

Initial Study

June 28, 2022

Prepared for:

City of Corona Planning and Development Department 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Suite 120 Corona, CA 92882

Prepared by:

Stantec Consulting Services Inc. 290 Conejo Ridge Avenue Thousand Oaks, CA 91362



Page Is Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

ACRO	NYMS ANI	D ABBREVIATIONS	IV
1.0	INTRODU	CTION	1-1
1.1	PROJECT	[.] TITLE	1-1
1.2	LEAD AGE	ENCY NAME AND ADDRESS	1-1
1.3	CONTACT	FPERSON AND PHONE NUMBER	1-1
1.4	PROJECT	SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS	1-1
1.5	PROJECT	LOCATION	1-1
1.6	PROJECT	PURPOSE	1-5
	1.6.1	Intended Uses of the Initial Study	.1-5
2.0	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1	PROPOSE	ED AHO AND REZONING PROGRAM	2-1
2.2	PROJECT	LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION	2-2
	2.2.1	Current Site Conditions	.2-2
	2.2.2	Candidate Sites	.2-3
	2.2.3	Surrounding Land Uses	.2-1
2.3	PROJECT	COMPONENTS	2-1
2.4	SCHEDUL	.Ε	2-2
2.5	DISCRETI	ONARY ACTIONS	2-2
-			~ ~
-	2.5.1	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	.2-2
3.0	2.5.1 ENVIRON	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	.2-2 3-1
3.0 INTRO	2.5.1 ENVIRON	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	.2-2 3-1 3-1
3.0 INTRO	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation	.2-2 3-1 .3-1 .3-2
3.0 INTRC	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology	.2-2 3-1 .3-1 .3-2 .3-2
3.0 INTRO 3.1	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS.	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-2 3-4
3.0 INTRO 3.1	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation Initial Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 3-4 .3-4
3.0 INTRO 3.1	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis	.2-2 3-1 .3-1 .3-2 .3-2 3-4 .3-4 .3-4
3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 3-4 .3-4 .3-4 3-8
3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Environmental Setting	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 3-8 .3-8
3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Environmental Setting Environmental Setting	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 3-4 .3-4 .3-4 3-8 .3-8 .3-8
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS. Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Environmental Setting Environmental Setting ITY	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-8 .3-9 3-11
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis ITY	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-8 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11
3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 DIOLOGIO	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES Environmental Setting Environmental Setting ITY	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation Sental Assessment Methodology ICS. Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis ITY Environmental Setting CAL RESOURCES	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC 3.4.1 3.4.2	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-13 3-13 3-14
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC 3.4.1 3.4.2 CULTURA	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-14 3-14
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended L Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC 3.4.1 3.4.2 CULTURA 3.5.1	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-13 3-14 3-21
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC 3.4.1 3.4.2 CULTURA 3.5.1 3.5.2	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change MENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS Jses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation ental Assessment Methodology ICS Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis TURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES Environmental Setting Environmental Impact Analysis ITY	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-13 3-14 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21
 3.0 INTRO 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 	2.5.1 ENVIRON DUCTION Intended U Environme AESTHET 3.1.1 3.1.2 AGRICUL 3.2.1 3.2.2 AIR QUAL 3.3.1 3.3.2 BIOLOGIC 3.4.1 3.4.2 CULTURA 3.5.1 3.5.2 ENERGY	General Plan Amendment and Zone Change	.2-2 3-1 .3-2 .3-2 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-4 .3-8 .3-9 3-11 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-14 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-21 3-23 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-4 3-4 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-4 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1 3-1



3.6.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-27
GEOLOG	Y AND SOILS	3-28
3.7.1	Environmental Setting	.3-28
3.7.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-29
GREENH	OUSE GASES	3-35
3.8.1	Environmental Setting	.3-35
3.8.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-35
HAZARDS	SAND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	3-37
3.9.1	Environmental Setting	.3-37
3.9.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-38
HYDROLO	DGY AND WATER QUALITY	3-43
3.10.1	Environmental Setting	.3-43
3.10.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-44
LAND US		3-49
3.11.1	Environmental Setting	.3-49
3.11.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-49
MINERAL	RESOURCES	3-51
3.12.1	Environmental Setting	.3-51
3.12.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-51
NOISE	· · ·	3-54
3.13.1	Environmental Setting	.3-54
3.13.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-56
POPULAT	ION AND HOUSING	3-57
3.14.1	Environmental Setting	.3-57
3.14.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-58
PUBLIC S	ERVICES	3-61
3.15.1	Environmental Setting	.3-61
3.15.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-62
RECREAT	TION	3-66
3.16.1	Environmental Setting	.3-66
3.16.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-66
TRANSPO	ORTATION	3-68
3.17.1	Environmental Setting	.3-68
3.17.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-69
TRIBAL C	ULTURAL RESOURCES	3-71
3.18.1	Environmental Setting	.3-71
3.18.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-72
UTILITIES	AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	3-73
3.19.1	Environmental Setting	.3-73
3.19.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-75
WILDFIRE		3-80
3.20.1	Environmental Setting	.3-80
3.20.2	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-80
MANDAT	DRY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	3-83
3.21.1	Environmental Impact Analysis	.3-83
	3.6.2 GEOLOG 3.7.1 3.7.2 GREENHO 3.8.1 3.8.2 HAZARDS 3.9.1 3.9.2 HYDROLO 3.10.1 3.10.2 LAND USI 3.10.1 3.10.2 LAND USI 3.11.1 3.10.2 LAND USI 3.11.1 3.12.2 NOISE 3.13.1 3.12.2 NOISE 3.13.1 3.12.2 NOISE 3.13.1 3.14.2 POPULAT 3.14.1 3.14.2 PUBLIC S 3.15.1 3.15.2 RECREAT 3.16.1 3.15.2 RECREAT 3.16.1 3.16.2 TRANSPO 3.17.1 3.17.2 TRIBAL C 3.18.1 3.18.2 UTILITIES 3.19.1 3.19.2 WILDFIRE 3.20.1 3.20.2 MANDATO 3.21.1	3.6.2 Environmental Impact Analysis GEOLOGY AND SOILS 3.7.1 Environmental Setting 3.7.2 Environmental Impact Analysis GREENHOUSE GASES 3.8.1 Environmental Impact Analysis HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 3.9.1 Environmental Setting 3.9.2 Environmental Setting 3.9.1 Environmental Setting 3.9.2 Environmental Setting 3.9.1 Environmental Setting 3.10.2 Environmental Impact Analysis HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY 3.10.1 Environmental Setting 3.11.2 Environmental Setting 3.11.1 Environmental Setting 3.11.2 Environmental Impact Analysis MINERAL RESOURCES 3.12.2 3.12.2 Environmental Impact Analysis NOISE 3.13.1 3.13.1 Environmental Setting 3.14.2 Environmental Impact Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING 3.14.1 3.14.2 Environmental Setting 3.15.1 Environmental Setting 3.15.2 Environmental Sett

4.0	REPORT PREPARATION	4-1	1
4.1	LIST OF PREPARERS	4-′	1
5.0	REFERENCES	5-′	1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: General Plan and Zoning Code Definitions	2-2
Table 2: Proposed AHO Zone Sites	2-1
Table 3: Proposed Rezone Sites	2-1
Table 4: Adequacy of Residential Sites Inventory	2-1
Table 5: Agency Permits and Environmental Review Requirements	2-2
Table 6: City Interior and Exterior Noise Standards	3-54
Table 7: City Population Trends	3-57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Regional Location Map	1-	2
Figure 2. City of Corona Map	1-	3
Figure 3. City AHO Sites and Rezone Parcels	1-	4

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ADU	Accessory Dwelling Unit
af	acre-feet
AHO	Affordable Housing Overlay
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ARMR	Archaeological Resource Management Reports
BMP	best management practices
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
Cal/OSHA	California Division of Occupational Safety and Health
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFD	Corona Fire Department
CGS	California Geologic Survey
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
City	City of Corona
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNUSD	Corona-Norco Unified School District
CPD	Corona Police Department
County	Riverside County
CRHR	California Register of Historic Places
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DEH	Riverside County Department of Environmental Health
DIF	Development Impact Fee
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWP	Corona Department of Water and Power



DWR	Department of Water Resources
EAP	Emergency Action Plan
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
ESA	environmental site assessment
EVMWC	Eagle Valley Mutual Water Company
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
General Plan Update EIR	City of Corona General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpd	gallons per day
GPS	global positioning system
GWh	gigawatt-hours
HABS	Historic American Buildings Survey
HAER	Historic American Engineering Record
HALS	Historic American Landscape Survey
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
НСР	Habitat Conservation Plan
HGCWD	Home Gardens County Water District
HGSD	Home Garden Sanitary District
IS	Initial Study
ISMND	Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration
KWh	kilowatt-hours
Leq	equivalent continuous noise level
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LID	Low Impact Development
mgd	million gallons per day
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MSHCP	Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	National American Heritage Commission
NHMLA	Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NOx	Oxides of Nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places



OHP	California Office of Historic Preservation
O ₃	ozone
PM _{2.5}	fine inhalable particulate matter
PM ₁₀	coarse inhalable particulate matter
PQS	Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRMMP	Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan
Project (proposed Project)	City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program
	Update Project
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
RPS	Renewables Portfolio Standards
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE	Southern California Edison
SLF	Sacred Lands File
SPP	Structure Protections Plan
SoCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SOI	sphere of influence
SR	State Route
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TVPA	Temescal Valley Production Area
TVWP	Temescal Valley Water District
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFS	United States Forest Service
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
WMI	Waste Management Inc.
WMWD	Western Municipal Water District
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WRCRWA	Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority
WRF	water reclamation facility

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 **PROJECT TITLE**

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project (Project, proposed Project)

1.2 LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Corona Planning and Development Department 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Suite 120 Corona, CA 92882

1.3 CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Joanne Coletta, Planning and Development Director Planning and Development Department 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Suite 120 Corona, CA 92882 (951) 736-2434

1.4 PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Corona Planning and Development Department 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Suite 120 Corona, CA 92882

1.5 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project is located in the City of Corona (Corona), which is in northwestern Riverside County (County). The City is generally bordered by the City of Norco and the City of Riverside to the north and northeast, the City of Chino Hills and the City of Yorba Linda to the northwest, the City of Anaheim to the west, the Cleveland National Forest and the Santa Ana Mountains to the southwest, and unincorporated Riverside County along the remaining City borders, as shown in Figure 1. The Project is interspersed throughout the City, which has a land area of approximately 40 square miles, as shown in Figure 2. The Project would affect specific parcels within the City, by proposing to rezone parcels to accommodate high density residential uses or an Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) zone in order to plan for additional affordable housing units, as shown in Figure 3.





Regional Location Map



Source: City of Corona General Plan Update EIR, 2019





Title

Client/Project City of Corona City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study

Corona, California

Figure No. 2ັ

City of Corona Map



1.6 **PROJECT PURPOSE**

In accordance with California Government Code Section 65584, projected housing needs for each city and county in the Southern California region are prepared by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) under a process known as the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The RHNA allocates regional housing needs by income level among member jurisdictions. California law established the planning period for the current RHNA from June 30, 2021, to October 15, 2029.

Implementation of the Project is intended to accommodate the planning of low- and moderate-income households in the City, in accordance with the City's recently adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element Update. In addition to including goals, policies, and implementation programs regarding housing issues, housing elements must include an inventory or list of housing sites at sufficient densities to accommodate a specific number of units at various levels of affordability assigned to the City by SCAG. The Housing Element Update includes an inventory of properties that are intended to be rezoned to high density residential or an AHO zone in order to plan for low- and moderate-income units. The AHO zone is a new zoning designation that the City proposes to establish in order to create by-right development standards for affordable housing projects. The City also proposes to create development standards and architectural design guidelines for the AHO zone, which would cover existing properties that are developed with non-residential uses. The AHO zone would allow these properties to be redeveloped with residential land uses should a percentage of the housing units include low- and moderate-income housing.

1.6.1 Intended Uses of the Initial Study

This Initial Study (IS) is an informational document intended to inform the lead agency, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of potential environmental effects of the proposed Project. The environmental review process has been established to enable public agencies to evaluate potential environmental consequences and to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing any potentially significant adverse impacts. This document is intended to aid the City in determining the appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document needed to support agency discretionary approvals, permits, and consultations.

2.0 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

2.1 PROPOSED AHO AND REZONING PROGRAM

The City's General Plan was recently updated in 2020 and included adoption of the City of Corona General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (General Plan Update EIR), a Programmatic EIR certified on June 30, 2020. As part of the General Plan Update effort, the City's 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element Update was adopted by the City Council on November 3, 2021 and has been reviewed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The City is continuing to work with HCD on obtaining Housing Element compliance.

The General Plan Update EIR anticipated an additional 5,494 residential units; however, the RHNA allocation for the Housing Element Update now exceeds the City's housing unit projection for Year 2040 in the General Plan Update. The City's total RHNA allocation is 6,088 units with 3,888 allocated to low- and moderate-income housing units, consisting of 2,792 units and 1,096 units, respectively. Currently, the City's RHNA allocation of 6,088 exceeds its projected housing growth by 594 units, in addition to accommodating an additional buffer.

As such, the City is now proposing a rezoning program to accommodate the planning of low- and moderateincome households as required by the state's RHNA allocation for the City. These additional 594 housing units from the RHNA were not known at the time the General Plan Update EIR was prepared, potentially resulting in additional impacts that were not evaluated in the General Plan Update EIR. Therefore, supplemental environmental evaluation pursuant to CEQA is required to address the potential impacts from growth that could occur as a result of Project implementation.

The proposed Project is ultimately implementing the General Plan. As such, the General Plan Update EIR is incorporated by reference herein, as the evaluations of potential environmental impacts associated with adoption of the General Plan include mitigation measures and consistency evaluations which are directly applicable to the proposed Project.

The City's Housing Element Update includes an inventory of properties that are intended to be rezoned to high density residential or an AHO zone in order to plan for potential sites to accommodate the RHNA allocation of units that would also be suitable for low- and moderate-income units. The AHO zone is a new zone being proposed by the City to establish by-right development standards for affordable housing projects. The AHO zone will cover existing properties that are currently developed with non-residential land uses. General Plan designations and zoning would remain, with overlays added, which would allow property owners to have the option to develop under either set of standards (the underlying General Plan and zoning or the AHO). The City is proposing to create development standards (i.e., criteria for building setbacks, parking, building height, landscaping, open space amenities, lot coverage, etc.) and architectural design guidelines for the AHO zone.

In addition to the RHNA allocation, a buffer is necessary to ensure that if one or more of the identified candidate sites are developed at lower densities or with non-housing uses, there would be remaining



capacity to ensure an ongoing supply of sites for housing during the eight-year-cycle of the Housing Element. If there were no buffer provided, then the City could be obliged to identify new sites and amend the Housing Element if an identified site were developed with a non-housing project or developed at a density less than that anticipated in the Housing Element. The need for a substantial buffer is even more important during this cycle because of new rules in the Housing Accountability Act's "no net loss" provisions. Senate Bill (SB) 166 (2017) requires that the land inventory and site identification programs in the Housing Element always include sufficient sites to accommodate the unmet RHNA. This means that if a site identified in the Housing Element as having the potential to accommodate the lower-income housing portion of the RHNA is actually developed for a higher income level, the locality must either: 1) identify and rezone, if necessary, an adequate substitute site; or 2) demonstrate that the land inventory already contains an adequate substitute site. Providing an adequate buffer is necessary to ensuring that the City remains compliant with the provisions of SB 166.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

2.2.1 Current Site Conditions

The Project site expands across various urban and suburban areas of the City, as shown in Figure 3. The City has identified a number of potential sites for the proposed AHO zone and for rezoning. Current General Plan land use designations and proposed zoning are defined in Table 1 below.

General Plan Land Use Designation or Zoning	Abbreviation			
General Plan Land Use Designation				
Business Park	BP			
General Commercial	GC			
High Density Residential	HDR			
Medium Density Residential	MDR			
Mixed Use 1 – Commercial/Residential	MU1			
Mixed Use 2 – Commercial/Industrial	MU2			
Low Density Residential	LDR			
Light Industrial	LI			
Office Park	OP			
Zoning				
Agriculture	A			
Affordable Housing Overlay	AHO			
Business Park	BP			
Restricted Commercial	C2			
General Commercial	C3			
Community Services	CS			

Table 1: General Plan and Zoning Code Definitions

General Plan Land Use Designation or Zoning	Abbreviation
Gateway Business	GB
General Commercial	GC
Light Manufacturing	M1
Multi Family	MF
Multi Family Residential 1	MF1
Multi Family Residential	MFR
Mobile Home Park	MP
Mixed Use	MU
Single-Family Residential (7,200 square-foot lot minimum)	R1-7.2
Single-Family Residential (9,600 square-foot lot minimum)	R1-9.6
Low Density Multiple Family Residential	R2
Multiple Family Residential	R3
Multiple Family Residential	MF
Residential Office	RO
Single Family	SF
Transitional Commercial District	TC
Source: City of Corona General Plan	

2.2.2 Candidate Sites

An important component of the City's Housing Element Update is the identification of sites for future housing development, and an evaluation of the adequacy of those sites in fulfilling the City's share of regional housing needs. To accomplish this, all City parcels were surveyed to determine their development capacity. Due to the lack of vacant and underutilized sites in the City, candidate sites were selected for rezoning. Each site was analyzed in light of the development standards for its proposed zoning designation. All parcels in the City were evaluated through a process of elimination based on required criteria set by HCD

Candidate sites that are proposed for the AHO zone include a variety of uses on 100 parcels, including commercial, retail, industrial, surface parking, storage and vacant parcels, as described in Table 2 below. In the proposed AHO zone, residential uses will be allowed on sites currently designated as MU2 on the General Plan. Sites in the MU1 zones are permitted to be entirely for residential use zone, if located in the proposed AHO zone. There are 57 parcels considered as potential sites for proposed rezoning, and these are primarily parcels that are currently used for residential uses, in addition to parking lots, mobile home parks and some commercial, institutional and vacant parcels, as described in Table 3 below. Current and proposed zoning are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Initial Study Project Description

Table 2: Proposed AHO Zone Sites

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
1	211 S Joy Street	117122002	Vacant	0.20	MU1		тс	TC (AHO)
2	904 S Ramona Avenue	117238005	Vacant	0.17	MU1	1	CS	CS (AHO)
3	912 S Ramona Avenue	117238012	Vacant	0.20	OP	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
4	901 S Ramona Avenue	117238006	Vacant	0.21	OP	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
5	615 S Sherman Avenue	110040023	Commercial Use: Car wash, small lot in use, existing utilities available	0.39	OP	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
6	510 W 6th Street	117172002	Commercial: Retail Existing utilities available	0.53	MU1		тс	TC (AHO)
7	1065 Railroad Street	118210041	Commercial: Unoccupied building, existing utilities available	1.86	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
8	514 W 6th Street	117172001	Vacant	0.54	MU1	-	тс	TC (AHO)
9	904 S Ramona Avenue	117238004	Vacant	0.17	OP	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
10	S Main Street	117238007	Vacant	0.20	OP	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
11	915 S Main Street	117238016	Vacant	0.16	OP	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
12	Railroad Street	117042010	Vacant	0.35	LI	MU2	M1	M1 (AHO)

