



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 2020 (Updated February 19, 2020)

SUBJECT: City Responses on Comments to the Latitude Business Park MND

Letter: Golden State Environmental Justice Alliance, January 29, 2020.

1. Project Description

Comment 1-1:

The comment is the MND does not provide a site plan that includes meaningful information such as breakdown of total building square footage, parking, and other related development standards; and only the Supplemental Traffic Analysis (STA) includes a site Plan with this information. Burying this information in the technical appendices is in violation of CEQA's requirements for meaningful disclosure (CEQA § 21003(b)). The conclusion of the comment is that an EIR must be prepared which includes a site plan that provides meaningful information that is necessary for project analysis, including a breakdown of total building square footage, parking, and other related development standards.

Response 1-1:

CEQA includes two parts; the statute and the guidelines. The statute is the law, enacted and modified by the state legislature. The guidelines are the primary rules and interpretation of CEQA. The guidelines explain how to get through the process and contain mandatory, advisory and permissive direction. CEQA § 21003 (b) is part of the statute and states:

Documents prepared pursuant to this division be organized and written in a manner that will be meaningful and useful to decisions to makers and to the public.

The comment that the MND was prepared in violation of CEQA with specific reference to CEQA § 21003 (b) does not consider the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act under Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations §§ 15000 et seq. CEQA Guidelines § 15063 (d) describes the contents of an initial study. This section states an initial study shall contain in brief form:

- (1) A description of the project, including the location of the project;
- (2) An identification of the environmental setting;
- (3) An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries are briefly explained to show the evidence supporting the entries. The

EXHIBIT 7

brief explanation may be through either a narrative or a reference to other information such as attached maps, photographs, or an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration. A reference to another document should include a citation to the page or pages where the information is found;

- (4) A discussion of ways to mitigate any significant effects identified;
- (5) An examination of whether the project is consistent with existing zoning and local land use plans and other applicable land use controls;
- (6) The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.

The Latitude Business Park initial study/MND provides the above information in brief form as allowed by CEQA Guidelines § 15063 (d). Additionally, to imply that the mitigated negative declaration does not include meaningful information and therefore warrants an EIR is not an accurate statement. CEQA § 15150 (a) clearly states *an EIR or negative declaration may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Any incorporated document shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of the environmental document. When all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, that document shall be made available to the public for inspection at the City's offices. The environmental document shall state where incorporated documents will be available for inspection.*

Furthermore, CEQA § 15151 describes the standards for adequacy of an EIR. This section clearly states that *an evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible.* The project information provided in the Latitude Business Park MND describes the scope of the project, the total square footage of the buildings planned on the site, and a clear indication of how much building square footage will be used for manufacturing and warehouse. This information is more than adequate and provides the reader an understanding of the project being discussed in the initial study/MND. Additionally, the technical studies were also cited throughout the document based on the project. The technical studies were made available to the public on the city's website and were placed in the same location where the initial study/MND was made available. Therefore, the public has access to the information being referenced in the initial study/MND.

Comment 1-2:

The MND and STA Site Plan are also inconsistent. For example, the MND states the project proposes 535,205 sf of warehousing while the STA Site Plan depicts 695,978 sf of warehousing. The MND states the project proposes 159,744 sf of manufacturing while the STA Site Plan depicts 255,805 sf of warehousing. The MND is inconsistent and unreliable as an informational document. A project EIR must be prepared which is internally consistent and provides accurate square footage of each proposed use. The square footage of each proposed use must be utilized consistently throughout all portions and topics of environmental analysis.

Response 1-2:

The letter fails to recognize that the narrative in the Supplement Traffic Analysis dated November 29, 2019 and the Updated Project Trip Generation Forecast provided in Table A of the Supplemental TIA correctly notes the building square footages used for the traffic analysis. The square footages described in the Supplemental Traffic Analysis are identical to the square footages provided in the initial study/MND project description. Therefore, the results of the analysis were done based on the square footages noted in the trip generation forecast table. Also, the project's site plan is being reviewed by application Precise Plan 2019-0001 which shows the square footages of the project to be consistent with the project description of initial study/MND.

2. Population and Housing

Comment 2-1:

The comment is the MND concludes that the project will not induce substantial population growth but would increase the city's service population and not the city's overall residential population. No employment generation estimates were provided to support this conclusion. The comment further states that although Corona's General Plan does not include employment generation estimates by land use or a square feet per employee factor, Appendix E – *Socioeconomic Build-out Projections Assumptions and Methodology* of the Riverside County's General Plan does include employment generation ratios. If the city were to utilize the Riverside County General Plan, the project would generate 1,167 employees.

