	No	--	--
		PM	28.2	C	40.6	D	41.5	D	No	--	--
9. Lincoln Avenue at SR-91 WB Ramps	D	AM	22.9	C	40.0	D	40.1	D	No	--	--
		PM	21.3	C	28.5	C	27.8	C	No	--	--
10. Lincoln Avenue at D Street/2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	23.9	C	27.7	C	27.7	C	No	--	--
		PM	29.2	C	45.4	D	44.3	D	No	--	--
11. Lincoln Avenue at 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	D	AM	25.2	C	28.3	C	28.5	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.4	C	49.2	D	50.0	D	No	--	--
12. SR-91 EB Ramps at 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	D	AM	30.1	C	30.6	C	30.6	C	No	--	--
		PM	31.5	C	31.7	C	33.4	C	No	--	--

Notes:

- s/v = seconds per vehicle (delay)
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to *Tables 3-1* and *3-2* for the LOS definitions
- Bold Delay/LOS values** indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report

Table 6-G shows the level of service of the studied roadway segments in year 2040 using average daily trip. Four of the roadway segments in year 2040 without the project will exceed the city's acceptable level of service threshold. The impacted roadway segments are: 1) Lincoln Avenue between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> streets at LOS F, 2) 6<sup>th</sup> street between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista at LOS E, 3) 6<sup>th</sup> street between Avenida Del Vista and Smith street at LOS F and 4) 6<sup>th</sup> street between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue at LOS E. In year 2040 with the project the impacted roadway segments continue to operate at the same level of service except for the segment on 6<sup>th</sup> street between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue which increases to LOS F. Therefore, to determine the true deficiency of this roadway segment with the project an analysis was done using peak hours. Table 6-I shows the peak hour roadway segment capacity for the impacted segments in year 2040 with the project. The roadway segment on 6<sup>th</sup> street between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue will operate at LOS A in the peak hours. Therefore, the project is not considered to have an impact on this roadway segment.

**Table 6-G**  
**YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>29</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Year 2040 Without Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions			(6) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/No
A. Smith Avenue, between Pomona Road and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,397	0.517	A	15,524	0.599	A	15,747	0.608	B	0.009	No
B. Lincoln Avenue, between 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	<b>29,682</b>	<b>1.146</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>32,796</b>	<b>1.266</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>33,131</b>	<b>1.279</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>0.013</b>	Yes
C. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	23,782	0.697	B	30,978	0.908	E	31,536	0.925	E	0.017	Yes
D. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue	Major Arterial	34,100	4D	28,068	0.823	D	<b>38,410</b>	<b>1.126</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>39,035</b>	<b>1.145</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>0.019</b>	Yes

**YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	(1) LOS E Capacity <sup>30</sup> (VPD)	(2) Lanes	(3) Existing Traffic Conditions			(4) Year 2040 Without Project Traffic Conditions			(5) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions			(6) Adverse Condition	
				Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	Daily Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Inc.	Yes/No
E. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Smith Avenue and Sherman Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	21,258	0.623	B	25,320	0.743	C	27,552	0.808	D	0.065	No
F. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	34,100	4D	28,607	0.839	D	33,618	0.986	E	34,399	1.009	<b>F</b>	<b>0.023</b>	Yes
G. Smith Avenue, between 6 <sup>th</sup> Street and Sherman Ave/Border Ave	Secondary Arterial	25,900	4D	13,020	0.503	A	18,459	0.713	C	18,905	0.730	C	0.017	No

**Notes:**

- VPD = Vehicles Per Day
- D = Divided; U = Undivided
- V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio
- LOS = Level of Service, please refer to Table 3-3 for the LOS definitions
- Bold "V/C"/LOS values indicate adverse service levels based on the LOS standards mentioned in this report

**Table 6-H**  
**YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	Approach	Time Period	(1) Link Capacity (VPHPL)	(2) Lanes	(3) Total Link Capacity (VPH)	(4) Year 2020 With Project Traffic Conditions		
							Peak Hour Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS
B. Lincoln Avenue, between 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Major Arterial	Northbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,225	0.383	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	501	0.157	A
		Southbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	900	0.281	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,234	0.386	A
D. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue	Major Arterial	Eastbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	666	0.208	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	779	0.243	A
		Westbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,177	0.368	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	780	0.244	A
F. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	Eastbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	589	0.184	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	795	0.248	A
		Westbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,151	0.360	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	882	0.276	A