 \bigcirc

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
13	6th Street	110020018	Vacant	0.22	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
14	905 W 6th Street	118283011	Parking lot	1.50	MU1		CS	CS (AHO)
15	901 W 6th Street	118283026	Commercial: Retail (Crown Vacuum and Sewing), existing utilities available	0.16	MU1		CS	CS (AHO)
16	507 S Vicentia Avenue	117340022	Commercial: Settlement House, existing utilities available	0.40	MU1		CS	CS (AHO)
17	511 S Vicentia Avenue	117340023	Commercial: Residential	0.32	MU1		CS	CS (AHO)
18	852 W 6th Street	110101012	Commercial: Retail (Enterprise Auto Rental), existing utilities available	0.35	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
19	844 W 6th Street	110101011	Commercial: Retail (Flower Shop with small parking lot), existing utilities available	0.20	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
20	836 W 6th Street	110101010	Commercial: Retail (Tire shop and parking lot), existing utilities available	0.38	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
21	832 W 6th Street	110101009	Commercial: Dentist Offices, two separate structures and a parking lot, existing utilities available	0.15	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
22	828 W 6th Street	110101027	Commercial: Retail (Cosmetic Implants and Dentist office, separate structures and a parking lot), existing utilities available	0.18	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
23	826 W 6th Street	110101007	Commercial: Barber Shop, existing utilities available	0.11	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
24	820 W 6th Street	110101006	Commercial: Residential home adjacent to empty plot, existing utilities available	0.21	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
25	816 W 6th Street	110101005	Commercial: Retail (Mower shop building and small parking lot), existing utilities available	0.18	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
26	812 W 6th Street	110101004	Vacant	0.18	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
27	808 W 6th Street	110101003	Commercial: Building and parking spot, existing utilities available	0.15	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
28	802 W 6th Street	110101001	Commercial: Retail (Insurance agencies, one building, small parking lot), existing utilities available	0.10	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
29	612 S Vicentia Avenue	110101002	Commercial: Residential home, existing utilities available	0.10	MU1		GC	GC (AHO)
30	229 Grand Boulevard	117091022	Commercial: Residential, existing utilities available	1.10	GC	MU1	CS	CS (AHO)
31	1341 W 6th Street	118130013	Vacant	0.92	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
32	1335 W 6th Street	118130014	Vacant	1.02	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
33	1338 W 6th Street	110030004	Commercial: Retail (Firearm shop, two structures and small parking lot), existing utilities available	0.24	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
34	1334 W 6th Street	110030003	Commercial: Large parking lot, existing utilities available	0.48	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
35	1330 W 6th Street	110030008	Commercial: Retail (Bar, small building), existing utilities available	0.28	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
36	1865 W 6th Street	102270015	Commercial: Retail (Restaurant, large, underutilized parking lot), existing utilities available	0.77	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
37	1180 W 6th Street	110040039	Commercial: Strip mall, partially unoccupied with large parking lot,	0.69	GC	MU1	С	C (AHO)

Initial Study Project Description

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
			slight disrepair, existing utilities available					
38	1210 W 6th Street	110040042	Commercial: Retail (Strip mall and parking lot), existing utilities available	1.46	GC	MU1	С	C (AHO)
39	1201 E 6th Street	115690013	Commercial: Retail, existing utilities available	2.96	MU2		BP	BP (AHO)
40	Circle City Drive	111290040	Industrial: No built structures, industrial storage (i.e., trucks)	0.44	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
41	Circle City Drive	111290039	Industrial: No built structures, industrial storage (i.e., trucks)	1.71	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
42	Circle City Drive	111290021	Vacant	1.08	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
43	Circle City Drive	111290022	Vacant	0.77	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
44	Circle City Drive	111290023	Vacant	0.47	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
45	E 6th Street	115090024	Industrial: No built structures, industrial storage (i.e., trucks)	2.66	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
46	E 6th Street	115090021	Industrial: No built structures, industrial storage (i.e., trucks)	1.17	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
47	E 5th Street	117331006	Industrial: one structure and large parking spaces	0.74	MU2		BP	BP (AHO)
48	Pleasant View Avenue	118130031	Vacant	0.49	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
49	W 6th Street	110030030	Vacant	0.43	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
50	Yorba Street	102290010	Industrial: Parking lot space adjacent to used car dealership	0.17	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
51	W 6th Street	110040041	Commercial: Retail (parking lot adjacent to strip mall)	1.16	GC	MU1	С	C (AHO)

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
52	6th Street	110020008	Vacant	0.61	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
53	E 6th Street	117332015	Vacant	0.27	MU2		GC	GC (AHO)
54	E 6th Street	117332016	Vacant	0.33	MU2		GC	GC (AHO)
55	E Blaine Street	119311019	Vacant	0.27	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
56	E Blaine Street	119311018	Vacant	0.17	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
57	E Blaine Street	119311017	Vacant	0.07	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
58	E Blaine Street	119311016	Vacant	0.07	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
59	E Blaine Street	119311043	Vacant	0.10	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
60	E Blaine Street	119311042	Vacant	0.10	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
61	E Blaine Street	119311041	Vacant	0.10	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
62	100 E Harrison Street	119311025	Commercial: Retail (Bar/Pub), existing utilities available	1.09	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
63	E Blaine Street	119311015	Commercial: Industrial (Warehouse/Office), existing utilities available	0.07	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
64	E Blaine Street	119311014	Commercial: Industrial (Warehouse/Office), existing utilities available	0.07	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
65	E Blaine Street	119311013	Commercial: Industrial/Vacant, existing utilities available	0.04	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)

 \bigcirc

Initial Study Project Description

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
66	320 E Harrison Street	119311005	Commercial: Retail (Auto Shop), existing utilities available	0.53	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
67	280 E Harrison Street	119311004	Commercial: Industrial (Warehouse/Office)	0.35	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
68	240 E Harrison Street	119311003	Commercial: Industrial (Warehouse/Office), existing utilities available	0.27	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
69	122 E Harrison Street	119311002	Commercial: Industrial (Warehouse/Office), existing utilities available	0.97	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
70	E Blaine Street	119311040	Commercial	0.20	MU1		MU	MU (AHO)
71	S Smith Avenue	110020012	RV Storage: parking spots adjacent to structure	0.50	HDR	UDR	R3	R3 (AHO)
72	1362 W 6th Street	110030015	RV Storage with large parking lot	3.60	HDR	UDR	R3	R3 (AHO)
73	1553 Yorba Street	118050020	Storage	0.64	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
74	1549 Yorba Street	118050019	Commercial: Retail (Painting and Wall covering), large back lot, near residential uses, existing utilities available	0.43	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
75	1545 Yorba Street	118050018	Commercial: Retail (Auto Repair Shop), existing utilities available	0.65	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
76	1539 Yorba Street	118050017	Commercial: Retail (Used Auto Sale), existing utilities available	0.95	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
77	1535 W 6th Street	118050016	Commercial: Retail (Alex Furniture, building with parking lot), existing utilities available	0.99	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
78	W 6th Street	102290020	Commercial: Retail (Truck and Van Repair, building with large parking lot), existing utilities available	4.56	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
79	1625 W. 6th Street	102290017	Commercial: Retail (Used Car Dealership, large parking lot), existing utilities available	1.62	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
80	1541 W 6th Street	103280001	Commercial: Retail (Auto Repair Shop building, large parking lot), existing utilities available	0.99	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)
81	1210 E 6th Street	115080002	Parking lot	0.38	MU2		BP	BP (AHO)
82	1210 E 6th Street	115080041	Parking lot	0.62	MU2		BP	BP (AHO)
83	1210 E 6th Street	115080012	Commercial: Retail (Auto Shop), existing utilities available	1.82	MU2		BP	BP (AHO)
84	W. 8th Street	110040054	Vacant	0.46	HDR	UDR	MP	R3 (AHO)
85	W 8th Street	110061005	Vacant	0.88	HDR	UDR	R3	R3 (AHO)
86	W 8th Street	110040010	Vacant	0.20	HDR	UDR	MP	R3 (AHO)
87	1203 Circle City Drive	111280005	Vacant	1.05	HDR	UDR	R3	R3 (AHO)
88	1154 E 6th Street	111280001	Vacant	2.13	MU2		GC	GC (AHO)
89	6th Street	111280004	Vacant	0.90	MU2		GC	GC (AHO)
90	n/a	111290036	Commercial: Industrial (large Warehouse/Office and parking lot), existing utilities available	2.31	MU2		M1	M1 (AHO)
91	S Sherman Avenue	118101014	Vacant	1.51	HDR	UDR	R3	R3 (AHO)

Initial Study Project Description

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning	
92	1910 Frontage Road	102250054	Three story hotel, surface parking	1.27	GC	MU1	C2	C2 (AHO)	
93	E 3rd Street	117122003	Vacant, City water well	0.54	MU1		TC	TC (AHO)	
94	1434 W 6th Street	110020005	Two commercial buildings	0.94	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)	
95	Pleasant View Avenue	118130022	Vacant	1.42	LDR	MU1	R1-7.2	R3 (AHO)	
96	400 E Rincon Street	119280070	Office building (potential residential development)	3.00	LI	MU1	BP	BP (AHO)	
97	400 E Rincon Street	119280071	Vacant building pad and parking lots	3.00	LI	MU1	BP	BP (AHO)	
98	1833 W 6th Street	102270014	Commercial building and parking lot	0.82	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)	
99	1833 W 6th Street	102270013	Parking lot	0.22	GC	MU1	C3	C3 (AHO)	
100	526 Railroad Street	117041001	Small buildings, mostly outside storage	2.45	LI	MU2	M1	M1 (AHO)	
	Source: City of Corona Planning Division (2022)								

 \bigcirc

Initial Study Project Description

Table 3: Proposed Rezone Sites

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
1	2550 S Main Street	113310005	Industrial: Church complex, very large parking lot, and industrial land	4.00	MDR		A	R2
2	777 S Temescal Street	107050034	Vacant	1.80	GC	HDR	C2	MP
3	820 S Victoria Avenue	117232002	Residential: Occupied, existing utilities available	0.17	LDR	MDR	SF	MFR
4	822 S Victoria Avenue	117232001	Residential: Home adjacent to large empty grass area, occupied, existing utilities available	0.18	LDR	MDR	SF	MFR
5	801 S Victoria Avenue	117233008	Residential: Occupied, existing utilities available	0.17	LDR	MDR	SF	MFR
6	724 Barth Street	111042031	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.50	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
7	730 Barth Street	111042024	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.50	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
8	802 Barth Street	111042025	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.51	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
9	808 Barth Street	111042026	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.50	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
10	814 Barth Street	111042027	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.52	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
11	813 Ford Street	111042013	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.51	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
12	807 Ford Street	111042014	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.50	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2

Initial Study Project Description

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
13	801 Ford Street	111042015	Residential: Home, occupied, back lot house with large yard, existing utilities available	0.51	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
14	779 Ford Street	111042016	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.50	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
15	716 Barth Street	111042021	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.32	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
16	801 Quarry Street	117281007	Residential: Occupied, large front and back lot, existing utilities available	0.25	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
17	805 Quarry Street	117281008	Residential: Occupied, existing utilities available	0.24	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
18	901 Quarry Street	117281010	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.23	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
19	907 Quarry Street	117281012	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.21	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
20	911 Quarry Street	117281013	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.22	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
21	915 Quarry Street	117281014	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.23	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
22	919 Quarry Street	117281015	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.22	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
23	923 Quarry Street	117281016	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.22	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
24	1001 Quarry Street	117282005	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.84	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
25	1019 Quarry Street	117290019	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.20	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
26	1023 Quarry Street	117290020	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.20	LDR	MDR	SF	R2

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
27	1025 Quarry Street	117290021	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.20	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
28	S Merrill Street	117133004	Recreational	0.51	LDR	MDR	SF	MFR
29	Ford Street	111042019	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.29	LDR	MDR	R1-7.2	R2
30	Quarry Street	117281009	Vacant	0.24	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
31	Quarry Street	117281011	Vacant	0.23	LDR	MDR	SF	R2
32	6th Street	118283033	Parking lot	0.42	MDR	HDR	MF1	MF
33	6th Street	115080001	Vacant	0.27	MU 2		BP	BP(AHO)
34	44 E Grand Boulevard	117080003	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.18	GC	HDR	GB	MF
35	116 N Victoria Avenue	117080004	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.17	GC	HDR	GB	MF
36	110 N Victoria Avenue	117080005	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.18	GC	HDR	GB	MF
37	108 N Victoria Avenue	117080018	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.17	GC	HDR	GB	MF
38	115 N Victoria Avenue	117080009	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.21	GC	HDR	GB	MF
39	111 N Victoria Avenue	117080022	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.16	GC	HDR	GB	MF



Initial Study Project Description

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning
40	101 S Sheridan Street	117070004	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.24	GC	HDR	GB	MF
41	103 N Sheridan Street	117070003	Vacant	0.17	GC	HDR	GB	MF
42	114 N Belle Avenue	117070006	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.17	GC	HDR	GB	MF
43	110 N Belle Avenue	117070007	Residential: Occupied home, potentially vacant plot separate from fenced-in backyard, existing utilities available	0.17	GC	HDR	GB	MF
44	49 W Grand Boulevard	117070013	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.21	GC	HDR	GB	MF
45	45 W Grand Boulevard	117070014	Residential: Home, occupied, existing utilities available	0.14	GC	HDR	GB	MF
46	E 8th Street	117232006	Vacant	0.16	LDR	HDR	SF	MF
47	E 8th Street	117232005	Vacant	0.18	LDR	HDR	SF	MF
48	312 S Merrill Street	117092007	Commercial: Youth Organization (YMCA Youth Center at Merrill, single building with outdoor recreation area)	0.52	LDR	HDR	SF	MF
49	1220 W Ontario Avenue	113020015	Institutional: Church building with large parking lot, adjacent to field	2.00	LDR	HDR	R1-9.6	R3
50	551 S Joy Street	117165020	Commercial bldg. with parking lot, existing utilities available	0.52	MU1		RO	MF
51	1410 E 6th Street	107020002	Mobile home park	3.82	MU2	HDR	BP	HDR
52	1108 E 5th Street	117332005	Mobile home park	0.5	MU2	MU1	GC	MF

ID No.	Site Address or Street	Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)	Existing On-Site Use(s)	Acres	General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed General Plan	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning	
53	6th Street	117332006	Mobile home park	0.5	MU2	MU1	GC	MF	
54	1111 E 6th Street	117332004	Mobile home park	0.67	MU2	MU1	GC	MF	
55	5th Street	117332003	Mobile home park	0.32	MU2	MU1	GC	MF	
56	6th Street	117332007	Mobile home park	0.17	MU2	MU1	GC	MF	
57	6th Street	117332008	Commercial: Unoccupied building, existing utilities available	0.17	MU2	MU1	GC	MF	
	Source: City of Corona Planning Division (2022)								

2.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

As the existing land uses are comprised of a variety of land uses across the City, the surrounding land uses are similarly varied in character. They consist of residential development, vacant land, commercial and retail uses, parking lots, mobile home parks, institutional and industrial uses, as well as other urban and suburban land uses throughout the City.

2.3 PROJECT COMPONENTS

The City's RHNA allocation for the current cycle calls for accommodating 6,088 units at low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income levels. Of this total allocation, there are planned, recently approved, or Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) that are anticipated for development, which can be counted towards the City's overall unit requirement. To enable the production of units needed to meet the overall unit requirements, the proposed Project has identified vacant units located in existing buildings and is proposing to rezone or apply a new AHO to select properties.

As shown in Table 4 below, vacant parcels (750 units) and nonvacant parcels (452 units) can accommodate a total of approximately 1,202 new housing units, and potential rezone parcels (368 units) and AHO parcels (4,651 units) at a maximum density of 60 units per acre can accommodate a total of approximately 6,221 additional housing units. Based on this, by implementing the Project, the City would be able to accommodate the 2021-2029 RHNA and provide a RHNA-buffer of 39.5 percent for low-income households and 32 percent for moderate-income households.

	Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
RHNA Allocation	2,792	1,096	2,200	6,088
Planned and Approved Units	0	92	2,110	2,202
ADUs Anticipated for Development	46	28	6	80
Remaining RHNA Units Required After Credits	2,746	976	84	3,806
Vacant Units	164	24	562	750
Nonvacant Units	82	115	255	452
Potential Rezone	149	219	0	368
Affordable Housing Overlay (60 du/ac maximum)	3,442	930	279	4,651
Total Units	3,837	1,288	1,096	6,221
Percent Buffer of Remaining Needs after Credits	39.5%	32%		
Total Unit Surplus	1,091	312	1,012	2,415
Source: City of Corona Planning Divis	sion (2022)			

Table 4: Adequacy of Residential Sites Inventory

2.4 SCHEDULE

 \bigcirc

Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would generally occur during the same time frame of the Housing Element, which is from 2021 through 2029.

2.5 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

2.5.1 General Plan Amendment and Zone Change

Anticipated permits, approvals, and consultations include, but are not limited to, the actions described in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Agency Permits and Environmental Review Requirements

Agency	Permits and Other Approvals			
City of Corona	Certification of CEQA document			
	 Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program 			
	 Adoption of the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (if applicable) 			
	General Plan Amendment			
	 Change of Zone / Specific Plan Amendment 			
	 Adoption of Design Guidelines and Development Standards 			
	 Corona Municipal Code, Title 17 Zoning Code Amendment 			

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

INTRODUCTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

As defined by Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for any proposed project.

⊠ According to Section 15065, an EIR is deemed appropriate for a particular proposal if the following conditions occur:

- The proposal has the potential to substantially degrade quality of the environment.
- The proposal has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposal has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposal could cause direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings.

□ According to Section 15070(a), a Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if the proposal would not result in any significant effect on the environment.

□ According to Section 15070(b), a Mitigated Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if it is determined that though a proposal could result in a significant effect, mitigation measures are available to reduce these significant effects to insignificant levels.

This Initial Study has determined that the proposed applications will result in potentially significant environmental impacts and therefore, an Environmental Impact Report is deemed as the appropriate document to provide necessary environmental evaluations and clearance for the proposed Project.

This Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) are prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et. seq.); Section 15070 of the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et. seq.); applicable requirements of the City; and the regulations, requirements, and procedures of any other responsible public agency or an agency with jurisdiction by law.

The City is the Lead Agency, in accordance with Section 15050 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for approving the necessary environmental clearances and analyses for any project in the County.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Intended Uses of Initial Study and Notice of Preparation

This IS and Notice of Preparation (NOP) are informational documents which are intended to inform decision makers, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of potential environmental effects of the proposed applications. The environmental review process has been established to enable public agencies to evaluate environmental consequences and to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing any potentially adverse impacts. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding environmental damage, the Lead Agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including economic and social goals. The IS and NOP prepared for the Project will be circulated for a period of 30 days for public and agency review and comments.

Environmental Assessment Methodology

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact from "Potentially Significant" to "Less than Significant" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics	\boxtimes	Greenhouse Gases	\boxtimes	Public Services
	Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials	\boxtimes	Recreation
\boxtimes	Air Quality		Hydrology and Water Quality	\boxtimes	Transportation
\boxtimes	Biological Resources	\boxtimes	Land Use and Planning	\boxtimes	Tribal Cultural Resources
\boxtimes	Cultural Resources	\boxtimes	Mineral Resources		Utilities and Service Systems
\boxtimes	Energy Resources	\boxtimes	Noise		Wildfires
\boxtimes	Geology and Soils		Population and Housing	\boxtimes	Mandatory Findings of Significance

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Section 3.0, Environmental Checklist and Environmental Evaluation presents the environmental checklist form found in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the Project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. Included in each discussion are project-specific mitigation measures, if needed.