The comment is the MND utilizes uncertain and misleading language which does not provide any meaningful analysis of the project's population and employment generation. In order to comply with CEQA's requirements for meaningful disclosure, a project EIR must be prepared which provides an accurate estimate of employees generated by all uses of the proposed project according to the Riverside County General Plan employment generation ratios or a project specific employment generation study. It must also provide demographic and geographic information on the location of qualified workers to fill these employment positions.

Response 2-1:

The Latitude Business Park initial study/MND states that the General Plan designation of the project site is Light Industrial. The initial study/MND further states the city's General Plan was last updated in 2004 and the project site was designated light industrial under the General Plan Update and that no change to the General Plan land use on the project site has occurred since 2004.

The General Plan EIR (2004), Table 3-1, *City of Corona Potential New Development* discusses new development that could occur under the General Plan Update and covers residential, commercial and industrial land uses. The project site was included in the estimated potential new development category for industrial. The information provided in Table 3-1 was then used in the General Plan EIR to determine potential residential population growth and potential new employment generation. Table 4.3-5, *Potential New Employment Generation* includes potential employment generated from new commercial and industrial land uses under the General Plan Update. Therefore, service population growth anticipated from the project site was already considered and analyzed in the General Plan EIR (2004) and General Plan Update. This information will be added to the Final MND to provide clarity on the analysis already by the 2004 General Plan Update.

3. Geologic Problems

Comment 3-1:

The comment is the project grading described in the MND which involves 735,000 cubic yards of cut and 673,000 cubic yards of fill will balance the site even though there will be a minimum 62,000 cubic yard surplus soil. The MND does not indicate if the reduced 0.5 cut ratio described was included for analysis, whether as part of the 62,000 cubic yard surplus or otherwise. Also, there is no mechanism for public verification of conclusions made by the MND, such as a grading plan. A project EIR must be prepared to provide supporting evidence to demonstrate how project grading will balance onsite, including a grading plan, in order to adequately and accurately analyze all potentially significant environmental impacts.

Response 3-1:

The initial study/MND prepared for the Latitude Business Park was based on the Tentative Tract Map 37608 and Precise Plan 2019-0001 applications submitted for the project. These applications are noted in the initial study/MND and are public record and available to public if requested. The Precise Plan 2019-0001 application contains a preliminary grading plan and site plan for the project. Therefore, on-site grading conditions were evaluated for the project site.

4. Air Quality

Comment 4-1:

The CalEEMod output sheets do not accurately model the proposed project. For example, only 519,665 sf of warehouse is modeled while the project proposes 535,205 sf of warehouse.

Response 4-1:

As indicated in the initial study/MND under operational emissions the air quality assessment was prepared using the project's initial traffic impact analysis that analyzed 1,124,290 square feet of total building area. The project was reduced by 49,519 square feet resulting in a total building square footage of 1,074,771. This resulted in a redistribution of the industrial park, manufacturing and warehouse square footages. The air quality assessment dated June 24, 2019, concluded that the project at 1,124,290 square feet of building area (breakdown: office 148,000 square feet, industrial park 456,629 square feet, and warehouse 519,665 square feet) was below emission thresholds established by AQMD for construction and operation. This information is provided in Table 1 below.

However, to further demonstrate that the project at the slightly higher warehouse square footage (535,205 square feet) is still within established emission thresholds, the CalEEMod was redone. The updated CalEEMod dated February 13, 2020, included the revised warehouse square footage and the addition of the parking lot containing 2,247 parking spaces. Construction emissions under this scenario are shown in Table 2 and operational emissions are shown in Table 3. Additionally, the parking lot was included in the modeling based on the comment that the air quality modeling did not include the use of the parking lot.