**Table 6-I**  
**YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	Approach	Time Period	(1) Link Capacity (VPHPL)	(2) Lanes	(3) Total Link Capacity (VPH)	(4) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions		
							Peak Hour Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS
B. Lincoln Avenue, between 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street	Major Arterial	Northbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,268	0.396	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	588	0.184	A
		Southbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,273	0.398	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,557	0.487	A
C. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Paseo Grande and Avenida Del Vista	Major Arterial	Eastbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	875	0.273	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	617	0.193	A
		Westbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,274	0.398	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,563	0.488	A
D. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Avenida Del Vista and Smith Avenue	Major Arterial	Eastbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,074	0.336	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,000	0.313	A
		Westbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,540	0.481	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,082	0.338	A

**YEAR 2040 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR ROADWAY SEGMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

Key Roadway Segment	Type of Arterial	Approach	Time Period	(1) Link Capacity (VPHPL)	(2) Lanes	(3) Total Link Capacity (VPH)	(4) Year 2040 With Project Traffic Conditions		
							Peak Hour Volume	V/C Ratio	LOS
F. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, between Sherman Avenue and Lincoln Avenue	Mixed Use Boulevard	Eastbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	738	0.231	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	834	0.261	A
		Westbound	AM	1,600	2	3,200	1,461	0.457	A
			PM	1,600	2	3,200	1,015	0.317	A

## 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. Wetland habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. 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/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 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, narrow endemic plants survey area, or a burrowing owl survey area.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., dated April 19, 2018, the assessment includes historical aerial photographs of the subject property and its vicinity dated 1931 through 2014. The historical aerial photographs and historical city directories indicate that the subject property was utilized for agricultural purposes as an orchard in at least 1931. By 1961, the subject property was occupied by several structures (possible motel buildings) located along the southern and southeastern portions. The eastern portion of the subject property appeared to have been occupied by a rural single-family residence and small orchard. By 1985, the subject property structures were demolished and the property has remained undeveloped since.

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).

The applicant is required to pay applicable mitigation fees related to the MSHCP. 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.

**8. MINERAL RESOURCES:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Loss of mineral resource or recovery site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

Per Figure 4.5-7 of the General Plan Technical Background Report, the project site is not located in an oil, gas or mineral resource site. Therefore, mitigation is not required.

**9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Risk of accidental release of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Hazardous materials/emissions within ¼ mile of existing or proposed school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Located on hazardous materials site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport land use plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair emergency response plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Increase risk of wildland fires	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., dated April 19, 2018, to identify Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), including the storage and handling of hazardous substances and petroleum products on or in the vicinity of the subject property which have the potential to environmentally impact on-site soils, surface water and groundwater. The assessment included a site reconnaissance held on April 16, 2018. Based on the observed uses of the properties located immediately adjacent to the subject property, it is unlikely that significant quantities of hazardous materials are stored or handled at the adjacent properties with the exception of the automotive repair facility at 1443 West Sixth Street, located adjacent to the west of the subject property, which is registered as a large quantity generator of hazardous waste. However, no Notices of Violation (NOVs) regarding hazardous material storage and handling practices were identified in the Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) provided Radius Map Report for the automotive repair facility. Additionally, the automotive repair facility was not listed on any government databases as having had an unauthorized release of hazardous materials or petroleum products to the subsurface. Therefore, the automotive repair facility is deemed to have a low potential to environmentally impact the subject property and does not currently present any REC to the subject property.

Historic sources reviewed by Salem Engineering Group, Inc. included historical aerial photographs of the subject property

and its vicinity dated 1931 through 2014. The historical aerial photographs and historical city directories indicate that the subject property was utilized for agricultural purposes as an orchard in at least 1931. By 1961, the subject property was occupied by several structures (possible motel buildings) located along the southern and southeastern portions. The eastern portion of the subject property appeared to have been occupied by a rural single-family residence and small orchard. By 1985, the subject property structures were demolished and the property has remained undeveloped since.