For the checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that could be significant and for which mitigation has not been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared. An Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration (ISMND) cannot be used if there are potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: This designation applies when applicable and feasible mitigation measures previously identified in prior applicable EIRs or in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (General Plan Update EIR) have reduced an effect from "Potentially



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact" and, pursuant to Section 21155.2 of the PRC, those measures are incorporated into the ISMND.

This designation also applies when the incorporation of new project-specific mitigation measures not previously identified in prior applicable EIRs or in the General Plan Update EIR have reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact".

Less Than Significant Impact: Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA, relative to existing standards.

No Impact: The proposed Project would not have any impact.

Important Note to the Reader

The California Supreme Court in a December 2015 opinion [California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 62 Cal. 4th 369 (No. S 213478)] confirmed that CEQA, with several specific exceptions, is concerned with the impacts of a project on the environment, not the effects the existing environment may have on a project. Therefore, the evaluation of the significance of project impacts under CEQA in the following sections focuses on impacts of the Project on the environment, including whether a Project may exacerbate existing environmental hazards.

This is consistent with one of the primary objectives of CEQA and this document, which is to provide objective information to decision-makers and the public regarding the proposed Project as a whole. The CEQA Guidelines and the courts are clear that a CEQA document (e.g., EIR or IS) can include information of interest even if such information is not an "environmental impact" as defined by CEQA.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.1 **AESTHETICS**

	AESTHETICS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact						
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 20199:											
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\boxtimes							
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?			\boxtimes							
c)	In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. (Public Views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the Project is in an urbanized area, the potential of the project to conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?										
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			\boxtimes							

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

As described in the General Plan Update EIR, visual resources in the City include scenic mountain views, scenic city views, prominent scenic vistas and scenic corridors. As the Project implementation would result in future development and more dense residential uses, potential impacts to aesthetics are evaluated below.

3.1.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Scenic vistas generally include extensive panoramic views of natural features, unusual terrain, or unique urban or historic features, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance, and focal views that focus on a particular object, scene or feature of interest. According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, scenic vistas include Chino Hills State Park and Prado Basin to the northwest, San Bernardino Mountains to the North, Cleveland National Forest to the West, Santa Ana Mountains to the south, and the Gavilan Hills to the east. Mountain vistas and views of the Prado Basin are available from all parts of the City and are prominent from within most viewsheds. More rural, open space areas in the far southern and eastern parts of the City provide views of other scenic and natural resources. City views are also available the many ridges and peaks surrounding the City (City of Corona 2019).

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the overall development proposed in the General Plan Update EIR and the related Housing Element Update would allow for currently undeveloped parcels to be developed, as well as permitting the intensification of existing land uses throughout the City, including along publicly available areas which currently provide scenic vistas. The proposed Project is a rezoning program to accommodate the planning of low- and moderate-income households, including an AHO zone and an increase of approximately 2,415 dwelling units, which includes the city's minimum RHNA allocation for low and moderate-income units and a buffer using a maximum density of 60 du/ac in the AHO zone. As with General Plan implementation, Project implementation, including the increased residential density, would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, as the Project would continue to preserve open space areas, parks, and agricultural lands that provide views of scenic vistas and resources.

Furthermore, the General Plan includes goals and policies related to the preservation of scenic vistas in the City. General Plan Goal CD-6 includes the development of land use controls that preserve significant visual resources from potential loss or disruption. As Project implementation would be consistent with the City's General Plan, future development within the City would be required to adhere to the City's General Plan, including applicable design standards and municipal goal requirements. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not adversely impact vistas and scenic resources in and around the City, and impacts would be less than significant. This topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The State Scenic Highway Program, which is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), identifies designated scenic highways across the state. As identified in the General Plan Update EIR, there are no officially designated state scenic highways in the City; however, portions of some highways are considered eligible for designation as a state scenic highway, including portions of State Route (SR) 72, Interstate 15, and SR 91, west of the Interstate 15 interchange (City of Corona 2019). The closest officially designated state scenic highway is SR 91 in Orange County, west of its intersection with SR 55.

The City's General Plan update identified the three state-eligible scenic highways and six additional locally designated highways as City scenic corridors. According to the General Plan Update EIR, the mix of land uses near these identified roadways is varied and includes residential, commercial, office, industrial and other urban/suburban uses. The Project's proposed rezoning program would result in increased density and intensity of uses in many areas of the City; however, adherence to the General Plan, including Goal CD-7 to maintain, establish, develop and protect the City's highways and corridors for scenic purposes, would continue to preserve corridors that currently provide views of scenic vistas. As such, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources from within a state scenic highway, either designated or eligible, and impacts would be less than significant. This topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.


c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. (Public Views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the Project is in an urbanized area, the potential of the project to conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Future residential development associated with Project implementation would be located in an urbanized area; however, portions of these future Project could affect areas along the City's wildland-urban interface. As required by the General Plan, the Community Design Element includes goals and policies that are implemented through more detailed residential and non-residential design guidelines and specifications. Therefore, all development in the City, including that which would occur as a result of Project implementation, would be required to comply with existing regulations relating to the maintenance of the City's character, including development design guidelines which encourage the City's goals and objectives to provide for well-designed and attractive development intended to promote a sense of community. Provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance (City Municipal Code Title 17) are applicable to the development and use of property through the implementation of development standards intended to preserve visual resources and maintain the aesthetic appearance of residential neighborhoods and non-residential properties and corridors (City of Corona 2019). As the proposed Project would be implemented in accordance with the City's General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and all applicable regulations, the increased residential density associated with Project implementation would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Typical current sources of light and glare throughout the City include interior and exterior building lighting, illuminated signage, ballfield lighting, lighting from vehicles along existing roadways, and other ambient lighting present in urbanized settings. Sources of glare include glass or metallic surfaces or finishes, on structures and even off of vehicle windshields, that could cause glare effects. Some of the more suburban, lower density, open space or rural residential areas of the City have less sources of illumination, lighting and glare, particularly those areas adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest (City of Corona 2019). As with the General Plan, implementation of the proposed Project would occur in areas designated for development and would allow for development of currently underutilized and undeveloped parcels in the City. While the increased residential density associated with Project implementation would likely introduce new sources of light and glare the their immediate surroundings, all new development would be required to comply City guidelines and Municipal Code requirements, including Chapter 17.76 (directing lighting in parking areas designed to minimize the effects of spillover lighting) and Chapter 17.86 (requiring exterior lighting to be



Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

directed downward to minimize spillover lighting on adjacent properties, sensitive uses and open space areas).

In addition, the General Plan includes specific policies to minimize the impacts of light and glare, including Policy LU 11.12 (design of commercial projects abutting residential uses), Policy HC-2.4 (ensuring that the potential for lighting and glare impacts are understood when development is proposed), and Policy HC-2.6 (enforcement of performance standards with respect to glare). As future residential development resulting from Project implementation would adhere to the provisions of the General Plan, Municipal Code, and all other applicable regulations related to light and glare, the increased residential density proposed by the Project would not create substantial new sources of light or glare which would adversely affect views in the area. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant, and this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

AC	GRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\square
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

The City's history and development is closely linked to agriculture although agricultural resources in the City have largely been replaced by residential subdivisions. Much of present-day Corona was used by the citrus industry, but over the past 50 years, the land required for agricultural production has gradually transitioned to master-planned developments. According to the City's General Plan, there are no longer agricultural preserves under a Williamson Act contract within the City, and only smaller niche agricultural land uses remain (City of Corona 2020). The vast majority of productive farmland is located in southwest Corona, and the majority of grazing land is located east of the Interstate 15 in the City's sphere of influence (SOI) (City of Corona 2019).

The City's western border is shared by the Cleveland National Forest. The City's hillside and canyons contain a mix of riparian forest, southern sycamore alter riparian woodland, and southern coast live oak riparian forest. Montane coniferous forest resources are also located in several locations in the City, including the westernmost SOI and Sierra del Oro area, Eagle Valley, the western interface with the Cleveland National Forest, and portions of El Cerrito. The Prado Basin also contains areas with forestland, riparian scrub, and woodland forest. Isolated woodlands that could fall under the definition of forest land per PRC Section 12220(g) are located in Temescal Canyon, the western boundary of the City, and west of

Coronita. Additionally, riparian scrub, woodland, and forest lands are predominately found in El Cerrito, Temescal Canyon, and the northern portion of the City, east of the Prado Basin (City of Corona 2019).

3.2.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Finding: No Impact

The Project is proposing a rezoning program to accommodate the planning of low- and moderate-income housing required under the Housing Element Update pursuant to the state's RHNA allocation and incorporation of 594 additional housing units that were not analyzed in the Housing Element Update. The Project is proposing to rezone parcels within the City identified in the Housing Element Update to high-density residential or an AHO zone in order to plan for sites suitable for low- and moderate-income units.

According to the California Department of Conservation (DOC)'s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), a majority of the City is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land. Parcels identified for rezoning or the AHO zone in the Housing Element Update are identified as Urban and Built-Up Land by the DOC and are not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC 2016). Therefore, development of the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: No Impact

According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, there are no parcels of land within the City that are currently under a Williamson Act contract (City of Corona 2019). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract, and there would be no impact.

Of the parcels of land identified in the Housing Element Update for rezoning or the AHO zone, one parcel is currently zoned for agricultural uses. A parcel located at 2550 S Main Street with APN 113-310-005 is zoned Agriculture (A) by the City's zoning code. Though the site is zoned Agriculture, the site is designated as Medium Density Residential by the General Plan and is currently developed with a church complex, parking lot, and industrial land. The site does not include any current agricultural uses, and the surrounding lands are developed with residential and urban uses. The Project proposes to rezone the site to Low Density Multiple Family Residential (R2). With the rezone, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. No other parcels of land identified for rezoning as part of Project implementation are zoned for agricultural purposes; therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.



c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

Finding: No Impact

According to the City's General Plan Update EIR and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), there are no current or planned commercial timber operations subject to a Timber Harvesting Plan in southwest Riverside County, and there are no timber production zones in the City or its SOI (City of Corona 2019). There are no lands within the City that are zoned as forest land, timberland, or zoned for timberland production. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No Impact

As discussed above, portions of the City and SOI contain woodland and forest vegetation, predominately along the eastern and western borders of the City. The parcels proposed for rezoning or the AHO zone are located near the central portion of the City, and there are no forest lands located near the parcels proposed for rezoning. The parcels are located within an urban area, and there are no existing forestlands on these parcels. Therefore, development of the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No Impact

The parcels of land proposed for rezoning is located in an urbanized area surrounded by residential and commercial developments. The parcels are not currently used for agricultural or forest land uses. Due to the location of these parcels within the City, and being located in an existing urbanized area, the Project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or conversion of forest-land to non-forest uses. Therefore, there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.3 AIR QUALITY

	AIR QUALITY Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	\boxtimes			
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	\boxtimes			
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	\boxtimes			
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	\boxtimes			

3.3.1 Environmental Setting

The City is within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which includes all of Orange County and the nondesert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernadino Counties. SoCAB is designated nonattainment for ozone (O₃) and fine inhalable particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) under the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS), nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS, and nonattainment for coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀) under the California AAQS (City of Corona 2019).

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for preparing the air quality management plan (AQMP) for the SoCAB in coordination with SCAG to attain the National AAQS. In March 2017, SCAQMD adopted the 2016 AQMP which is composed of stationary and mobile-source emission reductions from regulatory control measures, incentive-based programs, co-benefits from climate programs, mobile-source strategies, and reductions from federal sources such as aircrafts, locomotives, and ocean-going vessels. Strategies outlined in the 2016 AQMP would be implemented in collaboration between California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP forecasts that the SoCAB will need to increase oxides of nitrogen (NOx) reductions by 45 percent additional reductions above existing regulations for the 2023 ozone standard and 55 percent additional reductions above existing regulations to meet the 2031 ozone standard.

3.3.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

As result of increased development and densification associated with Project implementation, emissions would be generated during both construction and operation of individual developments. Project



implementation has the potential to cause significant environmental effects through conflict or obstruction of the applicable air quality plans. Therefore, these impacts will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The proposed Project site is located in a non-attainment area for National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). As such, Project implementation has the potential to cause significant environmental effects through a potential cumulatively considerable net increase of particulate matter during construction. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

While it is unlikely that sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations, due to construction or operation of the proposed Project, there is the potential to cause significant environmental effects if such exposure were to occur. Implementation of the proposed Project would include the development and operation of new and more intense land uses that could generate new sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) in the City, from both stationary and mobile sources. As such, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Project implementation could cause the generation of new sources of odors or other emissions. Generally, residential land uses do not generate odors that could affect a substantial number of people, because they are not considered a typical odor-producing source, such as a waste treatment facility or an industrial operation. While it is unlikely that substantial numbers of people could be adversely affected by odors due to construction or operation of the proposed Project, there is the potential for the Project to result in other emissions. Therefore, these potentially significant impacts will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.4 **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes		
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		\boxtimes		
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				\boxtimes
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				\boxtimes

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

While highly urbanized, the City contains significant expanses of vegetation along its periphery and within its SOI areas. Open space areas surrounding the City supports a variety of plants and animals native to California and the combination of terrain, drainages and creeks, and other natural features provide opportunities for habitat and wildlife species.

The City is surrounded by expansive natural areas, such as the Cleveland National Forest, Chino Hills State Park, Prado Basin, Lake Matthews-Gavilan Plateau, and other areas, which may be crossed by a wide variety of wildlife species. These species move between patches of suitable habitat in undisturbed landscapes and environments fragmented by development. In the City, the few areas with natural characteristics that could be used by wildlife as movement or migratory corridors occur in orchards and along drainages. The most prominent features that may provide valuable habitat linkage are the Bedford

Canyon Wash and Temescal Canyon Wash, which connect the Cleveland National Forest and the Lake Mathews Estelle Mountain Reserve. There are no other notable wildlife movement and migratory corridors in the City (City of Corona 2020).

The City and its SOI have many biological resources, although most have been found or could be present in undeveloped areas of the SOI and not necessarily within the City itself. These resources include: 12 sensitive natural communities, 5 designated critical habitats for threatened or endangered species, 64 special status plant species, 59 special status wildlife species, and several wildlife movement corridors.

In the City and its SOI, several animals and plants have been designated federal endangered, federal threatened, and/or state endangered species. These species also have designated critical habitat areas in the vicinity of the City and its SOI. These areas include the Prado Dam, the Santa Ana River emanating from the dam, and the southwest portion of the SOI abutting the Cleveland National Forest. According to the California Natural Diversity Database and the California Native Plant Society Rare Plant Inventory, 64 special status plant species may be present in the City or SOI. Of those species, 11 have been sighted in the City or its SOI (City of Corona 2020).

3.4.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

This Project sets the framework for future growth and development in the City by providing additional opportunities for development of low- and moderate-income housing, and therefore, it does not directly result in development. Certification of the Project itself would not lead to alteration or modification biological resources or habitats, and before any development or redevelopment activities could occur on identified parcels, they would be required to be analyzed for conformance with the requirements of CEQA. The Project's identified parcels are located within a highly urbanized area and are not located in areas identified as designated critical habitat for wildlife species in the City. Biological resources in the City exist within several large areas of open space surrounding the City and the SOI and are not located directly within the City. According to the General Plan Update EIR, sensitive natural communities recorded within the City and SOI are located along the edges of the City and SOI (City of Corona 2019). Future residential development resulting from Project implementation is unlikely to result in adverse effects to special status species, as the identified parcels are either currently developed with existing uses or located in areas surrounded by development. Therefore, it is unlikely that these parcels would provide suitable habitats for wildlife species. However, vacant parcels could contain wildlife species and habitats, and Project implementation could have an adverse effect on special status species.

Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would also be required to implement General Plan policies identified to reduce impacts to the City's biological resources. In addition to General



Plan policies, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with the Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Adherence to General Plan policies and the MSHCP would assist in reducing impacts to special status species. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 which require future development projects to include a biological resources survey in compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and outline procedures for when sensitive biological resources are identified within or adjacent to the proposed development project area.

Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would also be required to implement General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measure BIO-7, which requires pre-construction nesting bird surveys for new developments. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act is administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and protects migratory birds, their eggs, parts and nests. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-7 would minimize impacts to migratory birds that are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 and BIO-7 would ensure that impacts to special status and protected species are avoided or minimized, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Applicants for future development projects shall include a biological resources survey. The biological resources survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The biological resources survey shall include, but not be limited to:

- An analysis of available literature and biological databases, such as the California Natural Diversity Database, to determine sensitive biological resources that have been reported historically from the proposed development project vicinity.
- A review of current land use and land ownership within the proposed development project vicinity.
- An assessment and mapping of vegetation communities present within the proposed development project vicinity.
- An evaluation of potential local and regional wildlife movement corridors.
- A general assessment of potential jurisdictional areas, including wetlands and riparian habitats.

<u>Habitat Assessment</u>. If the proposed development project site supports vegetation communities that may provide habitat for plant or wildlife species, a focused habitat assessment shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the potential for special status plant and/or animal species to occur within or adjacent to the proposed development project area. Adjoining properties should also be surveyed where direct or indirect project effects, such as those from fuel modification or herbicide application, could potentially extend off-site. If feasible, the habitat assessment should be conducted during non-drought years. Vegetation communities should be classified and mapped to the alliance or association level using classification methods and membership rules according to A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd edition (2009).



<u>Focused Surveys</u>. If one or more special status species has the potential to occur within the proposed development project area, focused species surveys shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of these species to adequately evaluate potential direct and/or indirect impacts to these species. The focused survey shall record the location and boundary of special status species by use of global positioning system (GPS). The number of individuals in each special status plant population shall be provided as counted (if population is small) or estimated (if population is large). If applicable, information about the percentage of individuals in each life stage, such as seedlings vs. reproductive individuals, should be provided. If feasible, images of the target species and representative habitats should be included to support information and descriptions.

<u>Preconstruction Surveys</u>. If construction activities are not initiated immediately after focused surveys have been completed, additional preconstruction special status species surveys may be required to ensure impacts are avoided or minimized to the extent feasible. If preconstruction activities are required, a qualified biologist would perform these surveys as required for each special status species that is known to occur or has a potential to occur within or adjacent to the proposed development project area.

