



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

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

**TTM 37719:** Tentative tract map application to subdivide 5.19 acres into 23 numbered lots for the development of single-family residential homes and four lettered lots for street dedication and landscape purposes located at the southwest corner of East Cresta Road and South Promenade Avenue in the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2).

**PP2019-0005:** Precise Plan application to review the site plan, architecture, landscaping, and fencing associated with the development of 23 single-family residential homes proposed on 5.19 acres located on the southwest corner of Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road in the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2).

**ENTITY OR PERSON UNDERTAKING PROJECT:**

Brad Porter  
Westcal Property Group, Inc.  
2711 N. Sepulveda Boulevard #530  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

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

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

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

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

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



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

### **PROJECT TITLE:**

**TTM 37719:** Tentative tract map application to subdivide 5.19 acres into 23 numbered lots for the development of single-family residential homes and four lettered lots for street dedication and landscape purposes located at the southwest corner of East Cresta Road and South Promenade Avenue in the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2).

**PP2019-0005:** Precise Plan application to review the site plan, architecture, landscaping, and fencing associated with the development of 23 single-family residential homes proposed on 5.19 acres located in the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2).

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

Southwest corner of Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road, in the City of Corona, County of Riverside (APNs: 115-100-046, 115-415-001, and 115-415-002).

### **PROJECT PROPONENT:**

Brad Porter  
Westcal Property Group, Inc.  
2711 N. Sepulveda Boulevard #530  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is for the development of single-family residential lots on 5.19 acres located on the southwest corner of Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road in the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2). The project site is an infill lot which has been vacant since 1931. The project requires two entitlements, TTM 37719 and PP2019-0005, which are described above.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Presently, the subject site is undeveloped with low-lying weeds and cactus plants. The site contains a mixture of wood fencing along the west perimeter adjacent to existing single-family homes, and chain link fencing along the north, east and south perimeters of the property. Abutting the property to the north is Cresta Road with single family homes beyond, and to the east is Promenade Avenue with single family homes beyond. The portion of Cresta Road adjacent to the site is improved with roadway, curb and gutter, parkway and sidewalk. The portion of Promenade Avenue adjacent to the site is improved with roadway, curb and gutter and sidewalk. Single-family residential development surrounds the property to the north, east and west, with Interstate 15 to the south.

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

The subject property has a zoning of SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2) and a General Plan designation of LDR (Low Density Residential) which permits residential development to occur at a density ranging from 3 to 6 du/ac. The project is consistent with the site's zoning and General Plan designation as the project is to subdivide 5.19 acres into 23 lots for development of 23 single family residential homes with an average lot area of 7,014 square feet. The subdivision results in a density of 4.43 du/ac which is within the allowable density range under the LDR designation.

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

Date Prepared: January 7, 2020

Prepared By: Lupita Garcia, Associate 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 SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2) and designated as LDR (Low Density Residential) 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 subdivision and development of 23 single family residential homes complies with the SFR-5 zone and LDR designation in terms of land use. Therefore, no mitigation would be required. The LDR designation prescribes a density of 3-6 du/ac and the project proposes a density of 4.43 du/ac. The Northeast corona Specific Plan (SP81-2) prescribes a maximum allowable number of dwelling units for project area 3E to be 273. Currently, project area 3E contains 123 constructed dwelling units, the proposed project will add 23 dwelling units, for a total of 146 dwelling units, which does not exceed the maximum allowable number of dwelling units for the project area. Therefore, the development proposed by TTM 37719 does not exceed the allowable densities prescribed for the LDR designation of the City's General Plan and by the Northeast Corona Specific Plan.

The project is bounded by Cresta Road to the north with single family developments beyond, Promenade Avenue to the east with single family developments beyond, Interstate 15 to the south with industrial developments beyond, and single family developments to the west. Since the project is for single family development, it would not conflict with the surrounding land uses or physically divide an established community. 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:**

Low density residential development is proposed on the 5.19-acre project site. The LDR designation of the General Plan enables 3 to 6 du/ac which this project proposal does not exceed. The project proposes 23 dwelling units which yields a density of 4.43 du/ac. The project will not induce substantial growth or exceed the city's population projections established in the 2004 General Plan for build-out year 2025. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

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<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>Impact  | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fault /seismic failures (Alquist-Priolo zone) /Landslide/Liquefaction | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e. Unstable soil conditions from grading                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f. Expansive soils   | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

Per the Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation report prepared for the project site by Albus-Keefe & Associates, Inc. (November 29, 2018), no active faults are known to project through the site nor does the site lie within the bounds of an "Earthquake Fault Zone" as defined by the State of California in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. As such, the potential for ground rupture due to fault displacement beneath the site is considered very low. The nearest zoned fault is the Chino Fault located approximately 4 miles to the southwest. 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 supplemental 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.

Per the Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation report prepared for the project site by Albus-Keefe & Associates, Inc. (November 29, 2018), the site predominantly slopes gently towards the north. As such, landslide/slope instability/ rock fall issues pose a very low risk. Engineering research of soil liquefaction potential (Youd, et al., 2001) indicates that generally three basic factors must exist concurrently for liquefaction to occur. These factors include:

- A source of ground shaking, such as an earthquake, capable of generating soil mass distortions.
- A relatively loose silty and/or sandy soil.
- A relatively shallow groundwater table (within approximately 50 feet below ground surface) or completely saturated soil conditions that will allow positive pore pressure generation.

The liquefaction susceptibility of the onsite soils was evaluated by analyzing the potential concurrent occurrence of the above-mentioned three basic factors. The liquefaction evaluation for the site was completed under the guidance of Special Publication 117A: Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (CDMG, 2008). The site is underlain by shallow bedrock that is not prone to liquefaction. Furthermore, no groundwater was encountered during the investigation and the previous investigation by Earth Strata. Based on the research and review of the referenced geotechnical report, groundwater is expected at approximately 60 to 100 feet below the existing ground surface and the subsurface material observed were very dense. Finally, the site is not located within the Riverside County General Plan liquefaction hazard zone. As result, the potential for liquefaction to occur beneath the site is considered very low. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

The project involves grading approximately 10,800 cubic yards, which is more than 100 cubic yards. The site is generally underlain by shallow granitic bedrock. However, based on historical aerial photographs, the depth to bedrock is anticipated to vary throughout the site. The Supplemental Geotechnical Investigations report recommends that the upper 2 feet of existing earth materials should be removed and recompacted in the area of the proposed structural site improvements (i.e., residences, walls and "other" structural areas). Removals should be deepened so that a minimum 2 feet of engineered fill is provided below the proposed foundations. Per the Geotechnical Map provided below, in the vicinity of boring B-4 (located on the southeast corner of the project site) deepened removals of up to 5 feet will be locally required. Competent artificial fill should be exposed within this area and evaluated by the geotechnical consultant during grading. Localized artificial fill may also be present in different areas of the site.

Prior to placement of compacted fill, the exposed ground should be scarified where practical to a depth of 6 inches, brought to relatively uniform moisture content of 100 percent of optimum, then compacted to at least 90 percent of the laboratory standard. Within the limits of pavement and free-standing walls or retaining walls over 3 feet in height, the upper 12 inches of existing fill soils should be removed or to a minimum depth of 12 inches below subgrade or footing, whichever is deeper. Removals should extend laterally beyond the limits of the proposed structures a distance equal to the depth of removal (i.e. 1:1 projection) but not less than 5 feet. Existing soils within roadways should extend at least 2 feet beyond the curbs. Where removals are limited by existing structures, protected trees or property lines, special considerations may be required in the

construction of affected improvements. All removal excavations should be evaluated by the geotechnical consultant during grading to confirm the exposed conditions are as anticipated and to provide supplemental recommendations if required. Adherence to the city's grading regulations and the grading specifications identified in the supplemental 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.