Table 1: Expected Daily Pollutant from Air Quality Assessment dated June 24, 2019

	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summer Scenario						
Area Source Emission Estimates (Lb/Day)	24.13	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source Emissions (Lb/Day)	0.09	0.83	0.69	0.00	0.06	0.06
Operational Vehicle Emissions (Lb/Day)	7.09	35.02	95.55	0.36	30.21	8.26
Total with Design Features (Lb/Day)	31.31	35.85	96.36	0.36	30.27	8.32
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Winter Scenario						
Area Source Emission Estimates (Lb/Day)	24.13	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source Emissions (Lb/Day)	0.09	0.83	0.69	0.00	0.06	0.06
Operational Vehicle Emissions (Lb/Day)	6.80	35.79	89.69	0.34	30.21	8.27
Total with Design Features (Lb/Day)	31.02	36.61	90.50	0.35	30.27	8.33
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Daily pollutant generation assumes trip distances within CALLEEMOD 2016.3.2						

Tables 2 and 3
Expected Construction and Operation Emissions with 2,247 parking spaces and updated Warehouse SF
(February 13, 2020)

Table 2: Updated Construction

Year	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀ (Dust)	PM ₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM ₁₀ (Total)	PM _{2.5} (Dust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Total)
Worst Case Construction	39.94	39.40	68.12	0.23	18.27	0.30	18.33	9.98	0.28	10.05
Significance Threshold (lb/day)	75	100	550	150	-	-	150	-	-	55
Exceeds Screening Threshold	No	No	No	No	-	-	No	-	-	No

Table 3: Updated Operations

	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summer Scenario						
Total with Design Features (Lb/Day)	31.45	48.35	101.56	0.43	32.95	9.26
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Winter Scenario						
Total with Design Features (Lb/Day)	31.22	49.36	94.97	0.41	32.96	9.26
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

The emission thresholds based on the increased warehouse square footage and parking lot continues to be less than significant.

This information will be updated in the project's Final MND.

Comment 4-2:

No manufacturing space is modeled even though the project proposes 159,744 sf of manufacturing.

Response 4-2:

The CalEEMod analysis utilized the Industrial Park land use which is a more conservative options since energy usage in an industrial park is higher than manufacturing, and water and solid waste is the same intensity with respect to water and solid waste usage. Therefore, the analysis would adequately represent the proposed project. Data verification for each use can be identified within Appendix D of the CalEEMod User Guide provided by South Coast, comparing manufacturing with industrial park.

<http://www.aqmd.gov/caleemod/user's-guide>

Comment 4-3:

The CalEEMod output sheets do not model any of the proposed warehouse space as refrigerated/cold storage. At least 50% of the proposed warehouse space must be modeled as refrigerated/cold storage, which is especially necessary as the noise analysis states that trucks utilizing the project site will "consist of regular trucks and refrigerated trucks." An EIR must be prepared which models the at least 50% of the proposed warehouse space as refrigerated warehouse in order to present an accurate analysis of the project's potentially significant Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas impacts.

Response 4-3:

There is no rule, regulation or cited source provided by the commenter that requires the project to model 50% of the proposed warehouse space as refrigerated/cold storage. This is an arbitrary number with no justification.

Comment 4-4:

The CalEEMod output sheets further misrepresent the project because the analysis is inconsistent with the project description. The project description states that construction will occur in two phases. Phase 1 will construct 752,889 sf of buildings in the central/east area of the site and Phase 2 will construct 321,882 sf of buildings on the west side of the site. The CalEEMod output sheets only modeled project construction as one phase, which does not capture the potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from overlap of Phase 1 operations and Phase 2 construction.

Response 4-4:

To balance the amount of earthwork across the entire site the project site will be graded in a single phase. However, the construction of the buildings can occur over time depending on the market.

The air quality analysis assumed a worst-case scenario by showing construction in single phase. In fact, the commenters scenario for a phased construction approach would result in construction emissions that are less than the project's worst-case scenario.

To demonstrate, if both 100% construction and 100% operations occurred at the same time the project's emissions would still be less than significant (Table 4). Using this information, a phased construction scenario with a partial occupancy would continue to be less than significant.

Additionally, to respond to the comment that the parking lot along with the truck parking spaces was not included in the air quality modeling, this information was also provided in Table 4. The results show that the project's emissions would be less than significant as they would not exceed the thresholds established by AQMD. The updated CalEEMod dated February 13, 2020 will be provided in the Final MND and available on the city website at <https://www.coronaca.gov/government/departments-divisions/building/projects>.