<u>Biological Resources Report</u>. The results of the biological survey for proposed development projects with no significant impacts may be presented in a biological survey letter report. For proposed development projects with significant impacts that require mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, the results of the biological survey shall be presented in a biological technical report.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: If sensitive biological resources are identified within or adjacent to the proposed development project area, the construction limits shall be clearly flagged to ensure impacts to sensitive biological resources are avoided or minimized to the extent feasible. Prior to implementing construction activities, a qualified biologist shall verify that the flagging clearly delineates the construction limits and sensitive resources to be avoided.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: If sensitive biological resources are known to occur within or adjacent to the proposed development project area, a project-specific contractor training program shall be developed and implemented to educate project contractors on the sensitive biological resources within and adjacent to the proposed development project area and measures being implemented to avoid and/or minimize impacts to these species. A qualified biologist shall develop and implement the contractor training program.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: If sensitive biological resources are present within or adjacent to the proposed development project area and impacts may occur from implementation of construction activities, a qualified biological monitor may be required during a portion or all of the construction activities to ensure impacts to the sensitive biological resources are avoided or minimized to the extent feasible. The specific biological monitoring requirements shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. The qualified biological monitor shall be approved by the City on a project-by-project basis based on applicable experience with the sensitive biological resources that may be impacted.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: The City of Corona shall require applicants for future development projects to contract with a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction general nesting bird survey within all suitable nesting habitats that may be impacted by active construction during general avian breeding season

(February 1 through August 31). The preconstruction surveys shall be conducted no more than 7 days prior to initiation of construction. If no active avian nests are identified within the proposed development project area or within a 300-foot buffer of the proposed development project area, no further mitigation is necessary. If active nests of avian species covered by the Fish and Game Code are detected within the proposed development project area or within a 300-foot buffer of the group development project area, no further mitigation is necessary. If active nests of avian species covered by the Fish and Game Code are detected within the proposed development project area or within a 300-foot buffer of the proposed development project area, construction shall be halted until the young have fledged, until a qualified biologist has determined the nest is inactive, or until appropriate mitigation measures that respond to the specific situation have been developed and implemented in consultation with the regulatory agencies. Based on the discretion of the qualified biologist, the 300-foot buffer may be expanded as appropriate to the species.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

Figure 5.4-5 of the General Plan Update EIR identifies areas within the City with riparian vegetation communities, including wetlands, rivers, streams, and other riverine habitats. These water resources may support biological resources, including riparian vegetation and associated wildlife species. As described above, implementation of General Plan policies would help protect and manage the City's biological resources. According to Figure 5.4-5 of the General Plan Update EIR, future residential development resulting from Project implementation are not located in areas identified as being within riparian vegetation communities. However, the Project implementation could impact riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities if it is located in the vicinity of these communities or if the identified parcels themselves include unidentified riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. Therefore, the Project would be required to implement General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4, identified above. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 would ensure that the identified parcels go through a biological resources survey prior to development to assess the parcels for potential riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities and would mitigate any potential impacts if sensitive biological resources are discovered. Therefore, with implementation of General Plan policies and Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 identified in the General Plan Update EIR, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not have substantial adverse effects on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

According to the General Plan Update EIR, the City has a number of potential wetlands that may be regulated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and/or Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to several



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

federal and state regulations, which include freshwater lakes/ponds, creeks, washed, aguifers, and other blue line streams. Figure 5.4-5 in the General Plan Update EIR identified areas of known wetlands within the City. The parcels proposed for rezoning under the Project are not located in areas identified as having wetlands; however, there is still a potential for wetlands to occur onsite or for the Project to be located within the vicinity of wetlands. Therefore, the Project may result in impacts to state or federally protected wetlands. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies to minimize potential impacts to wetlands. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measure BIO-5 which would require preparation of jurisdictional delineations mapping waters, wetlands, and riparian habitats jurisdictional to the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB and specifying impacts to such resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would also require project applicants to obtain permits and authorizations from the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB specifying measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts. With implementation of General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure BIO-5 identified in the General Plan Update EIR, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not have substantial adverse effects on state or federally protected wetlands, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: The City of Corona shall require applicants of development project that have the potential to affect jurisdictional resources to contract with a qualified biologist to conduct a jurisdictional delineation following the methods outlined in the 1987 USACE *Wetland Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the USACE Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region* (USACE 2008) to map the extent of wetlands and non-wetland waters, determine jurisdiction, and assess potential impacts. The results of the delineation shall be presented in a wetland delineation report and shall be incorporated into the CEQA document(s) required for approval and permitting of the proposed development project.

Applicants of development projects that have the potential to impact jurisdictional features, as identified in the wetland delineation letter report, shall obtain permits and authorizations from the Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and/or Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The regulatory agency authorization(s) would include impact avoidance and minimization measures as well as mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts. Specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts to jurisdictional resources shall be determined through discussions with the regulatory agencies during the proposed development project permitting process and may include monetary contributions to a mitigation bank or habitat creation, restoration, or enhancement.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Parcels identified for rezoning as part of the Project are located within the central portion of the City and are located within a highly urbanized area. Figure 5.4-7 in the City's General Plan Update EIR identified areas of potential wildlife movement corridors. Areas where the identified parcels for the Project are located are not located within areas identified as potential wildlife movement corridors. Parcels identified for future



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

residential development resulting from Project implementation are either currently developed with existing uses or are located within highly urbanized areas with existing development surrounding the sites. Therefore, the potential for identified parcels to be used by wildlife species as movement corridors or nursery sites are highly unlikely. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies identified to reduce impacts to wildlife movement. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: No Impact

Chapter 12.22. Community Forestry Program, of the City's Municipal Code recognizes, designates, and protects landmark trees. Pursuant to the municipal code, the City Council can designate a tree as a "landmark tree" on City property if it meets certain criteria adopted by resolution of the council. The Municipal Code restricts permanent removal of landmark trees except in emergency situations. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to abide by this regulation and ensure the Project does not lead to removal of designated landmark trees. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Finding: No Impact

The City is a participant in the Western Riverside County MSHCP which is a comprehensive, multijurisdictional plan that addresses biological and ecological diversity by conserving species and associated habitats while allowing approval of development in western Riverside County (City of Corona 2019). If one of the Project's identified parcels is located in "criteria area" of the MSHCP, the Project would be required to obtain approval from the Regional Conservation Authority and a permit from the local responsible agency and, if approved, would be required to pay fees for review and construction in accordance with Municipal Code Chapter 16.33, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee (City of Corona 2019). The Project's identified parcels are not located within the MSHCP's "criteria area," and therefore, the Project would not conflict with the MSHCP.

The City has prepared a long-term habitat conservation plan (HCP) for Stephen's kangaroo rat that is administered by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency. Projects located in the eastern and southern portions of the City and its SOI would be required to comply with the HCP for the Stephen's



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

kangaroo rat. The Project is not located in areas designated as a Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Fee Area, as demonstrated by Figure 5.4-1 in the General Plan Update EIR. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat HCP.

Although the City is under the jurisdiction of the Western Riverside County MSHCP and the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat HCP, the identified Project parcels are not located within areas identified as "criteria area" by the MSHCP or Stephen's Kangaroo Rat boundaries in the HCP. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not conflict with provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

	CULTURAL and TRIBAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		\boxtimes		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		\boxtimes		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\square	

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

The City is located within an ethnographic transition zone between three Native American groups: the Juaneño, the Gabrielino, and the Cahuilla. It is said that these Native American groups occupied the Corona area in the early 1700s, prior to the arrival of the Spanish. During the early 1800s, lands within the City were part of several Mexican land grants, and with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in 1848, Mexico ceded the area to the United States with the rest of California (City of Corona 2020).

Archaeological resources refer to any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 50 years of age and that can provide scientific or humanistic understanding of past human behavior, cultural adaptation, and related topics. The City and its SOI are sensitive for existing archaeological resources, and cultural records search show 70 recorded resources within the City, of which 30 are prehistoric archaeological sites, 38 are historic archaeological sites, and two are multicomponent resources (City of Corona 2020).

Architectural and historic resources typically refer to resources that date back a century or more. The City has a documented variety of historic resources. The Corona Register of Historic Resources and the Corona Heritage Inventory comprise 482 buildings, structures, and sites of local significance, civic identity, and character. Additionally, there are several sites within the City that are listed or are eligible for listing for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (City of Corona 2020). The City has established ten historic districts within the City.

3.5.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as identified in Section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

According to the General Plan Update EIR, there are 31 previously recorded built environment resources identified within the City, as well as seven historic properties defined as listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP. Within the City, there are no State Historic Landmarks, but there are two State Historical Points of



Interest. The five properties listed on the NRHP are automatically eligible for listing to the CRHR; additionally, there are eight other properties that are eligible for CRHR. The Corona Register of Historic Resources contains 367 individual built-environment resources. Additionally, there are 57 identified properties that are listed on the Corona Historic Landmarks, and 10 identified Historic Markers (City of Corona 2019).

Development of the Project could adversely impact some of these historic resources if they are located on or near an identified resource. Known or future historic sites or resources listed in the national, California, or local registers maintained by the City would be protected through local ordinances, General Plan policies, and state and federal regulations restricting alteration, relocation, and demolition of historical resources. Compliance with the proposed General Plan policies and state and federal regulations would ensure that development would not result in adverse impacts to identified historic resources (City of Corona 2019).

This Project sets the framework for future growth and development in the City by providing additional opportunities for development of low- and moderate-income housing, and therefore, it does not directly result in development. Certification of the Project itself would not lead to demolition or alteration of any historic resources. Furthermore, the Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 identified in the City's General Plan Update EIR. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 would reduce potential impacts to historic and cultural resources and include requirements for historic resources assessments to be conducted on an individual project level, setting standards and regulations for future developments that may impact historical and cultural resources. Therefore, compliance with existing laws and regulations and implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update EIR, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Prior to any construction activities that may affect historical resources (i.e., structures 45 years or older), a historical resources assessment shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history. This shall include a records search to determine if any resources that may be potentially affected by the project have been previously recorded, evaluated, and/or designated in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or Corona Register of Historic Resources. Following the records search, the qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct a reconnaissance-level and/or intensive-level survey in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) guidelines to identify any previously unrecorded potential historical resources that may be potentially affected by the proposed project. Pursuant to the definition of a historical resource under CEQA, potential historical resources shall be evaluated under a developed historic context.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: To ensure that projects requiring the relocation, rehabilitation, or alteration of a historical resource not impair its significance, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent possible. The application of the standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the PQS. Prior to any



construction activities that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City of Corona.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If a proposed project would result in the demolition or significant alteration of a historical resource, it cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, recordation of the resource prior to construction activities will assist in reducing adverse impacts to the resource to the greatest extent possible. Recordation shall take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation, and shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the PQS. Documentation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; medium- or large-format black and white photographs, negatives, and prints; and supplementary information such as building plans and elevations, and/or historic photographs. Documentation shall be reproduced on archival paper and placed in appropriate local, state, or federal institutions. The specific scope and details of documentation would be developed at the project level.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: If cultural resources that are eligible for listing to the NRHP, CRHR, or Corona Register of Historic Resources are identified within or adjacent to the proposed development, the construction limits shall be clearly flagged to assure impacts to eligible cultural resources are avoided or minimized to the extent feasible. Prior to implementing construction activities, a qualified archaeologist shall verify that the flagging clearly delineates the construction limits and eligible resources to be avoided. Since the location of some eligible cultural resources is confidential, these resources will be flagged as environmentally sensitive areas.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

As discussed above, approval of the proposed Project by itself would not directly affect archaeological resources as the Project sets the framework for future growth and development in the City by providing additional opportunities for development of low- and moderate-income housing and, therefore, does not directly result in development. However, Project implementation could indirectly affect archaeological resources, as it would allow for future development of the sites. Grading and construction activities of parcels identified for the Project could require earth moving activities that could potentially unearth previously unrecorded resources.

According to the General Plan Update EIR, there are 70 cultural resources within the City, which include 30 prehistoric archaeological sites, 38 historic archaeological sites, 2 multicomponent resources, and 6 resources located on the border between the City and its SOI. There are multiple known fossil localities within the City, as well as within the vicinity (City of Corona 2019).

Archaeological sites are protected by a wide variety of state policies and regulations under the California Public Resources Code, and cultural resources receive protection under both the California Public Resources Code and CEQA. Long term implementation of the Project could allow development including

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

construction activities and grading in areas with undiscovered archaeological resources. Therefore, the Project could result in potential unearthing of previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological resources and result in significant impacts. The Project would be required to implement General Plan policies related to reducing impacts of potential development on cultural resources and would be required to comply with existing laws and regulations pertaining to archaeological and cultural resources. Additionally, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-5, identified in the General Plan Update EIR. Mitigation Measure CUL-5 requires that an archaeological resources assessment be conducted for future development projects and outlines procedures to be followed depending on the results of the archaeological resources and compliance with existing laws and regulations, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure CUL-5: To determine the archaeological sensitivity for discretionary projects within the City, an archaeological resources assessment shall be performed under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards (PQS) in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. The assessments shall include a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search and a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The records searches shall determine if the proposed project has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. A Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in areas that are undeveloped to locate any surface cultural materials.

- a. If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified through an archaeological resources assessment, and impacts to these resources cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the PQS prior to any construction-related ground-disturbing activities to determine significance. If resources determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. These might include a Phase III data recovery program that would be implemented by a qualified archaeologist and shall be performed in accordance with the Office of Historic Preservation's Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format (1990) and Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs (1991).
- b. If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources within the proposed General Plan area but indicated the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all ground disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting, and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate

vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the PQS. If the discovery proves to be significant, it shall be curated with a recognized scientific or educational repository.

c. If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources, but indicates the area to be of medium sensitivity for archaeological resources, an archaeologist who meets the PQS shall be retained on an on-call basis. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting, and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call archaeologist is contacted. If the discovery proves to be significant, it shall be curated with a recognized scientific or educational repository.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Project construction activities could result in unknown human remains being unearthed during earth moving activities. The General Plan Update EIR identified that General Plan policy HR-3.8 would minimize potential impacts. General Plan policy HR-3.8 identifies the required procedures in the event of the discovery or a burial, human bone, or suspected human bones during construction activities. California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5; CEQA Section 15064.5; and PRC Section 5097.98, mandate the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery. California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, requires that if human remains are discovered on a project site, disturbance of the site shall remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the PRC. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (City of Corona 2019). Although construction activities associated with development of the Project could result in the discovery of human remains, compliance with existing law would ensure that significant impacts to human remains would not occur. Therefore, implementation of relevant General Plan policy and compliance with existing laws and regulations would ensure that future residential development resulting from Project implementation does not disturb any human remains, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.6 ENERGY RESOURCES

	ENERGY RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	\boxtimes			
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			\boxtimes	

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

Southern California Edison (SCE) is the provider of electrical services to most of the City and its SOI. Total electricity consumption in SCE's service area, which spans much of southern California from Orange and Riverside Counties on the south to Santa Barbara County on the west to Mono County to the north, in gigawatt-hours (GWh) was 102,521 GWh in 2018 (City of Corona 2019). Sources of electricity sold by Southern California Edison (SCE) in 2017 were:

- 32 percent renewable, consisting mostly of solar and wind
- 8 percent large hydroelectric
- 20 percent natural gas
- 6 percent nuclear
- 34 percent unspecified sources

On April 4, 2001, the City Council passed Resolution No. 2001-25, which established a municipally owned electric utility. In August 2001, this electric utility, which is part of the Corona Department of Water and Power (DWP) [Corona DWP has since been renamed Corona Utilities Department], entered into an agreement with SCE to provide retail services as an electric services provider. Corona Utilities buys and sells power on behalf of the City's municipal electric accounts and properties within specific service areas. In 2018, the estimated existing electricity demand for residential developments in the City was 371,670,609 kWh (kilowatt-hours) per year, with the City and SOI having a total demand of 1,412,642,823 kWh per year (City of Corona 2019).

Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) provides natural gas services to the City and maintains transmission and distribution lines through the City and SOI. The service area of SoCalGas spans much of the southern half of California, from Imperial County in the southeast, to San Luis Obispo County in the northwest, to part of Fresno County in the north, and to Riverside County and most of San Bernardino County in the east. According to the General Plan Update EIR, existing natural gas demands in the City for residential developments is 19.4 million therms per year, and total natural gas demand for the City and its SOI was estimated at 43.9 million therms per year (City of Corona 2019).

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.6.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Construction and operation of the proposed Project would result in an increased intensity of uses and more residential units than were originally envisioned under the General Plan and Housing Element. These additional uses would consume more energy which could result in a potentially significant environmental impact. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

According to the General Plan Update EIR, the state's electricity grid is transitioning to renewable energy under the California Renewables Portfolio Standards (RPS) Program. In general, the state has RPDS requirements of 33 percent renewable energy by 2020, 40 percent by 2024, 50 percent by 2026, 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045 (City of Corona 2019). The statewide RPS requirements do not directly apply to individual development projects, but to utilities and energy providers such as SCE and Corona Utilities. The Project is intended to be consistent with the implementing General Plan, and individual development projects constructed as a result of Project implementation would be required to comply with the current and future iterations the Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies which support the statewide goal of transitioning the electricity grid to renewable sources. Therefore, with the implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with existing standards and regulations related to renewable energy, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. 			\boxtimes	
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			\square	
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes	
	iv. Landslides?			\boxtimes	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes	
C)	Be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			\boxtimes	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			\boxtimes	
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

The City is situated in the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province which encompasses an area that extends approximately 900 miles from the Transverse Ranges and the Los Angeles Basin, south to the southern tip of Baja California (City of Corona 2019). The province consists of a northwest-southeast oriented complex of blocks separated by similarly trending faults. Project parcels are located in areas with a basement bedrock complex consisting of Holocene to Late Pleistocene age younger sediments and Pleistocene older sediments, as identified in Figure 5.7-1 of the General Plan Update EIR.

Major active faults zones are located within the City and its surrounding areas. Mapped Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones within the City are associated with the Chino Fault and Glen Ivy segment of the Elsinore Fault and

active and potentially active faults are located close to the City. The Peninsular Ranges Province is traversed by a group of subparallel fault zones trending northwest. Major fault systems include the active San Andreas, San Jacinto, Whittier-Elsinore, and Newport-Inglewood Fault Zones which form a regional tectonic framework consisting of primarily of right-lateral, strike-slip movement. The City is located between two major, active fault zones; the Whittier-Elsinore Fault Zone located to the southwest and the San Jacinto Fault located to the northeast.

3.7.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

- a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Fault Rupture

According to the California Geologic Survey (CGS) California Earthquake Hazards Zone Map, much of the western portion of the City extending southeast through the Project area and the General Plan SOI is located within a fault zone (CGS 2021). Though none of the parcels identified for rezoning and AHO zoning are located within an identified fault zone, due to the proximity to the fault zone, there are significant risks for the Project to be impacted by rupture of a known earthquake fault. The General Plan Update EIR identified that mandatory compliance with existing regulations, including preparation and submittal of seismicity reports prior to approval of grading plans, would ensure that surface fault rupture impacts to any new development within the City would be reduced to a less than significant level (City of Corona 2019). Therefore, with compliance with existing regulations and preparation of seismicity reports, Project implementation would have a less than significant impact related to rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Seismic Ground Shaking

Due to the City's proximity to several major faults, there is a significant potential for seismic ground shaking to occur. The General Plan Update EIR identified that although there is no way to avoid ground shaking and earthquake hazards, compliance with the California Building Code (CBC), including specific provisions for seismic design would mitigate and minimize the effects of earthquakes. The CBC is accepted as the basic design standard for the City and Riverside County (City of Corona 2019). The Project would be



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

required to design structures in accordance with the CBC requirements to minimize the effects of ground shaking to the greatest degree feasible, and therefore, Project implementation would have a less than significant impact related to seismic ground shaking.

Seismic related ground failure (liquefaction)

According to the General Plan Update EIR, Figure 5.7-5 Liquefaction Hazards, areas within the City with high to very high liquefaction susceptibility are located within the northern portion of the City (City of Corona 2019). The majority of the Project site is located in areas with very low to low susceptibility to liquefaction, with a small portion being located in areas with moderate susceptibility. The General Plan Update EIR identifies that although liquefaction is expected within the City, mandatory compliance with existing regulations, including the preparation and submittal of soil engineering reports, reduces liquefaction impacts to new developments within the area to a less than significant level. Therefore, with compliance with existing regulations and preparation of soil engineering reports, Project implementation would have a less than significant impact related to seismic related ground failure.