### Geotechnical Map



**4. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:**

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

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Violate water quality standards/waste discharge requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Deplete groundwater supplies                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Alter existing drainage pattern                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Increase flooding hazard                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 Fuscoe Engineering, Inc. (December 6, 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. Another 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.

Per the Hydrology Study prepared for the project site by JLC Engineering & Consulting Inc. (July 16, 2019), the proposed development will incorporate drainage improvements which provide a system to treat water quality and intercept runoff to mitigate potential issues downstream of the project site. The project meets the street design policies outlined in the City of Corona Design Criteria. The project will not adversely impact runoff within Cresta Road, since a 14-foot catch basin will be provided to intercept runoff from the project. The project will reduce the amount of flows that currently impact the Caltrans right-of-way to the south and a private home on Wynola Court located west of the project site. Lastly, the runoff to Promenade Avenue has been reduced. The proposed project proposes drainage improvements that will improve the existing flooding conditions and provide flood protection for the proposed development. 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 proposed drainage 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create objectionable odors               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



**Discussion:**

An Air Quality Impact Analysis was prepared for the project by LSA (May 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 (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD. To the west of the Basin is the Pacific Ocean. To the north and east of the Basin are the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains, while the southern limit of the Basin is the San Diego County Line. The Basin 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 Project Emissions**

Construction activities produce emissions from various combustion sources (utility engines, tenant improvements, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew). Exhaust emissions from construction activities envisioned on site would vary daily as construction activity levels change.

Project construction impacts were evaluated for the project by estimating the construction equipment that would be used during each construction activity, the hours of use for that construction equipment, the quantities of earth and debris to be moved, and on-road vehicle trips (worker, soil hauling, and vendor trips). CalEEMod defaults are assumed to represent the construction activities, off-road equipment, and on-road construction fleet mix and trip lengths. Table 5-A lists the tentative project construction schedule for the proposed project. It is expected that construction would start in early 2020 and conclude in early 2022, lasting approximately 24 months. Construction phase durations are indicated in the project plans.

**Table 5-A: Tentative Project Construction Schedule**

| <b>Phase Name</b>     | <b>Phase Start Date</b> | <b>Phase End Date</b> | <b>Number of Days</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Site Preparation      | 2/3/2020                | 2/7/2020              | 5                     |
| Grading               | 2/8/2020                | 4/9/2020              | 44                    |
| Building Construction | 4/10/2020               | 10/21/2021            | 400                   |
| Paving                | 10/22/2021              | 11/16/2021            | 18                    |
| Architectural Coating | 11/17/2021              | 1/17/2022             | 44                    |

Source: Estimated by LSA from the site plan (assuming a 2022 opening year) (April 2019).

The most recent version of CalEEMod (Version 2016.3.2) was used to develop the construction equipment inventory and calculate the construction emissions. Table 5-B lists the estimated construction equipment that would be used during project construction as estimated by CalEEMod default values.



**Table 5-B: Diesel Construction Equipment Use by Construction Phase**

| Construction Phase    | Off-Road Equipment Type   | Off-Road Equipment Unit Amount | Hours Used per Day | Horsepower | Load Factor |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|
| Site Preparation      | Graders                   | 3                              | 8                  | 247        | 0.4         |
|                       | Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes | 4                              | 8                  | 97         | 0.37        |
| Grading               | Excavators                | 1                              | 8                  | 158        | 0.38        |
|                       | Graders                   | 1                              | 8                  | 187        | 0.41        |
|                       | Rubber-Tired Dozers       | 1                              | 8                  | 247        | 0.4         |
|                       | Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes | 3                              | 8                  | 97         | 0.37        |
|                       |                           |                                |                    |            |             |
| Building Construction | Cranes                    | 1                              | 7                  | 231        | 0.29        |
|                       | Forklifts                 | 3                              | 8                  | 89         | 0.2         |
|                       | Generator Sets            | 1                              | 8                  | 84         | 0.74        |
|                       | Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes | 3                              | 7                  | 97         | 0.37        |
|                       | Welders                   | 1                              | 8                  | 46         | 0.45        |
| Architectural Coating | Air Compressors           | 1                              | 6                  | 78         | 0.48        |
| Paving                | Cement and Mortar Mixers  | 2                              | 6                  | 9          | 0.56        |
|                       | Pavers                    | 1                              | 8                  | 130        | 0.42        |
|                       | Paving Equipment          | 2                              | 6                  | 132        | 0.36        |
|                       | Rollers                   | 2                              | 6                  | 80         | 0.38        |
|                       | Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes | 1                              | 8                  | 97         | 0.37        |

Source: Compiled by LSA using CalEEMod defaults (April 2019).

CalEEMod = California Emission Estimator Model

The emissions rates shown in Table 5-C are from the CalEEMod output tables listed as “Mitigated Construction,” even though the only measures that have been applied to the analysis are the required construction emissions control measures, or standard conditions. They are also the combination of the on- and off-site emissions. No exceedances of any criteria pollutants are expected.

**Table 5-C: Short Term Regional Peak Day Construction Emissions**

| Construction Phase         | Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day) |                 |            |                 | Fugitive PM <sub>10</sub> | Exhaust PM <sub>10</sub> | Fugitive PM <sub>2.5</sub> | Exhaust PM <sub>2.5</sub> |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                            | VOC  | NO <sub>x</sub> | CO         | SO <sub>x</sub> |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Site Preparation           | 4  | 42              | 22         | <1              | 7                         | 2                        | 4                          | 2                         |
| Grading                    | 3  | 26              | 17         | <1              | 3                         | 1                        | 1                          | 1                         |
| Building Construction      | 2  | 19              | 17         | <1              | <1                        | 1                        | <1                         | 1                         |
| Paving                     | 1  | 11              | 13         | <1              | <1                        | <1                       | <1                         | <1                        |
| Architectural Coating      | 6  | 2               | 2          | <1              | <1                        | <1                       | <1                         | <1                        |
| <b>Peak Daily</b>          | <b>6</b>                                     | <b>42</b>       | <b>22</b>  | <b>&lt;1</b>    | <b>9</b>                  |                          | <b>6</b>                   |                           |
| <b>SCAQMD Thresholds</b>   | <b>75</b>                                    | <b>100</b>      | <b>550</b> | <b>150</b>      | <b>150</b>                |                          | <b>55</b>                  |                           |
| <b>Exceeds Thresholds?</b> | <b>No</b>                                    | <b>No</b>       | <b>No</b>  | <b>No</b>       | <b>No</b>                 |                          | <b>No</b>                  |                           |

Source: Compiled by LSA (April 2019).

CO = carbon monoxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxidesPM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in sizePM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides

VOC = volatile organic compounds

Table 5-D shows the peak day construction emissions that would be emitted on the project site compared to the LSTs. Table 5-D shows that the localized construction emissions would not result in a locally significant air quality impact.