Table 4 Expected Construction and Operational Emissions with 2,247 Parking Spaces

Year	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀ (Dust)	PM ₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM ₁₀ (Total)	PM _{2.5} (Dust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Total)
50% Construction as updated to include land use in Table 1 and updated traffic (lb/day)	19.97	19.70	34.06	0.12	9.14	0.15	9.17	4.99	0.14	5.03
50% operational emissions as updated to include land use in Table 1 and updated traffic (lb/day)	15.725	24.175	50.78	0.215	16.475	4.63	15.725	24.175	50.78	0.215
Total (Lb/day)	35.70	43.88	84.84	0.34	25.62	4.78	24.90	29.17	50.92	5.25
Significance Threshold (lb/day)	75	100	550	150	-	-	150	-	-	55
Exceeds Screening Threshold	No	No	No	No	-	-	No	-	-	No

Comment 4-5:

Corona Municipal Code Section 17.84.040 permits construction activity between the hours of 7:00 A.M. - 8:00 P.M. Monday through Saturday and 10:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M. on Sundays/federal holidays. The MND does not provide a "worst-case scenario" analysis of construction equipment emitting pollutants for the legal 13 hours on weekdays and Saturday plus 8 hours on Sunday. It is legal for construction to occur for much longer hours and more days (7 days per week including Saturday and Sunday, 365 days per year) than modeled in the AQA. The Air Quality modeling must be revised to account for these legally possible longer construction days and increased number of construction days.

Response 4-5:

The project's air quality modeling under CalEEMod considered a typical work week, Monday through Friday, with construction activity occurring within an 8 hour work day. The city's municipal code provides hours of opportunities for construction activity but does not mean all construction

projects would work continuously within the hours allowed by the Corona Municipal Code. The air quality assessment used a typical work week schedule and typical working hours for the project, which is a reasonable assumption for the project.

Comment 4-6:

The LST analysis includes modeling of four sensitive receptors “at discrete sensitive receptor locations (nearest homes) and are represented by yellow circles.” There is no other information given regarding the exact location of the sensitive receptors or the distance from the project site utilized for modeling and analysis. The nearest residences are located across Liberty Ave., which are approximately 25 feet from the site and must be modeled at this distance for analysis.

Response 4-6:

The LST (localized significance thresholds) analysis has been prepared similar to SCAQMDs LST lookup charts starting at 25 meters from the project boundary. Figure 3-B of the Air Quality Assessment shows how the contours were set up using boundary receptors. These receptors are touching the worst-case residential receptors and LST impacts were found to be less than significant at these locations.

Comment 4-7:

The MND does not indicate that any schoolchild or worker modeling was including for analysis, which is vital since El Cerrito Middle School is approximately 1,600 feet from the project site and businesses are also located approximately 25 feet from the project site across Liberty Ave. and approximately 93 feet from the project site across Tom Barnes St. A project EIR must be prepared to include this analysis in order to provide an accurate analysis of all potentially significant environmental impacts.

Response 4-7:

Figure 3-A of the Air Quality Assessment shows how the health risk model was prepared and identifies sensitive receptors representative of the project area. Sensitive receptors are homes and schools and not businesses. However, because residential properties are located north of the project in addition to businesses, the businesses are also represented in the health risk assessment model due the location. Cancer risk calculations includes human age sensitivities from newborns to adult and have been calculated at these sensitive receptor locations and were found to be less than significant through using Tier 4 diesel construction equipment. The City will require that all equipment onsite during construction is Tier 4. Sensitive receptors further away from the project site would be exposed to fewer project emissions and would therefore be less than significant.

Comment 4-8:

The MND only discusses odors related to construction and does not provide any analysis of potentially offensive odors generated with project operations. The MND concludes that construction odors are “short term” and therefore not considered an impact, but does not include a CEQA exemption or reference for this conclusion. Additionally, uses that are permitted by right at the project site include facilities that may result in objectionable odors, such as food processing, fiberglass and acid manufacturing, and rubber reclaiming. The MND is inadequate and avoids

discussion regarding the potentially objectionable operational odors by not disclosing the types of uses that may operate at the property. A project EIR must be prepared to include analysis of operational odors with a use analysis that includes all types of permitted uses at the project site, including those that emit objectionable odors.

Response 4-8:

Future business operations are required to obtain necessary regulatory permits from AQMD, if necessary, for their operation. Industrial buildings over time are re-occupied with new businesses and not every new business is subject to discretionary review under CEQA. However, certain businesses may be subject to certain regulatory permits, which are considered ministerial under CEQA. New businesses would only be subject to CEQA if the proposed use requires discretionary review by the zoning of the property. Therefore, this project is not required to assess every type of business that could potentially occupy the buildings. The uses for the buildings are required to adhere to the light industrial zoning of the property, which already describe the types of uses allowed in this zone.

Comment 4-9:

The MND includes Mitigation Measure (MM) 5-1 which states: MM 5-1:

The project shall use Tier 4 diesel construction equipment during project construction. The project's grading plans shall clearly note the use of this equipment.