Landslides

According to Figure 5.7-3 of the General Plan Update EIR, the Project is not located within areas with high landslide hazard potential (City of Corona 2019). The General Plan Update EIR identified that any grading permit for a hillside development must have an engineering geology report prepared and submitted to the City. Compliance with this requirement would reduce impacts and landslide impacts are not expected for any new developments in the City. Therefore, Project implementation would have a less than significant impact related to landslides.

City Municipal Code Chapter 15.36, Grading Regulations, requires submittal of grading plans and a geotechnical evaluation to minimize differential settlement and the slipping or sliding of earth, minimizing impacts from unstable geologic or soil conditions. The City also requires a soils engineering report that includes an evaluation to determine the presence of expansive or corrosive soil conditions. The recommendations in the geotechnical reports (soils engineering, engineering geology, and seismicity reports) are required to be incorporated into the grading plans and implemented during construction of projects. Mandatory compliance with existing regulations, including the preparation and submission of soil engineering studies, geotechnical evaluations, and seismicity reports for new developments would reduce potential impacts to a less than signification level. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with General Plan policies related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, by complying with applicable regulations, preparation of required reports and studies, and compliance with relevant General Plan policies, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not cause substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a fault, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, or landslides, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The General Plan Update EIR identified that soils in the City are prone to erosion during the grading phase of development projects. To reduce the potential for erosion during construction activities, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies best management practices (BMPs) for temporary erosion control measures, is required. Standard erosion control measures would be implemented as part of the SWPPP to minimize the risk of erosion or sedimentation during construction. Additionally, the SWPPP is required to include an erosion control plan that describes measures such as phased grading, limiting areas of disturbance, and diverting runoff from disturbed areas. The erosion control plan, which is required under Section 15.36.060 of the City's Municipal Code, would also be required to include treatment measures to trap sediment. The Project would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and erosion control plan to minimize soil erosion impacts that could result from Project implementation. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

c) Would the project be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The General Plan Update EIR identified that the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.36 requires development projects to submit grading plans and a geotechnical evaluation to minimize differential settlement and the slipping or sliding of earth. Compliance with this requirement would minimize impacts resulting from unstable geologic or soil conditions. Additionally, the City requires a soils engineering report that describes and evaluates the nature, distribution, and physical and chemical properties of existing soils to identify the presence of expansive or corrosive soil conditions. As described above, the recommendations included in the geotechnical reports are required to be included in the grading plans and implemented during project development. Furthermore, the General Plan Update EIR describes that site specific mass grading and compaction that would occur as part of future development in the City would mitigate any potential impacts from seismically induced lateral spreading, settlement, and collapse. Compliance with existing regulations, including the preparation and implementation of soil engineering and geotechnical evaluations for new development resulting from Project implementation would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of Project implementation, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The General Plan Update EIR identified that the City and SOI are known to have a low to moderate potential for expansive soils, and the presence of expansive soils in areas proposed for construction would be considered a potentially significant impact. However, the General Plan Update EIR identifies that implementation of existing codes, regulations and policies that serve to mitigate impacts of development within areas containing expansive soils would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Project would be required to prepare and submit a soil engineering report, and geotechnical evaluations as required under Chapter 15.36 of the Municipal Code. Recommendations in the geotechnical reports are required to be implemented into grading plans and during construction activities related to future residential development resulting from Project implementations. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with CBC and grading regulations that would minimize the risks associated with development proposed in areas containing expansive soils. With implementation of recommendations included in geotechnical reports and adherence to existing regulations related to development in areas with expansive soils, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Finding: No Impact

General Plan policy IU-3.8 requires that new developments be connected to the City's sewer system. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

There are multiple known fossil localities within the City and its vicinity. As shown in General Plan Update EIR Figure 5.7-6, areas of the City that include potential Project rezoning parcels are identified as high sensitivity to paleontological resources and low-to-high sensitivity that increases with depth. The Project is proposing rezoning and AHO zones for parcels within the City, in order to provide for more areas where higher-density residential development could be constructed. This would result in an increased intensity of construction activities, including grading that could occur on land within the City with sensitivity to paleontological resources, and unknown paleontological resources could be unearthed. Implementation of the proposed Project would require compliance with policies included in the General Plan pertaining to paleontological resources. However, the General Plan Update EIR identifies that although compliance with



General Plan policies would minimize impacts to paleontological resources from new development and redevelopment, soil excavations would continue to have the potential for significant impacts on paleontological resources. Therefore, the General Plan Update EIR identified Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-6 to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1 through GEO-6 prescribe requirements for monitoring based on the sensitivity of sites in the City for paleontological resources. Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-6 are applicable to the Project. Mitigation Measures GEO-4 and GEO-5 pertain to Projects located in areas mapped as having low or unknown sensitivity, and as the Project area is located in areas mapped as high and low-to-high sensitivity, these mitigation measures are not applicable to the Project. Therefore, with implementation of General Plan policies and General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3 and GEO-6, impacts to paleontological resources from future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be mitigated to a less than significant level. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: High and Low-to-High Sensitivity. In areas designated as having "high" or "low-to-high" sensitivity for paleontological resources, the project applicant shall be required to submit a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP). The PRMMP shall be prepared by a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the standards of Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The plan shall address specifics of monitoring and mitigation based on the project area and project's construction plan, and shall take into account updated geologic mapping, geotechnical data, updated paleontological records searches, and changes to the regulatory framework at the time of analysis. The PRMMP shall be submitted to the City of Corona's Community Development Department prior to approval of a grading permit.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: High Sensitivity. Projects involving ground disturbances in previously undisturbed areas mapped as having "high" paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor on a full-time basis, under the supervision of the Qualified Paleontologist. Monitoring shall include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, if the fossils are determined to be significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. The paleontological monitor shall use field data forms to record pertinent location and geologic data, measure stratigraphic sections (if applicable), and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Low-to-High Sensitivity. Projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped with "low-to-high" paleontological sensitivity shall require monitoring if construction activity exceeds the depth of the low-sensitivity surficial sediments. The underlying sediments may have high sensitivity; therefore, work in those units shall require paleontological monitoring, as designated by the Qualified Paleontologist in the Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP).

Mitigation Measure GEO-6: All Projects. In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work shall halt within a 50-foot radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a Qualified Paleontologist. Significant fossils shall be recovered, prepared to the point of



curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The most likely repository is the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLA). The repository shall be identified, and a curatorial arrangement shall be signed, prior to collection of the fossils.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.8 GREENHOUSE GASES

	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	\boxtimes			
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	\boxtimes			

3.8.1 Environmental Setting

An emissions inventory of the City of Corona and SOI was conducted for the General Plan Update EIR for the existing residential, institutional, commercial, office, and industrial uses identified on Figure 3-4, Existing Land Use in the General Plan Update EIR. GHG emissions generated in the City and SOI were estimated using EMFAC2017, OFFROAD2017, and data provided by SCE (electricity), SoCalGas (natural gas), and the City of Corona (electricity and water use). Emissions in the City and SOI come from the following sources:

- Transportation: Emissions from vehicle trips beginning and ending in the City and SOI boundaries and from external/internal vehicle trips (i.e., trips that either begin or end in the City and SOI).
- Energy: Emissions generated from purchased electricity and natural gas consumption used for cooking and heating in the City and SOI.
- Solid Waste Disposal: Indirect emissions from waste generated in the City and SOI.
- Water/Wastewater: Emissions from electricity used to supply, treat, and distribute water based on the overall water demand and wastewater generation in the City and SOI.
- Area Sources: Emissions generated from light commercial equipment, agricultural, and construction equipment use in the City and SOI.

3.8.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

This Project sets the framework for future growth and development in the City by providing additional opportunities for development of low- and moderate-income housing and therefore, does not directly result in development. Certification of the Project itself would not lead to direct greenhouse gas emissions; however, development of the identified parcels would result in greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore,



the Project could generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The Project identified parcels in the City to be rezoned and proposes to establish an AHO zone to allow for more residential development in the City. Development of the parcels would require activities that would result in more greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, Project implementation may conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions and greenhouse gases, and this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			\boxtimes	
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			\boxtimes	
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			\boxtimes	
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?			\boxtimes	
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			\boxtimes	

3.9.1 Environmental Setting

Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, and any material that a business or implementing agency has a reasonable basis for believing would be injurious to public health and safety or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.

The City's hazardous waste generators include more than 300 licensed commercial and industrial businesses and uses that generate some form of hazardous materials or waste. The EPA regulates generators of hazardous waste based on the amount of waste generated. Major concentrations of industrial land uses in the City and the General Plan SOI are located near the BNSF Railway tracks and SR 91 in the northern half of the City and SOI, and two sand and gravel quarries are located in the northeast quadrant of the City and SOI. Other additional industrial land uses are scattered throughout the City (City of Corona 2019). Additionally, there are several hazardous materials cleanup sites within the City and SOI that are listed on several databases, including the State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker website.

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.9.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Construction

Construction activities associated with future residential development resulting from Project implementation is anticipated to involve demolition, grading, and construction of new structures. Hazardous materials, such as paints, sealants, solvents, diesel fuels, and other typical construction materials, would be used during construction, resulting in the potential for these materials to spill or create hazardous conditions. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with all applicable regulations and General Plan policies that would minimize risks associated with the use of hazardous materials during construction activities, and they would be required to adhere to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the Corona Fire Department (CFD) throughout Project implementation.

Operation

The Project is proposing the rezoning and establishment of AHO zones for identified parcels in the City to allow for more residential development. Though the parcels would be zoned and designated for residential uses, some residential zoning in the City allows for a variety of land uses, including mixed-use, commercial, office, civic, and open space uses. Operation of future residential uses would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials used for routine cleaning and maintenance purposes, such as paints, household cleaners, fertilizers, and pesticides. If the parcels are not developed with residential uses but with a retail/commercial use, the use of commercial-grade chemicals, cleaners, and solvents would be anticipated. With the implementation of applicable General Plan policies and compliance with all applicable regulations related to the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste could result in accidental releases into the environment. However, compliance with applicable laws and regulations would minimize the potential for releases of hazardous materials that could pose harm to the public or environment. The Project proposes residential uses for identified parcels within the City. As residential uses utilize small



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

amounts of hazardous materials, such as cleansers and pesticides, mostly or entirely used for routine cleaning and maintenance purposes, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not pose substantial hazards to the public or environment through accidental releases. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to follow General Plan policies that would minimize risks associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore, by complying with existing laws, regulations, and General Plan policies, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not create a significant hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The potential Project site parcels identified for rezoning and the AHO zone are spread throughout the City, and some parcels would be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with existing laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials, waste, and emissions to minimize the potential for hazardous emissions to occur. Construction activities would require the use of routine hazardous materials; however, the use of such materials used during construction would be in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials and would be enforced at the construction site. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the public is not exposed to risks related to hazardous emissions from construction activities.

Residential uses planned for the sites would utilize small amounts of common hazardous materials, such as cleansers and pesticides used for routine cleaning and maintenance purposes. The small amounts of common hazardous materials typically utilized for residential uses would not emit hazardous emissions that would pose risks to the public, and Project implementation would not result in the handling of substantial amounts of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Although potential Project sites would be designated for residential uses, these sites could be developed with other non-residential uses, such as commercial and retail uses. If the Project sites are developed with businesses handling large quantities of hazardous materials, it would be required to maintain business plans including procedures in the event of a hazardous materials release, procedures for immediate notification of all appropriate agencies and personnel, identification of local emergency medical assistance, contact information for company emergency coordinators, a list and location of emergency equipment at the business, an evacuation plan, and a training program for business personnel (City of Corona 2019). The business would be required to have procedures in place to ensure that operation does not result in emission of hazardous substances. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.



d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

According to the General Plan Update EIR, there are numerous hazardous materials sites located within the City and its SOI. Development associated with Project implementation may disturb soil in which soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater may be contaminated with hazardous materials exceeding the environmental screening levels for the proposed land uses.

Any development that occurs on Project-identified parcels that would be located on or next to a hazardous materials site would be required to complete an environmental site assessment (ESA) by a qualified professional to ensure that the future development projects would not disturb hazardous materials sites and that any proposed development would not create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment. The Project would be required to prepare and submit a Phase I ESA, and if the Phase I identified recognized environmental conditions at the site, it would recommend preparation of a Phase II ESA, which would consist of sampling and testing of soil, soil vapor, and groundwater for hazardous materials and human health risks assessments based on concentrations of the hazardous materials identified. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement the recommendations included in the ESAs to remediate hazardous materials before the City would issue building permits. If a future parcel that is developed under the Project is located on a property contaminated by hazardous substances, compliance with laws and regulations for investigations and remediation regulated at the local, state, and federal level would be required. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies that would minimize risks from hazardous materials sites. As Project implementation would require adherence to General Plan policies, compliance with applicable laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials sites, and preparation of environmental site assessments, impacts would be less than significant.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public or private airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The closest airport to the City is the Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately three miles northwest of Downtown Corona. Portions of the City are within an airport influence area (which is part of the airport land use plan), which is generally the area in which current or future airport related noise-overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses (City of Corona 2019). As shown in General Plan Update EIR Figure 5.9-3, the majority of the parcels identified for rezoning as part of the Project are not located within the Corona Municipal Airport influence area. There is one parcel located within Zone D, which is identified as the Primary Traffic Patterns and Runway Buffer Zone. This refers generally to an area that includes most of the regular air traffic patterns and pattern entry routes. Prohibited uses within Zone D are highly noise sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses and hazards to flight.



The sole identified parcel located within Zone D is proposed for the AHO zone, which would allow for the property to be redeveloped with residential land uses and would be consistent with the airport land use plan with the safety zones. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The Project would be required to comply with all emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans that have been adopted by the City. The City has prepared an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) to identify the City's hazards and address the City's planned response to disasters. Additionally, the City has developed Structure Protections Plans (SPPs) to address evacuation routes. The Riverside County Strategic Contingency Plan coincides with the Corona SPP and incorporates these evacuation routes. CFD amended the Fire Code as part of the 2019 Building Code adoption, which now includes a requirement for two points of access for all new development and for areas proposing increased residential densities, such as the proposed Project. All developments that are constructed on parcels identified for the Project would be required to comply with these standards and regulations pertaining to emergency access, response, and preparedness. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not include changes to existing roadways that would interfere with identified emergency evacuation routes. Project construction and operation would be completed in accordance with all adopted emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans. Additionally, the Project would be required to implement General Plan policies which ensure adequate, efficient and safe access for emergency vehicles and ensure that efficient, orderly notification and evacuation is provided, as well as to maintain roadway evacuation routes, to facilitate evacuations and ensure proper functionality after an emergency. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement the City's EOP, LHMP, SPPs and any other applicable adopted emergency plan and relevant General Plan policies. Project implementation would require future development to be constructed and operated in accordance with City requirements for emergency access; therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The City is surrounded by extensive open space areas that are susceptible to wildfire and encroachment into the community. A majority of the undeveloped area surrounding the City is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) by CAL FIRE. While a majority of the areas surrounding the City to the north, west, and south are within designated VHFHSZs, the central portion of the City is not designated


as a VHFHSZ and is designated as a local responsibility non-VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE 2009). Additionally, the United States Forest Service (USFS) classifies a majority of the City as non-burnable, with some areas ranging from low to moderate wildfire hazard potential, with high and very high wildfire hazard potential areas located along the undeveloped portions surrounding the City (USFS 2020).

Parcels identified for rezoning and the AHO zone as part of the Project are located in the central portion of the City and are not located in hillside areas or areas with urban-wildland interfaces. Project implementation would not place assets in a VHFHSZ, as future developments would be located within urbanized areas of the City. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to adhere to a wide range of state and local codes pertaining to fire protection and would be required to abide by CFD's SPP. Adherence to the measures in the SPPs would minimize impacts to the extent possible and would ensure that new developments would not expose people or structures to significant risks associated with wildland fires. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies identified to minimize risk from wildfire hazards. Therefore, with implementation of applicable state and local codes and adherence to the SPP, future residential development resulting from Project or structures to significant wildland fire risks, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	н'	YDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Violate require surface	water quality standards or waste discharge ments or otherwise substantially degrade or groundwater quality?			\boxtimes	
b)	Substan interferent that the manage	ntially decrease groundwater supplies or e substantially with groundwater recharge such e project may impede sustainable groundwater ement of the basin?				
c)	Substan site or course impervi i. ii. iii. iii.	ntially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, including through the alteration of the of a stream or river or through the addition of ous surfaces, in a manner which would: Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or Impede or redirect flood flows.				
d)	In flood of pollu	hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release tants due to project inundation?				
e)	Conflict quality manage	t with or obstruct implementation of a water control plan or sustainable groundwater ement plan?				

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

The City is situated within the regional Santa Ana River Watershed, a flood control zone that is monitored by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Within Riverside County, the regional watershed is subdivided into the Santa Ana Sub-watershed consists of the Santa Ana River and its tributaries and the San Jacinto River Subwatershed includes the San Jacinto River and its tributaries that overflow into the Santa Ana River during high volume storm events. All channels converge with the Santa Ana River where downstream ends of the channel travel through Orange County prior to emptying into the Pacific Ocean (City of Corona 2019).

The Santa Ana Sub-watershed is further divided into smaller sub-watersheds based on major tributary channels that feed into the Santa Ana River. The City lies within two of the smaller sub-watersheds: the Middle Santa Ana River Sub-watershed and the Temescal Wash Sub-watershed. The Middle Santa Ana River Sub-watershed is located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and covers a total tributary area of approximately 170 square miles that generally drains westwards towards the Santa Ana River. The

Temescal Sub-watershed covers approximately 250 square miles and is defined as the tributary area draining into the Temescal Wash, also known as Temescal Creek, that connects Lake Elsinore with the Santa Ana River. A majority of the City lies within this sub-watershed, and the drainage channels that run through the City that tie into the Temescal Wash include Arlington Channel, Main Street Channel, Oak Street Drain, Joseph Canyon Wash, and Bedford Wash (City of Corona 2019).

The Middle Santa Ana River Groundwater basin contains twelve management zones: Arlington, bedford, Coldwater, Elsinore, Lee Lake, Riverside A through F, and Temescal. The City of Corona resides within the Bedford, Coldwater, and Temescal management zones. The Temescal subbasin underlies the southwest part of the upper Santa Ana Valley. Main recharge to the groundwater reservoir is from percolation of precipitation on the valley floor and infiltration of stream flow within tributaries exiting the surrounding mountains and hills. The Bedford subbasin is located south of the Temescal subbasin in Temescal Canyon between the Santa Ana Mountains and the El Sobrante Hills. The Coldwater subbasin is located southwest of the Bedford subbasin and Temescal Wash (City of Corona 2019).