**Table 5-D: Construction Localized Impacts Analysis (Maximum lbs./day)**

| Emissions Sources  | NO <sub>x</sub> | CO    | PM <sub>10</sub> | PM <sub>2.5</sub> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------------------|
| On-Site Emissions  | 42              | 22    | 9                | 6                 |
| LST                | 270             | 1,700 | 12               | 8                 |
| Exceeds Threshold? | No              | No    | No               | No                |

Source: Compiled by LSA (April 2019).

Note: Source Receptor Area – Norco/Corona, 5 acres, 82-foot distance.

CO = carbon monoxide

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

lbs/day = pounds per day

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

LST = localized significance threshold

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

Tables 5-C and 5-D show that peak daily regional construction emissions for the proposed project would not exceed the daily thresholds of any criteria pollutant established by SCAQMD, thus, during construction, there would be no air quality impacts.

### Odors from Construction Activities

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area would emit odors during construction, primarily from the equipment exhaust. However, the construction activity would cease to occur after individual construction is completed. No other sources of objectionable odors have been identified for the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are required.

SCAQMD Rule 402 regarding nuisances states: "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property." The proposed residential uses are not anticipated to emit any objectionable odors. Therefore, objectionable odors posing a health risk to potential on-site and existing off-site uses would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

### Naturally Occurring Asbestos

The proposed project site is in Riverside County, which is not among the counties that are found to have serpentine and ultramafic rock in their soils. Therefore, the potential risk for naturally occurring asbestos during project construction is small and would be less than significant.

### Long-Term Project Operational Emissions

Project operational impacts were evaluated for the project by analyzing air pollutant emission impacts from net increases in both area and mobile-source emissions. The area source emission categories include sources such as consumer products, fireplaces, and landscaping equipment.

**Table 5-E: Opening Year Regional Operational Emissions**

| Source                         | Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day) |                 |             |                 |                  |                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                                | VOC                           | NO <sub>x</sub> | CO          | SO <sub>x</sub> | PM <sub>10</sub> | PM <sub>2.5</sub> |
| Area                           | <1.00                         | <1.00           | 2.06        | <1.00           | <1.00            | <1.00             |
| Energy                         | <1.00                         | <1.00           | <1.00       | <1.00           | <1.00            | <1.00             |
| Mobile                         | <1.00                         | 3.08            | 5.11        | <1.00           | 1.67             | <1.00             |
| <b>Total Project Emissions</b> | <b>1.44</b>                   | <b>3.66</b>     | <b>7.25</b> | <b>&lt;1.00</b> | <b>1.73</b>      | <b>&lt;1.00</b>   |
| <b>SCAQMD Thresholds</b>       | <b>55</b>                     | <b>55</b>       | <b>550</b>  | <b>150</b>      | <b>150</b>       | <b>55</b>         |
| <b>Exceeds Thresholds?</b>     | <b>No</b>                     | <b>No</b>       | <b>No</b>   | <b>No</b>       | <b>No</b>        | <b>No</b>         |

Source: Compiled by LSA (April 2019).

CO = carbon monoxide

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

lbs/day = pounds per day

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

VOC = volatile organic compounds

Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis (LLG 2019) prepared for the project, the new residences would generate 217 total trips on a peak day. As the amount of project-related daily trips would vary from weekday to weekend and the traffic impact peak day is a weekday (when there is more non-project related traffic on surrounding roads), the default CalEEMod rates for Saturday and Sunday were used. Table 5-E shows opening year regional operational emissions associated with the proposed project. Energy source include natural gas consumption for heating.

**Table 5-F: Long Term Operational Localized Impact Analysis**

| <b>Emissions Sources</b>  | <b>NO<sub>x</sub></b> | <b>CO</b>    | <b>PM<sub>10</sub></b> | <b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>On-Site Emissions</b>  | <b>&lt;1</b>          | <b>2</b>     | <b>&lt;1</b>           | <b>&lt;1</b>            |
| <b>LST</b>                | <b>270</b>            | <b>1,700</b> | <b>3</b>               | <b>2</b>                |
| <b>Exceeds Threshold?</b> | <b>No</b>             | <b>No</b>    | <b>No</b>              | <b>No</b>               |

Source: Compiled by LSA (April 2019).

Note: Source Receptor Area – Norco/Corona, 4.8 acres, 82-foot distance, on-site traffic assumed to be 5 percent of total.

CO = carbon monoxide

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

LST = local significance threshold

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

Table 5-F shows the calculated emissions for the proposed operational activities compared with the appropriate local significance thresholds (LSTs). By design, the localized impacts analysis only includes on-site sources; however, the CalEEMod outputs do not separate on-site and off-site emissions for mobile sources. For a worst-case scenario assessment, the emissions shown in Table 5-F include all on-site project-related stationary sources and 5 percent of the project-related new mobile sources, which is an estimate of the amount of project-related new vehicle traffic that would occur on site. A total of 5 percent is considered conservative per the total trip length included in CalEEMod. In addition, the operational emission rates would not exceed the LSTs for sensitive receptors in the project area. Therefore, the proposed operational activity would not result in a locally significant air quality impact.

### **Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Analysis**

Vehicular trips associated with the proposed project would contribute to congestion at intersections and along roadway segments in the project vicinity. Localized air quality impacts would occur when emissions from vehicular traffic increase as a result of the proposed project. The primary mobile source pollutant of local concern is carbon monoxide (CO), a direct function of vehicle idling time and, thus, of traffic flow conditions. CO transport is extremely limited; under normal meteorological conditions, CO disperses rapidly with distance from the source. However, under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthful levels, affecting local sensitive receptors (e.g., residents, schoolchildren, the elderly, and hospital patients). Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with roadways or intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service or with extremely high traffic volumes. In areas with high ambient background CO concentrations, modeling is recommended to determine a project's effect on local CO levels.

An assessment of project-related impacts on localized ambient air quality requires that future ambient air quality levels be projected. Existing CO concentrations in the immediate project vicinity are not available. Ambient CO levels monitored at the Riverside-Rubidoux Station, the closest station with complete monitored CO data, showed a highest recorded 1-hour concentration of 3.0 ppm (the State standard is 20 ppm) and a highest 8-hour concentration of 2.2 ppm (the State standard is 9 ppm) during the past 3 years. The highest CO concentrations would normally occur during peak traffic hours; hence, CO impacts calculated under peak traffic conditions represent a worst-case analysis.

As described in the project Traffic Impact Analysis (LLG 2019), with the addition of the proposed project in the existing setting and all future scenarios, all key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable level of service. Also, the roadway segment analysis indicates the same conclusion with existing plus project having fewer than 10,000 vehicle trips per day. Therefore, comparing these conditions to those analyzed in the SCAQMD AQMP, the project impact on traffic along area streets would not result in CO hotspots.

Therefore, the project can be implemented in an existing setting with no significant peak-hour intersection impacts. Given the extremely low level of CO concentrations in the project area, and no traffic impacts at any intersections, project-related vehicles would not result in CO concentrations exceeding the State or federal CO standards. Because no CO hot spots would occur, there would be no project-related impacts on CO concentrations. Therefore, the operational CO impact would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required.

**6. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:**

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict or be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)  | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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**

As shown on the project's site plan, access to the project site will be provided via one (1) driveway at the existing intersection of Harding Road and Cresta Road. The project driveway will be a stop controlled full access driveway.