However, MM 5-1 is unenforceable as there is no enforcement entity, field verification, or lead agency oversight component. An EIR must be prepared with revised Mitigation Measures to include consistent and timely verification of compliance by the lead agency throughout the duration of project construction in order to comply with CEQA § 15126.4 (a)(2).

Response 4-9:

The city's field inspectors do on-site preconstruction meetings with project contractors. Specific mitigation associated with the project is verified by field staff. Additional language will be added in the Final MND.

5. Transportation/Traffic

Comment 5-1:

Table 5-1 Project Trip Generation Rates and Forecast of the Traffic Appendix does not accurately reflect the proposed project. For example, only 519,665 sf of warehouse is modeled while the project proposes 535,205 sf of warehouse. No manufacturing space is modeled even though the project proposes 159,744 sf of manufacturing. A project EIR must be prepared which includes a trip generation analysis that accurately reflects the proposed project. Additionally, the Study Area must be expanded to include the following traffic facilities: *Freeway Merge/Diverge* I-15 at CA-91 I-15 at I-210 Page of 7 11 I-15 at I-10 I-15 at CA-60

Response 5-1:

See Response 1-2. Additionally, the freeway interchanges are beyond the study area defined by the City TIA Scoping process.

Comment 5-2:

The assessment of fees here is not adequate mitigation as there is no evidence mitigation will actually result (*Gray v. County of Madera* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1099,1122.). An assessment of fees is appropriate when linked to a specific mitigation program, which the MND has not identified. (*Anderson First Coalition v. City of Anderson* (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1173, *Save our Peninsula Comm. v. Monterey County Bd. Of Supers.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 141.). The lead agency is unable to ensure that the fair share fees will be utilized to construct the improvements identified in MM 6-2, MM 6-5, MM 6-6 and MM 6-7. An EIR must be prepared for the project, including meaningful analysis regarding the traffic impacts if MM 6-2, MM 6-5, MM 6-6 and MM 6-7 are not constructed. The proposed mitigation measures represent uncertain mitigation and is improperly deferred in violation of CEQA. In order to reasonably achieve mitigation, the improvements could be required to be constructed by the project applicant prior to building occupancy.

Response 5-2:

The recommended traffic improvements are either part of a City/County improvement project or consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element and therefore a fair share contribution is appropriate. The mitigation measures indicate the project's fair share contribution toward the cost of future improvements. Certain traffic improvements are required to be either constructed or guaranteed to be constructed by the developer either prior to the issuance of the first building permit or prior to map recordation, whichever occurs first. Therefore, the city's collection of fees for improvements that are not warranted at project opening, but may be warranted in the future are being paid prior to project opening and not being deferred. Traffic improvements that are 100% responsible by the project are required to be constructed prior to project opening.

6. Noise

Comment 6-1:

The MND is erroneous in stating that the site "will be mass graded in one phase." The project description states that the project will be developed in two phases. A project EIR must be prepared which analyzes a worst-case scenario consistent with the project description - Phase 1 of the site will be graded, then constructed, and become operational while Phase 2 of the site is graded and then constructed.

Response 6-1:

See Response 4-4. The noise analysis was done using the worse-case scenario.

Comment 6-2:

The MND and Noise Analysis do not include any on-site noise measurements to establish baseline noise levels at the project site or nearby residences. The MND is not an adequate informational document and a project EIR must be prepared to establish baseline noise levels for the project site, nearby residences, and El Cerrito Middle School in order to provide an accurate and adequate analysis of all potentially significant noise impacts generated by the proposed project.

Response 6-2:

Direct noise impacts, truck noise and HVAC noise levels are discussed in the initial study/MND. Furthermore, all businesses operations, except for loading and unloading activities will be done inside the industrial buildings. Also, the El Cerrito Specific Plan prohibits the outside storage of materials and outdoor services within Planning Areas 1 and 2 of the Light Industrial designation, which is the project site location.

Comment 6-3:

The MND concludes that because “construction noise is of short-term duration” it “will not present any long-term impacts on the project site or the surrounding area. The most effective method of controlling construction noise is through local control of construction hours determined by the City.” The MND and Noise Analysis do not provide any meaningful analysis, quantified estimates, or supporting evidence to support the conclusion that construction noise impacts will be less than significant. An EIR must be prepared which includes a project specific technical Noise Analysis for construction of the proposed project.

