RESOLUTION NO. 2025-007

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF CORONA, CERTIFYING FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE GREEN RIVER RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT & BUSINESS PARK INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND RELOCATION OF PROPOSED CONSTRAINED LINKAGE 1 OF THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN (SCH #2022080640); ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND AN UPDATED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2001, the City Council of the City of Corona ("City") adopted Resolution No. 2001-09 certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report ("Certified EIR") for Green River Ranch Specific Plan (SCH #99091143) ("Approved Project"), made findings of fact and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and

WHEREAS, the Green River Ranch Specific Plan (SP00-001) area consists of approximately 165 acres and is located below the foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Corona ("Property"); and

WHEREAS, PSIP WR Green River, LLC ("Applicant"), the owner of the Property, seeks to amend the Green River Ranch Specific Plan (SP00-001) to rearrange the specific plan land use designations, modify the planning area boundaries, designate a large portion of the Property as open space for permanent preservation, and develop 746,167 square-feet of industrial building area within the proposed Business Park Industrial (BPI) designated portions of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan as amended ("SPA2020-0006"); and

WHEREAS, in connection with SPA2020-0006, the Applicant has also applied for a General Plan amendment ("GPA2020-0002") to change the land use designation of 5.5 acres of the Property located north of Green River Road and west of Dominguez Ranch Road from Mixed Use II (Industrial & Commercial) to General Commercial, and change the land use designations on the south side of Green River Road and west of Dominguez Ranch Road from General Commercial, Mixed Use II, and Estate Residential to 49.31 acres of Mixed Use II, and 103.73 acres of Open Space-General, a Tentative Tract Map ("TTM 37963") to subdivide 154.90 acres of the Property into nine (9) lots within Specific Plan Planning Areas 1 through 6, and a Precise Plan ("PP2020-0004") for the development of the proposed industrial park component

EXHIBIT 1

within Specific Plan Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3 (collectively referred to herein as the "Modified Project"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.) the City has determined that a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR") to the Certified EIR should be prepared pursuant to CEQA in order to evaluate proposed changes to the Approved Project that was originally analyzed in the Certified EIR; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a SEIR to the Certified EIR is the appropriate environmental document to analyze all potential adverse environmental impacts of the Modified Project because substantial changes in the Approved Project and the circumstances under which the Modified Project is undertaken are proposed that would require revisions to the Certified EIR due to new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and

WHEREAS, the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan ("MSHCP") identifies areas of habitat within Western Riverside County to be conserved to ensure the long-term survivability of the covered species contained in the plan. The habitat areas located on private property are identified by criteria cells, core areas consisting of groups of criteria cells, and wildlife corridors linking core areas. The Green River Ranch Specific Plan area contains four criteria cells that support Proposed Constrained Linkage (PCL-1) that connects Core Area A to the north (Prado Basin/Santa Ana River) with Core Area B to the south (Cleveland National Forest). At the request of the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority ("RCA"), PCL-1 is proposed to be relocated to an alternate location on property owned by RCA known as the B Canyon property, which would ensure that areas to the north and south of State Route 91 and the Santa Ana River can be linked to provide a viable wildlife linkage ("PCL-1 Relocation"). The B Canyon property is located west of its current alignment and west of and adjacent to the Green River Ranch Specific Plan area. The Applicant has agreed to include environmental analysis of the proposed PCL-1 Relocation in the SEIR as a separate but related project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15086, on or about October 11, 2024 the City provided public notice of the availability of the Draft SEIR and consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others for a 45-day comment period; and

WHEREAS, the City received 16 comment letters/emails on the Modified Project and 1 comment letter on the PCL-1 Relocation during the public comment period for the Draft SEIR; and

WHEREAS, on November 25, 2024, the Planning and Housing Commission of the City of Corona ("Planning Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing to hear and consider evidence and testimony concerning the Modified Project and the contents and

sufficiency of the Draft SEIR, and to investigate and make findings in connection therewith; and

WHEREAS, at said public hearing, the Planning Commission received evidence and reports, including all written comments received during the 45-day public review period and directed that a Final SEIR be prepared for certification by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City has evaluated the comments received from public agencies and persons who reviewed the Draft SEIR and has prepared responses to the comments received during the public review period; and

WHEREAS, the Modified Project originally proposed reducing the existing Estate Residential land use designation from 49.31 acres to 20.39 acres to permit development of up to 32 single-family residential dwellings and to create 83.34 acres of open space; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Government Code Section 66300) restricts the City's ability to adopt land use or zoning amendments that would result in the reduction of allowed residential density or intensity of land uses than what is allowed under the regulations in effect on January 1, 2018, unless a concurrent change in the land use or zoning designation of other parcels in the City is approved to replace the residential units lost with the land use or zoning amendment, thus ensuring a "no net loss" in the zoning for residential units; and

WHEREAS, Government Section 66300(e)(4) provides that the Housing Crisis Act does not apply to a housing development project located within a very high fire hazard severity zone. Because the Modified Project is on a site that is located entirely within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the Housing Crisis Act does not apply to the Modified Project; and

WHEREAS, during the public hearing on November 25, 2024, the Planning Commission determined that since the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 does not apply to the Modified Project, it would be preferable to eliminate the Estate Residential land use designation and increase the open space acreage from 83.34 acres to 103.73 acres and recommended that the Estate Residential land use designation be changed to Open Space General for GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006; and

WHEREAS, in conformance with the requirements of Section 15362(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City has prepared a Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Modified Project and the PCL-1 Relocation (SCH # 2022080640), consisting of comments received during the public review and comment periods on the Draft SEIR, written responses to those comments, and revisions and errata to the Draft SEIR ("Final SEIR"). For the purposes of this Resolution, the "Final SEIR" shall refer to the Draft SEIR, as revised by the Final SEIR's errata section, together with the other sections of the Final SEIR; and

WHEREAS, in conformance with the requirements of CEQA and the State

CEQA Guidelines, the City has prepared, or caused to be prepared: (a) CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations relating to the Modified Project and CEQA Findings relating to the PCL-1 Relocation, which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full; (b) an Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full; and

WHEREAS, as contained herein, the City has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision on the Modified Project and the Final SEIR; and

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2025, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing at which all persons wishing to testify in connection with GPA2020-0002, SPA2020-0006 and the Final SEIR were heard and GPA2020-0002, SPA2020-0006 and the Final SEIR were comprehensively reviewed; and

WHEREAS, at said public hearing, upon hearing and considering all testimony and comments of all persons desiring to be heard, the City Council considered all factors relating to GPA2020-0002, SPA2020-0006, TTM 37963 and PP2020-0004, including the Final SEIR, the recommendations of the Planning Commission, and the Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and

WHEREAS, all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in the Final SEIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the Modified Project and the PCL-1 Relocation have been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS, all of the findings and conclusions made by the City Council pursuant to this Resolution are based upon the oral and written evidence presented to it as a whole and the entirety of the administrative record for the Final SEIR, which are incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full, and not based solely on the information provided in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the City Council has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including, but not limited to, the Certified EIR, as revised by the Final SEIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all the meetings and hearings, all of which are incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full; and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council and is deemed adequate for the purpose of making decisions on the merits of the Modified Project; and

WHEREAS, no comments made in the public hearings conducted by the City or any additional information submitted to the City have produced substantial new information

requiring recirculation or additional environmental review under State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONA, CALIFORNIA AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Compliance with CEQA. The City Council has determined that, based on all of the evidence presented, including but not limited to, written and oral evidence presented at meetings and hearings, and the submission of testimony from the public, organizations and regulatory agencies, the Final SEIR prepared for the Modified Project, which consists of GPA2020-0002, SPA2020-0006, TTM 37963 and PP2020-0004, and the PCL-1 Relocation has been completed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 2. Review of Final SEIR. The City Council has carefully reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final SEIR prior to acting upon the Modified Project.

SECTION 3. Independent Judgment. The Final SEIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council and is deemed adequate for the purpose of making decisions on the merits of the Modified Project.

SECTION 4. Adequate Assessment. Based upon the information contained in the Final SEIR, the City Council finds that the Final SEIR provides an adequate assessment of the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Modified Project.

SECTION 5. CEQA Findings for Modified Project. The City Council hereby adopts the CEQA Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations, which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and which: (a) documents and supports the conclusion that even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures recommended in the Final SEIR, it is infeasible to reduce certain impacts of the Modified Project to a level of insignificance; and (b) further sets forth the overriding benefits of the Modified Project, which outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts of the Modified Project. Accordingly, the City Council finds and determines that the Modified Project's overriding benefits outweigh the Modified Project's unavoidable environmental impacts.

SECTION 6. CEQA Findings for PCL-1 Relocation. The City Council hereby adopts the CEQA Findings, which are included in Exhibit "A" and which conclude that all environmental effects of the PCL-1 Relocation are less than significant and do not require mitigation measures.