**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.

The proposed Project consists of subdividing 5.19 acres into 23 numbered lots for the development of 23 single family residential homes, and the proposed land use is consistent with the existing land use in the surrounding area, which satisfies one of the 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 3.5 miles northwest of the project site. Based on the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), the project site is not within any

identified safety or compatibility zone and therefore, does not conflict with the ALUCP and no mitigation is warranted.

#### Traffic Impact Analysis

A traffic impact analysis was prepared for the project by Linscott Law & Greenspan, dated September 17, 2019, to analyze existing traffic conditions, future traffic conditions and future traffic conditions with the proposed project. The project is anticipated to be completed and fully occupied by 2020 and is estimated to generate 217 daily trips, with 17 trips (4 inbound, 13 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 23 trips (14 inbound, 9 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour.

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.

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

1. Wynola Court at Cresta Road
2. Harding Road at Cresta Road
3. Promenade Avenue at Cresta Road

One existing key roadway segment located nearby the project site was analyzed. The study roadway segment is:

1. Cresta Road, between Harding Road and Promenade Avenue

#### Existing Traffic Conditions:

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, for the existing conditions Peak Hour Intersection, all three key study intersections currently operate at acceptable LOS D or above during the AM and PM peak hours in existing traffic conditions and in existing conditions with project traffic conditions.

**Table 6-A**  
**EXISTING CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>5</sup>**

| Key Intersection                   | Control Type              | Minimum Acceptable LOS | Time Period | (1)<br>Existing Traffic Conditions |     | (2)<br>Existing With Project Traffic Conditions |     | (3)<br>Significant Impact<br>Yes/No | (4)<br>Existing With Project With Mitigation |     |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|-------------------------------------|--|-----|
|                                    |                           |                        |             | Delay (s/v)                        | LOS | Delay (s/v)                                     | LOS |                                     | Delay (s/v)                                  | LOS |
| 1. Wynola Court at Cresta Road     | 2 Phase Signal            | C                      | AM          | 1.5                                | A   | 1.5   | A   | No                                  | --   | --  |
|                                    |                           |                        | PM          | 1.7                                | A   | 1.7   | A   | No                                  | --   | --  |
| 2. Harding Road at Cresta Road     | One-Way <sup>6</sup> Stop | C                      | AM          | 11.8                               | B   | 12.3  | B   | No                                  | --   | --  |
|                                    |                           |                        | PM          | 12.9                               | B   | 14.7  | B   | No                                  | --   | --  |
| 3. Promenade Avenue at Cresta Road | 8 Phase Signal            | D                      | AM          | 24.9                               | C   | 25.0  | C   | No                                  | --   | --  |
|                                    |                           |                        | PM          | 35.7                               | D   | 36.1  | D   | 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

As shown in Table 6-B, for the existing conditions daily roadway segment, the one (1) key study roadway segment currently operates at an acceptable level of service (LOS C) during the AM and PM peak hours.

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

| Key Roadway Segment   | Type of Arterial | (1)<br>LOS E<br>Capacity <sup>7</sup><br>(VPD) | (2)<br>Lanes | (3)<br>Existing<br>Traffic Conditions |              |     | (4)<br>Existing With Project<br>Traffic Conditions |              |     | (5)<br>Significant<br>Impact |            |
|---|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----|--|--------------|-----|------------------------------|------------|
|   |                  |  |              | Daily<br>Volume                       | V/C<br>Ratio | LOS | Daily<br>Volume                                    | V/C<br>Ratio | LOS | V/C<br>Inc.                  | Yes/<br>No |
| 1. Cresta Road,<br>between Harding Road and<br>Promenade Avenue | Collector        | 13,000   | 2D           | 9,363                                 | 0.720        | C   | 9,504  | 0.731        | C   | 0.011                        | No         |

**Notes:**

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

**Existing with Project Traffic:**

As shown in Table 6-A, for the Existing with Project traffic conditions, none of the three (3) key study intersections will be significantly impacted based on the LOS criteria defined in this report for the Existing with Project traffic conditions.

As shown in Table 6-B, for the Existing with Project traffic conditions, the one (1) key study roadway segment will not be significantly impacted based on the LOS criteria defined in this report for the Existing with Project traffic conditions.

**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 D 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 the key study intersection (Table 6-D). As there are no significant impacts, no traffic mitigation measures are required under this traffic scenario. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

**Table 6-C**  
**YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY<sup>8</sup>**

| Key Intersection                      | Minimum<br>Acceptable LOS | Time<br>Period | (1)<br>Existing<br>Traffic Conditions |     | (2)<br>Year 2020<br>Without Project<br>Traffic Conditions |     | (3)<br>Year 2020<br>With Project<br>Traffic Conditions |     | (4)<br>Significant<br>Impact | (5)<br>Year 2020<br>With Project<br>With Mitigation |     |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|------------------------------|---|-----|
|                                       |                           |                | Delay<br>(s/v)                        | LOS | Delay<br>(s/v)  | LOS | Delay<br>(s/v)   | LOS |                              | Delay<br>(s/v)                                      | LOS |
|                                       |                           |                |                                       |     |   |     |  |     | Yes/No                       |   |     |
| 1. Wynola Court at<br>Cresta Road     | C                         | AM             | 1.5                                   | A   | 1.5   | A   | 1.5  | A   | No                           | --  | --  |
|                                       |                           | PM             | 1.7                                   | A   | 1.8   | A   | 1.8  | A   | No                           | --  | --  |
| 2. Harding Road at<br>Cresta Road     | C                         | AM             | 11.8                                  | B   | 12.1  | B   | 12.6   | B   | No                           | --  | --  |
|                                       |                           | PM             | 12.9                                  | B   | 13.3  | B   | 15.2   | C   | No                           | --  | --  |
| 3. Promenade Avenue at<br>Cresta Road | D                         | AM             | 24.9                                  | C   | 25.6  | C   | 25.7   | C   | No                           | --  | --  |
|                                       |                           | PM             | 35.7                                  | D   | 36.5  | D   | 36.2   | D   | 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

## YEAR 2020 CONDITIONS DAILY ROADWAY SEGMENT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

| Key Roadway Segment   | Type of Arterial | (1)<br>LOS E<br>Capacity <sup>a</sup><br>(VPD) | (2)<br>Lanes | (3)<br>Existing<br>Traffic Conditions |              |     | (4)<br>Year 2020<br>Without Project<br>Traffic Conditions |              |     | (5)<br>Year 2020<br>With Project<br>Traffic Conditions |              |     | (6)<br>Significant<br>Impact |            |
|---|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----|---|--------------|-----|--|--------------|-----|------------------------------|------------|
|   |                  |  |              | Daily<br>Volume                       | V/C<br>Ratio | LOS | Daily<br>Volume   | V/C<br>Ratio | LOS | Daily<br>Volume  | V/C<br>Ratio | LOS | V/C<br>Inc.                  | Yes/<br>No |
| 1. Cresta Road,<br>between Harding Road and<br>Promenade Avenue | Collector        | 13,000   | 2D           | 9,363                                 | 0.720        | C   | 9,908   | 0.762        | C   | 10,049   | 0.773        | C   | 0.011                        | No         |

Notes:

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

**Site Access Analysis**

The Project driveway is forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak hours under the Year 2020 With Project traffic conditions.

The on-site circulation was evaluated in terms of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Based on the project's site plan, the overall layout does not create significant vehicle pedestrian conflict points such that access for the Project is not impacted by internal vehicle queuing/stacking. The alignment of the Project driveway is also deemed adequate. Turning movements into and out of the Project site at the Project driveway are anticipated to operate at acceptable service levels. As such, motorists entering and exiting the Project site from this driveway will be able to do so comfortably, safely, and without undue congestion.