The nearest school to the project site is Corona High School which is located approximately 0.50 miles southeast of the project site. Also located near the project site are Coronita Elementary School and Corona Norco Adult School which are less than one mile from the site. All three schools are separated from the site by various existing developments including commercial developments, residential neighborhoods 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 1.19 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure to excessive noise levels/vibrations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Permanent increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Temporary increase in ambient noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with Airport Land Use Plan noise contours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

##### Long-term Operational Noise

Long-term operational noise impacts will be minimal given that the proposed use is an indoor fitness facility. Additionally, a new six-foot high CMU block wall and trees will be installed along the north, east and west perimeters prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Also, there will be no loading activities behind the building adjacent to the residential properties to the north. At this time, the 9,300 square foot future pad does not have a potential user; however, noise impacts will be reduced as the building will be located on the southerly perimeter closer to Sixth Street.

##### Short-term Construction Noise

There may be short-term noise impacts in the immediate area during the construction phase of the project. This may temporarily affect the existing residential developments located to the north of the project site, but the impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant by compliance with city regulations prohibiting construction noise between the hours of 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., Monday through Saturday and 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m., Sundays and federal holidays. This will prevent nuisance noise impacts during sensitive time periods of early morning and nighttime.

##### Airport Land Use Plan Noise

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



**Mechanical Equipment**

Mechanical equipment typically generates 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 building at a minimum distance of approximately 100 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. HVAC noise levels at the nearest residences which is located approximately 98 feet from the building 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, as it pertains to mechanical noise 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.

**11. PUBLIC SERVICES:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:**

The development of a retail center will potentially impact existing 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 adopted development impact fees that are in effect at the time of issuance of building permits, and construction necessary facilities. 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	<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	<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 an infiltration system 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 (<https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/>).

**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	37,000 sf	0.0024 tons/sf/year <sup>1</sup>	88.8
<b>TOTAL (tons/year)</b>			<b>88.8</b>
<b>TOTAL (tons/day)</b>			<b>0.24</b>

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

Development of the proposed project would not significantly impact current operation of or the expected lifetime of the El Sobrante Landfill because solid waste generated by the proposed project represents substantially less than one percent of the landfill's maximum allowable daily capacity. Additionally, solid waste service fees would be charged to individual property owners when services are 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, Sixth Street is not a scenic vista or highway. Development of the site will be subject to the development standards of the C-3 zone which permits commercial buildings up to a maximum height of 40 feet. The single-story LA Fitness building will have splitface CMU block walls with stucco and aluminum siding accent material on the exterior. The proposed materials and earth tone color pallet are compatible with the existing commercial developments located in the vicinity. The building overall is aesthetically pleasing and attractive and would not cause degradation to the area. Therefore, no mitigation with respect to the aesthetics of the development is required.

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

#### Discussion:

A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by First Carbon Solutions (November 5, 2018) to analyze any potential cultural resources on the project site. The records search conducted at the EIC (Eastern Information Center) included the project boundaries and a half-mile radius and indicated that a small portion of the project area was previously surveyed. Nothing was found during that survey. The remainder of the property had never undergone a cultural resources survey. An FCS archaeologist surveyed the entire property in October 26, 2018, and no historic or prehistoric resources were observed. The NAHC (Native American Heritage Commission) Sacred Lands File search was also negative. The results of the records search, NAHC Sacred Lands File search, and desktop research suggested that the possibility of cultural resources being present in undisturbed native sediments is highly unlikely. Because of the generally low sensitivity of the project area for cultural resources, archaeological monitoring is not recommended.

The project is subject to tribal consultation under AB 52. The Community Development Department initiated the process by notifying seven local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the city's Letter of Transmittal dated September 10, 2018. The department received a request dated September 20, 2018 from Ms. Ebru Ozdil, Cultural Analyst for the Pechanga Cultural Resources Temecula Band of Luiseno Mission Indians requesting consultation of the project. Staff reached out to Ms. Ozdil via email on September 25, 2018, followed by a second email on October 11, 2018, which included a copy of the proposed plans. A third email was sent on November 2, 2018 followed by a fourth email on November 8, 2018, which included the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the proposed project and the city's standard mitigation measures for AB 52 projects. Staff followed up with a fifth email on April 25, 2019 and a sixth and final email on June 28, 2019, indicating that due to the lack of response from the Pechanga tribe the city would be closing consultation on the project. On July 1, 2019 staff received an email response from Molly Earp-Escobar, Cultural Planning Specialist with Pechanga Cultural Resources Department concluding consultation and requesting tribal monitoring during the grading phase of the development. Therefore, **mitigation measures 2-6** are necessary which would reduce any potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level. **(MM 2-6)**