SECTION 7. Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the City Council hereby adopts the Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto as Exhibit "B". Implementation of the Mitigation Measures contained in the Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is hereby made a condition of approval of the Modified Project.

SECTION 8. Certification of Final SEIR. Based on all the foregoing, the City Council hereby certifies the Final SEIR.

SECTION 9. Custodian of Records. The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the findings set forth in this Resolution have been based are located at City of Corona City Hall, 400 S. Vicentia Avenue, Corona, California 92882. The custodian for these records is Joanne Coletta, Planning and Development Director. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21081.6.

SECTION 10. Notice of Determination. A Notice of Determination shall be filed with the County of Riverside and the State Clearinghouse within 5 (five) working days of final approval of GPA2020-0002, SPA2020-0006, TTM 37963 and PP2020-0004.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of February, 2025.

_____

Mayor of the City of Corona, California

ATTEST:

_____

City Clerk of the City of Corona, California

CERTIFICATION

I, Sylvia Edwards, City Clerk of the City of Corona, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Corona, California, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 5th day of February 2025, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Corona, California, this 5th day of February, 2025.

_____

City Clerk of the City of Corona, California

EXHIBIT "A"

FINDINGS OF FACT

[SEE ATTACHED 168 PAGES]

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

The California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") requires that public agencies shall not approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report ("EIR") has been certified that identifies one or more significant adverse environmental effects of a project unless the public agency makes one or more written Findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each Finding (State CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.], § 15091). This document presents the CEQA Findings of Fact made by the City of Corona, in its capacity as the CEQA lead agency, regarding the Green River Ranch SPA & Business Industrial Development Project and Relocation of PCL-1 ("Project"), evaluated in the Draft Subsequent EIR ("Draft SEIR") and Final Subsequent EIR ("Final SEIR") for the Project.

SECTION I.
INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code section 21002 states that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" Section 21002 further states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Pursuant to section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, a public agency may only approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed that identifies any significant environmental effects if the agency makes one or more of the following written finding(s) for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

As indicated above, section 21002 requires an agency to "avoid or substantially lessen" significant adverse environmental impacts. Thus, mitigation measures that "substantially lessen" significant

environmental impacts, even if not completely avoided, satisfy section 21002's mandate. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 ["CEQA does not mandate the choice of the environmentally best feasible project if through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures alone the appropriate public agency has reduced environmental damage from a project to an acceptable level"]; *Las Virgenes Homeowners Fed., Inc. v. County of Los Angeles* (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, 309 ["[t]here is no requirement that adverse impacts of a project be avoided completely or reduced to a level of insignificance . . . if such would render the project unfeasible"].)

While CEQA requires that lead agencies adopt feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts, an agency need not adopt infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.1(c) [if "economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of a public agency"]; see also State CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a) [an "EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible"].) CEQA defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1.) The State CEQA Guidelines add "legal" considerations as another indicia of feasibility. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15364.) Project objectives also inform the determination of "feasibility." (*Jones v. U.C. Regents* (2010) 183 Cal. App. 4th 818, 828-829.) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) "Broader considerations of policy thus come into play when the decision making body is considering actual feasibility[.]" (*Cal. Native Plant Soc'y v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000 ("*Native Plant*"); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3) ["economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations" may justify rejecting mitigation and alternatives as infeasible] (emphasis added).)

Environmental impacts that are less than significant do not require the imposition of mitigation measures. (*Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337, 1347.)

The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 576.) In addition, perfection in a project or a project's environmental alternatives is not required; rather, the requirement is that sufficient information be produced "to permit a reasonable choice of alternatives so far as environmental aspects are concerned." Outside agencies (including courts) are not to "impose unreasonable extremes or to interject [themselves] within the area of discretion as to the choice of the action to be taken." (*Residents Ad Hoc Stadium Com. v. Board of Trustees* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 274, 287.)

The City Council of the City of Corona ("City Council") certifies that it has been presented with the Final SEIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final SEIR prior to making the following findings. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines § 15090, the City Council certifies that the Final SEIR has been completed and certified in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The City Council further certifies that the Final SEIR reflects its independent judgment and analysis.

SECTION II.
SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Green River Ranch Specific Plan

The current ±165.0-acre Green River Ranch Specific Plan (GRRSP) Planning Area is located below the foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Corona (City). The City is generally situated southwest of the City of Riverside, south of the City of Norco, and northwest of the City of Lake Elsinore. The GRRSP Planning Area is located south of SR 91, southwest of Dominguez Ranch Road, and southeast of Fresno Road. Green River Road bisects a small portion of the Planning Area in an east-west alignment.

The City first approved the GRRSP in 2001 and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), State Clearinghouse #99091143. The GRRSP as currently approved guides development of up to 8.12 acres of general commercial land uses, 45.64 acres of Mixed-Use land uses, 13.37 acres of Hotel/Mixed-Use/Office land uses, and 98.2 acres of Estate Residential land use (32 dus) in the Planning Area. After approval of the GRRSP, the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WR-MSHCP) was approved in 2004 by Riverside County. The GRRSP Planning Area is overlain by four Criteria Cells (1702, 1704, 1811, and 1812) and Proposed Constrained Linkage 1 (PCL-1) as defined by the WR-MSHCP.

The Modified Project

The Project Applicant, PSIP WR Green River, LLC, seeks approval of a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Tentative Tract Map, and Precise Plan to rearrange and change the previously approved GRRSP land uses, slightly modify the Planning Area boundary, designate a large portion of the site as Open Space for permanent preservation in compliance with the WR-MSHCP, and develop 746,167 square-feet of industrial building area within the proposed Business Park Industrial (BPI) designated portions of the proposed GRRSP as amended. The proposed reconfigured and changed land uses include 5.5 acres of General Commercial uses on proposed PA 4; ±49.31 acres of BPI uses on proposed PAs 1, 2, and 3; and ±103.73 acres of Open Space on proposed PA 6.

Since the time of the preparation of the Draft SEIR, the Modified Project was revised. As originally proposed, GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006 included 20.39 acres of Estate Residential and 83.34 acres of Open Space. However, during the public review and hearing on the Project, the City's Planning and Housing Commission recommended that the Estate Residential land use designation be replaced with an Open Space land use designation pursuant to Senate Bill

330, due to that acreage's location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). As a result of incorporating that recommendation, the total acreage being placed into the Open Space land use designation increased from 83.34 acres to 103.73 acres, and the Estate Residential land use acreage was deleted. The environmental effects of these Project revisions are not significant, particularly as they reduce – rather than increase – the development uses that could theoretically be placed on the site. As such, these revisions constitute minor amendments and clarifications, and do not require new or additional analysis in the SEIR.

The proposed changes to the GRRSP and development of the BPI PAs represent the "Modified Project" or "Project" under scrutiny in the Subsequent EIR (SEIR). A detailed description of these proposed Modified Project is provided in the Final SEIR.

Over the past 20 years since the WR-MSHCP was approved, discussions regarding the existing location of PCL-1 have occurred because of several known constraints associated with its alignment. The four Criteria Cells (1702, 1704, 1811, and 1812) and PCL-1 that currently overlay the GRRSP Planning Area are intended to connect Core Area A to the north (Prado Basin/Santa Ana River) with Core Area B to the south (Cleveland National Forest). Proposed Constrained Linkage 2 (PCL-2) is located further to the east, and both PCL-1 and PCL-2 are intended to connect Core Areas A and B. To this end, Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) purchased the property known as B Canyon located adjacent to and west of the GRRSP Planning Area for the purposes of relocating PCL-1. At the request of RCA, the City and the Project Applicant agreed to include environmental analysis of the relocation of PCL-1 to the alternate B Canyon property alignment. The relocated PCL-1 alignment has been approved by RCA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). A detailed description of these proposed Relocated PCL-1 Project is provided in Section 3.3 of the Draft SEIR.

SECTION III.
RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED

Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.

Here, the Modified Project was revised from the original proposal presented in GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006. GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006 originally included 20.39 acres of Estate Residential and 83.34 acres of Open Space. Now, the Modified Project proposes increasing Open Space land use from 83.34 acres to 103.73 acres and removing all the Estate Residential land use. This change to the Modified Project does not necessitate the recirculation of the SEIR because it does not constitute "significant new information" deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to

comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project. Rather, the revision actually reduces the environmental impacts of the Modified Project in response to public input and recommendations from the City's Planning and Housing Commission. Therefore, recirculation of the SEIR is not required under CEQA.

SECTION V.
FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT REQUIRING MITIGATION

The City hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project are less than significant and therefore do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures.