Based on the criteria set forth in the City of Corona's Sight Distance Standard (Standard Plan Number 120) a minimum of 300 feet of sight distance is available at the Project driveway, which equates to a speed limit of 40 miles per hour (mph). As a result, given the current speed limit of 30 mph along Cresta Road, which is 10 mph less than the available sight distance speed of 40 mph, the fact that eastbound traffic will be slowing along the Project frontage as they approach Promenade Avenue, and the relatively low volume of Project traffic utilizing the Project access from only 23 homes, it is believed that adequate sight distance is provided at the proposed Project access along Cresta Road. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

**7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                | <input type="checkbox"/>           | <input 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 an MSHCP Criteria Area or Public /Quasi-Public Lands. The project site does not contain riverine/riparian areas or vernal pools as defined in the MSHP and does not contain any fairy shrimp habitat. 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.

The site is suitable for ground nesting species, such as killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*), during the bird nesting season (typically February 1 through August 31). Additionally, large trees adjacent to the project site may be used by hawks,

ravens, or other birds for nesting. Nesting bird species, with potential to occur are protected by California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, 3503.5, and 3800, and by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC 703-711). These laws regulate the take, possession, or destruction of the nest or eggs of any migratory bird or bird of prey. However, the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) has recently determined that the BMTA should apply to “affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nests, or their eggs” and will not be applied to incidental take of migratory birds pursuant to other lawful activities.

According to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Consistency Analysis and Biology Report prepared by LSA (July 2019), to avoid potential effects to special-status bird species and other nesting birds protected by the California Fish and Game Code, and for compliance with MSHCP Incidental Take Permit Condition 5, **Mitigation Measure 1** is necessary to reduce any potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level. (**MM 1**)

**Mitigation Measure:**

1. **If project grading occurs between February 1 through August 31, a nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist three days prior to ground-disturbing activities and submitted to the Community Development Department for review. Should nesting birds be found, an exclusionary buffer will be established by the qualified biologist. The buffer may be up to 500 feet in diameter depending on the species of nesting bird found. This buffer will be clearly marked in the field by construction personnel under guidance of the qualified biologist and construction or clearing will not be conducted within this zone until the qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Nesting bird habitat within the biological study area will be resurveyed during bird breeding season if there is a lapse in construction activities longer than seven days.**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project by EFI Global, Inc., dated June 26, 2019. According to historical research data, the subject property has been vacant land from as early as 1931 and has remained undeveloped since. No significant hazardous material storage or recognized environmental conditions were observed at the site.

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<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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 was conducted for the project by EFI Global, Inc., dated June 26, 2019, 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 June 19, 2019. Based on the site inspection no current or historical improvements were noted. One storm drain was observed at the southeastern border of the subject property, along South Promenade Avenue. No staining was noted in the vicinity of this drain. Based on the use of the drain for storm water management, this feature is not expected to represent a significant environmental concern. No evidence of illicit dumping, construction debris or non-hazardous waste was observed during the site reconnaissance. No pole or pad mounted transformers were observed on the site. According to historical research data, the subject property has been vacant land from as early as 1931 and has remained undeveloped since. No significant hazardous material storage or recognized environmental conditions were observed at the site. Therefore, mitigation is not required.

The nearest school to the project site is Corona Ranch Elementary School which is located approximately 0.60 miles northwest of the project site. The school is separated from the site by various existing developments including residential neighborhoods, a golf course 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 3.5 miles northwest of the project site. Based on the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), the project site is not within any identified safety or compatibility zone and therefore, does not conflict with the ALUCP and no mitigation is warranted.

**10. NOISE:**

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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:****Short-term Construction Noise**

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the proposed project. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for the proposed project would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the site. Although there would be a relatively high single event noise exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance (passing trucks at 50 ft would generate up to a maximum of 84 dBA), the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be small. The paving phase would generate the most trips out of all of the construction phases, at 4 vehicles per hour, or 28 vehicles per day. Roadways that would be used to access the project site are Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road, which have estimated existing hourly/daily traffic volumes of 1,254/12,540 and 936/9,363, respectively. Construction-related traffic would not increase traffic noise levels along Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road. Therefore, short-term, construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the project site would not be significant.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during demolition, excavation, grading, and building erection on the project site. Construction is completed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics.

As stated in the Noise Impact Analysis prepared by LSA (June 2019), there could 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, east and west 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.

**Operational Noise****Table 10-A: Opening Year (2020) with Project Interior Traffic Noise Levels**

| Receptor No. | Units Represented | Noise Levels (dBA CNEL)                     |                                       |                                       |
|--------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|              |                   | Exterior Noise Level                        | Interior Noise Level                  |                                       |
|              |                   | 2020 Opening Year With Project <sup>1</sup> | Windows and Doors Open <sup>2,3</sup> | Windows and Doors Closed <sup>4</sup> |
| 1            | 1-4               | 61  | 49                                    | 37                                    |
| 2            | 5-10              | 61  | 49                                    | 37                                    |
| 3            | 11                | 65  | 53                                    | 41                                    |
| 4            | 12                | 65  | 53                                    | 41                                    |
| 5            | 13                | 65  | 53                                    | 41                                    |
| 6            | 14                | 64  | 52                                    | 40                                    |
| 7            | 15                | 61  | 49                                    | 37                                    |
| 8            | 16-20             | 58  | 46                                    | 34                                    |
| 9            | 21-23             | 60  | 48                                    | 36                                    |

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (2019).

<sup>1</sup> Exterior noise levels for the 2020 Opening Year with project conditions are based on the proposed 6 ft high property wall.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers in bold represent noise levels that exceed the City's interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL.

<sup>3</sup> Interior noise levels would be reduced by 12 dBA or more with windows and doors open.

<sup>4</sup> Interior noise levels would be reduced by 24 dBA or more with windows and doors closed.

CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

dBA = A-weighted decibels

ft = foot/feet

Table 10-A shows the Opening Year (2020) with project interior traffic noise levels with windows and doors open and closed. Based on the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Protective Noise Levels (1978), with a combination of exterior walls, doors, and windows, standard construction for Southern California (warm climate) residential buildings would provide more than 24 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows closed and 12 dBA or more with windows open (the national average is 25 dBA with windows closed and 15 dBA with windows open). With windows and doors open, all residences would exceed the City's interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL. With windows and doors closed,

none of the residences would exceed the City's interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL, as shown on Table 10-A. Therefore, mechanical ventilation such as air conditioning would be required for all residences so that windows and doors can remain closed for a prolonged period of time. As the project would provide air conditioning as a standard feature, no on-site interior traffic noise impacts would occur. No additional noise reduction measures are required.