3.10.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Construction

Construction activities related to Project implementation could impact water quality due to erosion and other pollutants entering construction site runoff, resulting in polluted runoff entering the City's stormwater system. Construction activities such as grading could accelerate the rate of erosion and cause substantial impacts to water quality. However, the General Plan Update EIR identifies that implementation of state and local regulations would mitigate construction stormwater runoff impacts. The City's grading ordinance includes expanded requirements for grading, site erosion control, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. Additionally, any projects that include one acre or greater of soil disturbance is required to comply with the Construction General Permit and associated NPDES regulations to ensure that potential for soil erosion is minimized. Future development associated with Project implementation would be required to comply with all relevant NPDES requirements and would be required to prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP would be required to include construction BMPs that address pollutant source reduction and provide measures of controls necessary to mitigate potential pollutant sources. The Project would also be required to implement General Plan policies that would ensure that new development minimizes potential water quality impacts. Therefore, with the implementation of General Plan policies, adherence to NPDES and Construction General Permit requirements, such as the preparation of a SWPPP, and adherence to all relevant state and local regulations, construction activities associated future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and impacts would be less than significant.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Operation

Operation of projects associated with the proposed rezoning Project could potentially create new sources of polluted runoff and increase post-construction pollutants. To prevent long-term impacts related to Project operation, the Project would be required to comply with requirements of the City's Municipal Code Chapter 13.27 and the Riverside County MS4 permit. Municipal Code Chapter 13.27 and Riverside County MS4 permit requires new development and significant redevelopment projects to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID)/site design and incorporate source control BMPs to address post-construction stormwater runoff management. Future residential development projects resulting from Project implementation would also be required to prepare a project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) that described the BMPs chosen for the Project, as well as include operation and maintenance requirements for all structural and treatment control BMPs. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would incorporate General Plan policies which ensure that new development minimizes potential water quality impacts. With the adherence to federal, state, and local regulations and requirements and relevant General Plan policies, runoff associated with both construction and operation of future residential development resulting from implementation of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The Project is proposing rezoning parcels in the City and the establishment of AHO zones to allow for more residential developments within the City than what was planned in the General Plan Update. This would result in an increase in population which could generate a higher demand for groundwater resources. According to the General Plan Update EIR, the City relies on local groundwater resources for approximately 40 percent of its water supply (City of Corona 2019). The City updates its urban water management plan (UWMP) every five years to evaluate existing and projected water supplies and demands to ensure that there will not be any water supply shortages or significant groundwater depletion. The City's 2020 UWMP identified that there are sufficient surface and groundwater supplies through 2045 (City of Corona 2021a). According to the City's 2020 UWMP, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) released their final list of critically overdrafted basins in February 2019. This list did not include the Temescal Basin or the Bedford-Coldwater Basin which are the two groundwater basins supplying water to the City. The Project would be required to comply with the City's groundwater management plan and Recharge Master Plan to ensure there are no impacts to groundwater supplies and the Project would not impede sustainable groundwater management. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation is not expected to result in a substantial increase in population as compared to what was forecasted in the General Plan Update. Furthermore, Project implementation would not result in a substantial increase in groundwater usage that would result in substantially decreased groundwater supplies.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Additionally, the City requires adherence to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and Local Implementation Plan which includes policies and regulations pertaining to hydromodification caused by new developments and water efficiency requirements. Adherence to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and Local Implementation Plan would ensure that new developments allow for groundwater recharge at a development site through site design, by allowing infiltration of groundwater, and Project implementation would include water efficiency measures to ensure groundwater supplies are not affected by future development. The General Plan also includes several policies that would decrease the demand for potable water in the City, thereby further ensuring that groundwater supplies are not depleted. With the implementation of relevant regulations and adherence to General Plan policies and the City's groundwater management plans, Project implementation would not result in substantially decreased groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, such that future residential development resulting from Project implementation would impede sustainable groundwater management. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

- c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would;
 - i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;
 - iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - iv. Impede or redirect flood flows.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Development of the Project would result in changes in land uses which may result in an increase of impervious surfaces. However, parcels identified for the Project are located in areas surrounded by existing developments and would utilize the existing City and County drainage facilities in the existing surrounding areas. The Project would implement the City's hydromodification requirement and standard flood control requirements for new developments which would minimize impacts of increased flows and volumes of downstream receiving waters. Additionally, Project implementation would require future developments to comply with the City and County's standard conditions of approval, requiring all new development and significant redevelopment projects to complete drainage and hydrology analyses to ensure that on- and off-site drainage facilities can accommodate increased runoff. Implementation of standard conditions of approval which include incorporation of LID designs, BMPs, and onsite retention basins, would minimize runoff volumes and rates. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would also be required to prepare a WQMP describing the BMPs and site design measures which would be implemented to minimize runoff from the site.



Project implementation would result in construction activities that could increase the potential for erosion and siltation to occur on- and off-site. The General Plan includes policies that ensure new developments minimize erosion and siltation to reduce impacts to stormwater systems. As discussed above, future development projects would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP, including standard erosion control measures and BMPs to minimize the risk of polluted runoff resulting from increased erosion and sedimentation. The SWPPP would include an erosion control plan that identifies measures, such as diverting runoff from disturbed areas and treatment measures to trap sediment, to ensure there is no polluted runoff.

Much of the central portion of the City is located within the 500-year flood zone but there are areas within the City that are located within the 100-year flood zone. Northwestern Corona, extending from the Prado Dam to the airport, and westward through Santa Ana Canyon are designated as areas within the 100-year flood zone (City of Corona 2019). All new developments in the City are required to meet federal floodplain regulations which would ensure that future developments do not impede or redirect flood flows. The City's Municipal Code Title 18, Floodplain Management, minimizes public and private losses due to flood conditions in areas by restricting or prohibiting uses that result in damaging increases in flood heights or velocity. The code controls the alteration of natural floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers that help accommodate or channel flood waters and prevents or regulates the construction of flood barriers that will unnaturally divert floodwaters or may increase flood hazards in other areas (City of Corona 2019). Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies that would reduce impacts from flooding.

Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies and adhere to City and County requirements, such as the preparation of a SWPPP and WQMP and include site design measures to reduce volumes and rate of runoff and polluted runoff. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in impacts related to erosion, flooding, increased polluted runoff, or substantially increased rate of runoff, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

d) Would the project in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Much of the central portion of the City is located within the 500-year flood zone but there are areas within the City that are located within the 100-year flood zone. Northwestern Corona, extending from the Prado Dam to the airport and westward through Santa Ana Canyon, are designated as areas within the 100-year flood zone (City of Corona 2019). Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and WQMP to minimize impacts to water quality. As discussed above, the General Plan includes several policies that ensure that new developments minimize potential water quality impacts during construction and operation. Therefore, Project implementation would not cause the release of pollutants due to flood inundation, and impacts would be less than significant.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

General Plan Update EIR Figure 5.10-3 identifies areas of the City that are located in dam inundation zones. The City is located within the inundation zone for several dams in the area. As identified in the General Plan Update EIR, the probability of fam failure is extremely low and the City has never been impacted by a major dam failure. Dams in California are continually monitored and inspected, and dam owners are required to maintain Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) that include procedures for damage assessment and emergency warnings. The General Plan Update EIR identified that released water from a seiche would result in much smaller footprints than the dam inundation zones, and the probability a seiche occurring is extremely low. In the rare chance that a seiche does occur, the seiche would flood into the identified dam inundation zones. Since the probability of seiche inundation to occur is extremely low and only occurs on rare instances, the probability that Project implementation would risk the release of pollutants due to inundation resulting from seiches are extremely low. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The City is located more than 30 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is located outside of the tsunami inundation zone. Therefore, there would be no impacts from tsunamis. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Measures identified above to ensure that developments have a less than significant impact on surface and groundwater quality would also ensure that future development does not obstruct or conflict with the implementation of a water quality control plan, such as the Santa Ana Basin Plan or the Santa Ana Watershed Action Plan.

Regulations and policies identified above to protect groundwater supplies and ensure sustainable groundwater management would also ensure that future development does not obstruct or conflict with the City's groundwater management plan. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies that would ensure that development of new projects would not obstruct with implementation of the watershed action plan for the Santa Ana Watershed Region of Riverside County, the Recharge Master Plan, or the City's groundwater management plan (City of Corona 2019). Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

	LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Physically divide an established community?	\boxtimes			
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	\boxtimes			

3.11.1 Environmental Setting

The City is located in the northwestern portion of Riverside County, near the convergence of Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside Counties and is located 45 miles southeast of the City of Los Angeles (City of Corona 2019). The City is bordered by the City of Norco to the north, City of Riverside to the east, and Riverside County to the west and the south. The City encompasses 25,551 acres with its SOI consisting of an additional 16,515 acres. The City currently has 31 specific plans where growth buildout would occur.

3.11.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The Project would rezone and establish AHO zones for identified parcels within the City to allow for more low- and moderate-income residential units to be provided than what was proposed in the General Plan Update. Rezoning and establishment of AHO zones could potentially result in development of parcels that would physically divide an established community. Therefore, this impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The Project is proposing to rezone parcels and establish AHO zones. The AHO zones would cover existing properties that are currently developed with non-residential land uses. The AHO zone is a new zone being proposed by the City to establish by-right development standards for affordable housing projects. The City is proposing to create development standards (i.e., criteria for building setbacks, parking, building height, landscaping, open space amenities, lot coverage, etc.) and architectural design guidelines for the AHO zone. The rezoning of parcels and establishment of a new overlay zone may cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the



purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect. Therefore, this impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

	MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?		\boxtimes		
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?			\boxtimes	

3.12.1 Environmental Setting

Mining has been part of the City's history since 1888, when the Temescal Rock Quarry was opened to furnish rocks for streets of Los Angeles and in nearby towns, and later decades saw oil and gas drilling in the Prado-Corona fields and Temescal Canyon. The City and the SOI are in the Temescal Valley Production Area (TVPA), an 820-square-mile area designated by the CGS and bounded by the Santa Ana Mountains on the west and the Perris Plateau to the east.

According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, Temescal Valley is known for its mineral resource deposits, and portions of the City and its SOI are designated by the state as a "Construction Aggregate Resource Area". These mineral resources generally consist of clay and construction aggregates, such as crushed rock, sand, and gravel.

As of 2017, the City has two active mining operations and the SOI has ten active mining operations. The City has been extensively mapped by the CGS and the City is primarily underlain by lands identified as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) -2 (City of Corona 2019). MRZ-2 lands are known to contain valuable mineral resources, specifically construction aggregate and industrial minerals. While much of that area has been developed, extensive resources still exist in the Gavilan Hills and in southwest Corona. A large portion of the aggregate resources have also been designated by the state as regionally significant.

3.12.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

General Plan Figure ER-8 identifies areas of the City by MRZs for industrial minerals, and Figure ER-9 identifies areas by MRZs for aggregate resources. All parcels identified for rezoning or the AHO zone are located in MRZ-4 for industrial minerals. A majority of the parcels are located in MRZ-3 areas for construction aggregate resources, and a small portion are located in areas identified as MRZ-2 for aggregate resources. MRZ-2 are areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral



deposits are present or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. MRZ-3 are areas containing mineral deposits whose significance cannot be evaluated from available data. MRZ-4 are areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other zone; minerals may be present, but information is not available to make a determination. Additionally, a small portion of the of the proposed rezoning and AHO zone parcels are located in an area with classified aggregate resources as identified in General Plan Figure ER-10, which identifies areas of regional significance.

Parcels identified for rezoning and the AHO zone are located in areas that are highly urbanized and surrounded by existing developments. Parcels located within the area that are identified with classified aggregate resources are developed with existing uses. In the City, mineral resource use must have a Mineral Resource (MR) Overlay which requires discretionary permit approved by the City Council (City of Corona 2019). Parcels identified for the Project implementation do not have a MR overlay, and therefore, are not used for mineral resource purposes. Although future residential development resulting from Project implementation could lead to loss of known mineral resources, identified candidate parcels are developed with existing uses or are surrounded by urban development, and the likelihood that it would be converted for mineral resource uses is highly unlikely.

Though mineral resource uses at identified parcels are unlikely, it is located in areas identified as having known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation could result in a significant impact. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement Mitigation Measures MIN-1 and MIN-2, identified in the City's General Plan Update EIR. Mitigation Measures MIN-1 and MIN-2 would require an evaluation of mineral resources prior to development activity. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update EIR would lessen impacts to mineral resources of significance. Therefore, since the identified parcels are not designated for mineral resource uses and the Project would require mineral resource evaluations prior to project approval, as required by General Plan Update EIR Mitigation Measure MIN-1 and MIN-2, the Project would have a less than significant impact on mineral resources with mitigation incorporation. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Mitigation Measure MIN-1: Prior to project approval for proposed development of properties classified as either regionally significant construction aggregate MRZ-2 or industrial minerals MRZ-2a, a mineral resource evaluation shall be conducted to determine the significant and economic viability of mining the resource. If development of a property would preclude future extraction of a significant mineral resource, in accordance with CEQA, the City shall make the appropriate findings and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to permitting development of the property.

Mitigation Measure MIN-2: Prior to approval of any project on lands classified as either regionally significant construction aggregate MRZ-2 or industrial mineral MRZ-2a, a report shall be prepared that analyzes the project's value in relation to the mineral values found onsite. The analysis shall consider the importance of construction aggregate mineral resource onsite to the market region as a whole, and not just the importance of the resources found within the City and SOI. The report shall be submitted to the City, such that the City has adequate information to develop a statement of reasons for permitting the proposed land use to the California Department of Conservation, State Mining and Geology Board, for subsequent



review, in accordance with SMARA, Article 2, Section 2762 and 2763 for areas designated of regional significance.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

Finding: Less than Significant

There are two active mineral resource recovery sites within the City and ten additional ones located within the SOI. The two active mining operations in the City are All American Asphalt and Corona Quarry (CalMat/Vulcan), which are both located in eastern Corona, east of Interstate 15. Parcels identified for rezoning and AHO are not located at these mineral resource recovery sites and are not designated for mineral resource recovery uses. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.13 NOISE

	NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	\boxtimes			
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	\square			
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

The City has set noise and vibration performance standards for noise sources in the City. Municipal Code Chapter 9.24, Loud and Unnecessary Noise, defines the qualitative standards used in determining a potential violation. Municipal Code Section 17.84.040, Noise, provides performance standards for two separate types of noise sources: transportation and stationary. Table 6 below shows the acceptable interior and exterior noise limits for various land uses. The exterior noise limits in the table are based on the land use compatibility guidelines in General Plan Update EIR Table 5.13-3.

Table 6: City Interior and Exterior Noise Standards

Land Use	Categories	Energy Ave	erage CNEL
Categories	Uses	Interior ¹	Exterior ²
Residential	Single Family, Duplex, Multiple Family	45 ³	65
	Mobile Home	NA	65 ⁴
	Hotel, Motel, Transient Lodging	45	65 ⁵
	Commercial Retail, Bank, Restaurant	55	NA
Commercial Industrial Institutional	Office Building, Research and Development, Professional Offices, City Office Building	50	NA
	Amphitheatre, Concert Hall Auditorium, Meeting Hall	45	NA
	Gymnasium (Multipurpose)	50	NA

Initial Study

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

Land Use	Land Use Categories		
Categories	Uses	Interior ¹	Exterior ²
	Sports Club	55	NA
	Manufacturing, Warehousing, Wholesale, Utilities	65	NA
	Movie Theatres	45	NA
	Hospitals, Schools' classroom	45	65
Institutional	Church, Library	45	NA
Open Space	Parks	NA	65

Notes:

¹ Indoor environment excluding bathrooms, toilets, closets, corridors.

² Outdoor environment limited to:

- Private yard of single family
- Multi-family private patio or balcony that is served by a means of exit from inside
- Mobile home park
- Hospital patio
- Park's picnic area
- School's playground
- Hotel and motel recreation area

³ Noise level requirements with closed windows. Mechanical ventilating system or other means of natural ventilation shall be provided as of Chapter 12, Section 1205 of UBC.

- ⁴ Exterior noise level should be such that interior noise level will not exceed 45 community noise equivalent level (CNEL).
- ⁵ Except those areas affected by aircraft noise.

Source: City of Corona 2019

For the preparation of the General Plan Update EIR, the City conducted noise monitoring throughout the different locations in the City and measurements were made during weekday periods when it was expected to be most active. Long-term (24 hour) measurements were conducted at four locations within the City and short-term (15 minute) measurements were conducted at twelve locations around the City. According to the General Plan Update EIR, the noise environment within the City and SOI is highly variable, depending on the location. Freeway noise from Interstate 15 and SR 91 tend to control the noise environment at most locations and in general, noise monitoring locations that experiences less than 50 A-weighted decibel (dBA) equivalent continuous noise level (Leq) were located relatively far from these major freeway sources. The time-averaged sound level in the City was in the range of 45 to 65 dBA Leq.

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.13.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Construction and operation resulting from Project implementation could result in the generation of temporary and permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of future development projects. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation may result in a substantial increase in ambient noise in excess of City standards. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Construction activities associated with development of the identified candidate Project sites would generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration and noise levels, depending on construction procedures and equipment. Construction and operation of the Project may result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Therefore, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: No Impact

The City is located within the airport land use plan for the Corona Municipal Airport. General Plan Update EIR Figure 5.13-3 shows the existing noise contours of the airport. As identified in the General Plan Update EIR, Corona Municipal Airport is not a substantial source of noise because the 65 dBA noise contour does not extend past the airport boundary (City of Corona 2019). Noise exposure areas of 55 dBA CNEL and above are largely within open space and industrial use areas immediately surrounding Corona Municipal Airport. The identified Project sites are not located within the designated noise contours for the airport, and therefore, they would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels from airport uses. Therefore, the Project would have no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

	POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			\boxtimes	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			\boxtimes	

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

The City was incorporated in 1896, and by 1940, the population had grown to approximately 8,764 people. By 1970, the population more than doubled to 27,519 people, and by 1980, it had increased to approximately 40,000 people. During the beginning of the 1980s, the City's population grew significantly, as more land was converted to residential uses. Between 2010 and 2017, population trends slowed as the availability of vacant land in the City gradually decreased (City of Corona 2019). Table 7 below shows the population trends and percent change in the City's population from 2005 to 2017.

The rate of housing growth in the City has varied over the years. Total number of housing units in the City in 2005 was approximately 48,369 housing units and grew by approximately four percent to 50,301 housing units by 2017 (City of Corona 2019). The General Plan Update EIR estimates that approximately 68 percent of the City's housing stock in 2018 was single-family homes.

Year	Population	Percent Change
2005	162,410	N/A
2006	161,998	-0.25%
2007	156,394	-3.46 %
2008	173,119	10.69%
2009	151,015	-12.77%
2010	153,335	1.54%
2011	155,884	1.66%
2012	158,388	1.61%
2013	159,507	0.71%
2014	161,498	1.25%
2015	164,242	1.70%

Table 7: City Population Trends

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

2016	166,774	1.54%		
2017	167,843	0.64%		
Source: City of Corona General Plan Technical Update Draft EIR				

3.14.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The City is proposing a rezoning program to accommodate the planning of low- and moderate-income households. The City's 2021-2029 Housing Element Update was adopted by the City Council on November 3, 2021. The Housing Element Update requires the City to plan for 2,792 low-income housing units and 1,096 moderate-income housing units, pursuant to the state's RHNA allocation. The City's total RHNA allocation is 6,088 units with 3,888 allocated to low- and moderate-income housing units. The City's Housing Element Update includes an inventory of properties that are intended to be rezoned to high density residential or an AHO zone in order to plan for sites suitable for low- and moderate-income units.

The City's RHNA allocation for the Housing Element Update exceeded the City's housing unit projection for Year 2040 in the General Plan Update. The General Plan Update EIR anticipated an additional 5,494 housing units. Currently, the City's RHNA allocation of 6,088 exceeds its projected housing growth by 594 units, in addition to accommodating a minimum buffer of four percent. These additional housing units from the RHNA were not known at the time the General Plan Update EIR was prepared. Therefore, supplemental environmental evaluation pursuant to CEQA is required to address the potential impacts from growth that could occur as a result of Project implementation.

Certification of the proposed Project itself would not result in direct unplanned population growth as the Project is proposing the rezoning and AHO zones for identified candidate parcels within the City and not the actual development of these sites. However, certification of the Project would lead to more parcels in the City being available for residential developments and could result in indirect impacts to population growth.