A. AESTHETICS

1. Scenic Vistas and Visual Character

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to the Prior EIR are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-13)

Explanation:

With implementation of the Modified Project, the northern half of the property (approximately 5.5 acres) would be developed with approximately 19,600 sf of General Commercial uses (PA 4), approximately 746,167 sf of BPI uses (PAs 1, 2, and 3) . The southern half of the Modified Project (approximately 83.34 acres) in PA 6 is proposed for Open Space to be acquired by the RCA and would therefore remain undeveloped in perpetuity.

Development of the Modified Project would be required to comply with the development standards and design guidelines of the GRRSP as amended, while development within the BPI Development portions of the Project would also be required to comply with the site-specific components included as part of Precise Plan No. 2020-0004. The GRRSPA and Precise Plan No. 2020-0004 implement the City's General Plan policies related to aesthetics and comply with the City's Landscape Design Guidelines. Development in conformance with the GRRSPA and Precise Plan No. 2020-0004 would ensure that the property is developed in a manner that is consistent with applicable design guidelines in the GRRSPA and General Plan, ensuring scenic resources are unaffected by the development and the development is aesthetically compatible with the existing visual character of surrounding developed structures.

The northern 5.5-acre portion of the Modified Project site are planned for General Commercial land uses in PA 4. This portion of the Modified Project occurs at the property's lowest elevations

and are not highly visible from off-site locations. This portion of the property is currently surrounded by the SR 91 freeway and railroad tracks to the north and Green River Road to the south. Additionally, lands to the east of this portion of the site are developed with business park and commercial retail uses, with residential and commercial uses occurring along the north side of SR 91. No specific development plans are proposed for this portion of the Project site at this time, and future development of the General Commercial uses would be governed by the GRRSP as amended. Development of the General Commercial land uses would appear as a continuation of existing development patterns in the local area, and the proposed development would be visually compatible with the existing surrounding land uses. Additionally, due to the relatively low topography of this portion of the Project site as compared to surrounding areas, development of commercial retail uses as proposed would not obstruct any views of scenic resources, such as the existing hillforms in the southern portions of the site. Development of the proposed General Commercial land uses would not result in an adverse effect on any existing scenic vistas, and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The Modified Project's proposed BPI land uses would occur in PAs 1, 2 and 3 on approximately 37.82 acres south of Green River Road in areas that largely contain gently sloping terrain. This portion of the site would be visible from areas to the north as well as from the existing residential homes to the east of the site. In order to visualize the appearance of the proposed Project, a series of renderings were prepared as depicted on Figure 4.1-2, Conceptual Rendering – Aerial Perspective and Figure 4.1-3, Conceptual Rendering – Westerly Perspective. The renderings were prepared only for the BPI Development proposed as part of Precise Plan No. 2020-0004. The renderings do not depict views of the General Commercial uses in the northern portions of the site, as there are currently no development plans proposed for these areas.

Figure 4.1-2 provides a conceptual depiction of the proposed BPI Development buildings proposed as part of Precise Plan No. 2020-0004. This conceptual rendering depicts views from an aerial perspective, looking south.

As shown in the figure, the northern portions of the BPI Development would be graded to provide level pads for development. Landscape buffers are proposed along manufactured slopes to the north of the proposed buildings. While grading would occur at the base of the prominent hillforms on site, the proposed slopes would be contour graded to match the existing topography of these hillforms, and the manufactured slopes would be landscaped with hydroseed and trees. The large hillforms in the southern 83.34 portions of the property proposed for Open Space would continue to be visible from off-site locations.

Figure 4.1-3 depicts views from the existing single-family residential neighborhood to the east of the BPI Development site, looking west. As shown from this perspective, the proposed BPI buildings would be visible from this location. As shown, the BPI development would not obstruct scenic vistas from this location. The hillsides in the southern portion of the Modified Project site would continue to be prominently visible from this location, and the proposed buildings would not obstruct distant views of the Chino Hills hillsides, which also are visible in the distance.

Figure 4.1-3 depicts views from the existing single-family residential neighborhood to the east of the BPI Development site, looking west. As shown from this perspective, the proposed BPI buildings would be visible from this location. As shown, the BPI development would not obstruct scenic vistas from this location. The hillsides in the southern portion of the Modified Project site would continue to be prominently visible from this location, and the proposed buildings would not obstruct distant views of the Chino Hills hillsides, which also are visible in the distance.

The conceptual renderings depicted on Figure 4.1-2 and Figure 4.1-3 demonstrate that development of the proposed BPI Development would not obstruct scenic vistas of the hillforms in the southern portions of the property, or distant views of the Chino Hills that are available from the existing single-family neighborhood to the east of the BPI Development site, and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Furthermore, and as previously noted, areas to the east and north of the BPI site are developed with a mixture of commercial retail, business park, and residential land uses, and the proposed BPI Development buildings would further existing development patterns in the local area. Development of the proposed BPI Development would not adversely affect scenic vistas in the area resulting in a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Furthermore, the planned 32 single-family homes would not obstruct or detract from views of other off-site scenic resources within the existing viewshed as the PA's would be the southernmost development. Moreover, the planned single-family homes would be visually compatible with and less intense than the existing residential development to the east of the Project site. Therefore, within implementation of PDF AES-1, GRRSP as Amended, development of the planned 32 single-family homes would not result in a significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista, and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. As a result, impacts would be less than significant requiring no mitigation. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to scenic vistas or the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings would occur with implementation of the proposed Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-13 – 4.1-20.)

2. Scenic Resources

Threshold: Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-20.)

Explanation:

The 2001 EIR concluded SR 91 and Green River Road were not identified as a Scenic Highway

or Corridor in the then current General Plan. The current General Plan identifies Palisades Drive and the segment of Green River Road between Palisades Drive and SR 91 as a City Designated scenic corridor, while SR 91 and SR 71 are identified as "State Eligible" scenic highways. Thereby, SR 91 and SR 71 are not officially designated as state scenic highways. Similar to the Approved Project, development of the Modified Project would be visible from these facilities. Nonetheless, potential visual effects to these facilities is provided as follows based on the Visual Impact Analysis prepared for the Modified Project assessed.

As previously depicted on Figure 4.1-3, the Modified Project site does not contain any visually prominent rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings on site. Numerous trees are scattered throughout the property, primarily in association with the existing single-family homes in the northeastern portions of the property along the Dominguez Ranch Road frontage and the Green River Road frontage.

As previously discussed, the development of General Commercial uses in the northern portion of the Modified Project site (PA 4) is at a relatively low elevation compared to the surrounding area and completely surrounded by SR 91 and railroad tracks to the north, and Green River Road to the south. There are no scenic resources on this portion of the Modified Project site, such as prominently visible trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Impacts to scenic highways from development of the General Commercial uses in PA 4 would be less than significant.

Building elevations depicted on Figure 4.1-4 through Figure 4.1-9 from the Visual Impact Analysis visualize the effects of the proposed BPI buildings on Green River Road. The elevations depict street-level views of the BPI Development along Green River Road that is a City designated scenic corridor. As shown within these elevations, the proposed BPI buildings would be developed on level development pads, with manufactured slopes heavily landscaped with trees, shrubs, and groundcover designed to be a buffer between Green River Road and the proposed buildings.

The existing scattered trees onsite would be the only potential scenic resources on this portion of the Project site, however not visually prominent from off-site locations. As seen in Figure 4.1-10, Conceptual Landscape Plan, the existing trees would be replaced with ornamental tree species included as part of the BPI Development's conceptual landscape plan. Therefore, development of the proposed "Business Park Industrial" buildings would not substantially affect scenic resources visible from nearby scenic highways, and impacts would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

As stated in the Visual Impact Analysis, the Modified Project would result in a substantial change in the visual character of the property. However, with mandatory compliance of the GRRSP development standards and design guidelines (PDF AES-1), and the site-specific development plans included as part of Precise Plan No. 2020-0004 (PDF AES-2), such compliance would ensure that the Modified Project's aesthetic design would be aesthetically pleasing and would not substantially damage scenic resources visible from nearby scenic highways. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to scenic resources as viewed from a

scenic highway would occur with implementation of the proposed Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with those identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-20 – 4.1-37.)

B. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

1. Farmland Conversion

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-7.)

Explanation:

No changes in the location, size, or boundaries of the GRRSP Planning Area boundary have occurred since adoption of the GRRSP in 2001. As discussed in the Project Description, the Modified Project would modify the size and boundaries of the GRRSP, however minimally in the northern portion of the Project site. In addition, the eastern portion of the Project site has been slightly expanded to incorporate appropriate grading limits within the hilly terrain.

Since certification of the EIR in 2001, a revised Important Farmland Map has been issued by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Based on the revised California Important Farmland Map (Department of Conservation, 2022) and similar to the analysis within the 2001 EIR, there are no Prime and Unique Farmland within the Specific Plan area. However, the Farmland of Local Importance located on the GRRSP Planning Area (northeastern) designated by the FMMP is not designated as such in the General Plan EIR, Figure 5.2-1, Agricultural Resources. Although the Modified Project increases the GRRSP Planning Area, the Modified Project would have no change in impacts in comparison to those identified in the 2001 EIR. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-7.)