The department also received a request dated September 19, 2018 from Mr. Andrew Salas, Chairman for Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requesting consultation on the project. Staff reached out to Mr. Salas via email on September 20, 2019 with a list of dates for consultation. On September 21, 2018, staff received an email from Brandy Salas, Admin Specialist for Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians, stating their next available consultation appointment was in November of 2018. On November 8, 2018 staff had a telephone consultation with Mr. Andrew Salas and Mr. Mathew Salas pursuant to AB 52 and the proposed project. Mr. Matthew Salas requested a copy of the Cultural Resource Assessment be emailed to him when it became available and concluded consultation. On February 12, 2019 staff emailed the Cultural Resource Assessment for the proposed project to Mr. Matthew Salas. Since no additional information was requested the city closed consultation at the end of February 2019.

Lastly, the department received a request dated October 17, 2018 from Mr. Joseph Ontiveros, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requesting consultation. Staff reached out to Mr. Ontiveros via email on November 16, 2018 and included a copy of the plans and the Cultural Resource Assessment for the proposed project. Staff sent a follow-up email on February 2, 2019 and a third email on April 25, 2019. Over the course of approximately six months, staff made multiple attempts to confirm with Mr. Ontiveros via email if additional consultation would be necessary. Staff was not able to obtain a response from Mr. Ontiveros; therefore, staff chose to end consultation with Soboba on April 25, 2019, as staff believes that a good faith and reasonable effort was made by staff to consult on the project.

**Mitigation Measures:**

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

examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b). Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If human remains are determined as those of Native American origin, the applicant shall comply with the state relating to the disposition of Native American burials that fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC Section 5097). The coroner shall contact the NAHC to determine the most likely descendant(s). The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The Disposition of the remains shall be overseen by the most likely descendant(s) to determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts.

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

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

#### 15. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Williamson Act contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

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

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

#### 16. GREENHOUSE GAS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with a plan, policy or regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

Per the greenhouse gas analysis prepared by First Carbon Solutions (June 6, 2019) for the project, the annual greenhouse gas emissions associated with the operation of the project are estimated to be 394 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e during construction and 2,879 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e during operation. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of the construction emissions to operational emissions over the project's lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the project will generate 13 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis and the operation of the project will generate 157 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis. The project will not exceed the SCAQMD's threshold significance of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e for small land use projects. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact and no mitigation is warranted.

The City of Corona adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2012. The purpose of the CAP is to provide guidance on analyzing GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development projects within the City. To address the state's requirement to reduce GHG emissions, the City of Corona prepared its CAP with the goal of reducing GHG emissions within the City by 15% below "existing" 2008 levels or 25% below a "forecasted" 2020 BAU scenario by the year 2020. The City's target is consistent with the AB 32 target and ensures that Corona will be providing GHG reductions locally that will complement state efforts to reduce GHG emissions. Because the City's CAP addresses GHG emissions reductions and is consistent with the requirements of AB 32 and international efforts to reduce GHG emissions, compliance with the CAP fulfills the description of mitigation found in the State CEQA Guidelines. Per the CAP, a project may utilize the screening tables that are included in the CAP to show compliance with the CAP or, as an alternative, conduct a separate emissions analysis. Since the project's GHG emissions were analyzed by a separate emissions analysis (First Carbon Solutions, June 6, 2019) which indicated that the project's emissions would be below 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, the project would be in compliance with the CAP.

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. In applying criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion:

A Cultural Resource Assessment was prepared for the project site by First Carbon Solutions, November 5, 2018. The Eastern Information Center located on the campus of California State University, Riverside conducted a cultural resources records search and literature review for the project. As previously discussed in Section 14 of this analysis, the record search included the project boundaries and a half-mile radius. Results of the records search indicate that there are no tribal cultural resources present within the project site. there is no new information or impacts other than those discussed under Section 14 of this analysis; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

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

18. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Fish/ wildlife population or habitat or important historical sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cumulatively considerable impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

Based on the analysis of this Initial Study, the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to the following environmental topic:

- Cultural Resources

However, appropriate mitigation has been developed. Mitigation Measures 1 through 4 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. WILDFIRE:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water resources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

According to the California Department of Forest and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the proposed project is not located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), State Responsibility Area (SRA), Federal Responsibility Area (FRA), or classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) (<https://www.egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>). In addition, the proposed project meets the Corona Fire Department's Standard of Cover. Therefore, there would be no impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no mitigation is required.