**Table 10-B: Existing (2019) Traffic Noise Levels Without and With Project**

| Roadway Segment   | Without Project Traffic Conditions |                                |                                |                                |  | With Project Traffic Conditions |                                |                                |                                |  |                                   |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|   | ADT                                | Centerline to 70 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 65 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 60 dBA CNEL (ft) | CNEL (dBA) 50 ft from Centerline of Outermost Lane | ADT                             | Centerline to 70 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 65 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 60 dBA CNEL (ft) | CNEL (dBA) 50 ft from Centerline of Outermost Lane | Increase from Baseline Conditions |
| SR-91 between I-15 and McKinley Road                        | 227,848                            | 698                            | 1,498                          | 3,223                          | 82.9   | 228,065                         | 698                            | 1,499                          | 3,225                          | 82.9   | 0.0                               |
| South Promenade Avenue North of Cresta Road                 | 15,380                             | < 50                           | 102                            | 214                            | 67.3   | 15,480                          | < 50                           | 102                            | 215                            | 67.3   | 0.0                               |
| South Promenade Avenue South of Cresta Road                 | 12,540                             | < 50                           | 90                             | 187                            | 66.4   | 12,600                          | < 50                           | 90                             | 188                            | 66.4   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road west of Wynola Court                            | 10,240                             | < 50                           | < 50                           | 85                             | 62.1   | 10,320                          | < 50                           | < 50                           | 85                             | 62.1   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road between Wynola Court and Harding Road           | 10,400                             | < 50                           | < 50                           | 86                             | 62.2   | 10,480                          | < 50                           | < 50                           | 86                             | 62.2   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road between Harding Road and South Promenade Avenue | 9,363                              | < 50                           | < 50                           | 80                             | 61.7   | 9,504                           | < 50                           | < 50                           | 81                             | 61.8   | 0.1                               |
| SR-91 between I-15 and McKinley Road                        | 227,848                            | 698                            | 1,498                          | 3,223                          | 82.9   | 228,065                         | 698                            | 1,499                          | 3,225                          | 82.9   | 0.0                               |

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (2019).

Note: Traffic noise within 50 ft of the roadway centerline should be evaluated with site-specific information.

ADT = average daily traffic

CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

dBA = A-weighted decibels

ft = feet

I-15 = Interstate 15

SR-91 = State Route 91

**Table 10-C: Opening Year (2020) Traffic Noise Levels Without and With Project**

| Roadway Segment   | Without Project Traffic Conditions |                                |                                |                                |  | With Project Traffic Conditions |                                |                                |                                |  |                                   |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
|   | ADT                                | Centerline to 70 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 65 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 60 dBA CNEL (ft) | CNEL (dBA) 50 ft from Centerline of Outermost Lane | ADT                             | Centerline to 70 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 65 dBA CNEL (ft) | Centerline to 60 dBA CNEL (ft) | CNEL (dBA) 50 ft from Centerline of Outermost Lane | Increase from Baseline Conditions |
| SR-91 between I-15 and McKinley Road                        | 232,405                            | 707                            | 1,517                          | 3,266                          | 83.0   | 232,622                         | 707                            | 1,518                          | 3,268                          | 83.0   | 0.0                               |
| South Promenade Avenue North of Cresta Road                 | 16,150                             | < 50                           | 105                            | 221                            | 67.5   | 16,250                          | < 50                           | 105                            | 222                            | 67.5   | 0.0                               |
| South Promenade Avenue South of Cresta Road                 | 13,400                             | < 50                           | 93                             | 196                            | 66.7   | 13,460                          | < 50                           | 94                             | 196                            | 66.7   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road west of Wynola Court                            | 10,750                             | < 50                           | < 50                           | 88                             | 62.3   | 10,830                          | < 50                           | < 50                           | 88                             | 62.3   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road between Wynola Court and Harding Road           | 10,910                             | < 50                           | < 50                           | 88                             | 62.4   | 10,990                          | < 50                           | < 50                           | 89                             | 62.4   | 0.0                               |
| Cresta Road between Harding Road and South Promenade Avenue | 9,908                              | < 50                           | < 50                           | 83                             | 62.0   | 10,049                          | < 50                           | < 50                           | 84                             | 62.0   | 0.0                               |
| SR-91 between I-15 and McKinley Road                        | 232,405                            | 707                            | 1,517                          | 3,266                          | 83.0   | 232,622                         | 707                            | 1,518                          | 3,268                          | 83.0   | 0.0                               |

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (2019).

Note: Traffic noise within 50 ft of the roadway centerline should be evaluated with site-specific information.

ADT = average daily traffic

CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

dBA = A-weighted decibels

ft = feet

I-15 = Interstate 15

Tables 10-B and 10-C show that the project-related traffic noise increase would be no greater than 0.1 dBA. Noise level increases below 3 dBA would not be perceptible to the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, traffic noise impacts from project-related traffic on off-site sensitive receptors would not occur. No noise reduction measures are required.

### **Long-Term Vibration Impacts**

The proposed single-family residences would not generate vibration. In addition, vibration levels generated from project-related traffic on the adjacent roadways (South Promenade Avenue and Cresta Road) are unusual for on-road vehicles because the rubber tires and suspension systems of on-road vehicles provide vibration isolation. Vibration impacts from project-related traffic on the adjacent roadways would not occur and no vibration reduction measures are required.

### **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.

According to the Noise Impact Analysis prepared by LSA (June 2019), the following measures would minimize construction noise impacts. Therefore, **Mitigation Measures 2-4** are necessary to reduce any potential construction noise impacts to a less than significant level. (**MM 2-4**)

**Mitigation Measures:**

2. During all project site excavation and grading, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
3. The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and most noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
4. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that the emitted noise is directed away from the sensitive receptors nearest the project site. Per the construction staging area map in the Noise Impact Analysis (Page 29).

**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 project does not warrant the construction of new public facilities such as police and fire stations, schools or parks. The project is part of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan approved in 1981, which master planned the development of 1,463 acres. The specific plan already considered the infrastructure and public facilities necessary to serve the plan which involved 6,241 housing units, a sub-regional shopping center, public parks and a fire station. Therefore, the development of the project site will not impact public services.

**12. UTILITIES:**

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements                                   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Involve construction/expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                               | <input 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 23 single family residential project would generate approximately 9.43 tons/year 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             | Potential New Development | Solid Waste Generation Factor    | Project Solid Waste Generated (tons/year) |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Residential              | 23 units                  | 0.41 tons/unit/year <sup>1</sup> | 9.43                                      |
| Residential              | 6,733 units               | 0.41 tons/unit/year              | 2,761                                     |
| <b>TOTAL (tons/year)</b> |                           |                                  | <b>2,761</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 9.43 tons per year. 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, Cresta Road and Promenade Avenue are not scenic vistas or highways. Development of the site will be subject to the development standards of the SFR-5 (Single Family Residential, 5,000 square foot minimum lot size) designation of the Northeast Corona Specific Plan (SP81-2) and the LDR General Plan Designation which permit single family residences with a density of 3-6 du/ac respectively. The proposed residential development will be similar in nature to the nearby residences and proposes similar architectural materials. The exterior of the homes will be finished in stucco with foam trim pieces, decorative window shutters, gable accents, and decorative garage doors. The roof material is concrete tile. Overall the buildings will be aesthetically attractive and would not degrade the visual character of the neighborhood. 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<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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 Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by LSA (July 2019) to analyze any potential cultural resources on the project site. A cultural resources records search, additional research, and a field survey were conducted for the project area. No cultural resources have been previously documented with or adjacent to the project parcels. However, the project is bracketed by 11 prehistoric resources, indicating some potential (sensitivity) for subsurface cultural resources. Therefore, archaeological monitoring is recommended, see discussion and Mitigation Measures in Section 17 (Tribal Cultural Resources).