2. Agricultural Zoning

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project would not include any new the land use designations beyond those previously analyzed in the 2001 EIR. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an existing zoning for an agricultural use. As stated in the City's General Plan EIR, a Williamson Act contract for a preserve in the City was terminated, and there were no Williamson Act contracts in the City. However, the General Plan EIR concluded development of the General Plan would convert Williamson Act Land to nonagricultural uses and the associated loss of agricultural preserve lands under would be significant and unavoidable.

As previously stated, there are no lands currently within the City that are in an existing Williamson Act contract. As a result, no conflicts with Williamson Act contract lands would occur. The Modified Project would result in no conflicts with Williamson Act contract lands. Although not specifically analyzed in the 2001 EIR, the Modified Project would result in no impact to Williamson Act Contract lands. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-8.)

3. Forestland Zoning

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-8.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project proposes a minor increase in acreage, and changes to the land use designations within the GRRSP boundary. However, the proposed changes are designed to accommodate build out of the GRRSP and the proposed BPI Development. The GRRSPA would result in minor changes in land uses and these changes would result in no conflicts with existing zoning.

Although not discussed in the 2001 EIR, the City's General Plan EIR concludes no forest land or timberlands are located within the City. The Cleveland National Forest is southerly adjacent to the City limits, however not within the City. The Modified Project is not zoned for any forest land or timberland uses. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-8.)

4. Loss of Forest Land

Threshold: Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-9.)

Explanation:

As previously discussed in Impact AGF-3, the Modified Project would have no impact on forestland or timberland. The 2001 EIR did not address this topic, however the General Plan EIR determined that there are no current or planned fixed commercial timber operations subject to a Timber Harvesting Plan in southwest Riverside County (CALFIRE) and there are no timber production zones in the City or its SOI. Consequently, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in loss or conversion of timberland to non-forest uses. It can be concluded the GRRSP Planning Area similarly does not contain any forest land or timberland uses, and implementation of the Modified Project would not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-9.)

5. Change in Existing Environment

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-9.)

Explanation:

As discussed above in Impacts AGF-1 through AGF-5, there are no farmlands in the vicinity of the GRRSP Planning Area that would be subject to potential conversion to non-agricultural use, and there are no forest lands in or within the vicinity of the Project. As concluded, the Farmland of Local Importance located on the GRRSP Planning Area (northeastern) designated by the FMMP is not designated as such in the General Plan EIR, Figure 5.2-1, Agricultural Resources. The Modified Project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses. The Modified Project would not result in impacts to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could convert Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-9.)

C. AIR QUALITY

1. Other Emissions

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

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-27.)

Explanation:

As discussed in the AQIA, the Modified Project has the potential to generate objectionable odors from construction and operation related activities. Potential odor sources associated with construction related activities from the Modified Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities. However, standard construction requirements would minimize odor related impacts from construction activities and equipment. Furthermore, the construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction. Therefore, construction odor related impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Land use operations that are generally associated with objectionable odor complaints include:

- Agricultural uses (livestock and farming)
- Wastewater treatment plants
- Food processing plants
- Chemical plants
- Composting operations
- Refineries
- Landfills
- Dairies
- Fiberglass molding facilities

As stated in the AQIA, potential odor related sources during operation of the Modified Project would primarily occur from development of Phase 2 which includes the super convenience gas station (with 12 vehicle fueling stations). Additionally, the refuse that would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the solid waste regulations would be a potential odor related source. Pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 461 the proposed gas station land

use would be required to utilize gas dispensing equipment that minimizes vapor and liquid leaks. Furthermore Rule 461 requires the equipment be maintained at proposed worker odor, which will minimize odor impacts occurring from the gasoline and diesel dispensing facilities. With required compliance of SCAQMD Rule 402 and Rule 461, odors associated with the Modified Project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. The 2001 determined the Approved Project would result in less than significant and no mitigation was required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-27 – 4.3-28.)

D. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historical Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-6.)

Explanation:

An adverse effect is found when a project may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic resource that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (CEQA, Title 14, Chapter 3, p78; Federal Register, 36 CFR Part 800).

As discussed in the Project Description, no changes in the location, size, or boundaries of the GRRSP Planning Area boundary have occurred since adoption of the GRRSP in 2001. In addition, the Modified Project would modify the size and boundaries of the GRRSP, however minimally in the northern portion of the Project site. In addition, the eastern portion of the Project site has been slightly expanded to incorporate appropriate grading limits within the hilly terrain. As such, BFSA conducted this updated assessment to locate and record any cultural resources identified within the Modified Project boundary in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and following City of Corona Environmental Guidelines.

As stated in the CRA prepared for the Modified Project, the previously discussed 1939 culvert recorded by LSA has been completely replaced when the City of Corona conducted improvements to Green River Road between 2015 and 2016. Although the 1939 culvert has been replaced, additional historic features were identified in the Modified Project's CRA within the GRRSP Planning Area. Within the CRA, BFSA identified these features as Site Temp-1 of which consist of a board-formed concrete water tank, a concrete-lined reservoir, and a front-gabled cinderblock garage. Based upon aerial photographs and property research, Site Temp-1 appears to be associated

with the ranching operations first visible on aerial photographs from 1946. However, Site Temp-1 is not eligible for listing on the CRHR and do not qualify as significant resources under CEQA. As determined in the CRA prepared for the Modified Project, there are no significant resources identified within the GRRSP Planning Area. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to historical resources would occur with implementation of the proposed Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-6 – 4.5-7.)

E. ENERGY

1. Wasteful Use of Energy

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

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.6-18.)

Explanation:

Construction

Construction of the Modified Project would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of construction materials, preparation of the site for grading and building activities, and construction of the building. All or most of this energy would be derived from nonrenewable resources. Petroleum fuels (e.g., diesel and gasoline) would be the primary sources of energy for these activities.

Construction of the Modified Project is proposed to be developed in three (3) phases. Phase 1 would include the construction of the 746,167 square-foot BPI Development within PAs 1, 2, and 3. Phase 2 would include Phase 1 plus the construction of PA 4 comprised of 19,600 square feet of GC uses. Project buildout Phase 3 would include Phases 1 and 2 plus the addition of 32 ER residential lots. Construction of PAs 1, 2, and 3 is expected to occur over 11 months, and construction of PAs 4 and 5 would occur over seven (7) months.

Based on estimations provided in the Energy Analysis prepared for the Modified Project, the estimated total electricity usage during construction, after full Project build-out, was calculated to be approximately 549,793 kWh. In addition, construction-related vehicle trips would result in approximately 1.28 million VMT and consume an estimated 271,647 gallons of gasoline and diesel combined. The construction-related equipment would not be powered by natural gas and no natural gas demand is anticipated during construction, therefore would not involve the consumption of natural gas.

Construction equipment use of fuel would not be atypical for the type of construction proposed because there are no aspects of the Project's proposed construction process that are unusual or

energy-intensive, and Project construction equipment would conform to the applicable CARB emissions standards, acting to promote equipment fuel efficiencies. In addition, CCR Title 13, Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. BACMs inform construction equipment operators of this requirement. Enforcement of idling limitations is realized through periodic site inspections conducted by City building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints. Moreover, given the cost of fuel, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction.

Although the temporary nature of construction and the financial incentives for owners and contractors to use energy-consuming resources in an efficient manner, the construction phase of the Modified Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the construction-related impacts related to electricity and fuel consumption would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Operation

Electricity and Natural Gas

Operation of the Modified Project would consume energy as part of building operations and transportation activities. Building operations would involve energy consumption for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting, and electronics. Based on CalEEMod energy use estimations, operations for the Modified Project would result in approximately 15,108,857 kWh of electricity and 23,731,098 kBTU per year of natural gas annually.

Development of the Modified Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the California Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building. For example, the Title 24 Lighting Power Density requirements define the maximum wattage of lighting that can be used in a building based on its square footage. Title 24 standards are widely regarded as the most advanced energy efficiency standards, would help reduce the amount of energy required for lighting, water heating, and heating and air conditioning in buildings and promote energy conservation. Therefore, operational impacts related to electricity and natural gas consumption would be less than significant requiring no mitigation.

Fuel

Operational gasoline and diesel energy would also be consumed during vehicle trips associated with the Modified Project. Fuel consumption would be primarily related to passenger vehicle use by residents, visitors, and employees as well truck trips to and from the BPI and commercial uses. Based on CalEEMod energy use estimations, project-related vehicle trips would result in approximately 28.78 million VMT and consume an estimated 1,522,736 gallons of gasoline and

diesel combined, annually.