Response 6-3:

Construction noise associated with construction equipment was provided in the initial study/MND (Table 10-5). Also, the Corona Municipal Code, Section 17.84.040 (D)(2) makes special provision for construction noise. Construction noise is recognized as noise which is disturbing, excessive or offensive and constitutes a nuisance involving discomfort or annoyance to persons of normal sensitivity residing in the area, which is generated by the use of any tools, machinery or equipment used in connection with construction operations. For this reason, construction noise is limited to certain hours of the day and identified in the initial study/MND. Also, construction will be done in stages with certain equipment being on the site on different days. A construction phasing schedule was provided in the Air Quality section of the initial study in Table 5-3. This table demonstrates the types of equipment that would be on the project site at a given time. Mitigation was also applied to the project that requires construction equipment to be staged on the project site that has the greatest distance to noise sensitive receptors.

7. Energy

Comment 7-1:

The MND concludes that because the project is within “walking distance” of the Corona Cruiser Red Line, VMT would be reduced and the project would have a less than significant energy impact. The MND does not provide quantified or meaningful supporting evidence to assert this conclusion. For example, there is no exact distance given to the Red Line or an estimate of how many employees may use the service. There are no implementation plans discussed for public transit, such as employee rideshares, carpools, or advertising/incentives for employees to use the Red Line. There

is also no discussion regarding reduced truck/trailer trips to support reduction of energy consumption.

Response 7-1:

The project is located less than .5 miles from the nearest transit area which could reduce daily trips from employees. Also, the initial study/MND talked about the nearby commercial retail services and eating establishments available within walking distance to future employees due to the location of The Crossings shopping center located directly south of the project site. Because these services are within walking distance, mid-day vehicle trips from the project site are likely to be reduced. Also, new construction projects are required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (2019). In this particular case, the project at a minimum is required to comply with the nonresidential mandatory measures for bicycle parking, designated parking for clean air vehicles and electric vehicle charging stations. The number of EV charging stations for a project is determined by Table 5.106.5.3.3 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11. Based on this table, the project would be required to provide EV charging stations at six percent of the total number of actual parking spaces. Compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code is checked by city staff during the plan check process and prior to the issuance of a building permit. This language will be updated in the Final MND.

Comment 7-2:

The MND and Energy Analysis Appendix are inconsistent. The Energy Analysis Appendix utilizes uncertain language by stating that the project “will *likely* be required by the City to provide the wiring and a dedicated space(s) and for multiple electric vehicle charging stations within parking areas of the facility.” Given the coordination with the lead agency required to produce a MND, it must be known whether or not this will be required and if it has potential to contribute towards the project’s energy reduction capabilities. The MND does not discuss this point from the Appendix and instead states that there is “an electric vehicle charging station located adjacent to the project site within the parking lot of the shopping center near Target. Therefore, employees will have access to vehicle charging stations within walking distance to the project.” The capabilities of adjacent properties cannot be utilized for energy consumption reduction of the proposed project. The proposed project must offer electric vehicle charging stations onsite in order to utilize that energy savings as a contribution towards a less than significant energy impact.

Response 7-2:

See response 7-1 on the requirement of EV charging stations for the project.

Comment 7-3:

It must also be noted that the text of the MND and Energy Analysis Appendix contain a mitigation measure for project construction that is not discussed or included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

Response 7-3:

The Energy Analysis Appendix references mitigation measures that include using cleaner engines for construction equipment, high efficiency lighting and recycling and compost services. The initial

study/MND already has a mitigation measure that requires the project to use Tier 4 diesel construction equipment. Also, it is mandatory that all new construction comply with the latest adopted California Building Standards Code and the California Green Building Standards Code. The California Green Building Standards Code references mandatory energy efficiency standards for nonresidential projects in Chapter 5, Division 5.2. Because this is a mandatory requirement for all new construction a separate mitigation measure is not required. Finally, the project is required to comply with all applicable ordinances governed by the Corona Municipal Code. The Corona Municipal, Chapter 8.20, Collection of Refuse and Recyclable Materials, as amended by the City Council on February 5, 2020, mandates recycling requirements for commercial facilities. The amended ordinance is scheduled for adoption on February 19, 2020. Because this requirement is enacted by city ordinance a separate mitigation measure is not required.

Letter: Better Neighborhoods, January 31, 2020

Comment 8-1:

We don't find out until page 38 of the Report discussing water usage that "The analysis considered the project in two phases; Phase 1 is assumed to begin within five years, and Phase 2 within ten years," which contradicts statements in several of the appendices indicating that construction would be complete within two years. Which is correct?