According to the City's Housing Element Update, the City has an average household size of 3.32 (City of Corona 2021b). If all parcels identified for rezoning and AHO zones are developed with residential uses to provide an additional 594 residential units, it would result in a population growth of approximately 1,972 residents. The forecasted additional population (1,972 residents) and housing units (594 units) at buildout of the Project would result in a 1.07 percent increase in population and 1.1 percent increase in housing units over what was estimated at General Plan buildout.

The Project proposes to meet and exceed the RHNA for low- and moderate-income households, and when considering the additional buffer in the AHO zone, Project implementation could result in the development of up to 6,221 units. This would represent a very conservative surplus of approximately 2,415 units,

assuming that every candidate parcel was developed at a density of 60 units per acre, which is unlikely. The 594 units required to meet RHNA and the surplus provided by the buffer would represent in total, an increased population growth of approximately 9,990 residents, thereby resulting in a 5.4 percent population increase and a 5.6 percent increase in housing units over what was estimated at General Plan buildout.

Even with the buffer and accounting for the surplus units, Project implementation would be in compliance with General Plan and Housing Element policies to provide for balanced housing types and affordability levels and provide access to affordable housing to lower and moderate-income households. Additionally, the Project would ensure that the City is in compliance with the state's RHNA allocation for the City. Therefore, since Project implementation would result in a less than significant increase to the projected population and housing units within the City and would be in compliance with General Plan and Housing Element policies and the City's RHNA allocation, Project implementation would result in less than significant increase to population growth. The rate of housing growth in the City has varied over the years. Total number of housing units in the City in 2005 was approximately 48,369 housing units and grew by approximately four percent to 50,301 housing units by 2017 (City of Corona 2019). The General Plan Update EIR estimates that approximately 68 percent of the City's housing stock in 2018 was single-family homes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Candidate sites that are proposed for the AHO zone include a variety of uses on 100 parcels, including commercial, retail, industrial, surface parking, storage and vacant parcels. The proposed AHO zone will cover existing properties that are currently developed with non-residential land uses, sporadic residential land uses or are currently vacant. The establishment of the AHO zone is intended to encourage housing. Existing residential inventory that could be affected by the AHO zone due to redevelopment would occur at a higher density and provide housing replacement opportunity. Therefore, the AHO zone would not displace existing people or housing.

There are 57 parcels considered as potential sites for proposed rezoning to a higher residential density, and these are primarily parcels that are currently used for residential uses, in addition to parking lots, mobile home parks and some commercial, institutional, and vacant parcels. Project implementation would result in changes to the zoning designations but would not require relocation of existing residential developments, as it would not lead to direct development of the identified sites. However, if the candidate Project sites are identified for new development or redevelopment on an individual basis, displacement of existing people or housing could occur. Development and redevelopment of the sites may result in displacement of existing people or housing if the identified site is currently developed with residential uses. However, the site would likely be developed or redeveloped with a higher density residential development and provide for more residential units compared to existing conditions. Therefore, any existing housing that would be demolished as a result of future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be replaced at a higher ratio of residential units. Therefore, Project implementation would not displace substantial numbers



of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

PUBLIC SE Would the	ERVICES project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact		
 Result in substantial a governmental facilities could cause significan or other performance 	 a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: 						
i) Fire protection?				\square			
ii) Police protection?				\boxtimes			
iii) Schools?				\square			
iv) Parks?							
v) Other Public Facilit	ies?						

3.15.1 Environmental Setting

Fire Protection

The CFD provides fire protection and emergency medical services in the City. The CFD also serves the communities of El Cerrito, Coronita, and Home Gardens through a service agreement with the County (City of Corona 2019). CFD headquarters are located at 735 Public Safety Way, with seven CFD fire stations located around the City. The CFD 2021 Annual Report identified that the department employed 93 firefighters, 10 fire prevention staff, one emergency management staff, three professional staff and 15 volunteers (CFD 2021). In 2021, the CFD responded to 14,927 total incidents with 90 percent of response times 7 minutes and 29 seconds or less and approximately 73 percent of response times hitting their target of 6 minutes or less. The parcels identified for rezoning and AHO zone as part of Project implementation are located within the fire response zones for CFD Fire Stations 1, 2 and 3 (City of Corona 2019).

Police Protection

The Corona Police Department (CPD) provides continuous police protection services to the City. CPD operates out of its headquarters at 730 Public Safety Way with several branches of offices situated throughout its service area, which is divided into four police patrol zones. The CPD 2021 Annual Report identified that in 2021, the department employed 162 sworn officers, 119 professional staff, and 60 volunteers. CPD has identified a target response time of five minutes and in 2021, of the 85,642 calls of service the department responded to, 90 percent of calls had a response time of 4 minutes and 41 seconds or less (CPD 2021).

Schools

The City's school-aged population is served primarily by the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD) which includes K-12 education, alternative education, an adult education. Within the CNUSD, there are 34



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

schools that serve more than 33,000 students in its jurisdiction. Additionally, the City has 14 private schools which include Montessori schools, alternative education, and religious schools. The City is also served by the Alvord Unified School District which serves portions of the eastern part of the City and its SOI (City of Corona 2019).

Parks

The City offers built and natural trails, developed parks, and golf courses as some of the recreational opportunities in the City. Corona has 35 public parks covering approximately 352 acres, which does not include natural open space areas such as Fresno Canyon and Sage Open Space. The public park system in the City includes mini, neighborhood, community, and major/regional arks that are differentiated by scale, population served, and amenities. The City's Park standard is based on guidance provided by California Government Code Section 666477, referred to as the Quimby Act, and the City has a park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents.

Other Public Facilities – Libraries

The Corona Public Library is located at 605 South Main Street and is a 62,000-square-foot facility that has a total of 112,500 registered members. The Corona Public Library's collection consists of 152,500 items which includes books, videos, CDs, CDROM software, audio cassettes, books on tape, and pamphlets (City of Corona 2019).

3.15.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - i. Fire Protection?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Project implementation would rezone and create an AHO zone for parcels within the City to provide residential units in excess of the amount planned for in the General Plan Update. These additional units would result in an increase in demand for fire services and facilities.

As identified in the General Plan Update EIR, fire vehicles, equipment, and expansion of existing facilities is funded partially through the payment of a Development Impact Fee (DIF) from new development, which is required under City Municipal Code Section 16.23.040. The City has also created a Community Facilities District to finance the costs of providing police, fire, and paramedic services to the City. Future development projects in the City are required to be reviewed by the City, CFD, and the Riverside County Fire Department to ensure compliance with requirements and standards set forth by the departments, prior to approval. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to pay all required



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

fees to offset impacts to fire protection services and facilities. The General Plan Update EIR identified that impacts to fire protection resulting from increase in demand would be less than significant with payment of the Development Impact Fee and the Community Facilities District fees.

Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with all applicable local, state and federal fire codes, buildings codes, and nationally recognized fire and safety standards. The Project would also be required to comply with applicable General Plan policies relating to fire and emergency services. Compliance with all applicable codes and standards, as well as compliance with applicable General Plan policies, would reduce the potential occurrence for fire emergencies at future project sites and reduce the demand for fire protection services. Therefore, with the payment of all required fees and compliance with regulations and standards set forth by the City and CFD, Project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

ii. Police Services?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Project implementation would rezone and create an AHO zone for parcels within the City to provide residential units in excess of the amount planned for in the General Plan Update. These additional units would result in an increase in demand for police services and facilities.

Similar to fire services, funds for additional police facilities, equipment, and officers are provided through DIFs and collected from new residential, commercial, and industrial/manufacturing developments, as well as Community Facilities District fees. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to pay these fees to offset the increase in demand. Although the General Plan Update EIR identified that 50 percent of the population and job growth associated with General Plan buildout would occur within the SOI which is served by Riverside County Sheriff's Department, the parcels identified for rezoning and AHO district are located within the City and would be served by CPD. The General Plan Update EIR identified that payment of DIFs would satisfy the additional demand for police services generated within the City from new developments. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with General Plan policies related to ensuring the provision of adequate protection of police services. With the payment of applicable fees and compliance with applicable General Plan policies, Project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

iii. Schools?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Project implementation would rezone and create an AHO zone for parcels within the City to provide residential units in excess of the amount planned for in the General Plan Update. These additional units would result in an increase in resident and student population and would increase demand on existing schools.



The General Plan Update EIR identified that CNUSD would have adequate capacity to serve the new students generated from General Plan buildout. The General Plan Update EIR identified that remaining capacity at CNUSD would be able to accommodate 8,596 elementary students, 1,911 middle school students, and 222 high school students (City of Corona 2019). Additionally, if and when CNUSD requires expansion and construction of new facilities to accommodate growth generated by new development, funding for new schools would be through the fee program pursuant to SB 50, as well as state and federal funding programs. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65996, payment of school fees is deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with policies in the General Plan pertaining to ensuring adequate school services. Therefore, since there is capacity at CNUSD to serve new student populations, with the payment of required fees and incorporation of General Plan policies, the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

iv. Parks?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Project implementation could result of in the conversion of some designated open space areas to residential uses. The City's park standard is based on the guidance provided by the Quimby Act, and the City has a park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents. As impacts on parks are population-driven and the Project proposes rezoning and establishment of AHO zones to accommodate more residential developments, Project implementation could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. As such, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

v. Other Public Facilities – Libraries?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Project implementation would rezone and create an AHO zone for parcels within the City to provide residential units in excess of the amount planned for in the General Plan Update. These additional units would result in an increase in demand on public facilities.

The General Plan Update EIR identified that although buildout of the General Plan would cause an increase in residents, it does not necessarily mean that there would be a significant demand for more library collection items or facility space. Project implementation would result in a greater increase in population than what was planned for in the General Plan, but it would not be expected to result in a more significant demand for library facilities than what was analyzed in the General Plan Update EIR. The General Plan Update EIR identified that payment of library facilities fees would ensure that adequate facilities and resources are continually available for the City's growing population. The City uses DIFs from residential uses to fund library facilities within the City (City of Corona 2019). Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with General Plan policies



that would ensure adequate library services are provided. Therefore, with the payment of development impact fees and compliance with General Plan policies, Project implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.16 RECREATION

	RECREATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	\boxtimes			
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	\boxtimes			

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

The location of the City near the convergence of three counties allows for residents to access natural open space areas including mountains, hillsides, canyons, and preserves (City of Corona 2019). The Prado Dam Basin, Chino Hills State Park, and Cleveland National Forest are recreational areas located within or near the City and provide recreational opportunities such as hiking, biking, equestrian uses, and camping. Sage Open Space and Fresno Canyon are local natural areas in the community that offer 67 acres of open space for walking, hiking, and bicycling. In addition to established open space areas, the City is part of the Riverside County MSHCP.

The City also offers built and natural trails, developed parks, and golf courses as additional recreational opportunities in the City. Corona has 35 public parks covering approximately 352 acres, not including natural open space areas such as Fresno Canyon and Sage Open Space. The public park system in the City includes mini, neighborhood, community, and major/regional parks that are differentiated by scale, population served, and amenities. The City's park standard is based on the guidance provided by the Quimby Act, and the City has a park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents.

3.16.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Project implementation could result of in the conversion of some designated open space areas to residential uses. As impacts on parks are population-driven and the Project proposes rezoning and establishment of AHO zones to accommodate more residential developments, future residential development resulting from Project implementation could result in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility could occur or be accelerated. As such, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

b) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Project implementation does not propose the development of recreational facilities; however, the increase in residential development which would result from the proposed rezoning and establishment of AHO zones to accommodate more residential developments could result in requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation could require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to meet the service standards due to this increase in residential population. As such, this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

	TRANSPORTATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation systems, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	\boxtimes			
b)	Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	\boxtimes			
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersection(s) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment))?			\boxtimes	
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	

3.17.1 Environmental Setting

SB 743 caused revisions to the CEQA Guidelines which established new criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts, so that level of service or other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion would not be the sole basis for determining significant impacts under CEQA. The revised CEQA Guidelines utilize the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric to evaluate the significance of transportation related impacts for development projects, land use plans, and transportation infrastructure projects. In accordance with SB 743, the City adopted its own thresholds for VMT in May 2019, which accounts for the complete length of the trip from the origin to the destination and assigns 100 percent of that trip distance to the City. The General Plan Update EIR modeled VMT per service population estimates for the City and SOI for home-based trips and employment trips for existing conditions (City of Corona 2019).

Regional and local access roads in Corona include Interstate 15, SR 91, SR 71, 6th Street, Main Street Magnolia Avenue, Ontario Avenue, Cajalco Road, River Road, McKinley Street, Grand Boulevard, Green River Road, Foothill Parkway, El Cerrito Road, Lincoln Avenue, and Hidden Valley Parkway. Riverside Transit Agency provides most of the available bus public transportation on the City and to its surrounding cities. MetroLink Provides commuter rail services via the 91 Line and the Inland Empire/Orange County Line, served by stations in West Corona and North Main Corona. Corona is also closely tied to the Orange County Transportation Authority for bus transit services, and paratransit services also provide alternative modes of flexible passenger transportation on undefined routes for those who need it. The City also adopted a Bicycle Master Plan which calls for bicycle lanes on various streets in order to increase the emphasis on active transportation, which classified bicycle facilities identified throughout the City. Pedestrian facilities exist throughout the City as well (City of Corona 2019).

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.17.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation systems, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in demand for public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian systems, which would require the improvement and expansion of the circulation system, in addition to what was evaluated in the General Plan Update EIR. As such, an evaluation of the policies addressing potential impacts to these facilities is required, and this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Traffic generated by Project implementation in addition to General Plan buildout, plus the traffic generated by regional growth, would contribute to the existing congested conditions of Interstate 15 and SR 91, resulting on a conflict with the Riverside County Congestion Management Plan. As such, an evaluation of Project consistency with the City's VMT thresholds is required, and this potentially significant impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

As with the General Plan, Project implementation would result in the alteration and intensification of existing land uses in the City. Therefore, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would require individual evaluations of the roadway alignments, intersection geometrics, and traffic control features. Roadway improvements would be made in accordance with the City's Circulation Plan and roadway design guidelines, as well as the Caltrans Roadway Design Manual, in addition to the General Plan Circulation Element policies pertaining to roadway design and improving the safety of all users of the transportation system. Therefore, with adherence to all applicable guidelines, policies and requirements related to roadway design, Project implementation would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Initial Study Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

As stated above, Project implementation would result in the alteration and intensification of existing land uses in the City and potentially result in inadequate emergency access. As such, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be subject to review and approval by the City's Public Works Department to evaluate roadway alignments, intersection geometrics, and traffic control features, which would be made in accordance with the City's Circulation Plan and all applicable local and state requirements related to emergency access and the safety of all users of the transportation system. Therefore, with adherence to all applicable guidelines, policies and requirements related to roadway design and emergency access requirements, Project implementation would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	
a)	Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defi Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geograp defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a Cal Native American tribe, and that is:					
	i.	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	\boxtimes			
	ii.	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 of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?				

3.18.1 Environmental Setting

Traditional models of California's prehistory hypothesize that the coastline was populated by Native Americans from the interior of North America during the end of the last Ice Age. The Takic or Numic Tradition is present mainly in the Los Angeles, Orange, and western Riverside Counties region. In Los Angeles, Orange, and western Riverside Counties, changes in material culture, burial practices, and subsistence focus at the beginning of the Late Prehistoric period are considered the result of a Takic migration to the coast from inland desert regions. Modern Gabrielino, Juaneño, and Luiseño in this region are considered the descendants of the prehistoric Uto-Aztecan, Takic-speaking populations that settled along the California coast during this period, or perhaps somewhat earlier (City of Corona 2019).

The City is located within the territory of the Gabrielino Native American group. Surrounding native groups include the Chumash and Tatataviam/Alliklik to the north, the Serrano to the east, and the Luiseño/Juaneño to the south. The Gabrielino group established large, permeant villages in the fertile lowlands along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast, stretching from the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains to the Pacific Ocean (City of Corona 2019). The City is located northwest of the border of the traditional Juaneño territory which was surrounded by the Luiseño to the south, the Gabrielino to the north, and the Cahuilla to the west. The Juaneño resided in permanent, well-defined villages and associated seasonal camps (City of Corona 2019). The City is also situated southwest of the traditional Cahuilla territory, which encompasses a large area and was bordered by 11 other Native American groups. Evidence suggests that the Cahuilla migrated to southern California approximately 2,000 to 3,000 years ago, most likely from the southern Sierra Nevada ranges of east-central California with other related Takic-speaking groups. The Cahuilla settled in a territory that extended west to east from the present-day City of Riverside



to the center portion of the Salton Sea in the Colorado Desert, and south to north from the San Jacinto Valley to the San Bernardino Mountains (City of Corona 2019).

The closest ethnographically documented village to the General Plan area is known as Paxangna. Some researchers state the village was located along the Temescal Creek, while others state the village was farther south (City of Corona 2019).

3.18.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

- a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - i. Listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - ii. 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 of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The City, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will consult with appropriate tribes with the potential for interest in the region. Based on this consultation, it will be identified if the proposed Project site is located in an area having the potential for tribal cultural resources. SB 18 states: "*Prior to the adoption or any amendment of a general plan or specific plan, a local government must notify the appropriate tribes (on the contact list maintained by the NAHC) of the opportunity to conduct consultations for the purpose of preserving, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places located on land within the local government's jurisdiction that is affected by the proposed plan adoption or amendment. Tribes have 90 days from the date on which they receive notification to request consultation, unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe."*

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and SB 18, the City provided notice to the appropriate Native American Tribes on June 7, 2022, inviting them to participate and consult with the City through its AB 52 and SB 18 Native American outreach efforts. The results of the outreach and consultation effort will be described in the EIR.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
b)	Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			\boxtimes	
c)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that is has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			\boxtimes	
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			\boxtimes	
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			\boxtimes	

3.19.1 Environmental Setting

The City's current population is served by existing utility and service systems, as described below.

Wastewater

The Corona Utilities Department is the primary provider of sewer and sanitation services to the City. Corona Utilities services approximately 168,000 people over its 38.5-square-mile service area. The City sewer system is comprised of 13 sewer lift stations and associated force mains, three water reclamation facilities (WRF), and a network of gravity sewer pipes (City of Corona 2019). The Home Gardens Sanitary District (HGSD) services the unincorporated areas of Home Gardens, located in the City's SOI and the Temescal Valley Water District (TVWD) provides sewer services to the Temescal Canyon area. The El Cerrito area is currently on septic systems.

The City's three WRFs treat up to 15.5 million gallons per day (mgd). Additionally, the City has a capacity of 2.62 mgd at the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) Plant. The current treatment capacity of the City's existing WRF is 15.5 mgd and 2.62 mgd at WRCRWA for a total of 18.12 mgd with plans to expand the wastewater treatment capacity at the City's WRF to 18 mgd in the future. The WRCRWA operates a WRF for Home Gardens and the Temescal Valley Water District

maintains a WRF for its service area (City of Corona 2020). According to the General Plan Update EIR, the City has an average daily sewer flow of 15.3 mgd and the SOI has an average daily sewer flow of 3.3 mgd.

Electric Power

The SCE provides electrical services to most of the City and its SOI, using numerous power plants throughout California and in other western states. As of 2017, ten substations serve Corona and the SOI, of which eight are owned and operated by SCE. Additional substations are proposed in Corona and, if approved by the California Public Utility Commission, would provide additional service capacity in the future. Most major electricity transmission lines are also maintained by SCE (City of Corona 2019).