The Modified Project is partially surrounded by urban uses, and the availability of existing transportation facilities and infrastructure would provide future residents, visitors, and employees associated with the Modified Project good access to a mix of nearby land uses, further reducing fuel consumption demand. Additionally, the Modified Project would provide parking and EV infrastructure that would further promote fuel efficient vehicles. For these reasons, operational-related transportation fuel consumption would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the operational impact related to vehicle fuel consumption would be less than significant requiring no mitigation.

Construction Plus Operation

Overall, the Modified Project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary of energy resources during Project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant requiring no mitigation. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.6-18 – 4.6-20.)

2. Energy Efficiency Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state of local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.6-20.)

Explanation:

Construction

As previously discussed in Impact EN-1, the Modified Project would result in energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment, and the use of electricity for temporary buildings, lighting, and other sources. California Code of Regulations Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, limit idling from both on- road and off-road diesel-powered equipment and are enforced by the ARB. The Modified Project would comply with these regulations. There are no policies at the local level applicable to energy conservation specific to the construction phase. Thus, it is anticipated that construction of the Modified Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. Therefore, construction- related energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency impacts would be less than significant requiring no mitigation.

Operation

California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) establishes a goal of renewable energy for local providers to be 44 percent by 2040. Similarly, the State is promoting renewable energy target to meet the 2022 Scoping Plan greenhouse gas emissions reductions. As previously discussed in Impact EN-1, the Modified Project would result in approximately 15,108,857 kWh of electricity and 23,731,098 kBTU/year of natural gas annually.

Future development projects would be designed and constructed in accordance with the City's latest adopted energy efficiency standards, which are based on the California Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Title 24 standards include a broad set of energy conservation requirements that apply to the structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in a building. For example, the Title 24 Lighting Power Density requirements define the maximum wattage of lighting that can be used in a building based on its square footage. Title 24 standards are widely regarded as the most advanced energy efficiency standards, would help reduce the amount of energy required for lighting, water heating, and heating and air conditioning in buildings and promote energy conservation.

Compliance with the aforementioned mandatory measures would ensure that future development projects would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use or increasing the use of renewable energy. Therefore, operational energy efficiency and renewable energy standards consistency impacts would be less than significant requiring no mitigation.

Construction Plus Operation

Overall, the Modified Project would be consistent with applicable plans and policies and would not result in wasteful or inefficient use of nonrenewable energy sources. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the or the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.6-20 – 4.6-21.)

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Fault Rupture

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; or landslides?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-12.)

Explanation:

Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault

As stated previously, the GRRSP Planning Area is not within a State of California defined Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone and no known active faults transect the Project site. As determined in the Geotechnical Study (Appendix G-1), no known surface traces of active or potentially active faults traverse any portion of the Modified Project site and field observations did not reveal evidence of ground rupturing faulting at the surface. Therefore, the potential for substantial adverse effects due to surface rupture along a known earthquake fault is less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-12 – 4.7-13.)

2. Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-13.)

Explanation:

The GRRSP Planning Area is located in a seismically active area of southern California. The type and magnitude of seismic hazards that may affect the Modified Project site are dependent on both the distance to causative faults and the intensity and duration of the seismic event. Although surface rupture is considered less than significant, the Modified Project could be subject to future seismic shaking and strong ground motion resulting in structural damage.

Future construction of the Modified Project and the construction of the proposed BPI Development and future construction of the balance of the Modified Project would be subject to applicable ordinances and requirements of the current California Building Code (CCR Title 24). The CBC provides requirements for foundation strength, tie-downs, shear strength, and other building requirements designed to withstand significant ground-shaking. Similar to the Approved Project, with implementation of design and construction techniques tailored to withstand ground shaking to an acceptable level defined by the CBC, potential impacts to the proposed BPI Development and balance of the Modified Project would be reduced to less than significant. Mitigation Measure 4.10.1A was identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project to require adherence to obligatory design and construction techniques related to mitigating the affects from ground shaking. However, such mitigation is not necessary because the requirements are obligatory. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-13.)

3. Seismic-related Ground Failure

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-13.)

Explanation:

The secondary effects of seismic activity that are typically considered as potential hazards to a particular site include several types of ground failure. The general types of ground failure that can occur as a consequence of severe ground shaking include liquefaction. The probability of occurrence of each type of ground failure depends on the severity of the earthquake, distance from the causative fault, topography, soil, and groundwater conditions and other factors.

Liquefaction occurs when dynamic loading of a saturated sand or silt causes pore-water pressures to increase to levels where grain-to-grain contact is lost or significantly reduced and material temporarily behaves as a viscous fluid. Typically, these conditions must be present within 30 to 35 feet of the ground surface. Liquefaction can cause settlement of the ground surface, settlement and tilting of engineered structures, flotation of buoyant buried structures and fissuring of the ground surface. A common surface manifestation of liquefaction is the formation of sand boils.

As stated in the Geotechnical Study, only dry-sand settlement appears to be a potential concern with respect to development of the Modified Project including proposed BPI development project. However, as stated in the 2001 EIR and consistent with the findings in the current Geotechnical Study, liquefaction beneath the Modified Project site is considered unlikely because groundwater was not encountered in the exploratory borings completed to a maximum depth of 87 feet below grade. As a result, the potential for the occurrence of liquefaction beneath the GRRSP Planning Area with impact to the development is considered less than significant.

In addition, the effects of seismic-related ground failure would be further mitigated through remedial grading, and the incorporation of strengthened foundation systems (i.e. mat or post-tensioned) into the project design which are obligatory requirements of State and local laws and ordinances, including Chapter 18 of the CBC as the City has adopted in its Municipal Code. These requirements include implementation of specific recommendations for remedial grading and foundation design determined in the design-phase geotechnical report. Remedial grading would include excavation and recompaction of near-surface soils to increase the relative density of the surficial dry sandy soils.

Therefore, impacts are considered to be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p .4.7-13 – 4.7-14.)

4. Landslides

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving landslides?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-14.)

Explanation:

Landslides or large unstable slopes can result in soil movement downslope that damages property or results in injury to persons located downslope. The potential for such soil movements can be evaluated to determine the presence of weak soil or rock layers, or unstable materials that may contribute to the occurrence of landslides..

Cut slopes up to approximately 180 feet in height have been proposed to facilitate building pad construction of the BPI Development. As stated in the Geotechnical Study, it is anticipated that the upper portion of these slopes will consist of very old alluvial fan deposits, while the lower portions and the toe of these slopes are likely to expose bedrock. As such, the proposed slope configurations are likely to be stable with adequate factors of safety under static conditions. As discussed previously, the BPI Development site is very close to active faulting associated with the Elsinore fault and therefore seismic shaking potential at the BPI Development site is very high as previously analyzed.

Preliminary results from the Geotechnical Study indicated that typical 2:1 slopes of 180 feet in height may not achieve adequate factors of safety. The Geotechnical Study identified one landslide surface within the southwesterly cut slope of the BPI Development; however, it will be removed during designed grading of the cut slope. Implementation of specific recommendations for remedial grading determined in the design-phase geotechnical report will include detailed evaluation of the slope stability and any landslides at the site for determination of appropriate design measures. The design-phase geotechnical report will include a pseudo- static analysis which takes into account the potential ground shaking at the site. The stability analysis will ensure an adequate factor of safety will be constructed at the slope, including modifications to the design if needed such as a further laid back or further stabilized such that the potential for seismically induced slope failure will be less than significant. With implementation of these obligatory requirements included in the BPI Development Project's design, impacts associated with slope stability and from a future landslide would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-14 – 4.7-15.)

5. Soil Erosion

Threshold: Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-15.)

Explanation:

As previously discussed, construction of the Modified Project would include the grading of slopes of moderate to significant height within the Modified Project site as it pertains to the proposed BPI Development. Potential runoff from precipitation or uncontrolled irrigation, erosion of graded areas could occur during construction of all portions of the Modified Project that would result in offsite transport of the non-cohesive surface soils.

Reduction of the erosion potential during construction activities can be accomplished through a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies best management practices (BMPs) for temporary erosion controls. As part of the SWPPP, standard erosion control measures would be implemented for development of each phase of development of the Modified Project including the BPI Development to minimize the risk of erosion or sedimentation during construction. The SWPPP requires the inclusion of an erosion control plan that prescribes measures such as phasing grading, limiting areas of disturbance, designating restricted-entry zones, diverting runoff from disturbed areas, protective measures for sensitive areas, outlet protection, and provisions for revegetation or mulching. The erosion control plan(required under Section 15.36.060, Erosion Control Plan, of the City's Municipal Code) would also include treatment measures to trap sediment, including inlet protection, straw bale barriers, straw mulching, straw wattles, silt fencing, check dams, terracing, and siltation or sediment ponds.