Response 8-2:

The report states within five years for Phase 1 and within 10 years for Phase 2. This means that each phase of the project can occur now and within the years specified. It does not say Phase 2 will occur 10 years later. The Water Supply Assessment analysis concluded that there is sufficient water supply projecting through 2040 for all phases of the project.

Comment 8-2:

Use is a crucial feature in every development application. Use very much determines the type of analysis to apply under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As tenants apply to become occupants at the Project, CEQA would almost certainly require new and updated analysis - studies based on actual fact, not notion or unexplained 'guesstimates'. Use might also prompt the need for changes to the proposed buildings. Why not wait until at least several tenancies are certain?

Response 8-2:

Industrial buildings over time are re-occupied with new businesses and not every new business is subject to discretionary review under CEQA. However, certain businesses may be subject to certain regulatory permits, which are considered ministerial under CEQA. New businesses would only be subject to CEQA if the proposed use requires discretionary review by the zoning of the property. Therefore, this project is not required to assess every type of business that could potentially occupy the buildings. The uses for the buildings are required to adhere to the light industrial zoning of the property, which already describe the types of uses allowed in this zone and therefore the project site.

Comment 8-3:

How do we know the Project site would support improvements of the size and scale contemplated? Latitude Phase I Environmental Part 1 study at page nine states that the site manager was unable to locate prior environmental assessment/s of the Project site – an extraordinary revelation considering the site's previous use as a sand mine that supposedly underwent reclamation. "The mining operation ceased in 1997 and the site has since been reclaimed by prior grading operations associated with the reclamation process under the previous surface mine permit." (Report, p. 3).

Why are there no records of the reclamation? How do we know whether clean-up is complete? Has the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSUC) been consulted?

Response 8-3:

The city's Community Development Department as well as the Office of Mine Reclamation (OMR) have records of the reclamation plan for the former Corona Sand Mine. The city has written verification from OMR dated September 29, 2015, that OMR staff inspected the site on September 16, 2015 and concurred with the city's certification that the mine site had been substantially reclaimed in accordance with the approved reclamation plan. OMR further confirmed that city fulfilled the requirements of CCR Section 3805.5.

Comment 8-4:

There is insufficient information for CEQA analysis of the Project site particularly regarding geology and soils, which may not even support the proposed Project. Nor does Part 2 of the environmental assessment assist. Why isn't this information available? Why commission a geotechnical study on the basis of incomplete information?

Response 8-4:

The end of the initial study discloses the documents incorporated by reference. The initial study states where the Preliminary Geotechnical Report is located, which is Appendix B of the Preliminary WQMP. The sources cited were made available on the city's website.

Comment 8-5:

According to the Report at page 42, "The project is expected to improve the current appearance of the project site and will not result in a situation that would degrade the visual character of the site or the surrounding area." Expected by whom? There are no drawings of the proposed buildings or descriptions or photos of the surrounding area by which to gauge whether an empty industrial park of 15 buildings of assorted size would degrade the visual character of the site and surrounding area. Do empty super-sized industrial parks typically improve the look of **any** neighborhood?

Response 8-5:

The initial study/MND identifies the project title applications associated with the project. The site plan and architecture of the buildings associated with the project are provided as part of Precise Plan 2019-0001. The project applications are available for public review at the city's Community Development Department. This information can also be provided to the public upon request.

Also, the initial study describes the surrounding area and provides an aerial photograph of the project site and surrounding area. The project site is surrounded by urban uses and is adjacent to a regional retail shopping center to the south. The regional shopping center contains just over 1 million square feet of building area, paved parking and landscaping.

Comment 8-6:

“The proposed Project consists of multiple industrial/office/warehousing buildings totaling 519,665 SF of industrial usage and 456,629 Square Feet (SF) of warehousing usage and 148,000 industrial offices within a 66-acre project site (different from 75 acres in the Project Description). The Project site is located on the west side of Temescal Canyon Road, between La Gloria Street Road and Tom Barnes Street, in the City of Corona, California. It’s expected that the project would be fully operational in 2022.” (Latitude Air Quality Analysis, Executive Summary).

This is inconsistent with the Report, which suggests the Project may be in limbo for as long as 10 years. Which is correct? What does “fully operational” mean when there are no prospective tenants? How does an expert study the impact on air quality for an undetermined use?

Response 8-6:

The initial study stated the project would be developed in two phases. The initial study never stated the project would be in limbo for 10 years.