On April 4, 2001, the Corona's City Council passed Resolution No. 2001-25, which established a municipally owned electric utility. In August 2001, this electric utility, which is part of the Corona Utilities, entered into an agreement with SCE to provide retail services as an electric services provider. Corona Utilities buys and sells power on behalf of the City's municipal electric accounts and properties within specific service areas. Total estimated existing electricity demand in the City and SOI in 2018, based on data provided by SCE and Corona Utilities, is estimated at 1,412,642,823 kWh per year (City of Corona 2019).

Solid Waste

The City contracts with Waste Management Inc. (WMI) for trash and recycling services. The General Plan Update EIR identified that in 2018, approximately 98 percent of solid waste from the City was transported to the EI Sobrante landfill, located east of the City in an unincorporated area of the County, and the Olinda Alpha landfill, located in the City of Brea (City of Corona 2019). In 2020, the City had a total landfill disposal quantity of 275,556 tons (CalRecycle 2020).

Water

There are four water districts providers that serve the City and SOI. Corona Utilities provides water services to the majority of the City except for a small portion in eastern Corona that is provided by Eagle Valley Mutual Water Company (EVMWC). The EVMWC, along with the Home Gardens County Water District (HGCWD) and the TVWD, provide water services to the City's SOI. Corona Utilities is responsible for supplying potable water to the City and surrounding areas. This area includes approximately 39 square miles within the City's municipal area and 35 square miles in the SOI.

The City receives water from two main sources: groundwater sources from basins managed by Corona Utilities and imported water from Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). According to the 2020 UWMP, the City's primary sources of imported water are supplied through WMWD which consist of treated surface water, untreated surface water, and desalinated brackish groundwater. Groundwater used by the City are from two basins: the Temescal Basin and the Bedford-Coldwater Basin (City of Corona 2021a). According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, the groundwater basins provide approximately 40 percent of the City's water supply from 22 wells with a total capacity of 39,200 acre-feet (af) per year (35 mgd). The remaining 60 percent of the City's water supply is imported from WMWD through the Lower Feeder Pipeline



Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

(raw Colorado River water) and Mills Pipeline Connection (treated State Project water). The total capacity of the imported water supply is 39,840 af per year (35.6 mgd).

Additionally, the City uses reclaimed water that services the irrigation needs of 26 City parks, 17 schools, and many City, commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential common area landscaping. The City's reclaimed water system ties into the three wastewater treatment facilities and treats an average of 13.5 mgd (City of Corona 2019).

Stormwater Drainage

The City's storm drain system is comprised of six main storm drain facilities: the Temescal Canyon Wash, Oak Street Channel, Main Street Channel, Arlington Channel, South Norco Storm Drain, and North Norco Storm Drain. The City's storm drain system releases water into flood control channels, washes, Santa Ana River, and Prado Basin (City of Corona 2020).

Natural Gas Facilities

SoCalGas provides natural gas services to the City and the SOI. SoCalGas maintains transmission and distribution lines throughout the City and the SOI. The General Plan Update EIR identified existing natural gas demands in the City and SOI, based on data provided by SoCalGas, which are estimated at 43.9 million therms per year (City of Corona 2019).

Telecommunications Facilities

Telecommunications in the City are offered by multiple service providers and through different types of infrastructure systems. The City is responsible for oversight and approval authority for the siting and operation of transmission antennas and other facilities within the City but does not exercise control over the provision of telecommunications services (City of Corona 2020).

3.19.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

As with buildout of the General Plan, Project implementation may result in the relocation and construction of new and expanded water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, natural gas, telecommunications, and electrical power facilities. The General Plan Update EIR indicated that potential impacts related to utilities and service systems from buildout of the General Plan, in the City and SOI, would be less than significant without the incorporation of mitigation measures. As discussed further below, impacts to water and wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant with Project implementation.

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

With respect to stormwater drainage, the General Plan Infrastructure Element includes multiple policies related to stormwater runoff and conveyance systems. City Municipal Code Chapter 13.16, Storm Drains, provides guidance regarding prohibited wastewater discharges, and Chapter 13.27, Storm Water Management and Discharge Controls, prohibits illicit connections and discharges to the storm drain system. In addition, the City's 2003 Storm Drain Master Plan analyzes storm drain facilities within the City and identifies deficiencies or capital improvements needed, with the objective of meeting a minimum 10-year frequency storm event. The Storm Drain Master Plan identified a total of 137 areas with insufficient street capacity and 152 deficient storm drain segments. Since the 2003 Storm Drain Master Plan, improvements have been made to the storm drain system and ongoing monitoring occurs through the City Public Works Department (City 2019). As with buildout of the General Plan, Project implementation would require individual developments to be constructed in accordance with City requirements and an assessment of how a project could affect the existing storm drain systems and to determine appropriate storm drain improvements, as applicable. Required improvements to storm drain facilities would be funded by DIFs. Therefore, with adherence to General Plan policies and adherence to all applicable regulations, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not result in a significant impact with respect to stormwater drainage facilities.

With respect to electrical power, buildout of the General Plan would result in an increase in electrical power of approximately 32 percent over existing conditions (City of Corona 2019). However, coordination with Corona Utilities, compliance with General Plan policies related to the maintenance of utility facilities, continued improvement of electrical poles and undergrounding of wires, adherence to all applicable permitting requirements and regulations, and payment of DIFs by future residential development projects would ensure that impacts related to the additional residential uses resulting from Project implementation would continue to be less than significant.

Similarly for natural gas, buildout of the General Plan would result in an increase in electrical power of approximately three percent over existing conditions (City of Corona 2019). The addition of 594 more residential units, as proposed under Project implementation, would represent a small fraction of additional demand for natural gas as compared to the General Plan buildout. In addition, with Project implementation, future residential development projects would be required to comply with General Plan policies relates to utility infrastructure and improvements and pay DIFs, as appropriate, to ensure that the additional residential uses would not cause significant environmental effects. As such, Project implementation would not result in a significant impact with respect to natural gas facilities or infrastructure.

Telecommunications facilities in the City are not owned by the City but are owned and operated by multiple service providers. As with buildout of the General Plan, Project implementation would not result in a significant impact to telecommunications facilities, as each individual future developer would be required to contract with the respective telecommunications company and coordinate with the City to connect to such facilities, as required by applicable regulations and requirements. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in a significant impact to telecommunications facilities.

In conclusion, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of



which could cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supply available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

The General Plan Update EIR provided water demand estimates as a baseline for land uses in the City and SOI. Under existing conditions, the average daily water demand was estimated at 27.7 mgd for both the City and SOI, with the majority of the service area consisting of residential uses. These estimates were considered conservative over-estimates for land planning purposes only. The 2015 UWMP estimated that the City's per capita water demand was 163 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is below the minimum water use reduction target of 213 gpcd.

Buildout of the General Plan was assumed to increase the City's population by approximately 11,511 residential units and an additional 26,476,352 square feet of non-residential uses in the City and its SOI; however, no water supply deficiencies were anticipated, as the City confirmed that it would have adequate capacity to accommodate the forthcoming increase in water demand associated with General Plan implementation. The City's 2005 Water Master Plan identified 19 water system improvement projects which would increase the City's water system capacity and functionality to accommodate the anticipated growth (City of Corona 2019).

The General Plan Update EIR anticipated an additional 5,494 units in the City resulting from buildout of the General Plan, which would result in an increase in water demand of approximately 2,471,856 gallons per day (gpd) (or an 11 percent increase), as compared to existing conditions. This proposed increase in water demand could be served by existing water resources without the need for new or expanded entitlements. Furthermore, the City is planning on increasing its use or recycled water and continue to receive its supply from TVWD, HGWCD and imported water from WMWD, which were considered to have adequate supply to meet the proposed increase in water demand at buildout of the General Plan (City of Corona 2019).

As the City's RHNA allocation exceeds the projected housing growth by 594 units, and the additional 594 units resulting from the rezoning program would further increase demand for water. As discussed above, the additional 594 units would cause an increase in population of approximately 1,972 people. Using the water demand per capita rate of 163 gpcd, this would result in an increase in water demand of 321,436 gpd or approximately 11.5 percent. Based on the existing availability of 35 mgd of groundwater in the City, in addition to continued imported water supplies of 35.6 mgd, the increase of 321,436 gpd resulting from Project implementation would be served by existing water supplies.

The Project proposes to meet and exceed the RHNA for low- and moderate-income households, and when considering the maximum density allowed at 60 units per acre in the AHO zone, Project implementation could result in the development of up to 6,221 units. As discussed above, this would represent a very conservative surplus of approximately 2,415 units, assuming that every candidate parcel was developed at a density of 60 units per acre, which is unlikely. The 594 units required to meet RHNA and the surplus


provided by the buffer based on the maximum density would represent in total, an increase population of 9,990 residents, resulting in an increased water demand of up to approximately 1.6 mgd. Even under this conservative estimate, water supplies would still be sufficient to serve future residential resulting from Project implementation.

Furthermore, future residential development resulting from implementation of the Project would be subject to City permits, fees, and applications to ensure that adequate water supply and infrastructure are available to serve each development. In addition, there are numerous General Plan policies that would be applicable to reduce potential water supply and distribution impacts which may result from Project implementation. As existing water suppliers would be able to serve increased water demands in the City and SOI, continued compliance with applicable regulations, planning requirements and the payment of DIFs to accommodate future expansions to infrastructure would be required, as necessary. As with buildout of the General Plan, there would be sufficient water supply available to serve future residential development resulting from Project implementation, in addition to reasonably foreseeable development. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that is has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

As stated in the General Plan Update EIR, buildout of the entire General Plan would involve the installation of new or expanded sewer laterals and mains in the City and its SOI. Total estimated sewer flows in the City would increase by 4,058,546 gpd, or approximately 12 percent, with full buildout of the General Plan assumed. Even with this increase in sewer flows compared to existing conditions, General Plan buildout would not exceed the projected future capacity of the City's WRFs, which have a total future treatment capacity of 18 mgd and would still have the capacity to receive portions of the proposed increase in sewer flows from across the SOI (City of Corona 2019). Portions of the City and its SOI sewer flows to TVWD and WRCWTP would be able to receive some of the 2.2 mgd increase in flows, as they have capacities of 2.3 mgd and 14 mgd, respectively (City of Corona 2019). Implementation of the entire General Plan would not create any major deficiencies in sewer lines Citywide, as improvement of deficient lines would be funded through DIFs and individually required permits. No significant impacts to sewer facilities or their ability to provide service capacity were anticipated as a result of General Plan buildout.

The addition of 549 residential units including the buffer, as proposed under Project implementation, would increase the demand for wastewater treatment; however, based on the currently available wastewater treatment capacity remaining after buildout of the General Plan, future residential development projects resulting from Project implementation would still have sufficient wastewater service capacity available. In addition, future projects would require individual permits and applications, the payment of DIFs and adherence to all applicable regulations, thereby further reducing potential impacts to wastewater treatment capacity. The relatively small number of additional residences proposed under the Project would not significantly impact the existing and projected wastewater treatment provider capacity, as compared to the impact of General Plan buildout across the City and SOI. Therefore, Project implementation would not result



in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments, and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

According to the General Plan Update EIR, solid waste from the City is disposed at two different landfills: the Sobrante Landfill and the Olinda Alpha Landfill (City of Corona 2019). The Sobrante Landfill currently has a remaining capacity of 143,977,170 cubic yards and the Olinda Alpha Landfill has a remaining capacity of 17,500,000 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2022a, 2022b). Therefore, the two landfills have a total remaining capacity of 161,477,170 cubic yards. The estimated closing dates of the landfills are 2051 and 2036. There would be adequate landfill capacity in the region for solid waste that would be generated by the future residential uses associated with Project implementation. The Project would be required to implement General Plan policies identified to reduce the amount of solid waste that is disposed in landfills. Additionally, new development projects approved by the City are required to contain storage areas for recyclable materials in conformance with PRC Section 42900 et seq., and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 8.20, Collection of Refuse and Recyclable Materials. The City's solid waste diversion programs would continue to operate and would have adequate capacity to accept all future wastes and recyclables to reduce landfill waste. Therefore, with implementation of the City's waste reduction programs and General Plan policies, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not generate solid waste in excess of standards or capacity of infrastructures and impacts would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Exiting regulations related to solid waste include AB 939 California Integrated Waste Management Act, AB 341, AB 1327 California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991, California Green Buildings Standards Code, and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 8.20, Collection of Refuse and Recyclable Materials. The Project would be required to adhere to all relevant existing statues and regulations related to solid waste, including waste diversion and reduction measures adopted by the City. Implementation of General Plan policies would ensure that new developments are constructed and operated in accordance with solid waste statues and regulations, and therefore, impacts associated with future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be less than significant. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.



3.20 WILDFIRE

	WILDFIRE Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact		
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones;							
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes		
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?				\boxtimes		
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				\boxtimes		
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?				\boxtimes		

3.20.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Corona is surrounded by extensive open space areas that are susceptible to wildfire and encroachment into the community. Vegetation to the north, in the Chino and Corona Hills, and to the east, in Gavilan Hills, is susceptible to wildfire. A majority of the undeveloped area surrounding the City is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by CAL FIRE.

Though the majority of the area surrounding the City is designated as a VHFHSZ, the City is not designated as a VHFHSZ and is designated as a local responsible non-VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE 2009). Additionally, USFS classifies a majority of the City as non-burnable, with some areas ranging from low to moderate wildfire hazard potential with high and very high wildfire hazard potential areas located along the undeveloped area surrounding the City (USFS 2020).

3.20.2 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: No Impact

The City has prepared an EOP and a LHMP to ensure protection of City residents in times of emergency and to identify local hazards and provide measures to address these hazards. The General Plan Update EIR identified that buildout of the General Plan would not result in substantial changes to the circulation patterns or emergency access routes identified in the LHMP and EOP. The Project would rezone parcels



City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

within the City that already exist and are located in developed areas of the City, and therefore, would not result in changes to the circulation patterns and emergency routes. Future residential development projects resulting from Project implementation would be required to comply with applicable fire and building codes and would be required to be reviewed by CFD prior to approval. Additionally, future projects would be required to comply with policies identified in the General Plan to ensure effective emergency response. Compliance with General Plan policies, applicable fire and building codes, and the City's EOP and LHMP would ensure that Project implementation would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

- b) Would the project 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?
- c) Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d) Would the project 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?

b-d) Finding: No Impact

The Project is proposing rezoning and establishment of AHO zone of identified parcels within the City to provide residential housing units in excess of the amount planned in the General Plan Update. Parcels identified for rezoning and AHO zone are located in the central portion of the City and are not located in hillside areas or areas with an urban-wildland interface. Project implementation would not place assets in the VHFHSZ, and future residential development would be located within urbanized areas of the City. Future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to adhere to a wide range of state and local codes pertaining to fire protection and would be required to comply with CFD's SPP. There are several SPPs, with each individual SPP tailored to the fire behavior associated with terrain, fuel, and fire infrastructure needed to address wildfire risk unique to these areas. Adherence to the measures in the individual SPPs for areas relevant to future residential development projects would minimize impacts resulting from Project implementation to the extent possible and would ensure that new developments would not exacerbate fire hazards and would not expose people or structures to significant risks associated with post-fire landslides, mudflows, and flooding. Therefore, with implementation of applicable state and local codes and adherence to the SPP, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would not exacerbate fire risks or expose people or structures to significant risks. and there would be no impact.

Project implementation would result in the parcels being converted for additional housing and would result in construction and installation of associated infrastructure to accommodate new development. Associated infrastructure would be constructed in accordance with City requirements and regulations and would be

required to adhere to the measures in the individual SPPs for new infrastructure to minimize potential impacts. Additionally, future residential development resulting from Project implementation would be required to implement General Plan policies identified to minimize risk from wildfire hazards. With adherence to applicable building practices and requirements, infrastructure associated with Project implementation would not exacerbate fire risk, and there would be no impact. As such, this topic does not require further evaluation in an EIR.

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	\boxtimes			
b)	Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?	\boxtimes			
c)	Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	\boxtimes			

3.21.1 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts with the incorporation of mitigation with respect to biological resources and cultural resources. However, as consultation pursuant to AB 52 has not yet been completed, impacts related to tribal cultural resources are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable? ("Cumulative considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable

when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

The proposed Project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future related projects, has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts when the independent impacts of the proposed Project and the impacts of related projects combine to create impacts greater than those of the proposed Project alone.

A list of the related projects or growth projections will be developed for the EIR. The potential for the proposed Project in conjunction with the related projects and their cumulative contributions to environmental impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

The cumulative impacts addressed in the EIR will be the same as the individual resource areas which will be evaluated in the EIR, which will include the following:

- Air Quality
- Energy
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use

- Public Services (Parks)
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources

Noise

The extent and significance of potential cumulative impacts resulting from the combined effects of the proposed Project plus other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects will be evaluated in the EIR.

The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution or result in a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the environmental resource areas to the following topics, which will not be further evaluated in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Hydrology and Drainage
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services (Fire, Police, Schools and Libraries)
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study

Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

c) Would the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Finding: Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially significant impacts to the following resources may have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings:

- Air Quality
- Energy

- Public Services (Parks)
- Recreation

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use
- Noise

- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources

Potential impacts to each of these resources will be analyzed further in the EIR.

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study Report Preparation

4.0 **REPORT PREPARATION**

4.1 LIST OF PREPARERS

Preparers				
Trevor Macenski	Senior Principal			
Anna Radonich	Principal Planner			
Christine Abraham	Principal Environmental Planner			
Jennifer Webster	Environmental Planner			
Kaela Johnson	Environmental Planner			

City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study References

5.0 **REFERENCES**

- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring System, California Important Farmland Finder. <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2009. Corona Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. <u>https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5911/corona.pdf</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2020. Disposal Rate Calculator Corona 2020. <u>https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/AnnualReporting/DisposalRateCalculator</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2022a. SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details. El Sobrante Landfill. <u>https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/2280?siteID=2402</u>. Accessed June 2022.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2022b. SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details. Olinda Alpha Landfill. <u>https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/2757?siteID=2093</u>. Accessed June 2022.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Scenic Highway, State Scenic Highway Map. <u>https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways</u>. Accessed June 2022.
- California Geologic Survey (CGS). 2021. California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- California State Water Resources Control Board. Geotracker. <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/</u>. Accessed June 2022.
- City of Corona. 2019. Corona General Plan Technical Update for the City of Corona, Draft Environmental Impact Report.

https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/17290/637122799157100000. Accessed May 2022.

City of Corona. 2020. City of Corona 2020 – 2040 General Plan. <u>https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/17292/637396648435970000</u>. Accessed May 2022.



City of Corona General Plan Housing Element Rezoning Program Update Project Initial Study References

City of Corona. 2021a. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. <u>https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/20292/637612402713400000</u>. Accessed May 2022.

- City of Corona. 2021b. City of Corona General Plan, Housing Element 2021-2029. <u>https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/21174/637707501610300000</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- Corona Fire Department (CFD). 2021. 2021 Annual Report. <u>https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/21776/637841661637200000</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- Corona Police Department (CPD). 2021. 2021 Annual Report. <u>https://www.coronaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/21772/637846757873130000</u>. Accessed May 2022.
- United States Forest Service (USFS). 2020. Wildlife Hazard Potential, Version 2020 Classified. <u>https://usfs.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?useExisting=1&layers=55226e8547f84a</u> <u>ae8965210a9801c357</u>. Accessed May 2022.