The project site is relatively flat land with a gentle slope to the south and an elevation ranging between 687 to 703 feet above mean sea level. The proposed LA Fitness health club and future commercial pad will not contribute to the spread of wildfire since the project's design is in compliance with the current California Building Codes which include fire construction standards. In addition, the project site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), undeveloped forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. Therefore, the project will not exacerbate wildfire risks, expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or cause uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities. The site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Therefore, the project will not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

The project site is relatively flat land with a gentle slope to the south and is not part of any of the fire history maps; therefore, development of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

**20. ENERGY:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

An Energy Impact Analysis was prepared for the project site by First Carbon Solutions, June 6, 2019. The study analyzed and evaluated the following environmental topics:



- Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy sources, during project construction and operation?
- Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

### **Construction**

During construction, the proposed project would result in energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment, and the use of electricity for temporary buildings, lighting, and other sources. Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during site preparation, grading, paving, and building construction. The types of equipment could include gasoline- and diesel-powered construction and transportation equipment, including trucks, tractors, loaders, backhoes, excavators, graders, bulldozers, rollers, forklifts, and cranes.

Other equipment could include construction lighting, field services (office trailers), and electrically driven equipment such as pumps and other tools. Singlewide mobile office trailers, which are commonly used in construction staging areas, generally range in size from 160 square feet to 720 square feet. A typical 720-square-foot office trailer would consume approximately 9,700 kilowatt-hour (kWh) during the approximately 1.1-year construction period. Due to the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for developers and contractors to use energy consuming resources in an efficient manner, the construction phase of the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the construction related impacts related to electricity and fuel consumption would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

### **Operation**

#### **Electricity and Natural Gas**

The operational phase of the project would consume energy as part of building operations and transportation activities. Building operations for the project would involve energy consumption for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting, and electronics. Based on CalEEMod energy use estimations, operations (for the health club building, retail and restaurant spaces, and parking lot lighting) would consume approximately 711,219 kWh of electricity and an estimated 2.58 million kilo-British Thermal Unit (kBtu) (2.53 million cubic feet) of natural gas on an annual basis. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the State's Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building. The City of Corona CAP reinforces these State standards. The City of Corona General Plan includes energy conservation policies that require the use and installation of energy conservation features in all new construction projects, and encourage energy audits, including installation of energy conservation measures, for all commercial projects. The General Plan policies provide for expanded opportunities for "green building" techniques. Compliance with these policies would ensure that building energy consumption would not result in the use of energy in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Therefore, the operational impact related to building electricity and natural gas consumption would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

#### **Fuel**

Operational energy would also be consumed during vehicle trips associated with the project. Fuel consumption would be primarily related to vehicle use by visitors and employees associated with the proposed project. Based on CalEEMod energy use estimations, project-related vehicle trips would result in approximately 4.24 million VMT and consume an estimated 175,174 gallons of gasoline and diesel combined, annually. The project site is located approximately 0.6 mile from SR-91/6<sup>th</sup> Street and SR-91/Lincoln Avenue interchanges. As such, the project site would be in proximity to a regional route of travel, thus limiting travel on local roads and reducing VMT. The project site is less than 0.2 mile from the Route 1 UC Riverside-Downtown Riverside-Corona bus stop at Smith Avenue and West Sixth Street, which is within what is considered walking distance. The existing transportation facilities in the area would provide future visitors and employees associated with the proposed project with access to public transportation, thus further reducing fuel consumption demand. For these reasons, operational-related transportation fuel consumption would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the operational impact related to vehicle fuel consumption would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

### **Energy Plan Consistency**

The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. As previously mentioned, the project would result in energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment, and the use of electricity for temporary buildings, lighting, and other sources. California Code of Regulations Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by California Air Resources Board. The project would comply with these regulations. There are no policies at the local level applicable to energy conservation specific to the construction phase.

Thus, it is anticipated that construction of the proposed plan would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, construction-related energy plan consistency impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires that 33 percent of electricity retail sales be served by renewable energy sources by 2020. The proposed project would be served with gas provided by SoCalGas. SoCalGas offers renewable natural gas captured from sources like dairies, wastewater treatment plants and landfills. The proposed project would be served with electricity provided by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's 2017 power mix included 32 percent eligible renewable (biomass and biowaste, geothermal, eligible hydroelectric, solar, and wind), 34 percent unspecified sources of power, 20 percent natural gas, 8 percent large hydroelectric, and 6 percent nuclear. SCE also offers a Green Rate 50 percent option that sources 66 percent of its power mix from eligible renewable energy sources, and a Green Rate 100 percent option that sources 100 percent of its power mix from eligible renewable energy sources. SCE is on track to meet the California RPS of 33 percent by 2020 mandate.