Comment 8-7:

“Air Quality impacts related to construction and daily operations were calculated using the latest CalEEMod air quality model, which was developed by ENVIRON International Corporation for SCAQMD. The construction module in CalEEMod calculates the emissions associated with the construction of the project using methodologies presented in the US EPA AP-42 document with emphasis on Chapter 11.9. The CalEEMod input/output model is shown in Attachment A to this report.” (Latitude Air Quality Analysis, p.14)

Nowhere does Attachment A explain the basis of the author’s calculations obtained without knowing how each of the buildings at the Project site would be used if at all. Nor is there any explanation of the basis for construction emissions calculations – not surprising as the actual construction period is also uncertain. What are all the speculative trip summaries based on, one wonders? Pages and pages of unexplained statistics does not constitute proper CEQA analysis of a Project’s impact on air quality. Could the City explain in plain language the significance of **any** of the charts provided in the Latitude Air Quality Analysis?

Response 8-7:

See responses 4-1, 4-2 and 4-4.

Comment 8-8:

According to the Environmental Checklist on page 7 of the Report, “The project site being developed for light industrial purposes and would not induce substantial population growth in the city. The project would increase the city’s service population, but not the city’s overall residential population.” Won’t prospective tenants and their employees want to live close to work? Won’t their businesses attract new suppliers, who might also wish to live closer to their clients?

Response 8-8:

See Response 2-1.

Comment 8-9:

Latitude Phase I Environmental Parts 1 and 2 is based on incomplete information and as such, there is insufficient information not only for CEQA purposes. There is no evidence to show whether the site would safely support the Project as proposed.

The lack of information regarding mine reclamation is especially troubling. The method of reclamation might have had significant environmental effects, which might have required the preparation of a new EIR. *Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma*, 6 Cal. App. 4th 1307, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473, 1992 Cal. App. LEXIS 672, 92 Cal. Daily Op. Service 4543, 92 Daily Journal DAR 7195 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. May 28, 1992).

Was an EIR completed regarding the site reclamation? If so, has the City compared the methodology applied with today's standards to determine whether a new EIR might be required?

Response 8-9:

See Responses 8-3 and 8-4.

Comment 8-10:

According to the Report at page 17, "Temescal Canyon Road adjacent to the project site is partially improved. The unimproved portion of the street adjacent to the project site will be improved to the city's arterial street standard for four lanes." Why four lanes?

Response 8-10:

Temescal Canyon Road is being improved according the city's General Plan Circulation Element and Riverside County's General Plan. The city's General Plan identifies Temescal Canyon Road as a major arterial 4 lane road.

Comment 8-11:

"The Project is expected to generate 4,127 daily trips, 471 (382 inbound, 89 outbound) AM peak hour trips, and 480 (102 inbound, 378 outbound) PM peak hour trips. It should be noted that these estimates include the conversion of truck-related trips to passenger car equivalents (PCE)." (Latitude Traffic Impact Analysis, Executive Summary).

What is the basis of this calculation obtained without knowing how or by whom the Project would be used? Why Year 2040 calculations and what is their basis?

Response 8-11:

The Supplement Traffic Analysis dated November 29, 2019 and the Updated Project Trip Generation Forecast provided in Table A of the report correctly notes the building square footages for each land use used for the traffic analysis.

The traffic analysis is also required to look at traffic impacts in the city's build out condition, which is

Year 2040.

Comment 8-12:

Nowhere does the Latitude Noise Analysis explain the basis of the speculative estimates from which its noise calculations derive without knowing how exactly the Project would be used. This study is pure speculation and as such does not constitute proper CEQA analysis of the Project's potential noise impact – especially important when sensitive receptors are just 800 feet away.

Response 8-12:

See Response 6-2.

Comment 8-13:

There is no proper analysis of the Project's impact on water. How could there be when there is no information regarding the site's previous use as a mine or whether the reclamation was properly completed? There is nothing to explain what toxins may remain at the site or the impact mining activities may have had on the groundwater.

Response 8-13:

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project was discussed under the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the initial study. The initial study also indicated research was done through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency database and Department of Toxic Substances Control's database and that based on field observations and literature review the site does not have hazardous materials.

Comment 8-14:

The Latitude Water Supply Analysis appendix fails to explain the basis of its water use calculation. Has the water district been consulted?

Response 8-14:

The City of Corona operates its own water agency under the Corona Department of Water and Power. The Water Supply Assessment was commissioned by the City of Corona and approved by the Corona Department of Water and Power.