Such standards include proper implementation of storm water BMPs (as mandated by the City's water quality ordinance) prior to commencement of earthwork operations within the Modified Project site including the BPI development, as well as diligent maintenance of erosion control devices throughout the early phases of construction until such time as the permanent storm water conveyance system has been constructed and activated. During the post-construction and occupancy period, the potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil would remain less than significant through proper maintenance of irrigation systems and permanent storm water conveyance devices, as well as though compliance with the City's water quality ordinance.

The 2001 EIR concluded construction of the Approved Project would create the potential for alluvium slope raveling and slope instability causing potential erosion impacts. With implementation of specific design recommendations from the Approved Project's geotechnical study as detailed in mitigation measures MM 4.10.3A through MM 4.10.3E identified in the 2001 EIR, potential impacts related to slope stability would be reduced to less than significant. However, it can be assumed implementation of standard obligatory regulations would reduce impacts from soil erosion and loss of topsoil associated with development of each phase of the Modified Project's development to less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the

Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-15 – 4.7-16.)

6. Unstable Soils

Threshold: Would the Project be located on a 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-17.)

Explanation:

Based on testing and a review of the borings and laboratory testing provided in the Geotechnical Study, existing soils within the low-lying/northerly portion of the BPI Development site are considered unsuitable. As a result, these soils are unsuitable for development and should be removed to underlying competent alluvial fan soils and replaced as properly compacted fill. Localized areas of deeper excavation of unsuitable soils may be necessary, and should be anticipated. Removal of soils in the natural canyon areas that extend southward into the hilly portion of the Modified Project site will likely be required down to bedrock. As such, the unsuitable soils and the recommendations detailed in the Geotechnical Study, over excavation and remediation of soils is required to render impacts to below a level less than significant.

In order to provide suitable support for the proposed BPI Development and similar conditions for future development of the GRRSP Planning Area, existing compressible materials should be over-excavated and the excavated material replaced as properly compacted, engineered fill. As stated in the Geotechnical Study, the depth of required over-excavation will vary below existing grades and actual remedial grading depths will need to be determined during supplemental investigations and during grading based on on-site field observations by the Project geotechnical consultant. Detailed recommendations for remedial and design grading should be provided in the comprehensive design-phase geotechnical report. Additionally, the remedial recommendations should consider the need to protect any adjacent offsite properties and other restrictions that may be imposed by property limit boundaries.

Remedial and design grading within the Modified Project site including the BPI Development site would be performed in accordance with local grading ordinances, current standards of practice in the area, and the site-specific recommendations to be provided by the Project geotechnical professional. Based on the preceding findings, it is expected that excessive settlement resulting from compression and/collapse of existing near surface soils will be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the detailed recommendations contained in the design-phase geotechnical report, during supplemental investigations, and during grading based on on-site field observations by the Project geotechnical consultant. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those

identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-17 – 4.7-18.)

7. Expansive Soils

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

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-18.)

Explanation:

Expansive soils are types of soil that expand or contract when they absorb or lose moisture. This can cause problems for buildings with concrete surfaces or rigid floors, like cracking or shifting. As stated in the Geological Study (Appendix G-1), laboratory testing determined near- surface soil and bedrock is anticipated to generally have a very low expansion potential. Similar to the conclusions in the 2001 EIR, the Geotechnical Study indicated clayey alluvial materials located in the northern portion of the proposed BPI Development have a higher expansion potential. The CBC, Section 1808.6, as adopted by the City, contains provisions for design of building foundations and floor slabs to address the potential detrimental effects of expansive soils.

As mentioned in the Geotechnical Study, construction at the Modified Project will include mass grading and mixing of the various materials that are currently beneath the site. As stated in the 2001 ERI, properly compacted-engineered fill would be considered adequate in strength and consolidation characteristics to support the future structures constructed as part of the Approved Project without detrimental settlement. After completion of grading, the Geotechnical Study determined any identified near-surface soils within building pad areas exhibit an elevated expansion potential, those expansive soils would be addressed through design of structural foundations and floor slabs in compliance with the provisions of Section 1808.6 of the CBC, as adopted by the City Development Code, to prevent structural damage to the structures. With implementation of these obligatory procedures, impacts from expansive soils would be less than significant and no further mitigation is required.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-18.)

8. Septic Tanks

Threshold: 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 conflict with or obstruct a state of local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-19.)

Explanation:

As discussed in Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, sewer services within the GRRSP Planning Area and BPI Development area would be provided by the City of Corona Water Utilities Department. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the Modified Project. Soils would not be required to support septic tanks once the project is implemented. As a result, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-19.)

G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Hazardous Materials

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

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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-17.)

Explanation:

No changes in the location, size, or boundaries of the GRRSP Planning Area boundary have occurred since adoption of the GRRSP in 2001. As discussed in the Project Description, the Modified Project would modify the size and boundaries of the GRRSP, however minimally in the northern portion of the Project site. In addition, the eastern portion of the Modified Project has been slightly expanded to incorporate appropriate grading limits within the hilly terrain.

All fuels, solvents and other materials used during construction of each phase of the Modified Project would be required to comply with applicable standards and regulations related to hazardous materials and hazardous waste as discussed in the 2001 EIR. Nonetheless, development of the GRRSP as proposed for amendment would result in an incremental increase over existing conditions in the potential for accidental releases of hazardous materials during routine transportation and disposal of hazardous materials. All materials used during construction and operation would be required to comply with applicable standards and regulations related to hazardous waste as specified in the 2001 EIR and as currently regulated through existing procedures and therefore no new or substantially greater impacts would occur. The Modified

Project's impacts associated with hazards from routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and from the release of hazardous materials from upset and accident conditions would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR This topic will not be evaluated further in this SEIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-17.)

2. Schools

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-17.)

Explanation:

As noted in the Prior EIR, there were no schools within 0.25 mile of the Approved Project. No schools have been built within 0.25 mile of the Modified Project since approval of the Approved Project. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project as compared to the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-17.)

3. Airports

Threshold: Would the Project be 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?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-19.)

Explanation:

There are no public or private airports in the vicinity of the GRRSP Planning Area that would be affect or be affected by the Modified Project. Development of the Modified Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the GRRSP Planning Area. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project. The Modified Project's impacts regarding public and private airports are consistent with the impacts identified in the Prior EIR and the level of impact (no impact) remains unchanged. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-19.)

4. Emergencies

Threshold: Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-19.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project would be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with applicable standards associated with vehicular and emergency access, which would ensure that access would be properly provided for adequate emergency access and evacuation to and from each phase of the Modified Project's development. Access to the BPI Development site would be provided to and from Green River Road via Street "A" and emergency vehicle access would be provided via a driveway on Dominguez Ranch Road. Traffic from all of the Modified Project would not use Fresno Road for site access. Construction activities that could temporarily restrict vehicular traffic on public roadways would be required to implement a Traffic Management Plan as part of building permit approval to ensure adequate access is maintained. Compliance with existing regulations for emergency access and evacuation would ensure impacts related to emergency access and response is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Members of the public expressed concerns regarding the Modified Project's potential to further limit the ability for emergency response vehicles to travel along Green River Road, Dominguez Ranch Road, and other roadways in the vicinity when responding to calls during congested weekday a.m. and p.m. peak commute periods. These concerns were expressed at the public scoping meeting held at City Hall on September 22, 2022 and in letter/email form in response to the Notice of Preparation distributed for review August 29, 2022 through September 28, 2022. The following analysis addresses these concerns.

At the time the 2001 EIR was prepared, the area currently proposed for BPI land uses in revised PAs 1, 2, and 3 was planned for Mixed-Use (MU) land uses as shown in the existing GRRSP. Because this MU land use category allows a wide range of land use types, analysis of impacts was conducted based on development of retail shopping uses. These uses entail the highest trip generation potential and therefore was used in the analysis assumptions of the Approved Project in the 2001 EIR in order to ensure impacts associated with air quality, noise and traffic were adequately assesses and not underestimated. Section 4.2 of the 2001 EIR estimated trip generation for the Approved Project to be 11,207 trips per day with 913 occurring during the a.m. peak hour and 965 occurring during the p.m. peak hour. As identified in Section 4.17 of this SEIR, trip generation for the Modified Project is estimated to be 4,370 trips per day with 429 occurring during the a.m. peak hour and 386 occurring during the p.m. peak hour. Table 4.9.A summaries the trip generation estimates contained in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project and in Section 4.17 of this SEIR for the Modified Project.

As shown in Table 4.9.A, the Modified Project would result in a substantially reduced trip

generation in comparison to the Approved Project. On a daily basis the Modified Project would generate approximately 61% fewer trips per day, approximately 53% fewer trips in the a.m. peak commute hour, approximately 60% fewer trips in the p.m. peak commute hour Approved Project.