Part 11, Chapter 5, of the State's Title 24 energy efficiency standards establishes mandatory measures for non-residential buildings, including material conservation and resource efficiency. The project would be required to comply with these mandatory measures. The project would also comply with the California Building Standards Code requiring proposed commercial buildings to be solar ready. Policies 10.2.3 and 10.21.2 of the City of Corona General Plan require implementation of energy conservation through various regulatory, educational, and fiscal techniques, and the use and installation of energy conservation features in all new construction projects. The proposed project would be required to comply with these City-mandated policies. Other policies that promote energy conservation at the local level are voluntary. Compliance with the aforementioned mandatory measures would ensure that the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. Therefore, operational energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

## **21. 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 Salem Engineering Group, Inc., April 19, 2018**
3. **Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, Inc., February 21, 2019**
4. **Hydrology Study, prepared by Joseph C. Truxaw & Associates, Inc. February 21, 2019**
5. **Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., March 23, 2018**
6. **Traffic Impact Analysis Report, prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers, June 6, 2019**
7. **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas/Energy Analysis Report, prepared by First Carbon Solutions, June 6, 2019**
8. **Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by First Carbon Solutions, November 5, 2018**

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
PP2018-0005

No.	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
AIR QUALITY						
1	During construction activities, all off-road equipment with engines greater than 50 horsepower shall meet either EPA or ARB Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards. The construction contractor shall maintain records concerning its efforts to comply with this requirement, including equipment lists. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include but are not limited to equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, and engine serial number. If engines that comply with Tier IV Interim off-road emission standards are not commercially available, then the construction contractor shall use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment (e.g., Tier III) available. For purposes of this mitigation measure, “commercially available” shall mean the availability of Tier IV Interim engines taking into consideration factors such as critical-path timing of construction; and geographic proximity to the project site of equipment. The contractor can maintain records for equipment that is not commercially available by providing letters from at least two rental companies for each piece of off-road equipment where the Tier IV Interim engine is not available.	Condition of Approval	Construction contractor shall maintain records for equipment on site during construction	During construction	Community Development Department (Planning)	
CULTURAL RESOURCES						
2	<p><u>Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources:</u> In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:</p> <p>a. <u>Temporary Curation and Storage:</u> During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location onsite or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process; and</p>	Condition of Approval	Submittal of Phase IV Monitoring Report	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Community Development Department (Planning)	

No.	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
3	<p><u>Treatment and Final Disposition:</u> The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Corona Community Development Department with evidence of same:</p> <p>a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed;</p> <p>b. A curation agreement with the appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;</p> <p>c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural minerals, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default; and.</p> <p>d. At the completion of grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project Archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during</p>					

No.	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
	the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Corona, Eastern Information Center and interested tribes.					
4	<u>Sacred Sites</u> : 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	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.	Community Development Department (Planning)	
5	<u>Fossil Specimens</u> : In the event that fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out:  a. The applicant shall immediately cease operation and retain a qualified and trained paleontologist. The paleontologist shall salvage all fossils in the area and provide additional field staff in accordance with modern paleontological techniques.  b. All fossils collected during the project will be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix will be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of all material collected and identified will be provided to the museum repository along with the specimens.	Condition of Approval	Submittal of report or document	Within 60 days of completion of grading; otherwise, report shall be submitted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Community Development Department (Planning)	
6	<u>Discovery of Human Remains</u> : In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors, project archaeologist, and/or designated Native American Monitor shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Corona Community and Development Department immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b). Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine	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.	Community Development Department (Planning)	

No.	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Action	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Person	Verification Date
	<p>whether the remains are those of a Native American. If human remains are determined as those of Native American origin, the applicant shall comply with the state relating to the disposition of Native American burials that fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC Section 5097). The coroner shall contact the NAHC to determine the most likely descendant(s). The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The Disposition of the remains shall be overseen by the most likely descendant(s) to determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts.</p> <p>The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings will be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC).</p> <p>According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052) determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that the project proponent and the MLD are in disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply, and the median and decision process will occur with the NAHC (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).</p>					