A cultural resources records search was conducted for the project at the Eastern Information Center (EIC). The objectives of this research review were to (1) establish the status and extent of previously recorded sites, surveys, and excavations within the project area and (2) note what types of resources might be expected to occur within the proposed project based on the existing data from known cultural resources sites located within a 1-mile radius.

In June 2019, LSA Archaeologist Riordan Goodwin conducted additional research, including review of historic period aeriels and maps. On June 27, 2019, LSA Archaeological Field Technician Melissa Jenkins completed a pedestrian survey of all accessible exposed areas of the project parcels. Portions of the property were surveyed in systematic parallel transects spaced by approximately 35 feet. Special attention was paid to areas of exposed soil for surface artifacts and features and rodent burrows for evidence of archaeosols. The purpose of this survey was to identify and document, prior to the beginning of ground-disturbing activities, any cultural resources and also to identify any area(s) that might be sensitive for buried cultural resources.

Data from the EIC indicate there have been 37 cultural resource studies previously conducted within one mile of the proposed project, one of which included the entirety of the project area (Cottrel 1980). Although none has been recorded within or adjacent to the project area, 28 cultural resources have been documented within one mile, including archaeological (milling features, lithic scatters and habitation sites) and built environment (residences, commercial buildings, and industrial buildings) resources. One of the built environment resources is listed in the Riverside County Historic Properties. The nearest resource is a prehistoric lithic scatter approximately 0.22 miles southwest of the project area.

The natural setting of the project vicinity is presented based on the underlying theoretical assumption that human and human societies are in continual interaction with the physical environment. Being an integral part of the ecological system, humans adapt to the environment through technological and behavioral changes. Locations of archaeological sites are based on the constraints of these adaptations, whether it is proximity to a particular resource, topographical restrictions, or shelter and protection. Sites will also contain an assemblage of artifacts and ecofacts consistent with the particular interaction.

It is highly unlikely that development of the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of Cultural Resources since the site is not known to contain any cultural resources. Therefore, there would be no impacts to cultural resources and no mitigation is required.

**15. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:**

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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<br>Significant<br>Impact | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Unless<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less than<br>Significant<br>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 LSA (May 2019) for the project, the annual greenhouse gas emissions from vehicular traffic, energy consumption, water conveyance and treatment, and waste generation were also calculated using CalEEMod using the same methodology for the criteria pollutant emissions. Based on SCAQMD guidance, construction emissions were amortized over 30 years (a typical project lifetime) and added to the total project operational emissions as shown in Table 16-A. The greenhouse gas emission estimates presented in Table 16-A show the emissions associated with the level of development envisioned by the proposed project at opening in 2022.

**Table 16-A: Long Term Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

| Source   | Pollutant Emissions (MT/yr) |                      |                       |                 |                  |                   |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|  | Bio-CO <sub>2</sub>         | NBio-CO <sub>2</sub> | Total CO <sub>2</sub> | CH <sub>4</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> O | CO <sub>2</sub> e |
| <b>Proposed Project</b>                        |                             |                      |                       |                 |                  |                   |
| Construction Emissions Amortized over 30 Years | 0                           | 19                   | 19                    | <1              | 0                | 19                |
| <b>Operational Emissions</b>                   |                             |                      |                       |                 |                  |                   |
| Area   | 0                           | 6                    | 6                     | <1              | <1               | 6                 |
| Energy   | 0                           | 101                  | 101                   | <1              | <1               | 102               |
| Mobile   | 0                           | 336                  | 336                   | <1              | 0                | 336               |
| Waste  | 5                           | 0                    | 5                     | <1              | 0                | 14                |
| Water  | <1                          | 10                   | 10                    | <1              | <1               | 12                |
| <b>Total Project Emissions</b>                 | <b>5</b>                    | <b>472</b>           | <b>478</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>489</b>        |

Source: Compiled by LSA (April 2019).

Bio-CO<sub>2</sub> = biologically generated CO<sub>2</sub>

CH<sub>4</sub> = methane

CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide

CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalent

MT/yr = metric tons per year

N<sub>2</sub>O = nitrous oxide

NBio-CO<sub>2</sub> = non-biologically generated CO<sub>2</sub>

As shown in Table 16-A, the proposed project would generate 489 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. This is less than SCAQMD's Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial level of GHG emissions.

The City of Corona adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2012. Consistency of the project with the goals of this CAP meets the threshold specified in SCAQMD GHG Tier 2 and fulfills the CEQA goal of fully informing local agency decision-makers of the environmental costs of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that GHG emissions concerns are addressed.

The project would comply with all the latest Title 24 energy efficiency standards and incorporate additional measures as design features. As indicated in the project's Screening Table (included in Appendix B of the Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by LSA, May 2019), the applicant has committed to reduction measures including enhanced building envelope measures, indoor space efficiencies, solar photovoltaic panels, water efficient landscaping, water saving features, and electric vehicle charging provisions. All these features result in a project total of 102 points. The project exceeds the 100-point minimum; therefore, the project would have a less than significant individual and cumulative impacts for GHG emissions. Thus, the project would be consistent with all City GHG policies and goals. Therefore, there would be no impacts and no mitigation would be required.

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

**Discussion:**

The project is subject to tribal consultation under AB 52. The Community Development Department initiated the process by notifying seven local Native American tribes of the proposed project through the city's Letter of Transmittal dated July 31, 2019. The department received a request dated August 20, 2019 from Ms. Cheryl Madrigal, Interim Cultural Resources Manager for the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians requesting consultation for the project. On July 5, 2019 staff had a telephone consultation Ms. Destiny Colocho, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians pursuant to AB 52 and the proposed project. In addition, staff emailed a copy of the Cultural Resources Assessment and a copy of the proposed plans to Ms. Colocho on September 6, 2019. On September 9, 2019 staff received an email from Ms. Colocho requesting tribal monitoring and concluding consultation.

The department also received a request dated August 31, 2019 from Mr. Joseph Ontiveros, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requesting consultation on the project. Staff reached out to Mr. Ontiveros with a list of dates for consultation. On September 30, 2019 staff had a telephone consultation with Mr. Ontiveros pursuant to AB 52 and the proposed project. Mr. Ontiveros requested a copy of the Cultural Resources Assessment and a copy of the site plan for the project. Both were emailed to him on September 30, 2019 and consultation was concluded.

The department also received a request dated September 11, 2019 from Ebru Ozdil, Cultural Analyst for Pechanga Cultural Resources Temecula Band of Luiseno Mission Indians requesting consultation on the project. Staff reached out to Ms. Ozdil with a list of dates for consultation. On October 17, 2019, staff emailed copies of the Paleo report, Cultural Resources Assessment, Geotech report and grading plans to Ms. Ozdil. On October 24, 2019, staff had a telephone consultation with Ms. Ozdil pursuant to AB 52 and the proposed project. Ms. Ozdil requested archeological and tribal monitoring for the project and concluded consultation.

All three tribes that staff consulted with regarding AB 52 requested tribal monitoring. Therefore, **Mitigation Measures 5-9** are necessary which would reduce any potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level. **(MM 5-9).**

**Mitigation Measures:**

5. **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 shall 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
6. **Treatment and Final Disposition:** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Corona Community Development Department with evidence of same:
  - a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

- b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
- c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center by default.
- 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.

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

8. **Fossil Specimens:** In the event that fossils are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project, the following procedures shall 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.

9. **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)).