Traffic conditions at the time the 2001 EIR was approved were similarly congested as they are currently. Although improvements to SR-91 and Green River Road have been constructed and completed, regional population growth has outpaced these improvements and traffic congestion persists. Nonetheless, this congestion is an existing condition not created by the Modified Project and traffic congestions is no longer used as the definition of a traffic impact. For these reasons and based on the substantially reduced quantity of trips estimated for the Modified Project in comparison to the Approved Project, it reasonable to conclude the Modified Project's impacts associated with physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan are consistent with the impacts identified in the Prior EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project as compared to the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9.-19 – 4.9-21.)

5. Wildfires

Threshold: Would the Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: See Section 4.20 of the SEIR for a detailed analysis of the Wildfire as required under CEQA. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-21.)

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Groundwater

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-23.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project is located within the Coastal Plain of Orange County westerly adjacent to the Temescal Groundwater Basin. As analyzed in the Drainage Report and WQMP, development of the GRRSP Planning would introduce approximately 36.65 acres of impervious surfaces to the site. Buildout of the GRRSP Planning would require 107.02 acres of irrigated surfaces and landscaping of the proposed BPI development would achieve the minimum 15.65 acers of irrigated landscape. Future development within the GRSSP Planning Area would be required to implement a project-specific WQMP as previously stated to achieve the required impervious surface. The

proposed BPI development would include the project design features, PDF HYD-1, of which would consist of 10 Biotreatment Units (Modular Wetland System) and two underground detention chambers to provide water quality treatment for Drainage Management Areas (DMA) 2 through DMA 11. DMA 1 was identified as a Self- Treating Area due to the lack of impervious surfaces and requires no BMP. In total, the proposed BPI development would incorporate approximately 16.1 acres of landscape acreage, thereby above the required acreage according the WQMP. Furthermore, the Project site is not located within an area known for hydrogeologic groundwater. As a result, the Modified Project would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; and the Project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge. No mitigation is required.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-23 – 4.10-24.)

2. Flooding

Threshold: 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 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

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 impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-25.)

Explanation:

As discussed previously, the Modified Project site is classified as Flood Zone X, area of minimal flood hazard. In addition, the Modified Project site does not include, and is not adjacent to, a body of water such as a natural stream or river that would increase the potential for flooding. Also, as discussed previously, the Modified Project would introduce approximately 36.65 acres of impervious surfaces to the GRRSP Planning Area, which would increase stormwater runoff from the Project site. However, the Modified Project, consistent with the 2001 EIR, would implement mitigation to reduce flooding hazards on- or offsite impacts to a less than significant level. As detailed below, MM 4.11.2.A requires that all proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the Modified Project. In addition, the MM 4.11.2A also requires future development of the GRRSP Planning Area drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of

grading permits. As it relates to the proposed BPI development, as previously stated, will incorporate PDF HYD-1 for the proposed on-site storm drain system consisting of catch basin inlets and storm drain pipes proposed to convey the runoff across the site to the designated discharge points. In addition, 10 Biotreatment Units (Modular Wetland System) and two underground detention chambers will be installed to provide water quality treatment for the proposed Drainage Management Areas (DMA). PDF HYD-1 shall be constructed to accommodate storm flows from the site designed, installed and maintained in a manner to reduce on-site runoff to a level that can be accommodated by the existing culverts beneath Green River Road.

Adherence to the existing requirements and implementation of the post construction stormwater requirements would be confirmed during Project plan check prior to Project approval. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measure MM4.11.2A and project design PDF HYD-1, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact on flood flows and flooding hazards on- or offsite.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-25 – 4.10-26.)

3. Runoff

Threshold: 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, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantially additional sources of polluted runoff or impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-26.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project site would include development of approximately 36.65 acres of impermeable surfaces, which would be an increase from the existing undeveloped vacant impervious surface area. Project site existing drainages flow from the south to a low point within the northern portion of the site, ultimately conveyed into the existing drainage pipelines/culverts crossing Green River Road and to SR 91.

Use of the subsurface infiltration chamber would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. As discussed above, the Modified Project would not result in significant impacts related to water quality. In addition, the drainage facilities proposed for the BPI development have been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the proposed development and are consistent with the County drainage plans and MS4 permit requirements. The proposed oversized infiltration system

would accommodate existing stormwater infrastructure capacity by holding the entire design capture volume in the chamber and allow high flows to discharge from the site at a reduced flowrate. The existing southerly drainage pattern is not maintained; however, times of concentration are preserved through the use of dual underground infiltration systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-26 – 4.10-27.)

4. Flood Hazard

Threshold: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-27.)

Explanation:

As discussed previously, the Modified Project site is classified as Flood Zone X, area of minimal flood hazard. The GRRSP Planning Area is located approximately 27 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the Modified Project is not located within a tsunami zone. Similarly, a seiche is the sloshing of a closed body of water from earthquake shaking. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water. The nearest body of water is the Prado Reservoir, approximately 1.1 miles to the north. According to the City's General Plan, the Project site is not within a dam inundation zone, nor in the vicinity of any impounded bodies of water; therefore, the Project is not at risk of a seiche.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-27.)

5. Water Quality Control Plan

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan??

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-27.)

Explanation:

As previously discussed, the Modified Project and BPI development would comply with the Construction General Permit by developing and implementing a site-specific SWPPP and construction stormwater BMPs throughout the construction phase. The Modified Project and BPI development would also comply with the MS4 Permit by incorporating LID BMPs into project design, which would avoid or minimize the amount and type of pollutants leaving the project,

entering receiving waters, and impacting water quality and beneficial uses defined for these waters by the Basin Plan. In addition, LID BMPs would allow stormwater infiltration into the local aquifer and minimize or avoid impacts to groundwater quality, and to beneficial uses of the Coastal Plain of Orange County Basin.

The Modified would not include a groundwater well, and the Project would not demand water at a rate exceeding what the City of Corona could supply (see Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, for discussion of Project water demands relative to water supplies). The Modified Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan; no impact would occur, and mitigation is not required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-2 – 4.10-28.)

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Established Communities

Threshold: Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.11-7.)

Explanation:

No changes in the location, size, or boundaries of the GRRSP Planning Area boundary have occurred since adoption of the GRRSP in 2001. As discussed in the Project Description, the Modified Project would modify the size and boundaries of the GRRSP, however minimally in the northern portion of the Project site. In addition, the eastern portion of the Project site has been slightly expanded to incorporate appropriate grading limits within the hilly terrain.

Since approval of the 2001 EIR, the horse boarding operation has ceased existence and the only active land use within the Modified Project boundary are the two homes located in the east and central portions of the Planning Area. Implementation of the proposed Modified Project would necessitate the removal of these facilities homes and other faculties. However, the on-site land uses do not represent an identified community. In addition, the GRRSP Planning Area is located at the western edge of the City and is not surrounded by a community. Development of the Modified Project would not physically divide an established community resulting in a less than significant impact requiring no mitigation. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.11-7 – 4.11-8.)

2. Conflict With Plans

Threshold: Would the Project 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?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4..11-8.)

Explanation:

As discussed previously, land use regulation of the Modified Project site are governed by the existing GRRSP. The main change to the existing GRRSP proposed as part of the GRRSPA involves replacing the current Mixed-Use (MU) land use in PAs 1, 2, and 3 with a more focused or specific Business Park Industrial (BPI) land use type and the permanent designation of approximately 80.77 acres in the southern half of the GRRSP Planning area for dedication to the Riverside Conservation Agency for the purposes of providing consistency with the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WR-MSHCP). In contrast to the wide range of land uses allowed in the MU designation including retail, service and support commercial, light industrial, hotel/motel, or office uses the proposed BPI land use would lock down the land use types allowed by focusing on accommodating single- and multitenant light industrial, warehouse, and incubator uses with supporting offices. The balance of the GRRSP planned land uses would remain essentially the same as originally approved with GC allowed in the approximately 5-acre area PA north of Green River Road and south of the railroad tracks, ER south of and above the proposed BPI Development but on a reduced amount of property, and Open Space further south.

The Modified Project also results in 103.73 acres of newly designated Open Space land use. Since the preparation of the Draft SEIR, the Modified Project was revised from the original proposal presented in GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006. GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006 originally included 20.39 acres of Estate Residential and 83.34 acres of Open Space. The Applicant incorporated this Project component in order to include additional residential density. During the public review and hearing on the Project, the Planning and Housing Commission recommended that the Estate Residential land use be removed from the Project and replaced with the Open Space land use pursuant to SB 330 due to the Project's location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). The change to the Project resulted in the Open Space land use increasing from 83.34 acres to 103.73 acres, and removing all the Estate Residential land use. The effects of these Project revisions are negligible and decrease potential environmental impacts Therefore, the revision does not require new or additional analysis in the SEIR because the change in land use designation does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation that purports to avoid or mitigation adverse environmental impacts.

Consistency discussions with applicable Connect SoCal goals are provided in Table 4.11-2. As discussed in Table 4.11-2, the proposed Project is consistent with applicable Connect SoCal goals.