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

- Biological Resources
- Noise
- Tribal Cultural Resources

However, appropriate mitigation has been developed to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measures 1 through 9 successfully mitigate all identified potential impacts to less than significant levels.

**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 towards the north and an elevation of approximately 741 feet above mean sea level. The proposed subdivision and development of 23 single family residential homes 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 towards the north 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 LSA (May 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**

The anticipated construction schedule assumes that the proposed project would be built over 24 months. The proposed project would require grading, site preparation, and building activities during construction.

Construction of the proposed project would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of building materials, preparation of the site for grading activities, and building construction and paving activities. Petroleum fuels (e.g., diesel and gasoline) would be the primary sources of energy for these activities. Energy usage on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature and would be relatively small in comparison to the State's available energy sources. Therefore, construction energy impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

**Operation****Electricity, Natural Gas and Fuel**

Energy use consumed by the proposed project would be associated with natural gas use, electricity consumption, and fuel used for vehicle trips associated with the project. The project estimated energy and natural gas consumption were calculated as part of the CalEEMod assessment of air pollutant and GHG emissions. Table 20-A shows electricity and natural gas usage estimates associated with the proposed project.

In addition, the proposed project would result in energy usage associated with gasoline to fuel project-related trips. It is estimated that the proposed project would result in 2,295 VMT per day or 737,556 VMT per year. The average fuel economy for light-duty vehicles (automobiles, pickups, vans, and sport utility vehicles) in the United States has steadily increased from about 14.9 miles per gallon (mpg) in 1980 to 22.0 mpg in 2015.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, using the EPA fuel economy estimates for 2015, the proposed project would result in the consumption of 33,525 gallons of gasoline per year. Table 20-A, below, shows the estimated potential fuel use associated with the proposed project.

**Table 20-A: Estimated Annual Energy Use of the Proposed Project**

| Land Use    | Electricity Use<br>(kWh per year) | Natural Gas Use<br>(therms per year) | Gasoline<br>(gallons per year) |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Residential | 200,479                           | 7039                                 | 33,525                         |

Source: California Energy Commission (2018) and U.S. Department of Transportation; compiled by LSA (May 2019). Estimated electricity and natural gas demand were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model.

kWh = kilowatt hours

As shown in Table 20-A, the estimated potential increased electricity demand associated with the proposed project is 200,479 kilowatt-hours (kWh) per year. In 2017, California consumed approximately 288,614 gigawatt-hours (GWh) or

288,614,000,000 kWh.<sup>1</sup> Of this total, Riverside County consumed 7,560 GWh, or 7,559,940,559 kWh.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, electricity demand associated with the proposed project would only be 0.003 percent of Riverside County's total electricity demand.

The estimated potential increased natural gas demand associated with the proposed project is 7,039 therms per year. In 2017, California consumed 12,571 million therms or 12,571,000,000 therms, while Riverside County consumed approximately 254.3 million therms or 254,262,566 therms.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, natural gas demand associated with the proposed project would be less than 0.003 percent of Riverside County's total natural gas demand.

The proposed project would result in energy usage associated with gasoline to fuel project-related trips. As shown in Table 20-A, vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would consume 33,525 gallons of gasoline per year. In 2015, vehicles in California consumed 15.1 billion gallons of gasoline.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, gasoline demand generated by vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would be a minimal fraction of gasoline fuel consumption in California.

Additionally, new automobiles purchased by residents driving to and from the project site would be subject to fuel economy and efficiency standards applied throughout the State. As such, the fuel efficiency of vehicles associated with the project site would increase throughout the life of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in transportation-related energy uses.

Lastly, the proposed project would be constructed to the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) which would help to reduce energy and natural gas consumption. The applicant has committed to energy reduction measures including enhanced building envelope measures, indoor space efficiencies, solar photovoltaic panels, water efficient landscaping, water saving features, and electric vehicle charging provisions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of fuel or energy and would incorporate renewable energy or energy efficiency measures into building design, equipment use, and transportation. 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 EFI Global Inc., June 26, 2019**
3. **Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by Fuscoe Engineering Inc., December 6, 2019**
4. **Preliminary Hydrology Study, prepared by JLC Engineering & Consulting Inc., July 16, 2019**
5. **Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Albus-Keefe & Associates, Inc., November 29, 2018**
6. **Focused Traffic Impact Analysis Report, prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers, September 17, 2019**
7. **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas/Energy Impact Analysis, prepared by LSA, May 2019**
8. **Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by LSA, July 2019**
9. **Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis and Biology Report, prepared by LSA, July 2019**

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
TTM 37719 and PP2019-0005

| No.                         | Mitigation Measures  | Implementation Action | Method of Verification  | Timing of Verification                           | Responsible Person                          | Verification Date |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------|
| <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> |  |                       |   |  |   |                   |
| 1                           | If project grading occurs between February 1 through August 31, a nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist three days prior to ground-disturbing activities and submitted to the Community Development Department for review. Should nesting birds be found, an exclusionary buffer will be established by the qualified biologist. The buffer may be up to 500 feet in diameter depending on the species of nesting bird found. This buffer will be clearly marked in the field by construction personnel under guidance of the qualified biologist and construction or clearing will not be conducted within this zone until the qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Nesting bird habitat within the biological study area will be resurveyed during bird breeding season if there is a lapse in construction activities longer than seven days. | Condition of Approval | Submittal of report or documentation  | Three days prior to ground-disturbing activities | Community Development Department (Planning) |                   |
| <b>NOISE</b>                |  |                       |   |  |   |                   |
| 2                           | During all project site excavation and grading, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.   | Condition of Approval | Construction contractor shall maintain records for equipment per manufacturers' standards                           | During construction                              | Community Development Department (Planning) |                   |
| 3                           | The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and most noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.   | Condition of Approval | Construction contractor shall maintain equipment per the construction staging area map in the Noise Impact Analysis | During construction                              | Community Development Department (Planning) |                   |
| 4                           | The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that the emitted noise is directed away from the sensitive receptors nearest the project site. Per the construction staging area map in the Noise Impact Analysis (Page 29).  | Condition of Approval | Construction contractor shall place all stationary equipment away   | During construction                              | Community Development Department (Planning) |                   |

| No.                       | Mitigation Measures   | Implementation Action | Method of Verification                  | Timing of Verification   | Responsible Person                          | Verification Date |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------|
|                           |   |                       | from sensitive receptors                |  |   |                   |
| TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES |   |                       |   |  |   |                   |
| 5                         | <p>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:</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) |                   |
| 6                         | <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> |                       |   |  |   |                   |

| No. | Mitigation Measures  | Implementation Action | Method of Verification               | Timing of Verification   | Responsible Person                          | Verification Date |
|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
|     | <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 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.</p> |                       |                                      |  |   |                   |
| 7   | <p><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.</p>   | 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) |                   |
| 8   | <p><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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>b. All fossils collected during the project will be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix</p>  | 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) |                   |

| No. | Mitigation Measures  | Implementation Action | Method of Verification               | Timing of Verification   | Responsible Person                         | Verification Date |
|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
|     | 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.  |                       |                                      |  |  |                   |
| 9   | <p><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 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</p> | 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 |                   |



**Environmental: TTM 37719 and PP2019-0005**

| No. | Mitigation Measures  | Implementatio<br>n Action | Method of<br>Verification | Timing of<br>Verification | Responsible<br>Person | Verification<br>Date |
|-----|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|     | (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)). |                           |                           |                           |                       |                      |