Consistency discussions with applicable City General Plan goals are provided in Table 4.11-3.

As presented in the discussions contained in Table 4.11-2, the Modified Project would be consistent with applicable Connect SoCal goals regarding sustainable communities, efficient transportation systems, and GHG reduction measures. As presented in the discussions contained in and 4.11-3, the Modified Project would conform with applicable City General Plan Goals

regarding: Type, Distribution and Form of Land Uses; Growth and Development; Community Quality and Sense of Place; General Residential; Existing Residential Neighborhoods; New Residential Neighborhoods; Commercial and Office Districts; Industrial Districts; Mixed Use Districts; Housing Production; Neighborhood Quality; Fair Housing; Community Design Context; City Entries and Monumentation; Community Signage and Wayfinding; Visual Resources; Paleontological Resources; Economic Base; Labor Force; Fiscal Viability; Financing Opportunities; Economic Development Program; Local Thoroughfares and Routes; Intercity and Regional Transportation; Transportation Management; Public Transportation; Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities; Goods Movement; Parking; Water System; Sewer/Reclaimed Water; Storm Drainage; Solid Waste Management; Energy; Telecommunications; Seismic and Geologic Hazards; Flooding and Inundation; Hazardous Materials; Police Services; Fire Hazards; Transportation Noise; Reduction in Pollution Exposure; Safe and Sanitary Housing; Water Resources; Biological Resources; and Air Resources. The Modified Project's consistency with applicable goals in SCAG's Connect SoCal and conformance with applicable goals in the City General Plan results in a less than significant impact regarding a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.11-8 – 4.11-22.)

J. MINERALS

1. Regional and Statewide Mineral Resources / Locally-Important Mineral Resource

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

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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.12-4.)

Explanation:

The City's General Plan Figure ER-8 maps locations of industrial minerals within the City's SOI, showing the southern portion of the GRRSP Planning Area partially covered by an MRZ- 3a area, indicative of areas containing known mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. General Plan Figure ER-9 maps the location of aggregate resources within the City's SOI, showing none of the GRRSP Planning Area is mapped as an aggregate zone. General Plan Figure ER-10 maps the location of areas of regional mineral significance within the City's SOI, showing none of the GRRSP Planning Area is mapped as an area of regional mineral significance. The southern portion of the GRRSP Planning Area that is mapped as MRZ-3b is part proposed PA 6, planned for Open Space General and dedication to the RCA for inclusion in the habitat reserve

assembly in accordance with the WR-MSHCP. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not result in the loss of or availability of a locally or regionally significant mineral resource resulting in a less than significant impact requiring no mitigation. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.12-4.)

K. NOISE

1. Noise Standards

Threshold: Would the Project generate 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-8.)

Explanation:

Construction Noise

Noise generated by during construction of each phase of the Modified Project will include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that when combined can reach high levels. The number and mix of construction equipment are expected to occur in the following stages of construction: demolition; site preparation; grading; building construction; paving; and architectural coating. As shown in Table 4.13-2, Municipal Code Section 17.84.040[D][2] states that construction noise is prohibited between the hours of 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., Monday through Saturday and 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m. on Sundays and federal holidays to prevent high levels of construction noise from impacting noise-sensitive land uses.

The Noise Study evaluated potential construction noise impacts by adding construction noise estimated for each stage of construction to existing noise levels measured at receiver locations in the northern and eastern edges of the GRRSP boundary. Using typical construction equipment noise levels and the CadnaA noise prediction model, construction noise levels were calculated and associated impacts were identified assuming multiple pieces of equipment were in operations simultaneously at the nearest sensitive receiver locations. To assess the upper end of potential noise levels and therefore avoid under estimating potential impacts, the construction noise analysis used the highest noise level impacts when the equipment with the highest reference noise level was operating at the closest point from the edge of construction to each receiver location. Based on these conservative assumptions, the construction noise levels were determined to range from 46.6 to 69.9 dBA Leq, and the highest construction levels were determined to range from 56.7 to 69.9 dBA Leq at the nearest receiver location R1 located north of proposed PA 4, north of SR-91 and Prado Road, near existing single-family residences on Pennyroyal Drive. The Noise Study determined a construction-related daytime noise level threshold of 80 dBA Leq is a reasonable

threshold to assess the daytime construction noise level impacts. Based on the highest construction noise level of 69.9 dBA Leq calculated at receiver location R1, daytime construction noise would satisfy the daytime 80 dBA Leq significance threshold during construction of all phases of the GRRSP (Modified Project). Therefore, construction noise impacts are considered less than significant at all receiver locations and no mitigation is required.

Although a noise variance from the City of Corona is required, nighttime concrete pouring activities may occur as a part of construction activities to reduce concrete mixer truck delivery times during off peak traffic periods and to take advantage of naturally occurring lower nighttime air temperatures. These activities are typically limited to the actual building area. Since the nighttime concrete pours may take place outside the permitted hours of construction, the Project Applicant or Contractor would be required to obtain prior authorization for nighttime work from the City and receipt of a Noise Variance application pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.84.040(H). The noise variance would need to be approved prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit associated with the nighttime work.

The Noise Study estimated noise levels during concrete pour activities (paving) and determined noise levels would range from 43.4 to 62.5 dBA Leq at the nearest sensitive receiver locations. Based on a nighttime noise level significance threshold of 70 dBA Leq, the Noise Study concluded noise levels during nighttime concrete pour activities would satisfy the nighttime construction noise level significance threshold. Therefore, the unmitigated nighttime concrete pour noise level impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

For these reasons, the Modified Project would not result in a construction noise impact during construction of all phases of the GRRSP's development and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater construction noise impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project.

Operational Traffic Noise

Off-site transportation noise level impacts were determined based estimating roadway noise levels using traffic volumes from the GRRSPA Traffic Study for each phase of the proposed GRRSPA and for existing, opening year, and future horizon year scenarios. Noise contours were developed measured in CNEL from the center of the roadway for the 70, 65, and 60 dBA CNEL noise levels. A summary of the noise levels for each scenario with buildout of the GRRSP follows.

Existing Plus Project Buildout Traffic Noise Level Impacts: An analysis of existing traffic noise levels plus traffic noise generated by the entire GRRSP was provided to fully analyze project level impacts attributable to the Modified Project. Although there are no development plans included as part of the Modified Project for the GC (PA 4) and ER (PA 5), the buildout condition was provided for informational purposes and is not expected to occur.

Existing with Project Buildout traffic noise levels were estimated to range from 66.2 to 73.2 dBA CNEL. The noise level increase attributable to the Modified Project was determined to range from 0.2 to 0.8 dBA CNEL. Based on the significance criteria for off-site traffic noise presented in Table

4.13-2, land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments would experience less than significant noise level increases on receiving land uses due to project- related traffic. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not result in an operational traffic noise impact in the existing condition with all phases of the GRRSP's development and no mitigation is required.

Opening Year Cumulative Plus Project Buildout Traffic Noise Level Impacts: Opening Year Cumulative with Project Buildout traffic noise levels were estimated to range from 66.4 to 72.0 dBA CNEL. The noise level increase attributable to the Modified Project was determined to range from 0.2 to 1.7 dBA CNEL. Based on the significance criteria for off-site traffic noise presented in Table 4.13-2, land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments would experience less than significant noise level increases on receiving land uses due to project- related traffic. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not result in an operational traffic noise impact in the opening year cumulative scenario with all phases of the GRRSP's development and no mitigation is required.

Future Horizon Year Plus Project Buildout Traffic Noise Level Impacts: Future Horizon Year with Project Buildout traffic noise levels were estimated to range from 66.4 to 72.4 dBA CNEL. The noise level increase attributable to the Modified Project was determined to range from 0.2 to 1.6 dBA CNEL. Based on the significance criteria for off-site traffic noise presented in Table 4.13-2, land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments would experience less than significant noise level increases on receiving land uses due to project- related traffic. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not result in an operational traffic noise impact in the future horizon year scenario with all phases of the GRRSP's development and no mitigation is required.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater operational traffic noise impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project.

On-Site Operational Noise

The Noise Study evaluated potential stationary-source operational noise impacts at the nearest receiver locations resulting from the operation of the proposed GRRSPA. Because there are no development details for the proposed GC uses in PA 4, the underlying uses permitted or conditionally permitted in the proposed GRRSPA for the GC land use designation by were used to estimate operational noise levels from this area of the GRRSP.

To estimate operational commercial noise, several commercial noise sources were assumed throughout the GC area in PA 4 to ensure potential noise from the potential GC are addressed. At the time the Noise Study was prepared, future tenants of the Modified Project including the BPI Development were unknown. Therefore, the operational noise analysis defined noise level impacts associated with the expected typical of daytime and nighttime activities associated with the range of land uses that could occur in each of the GRRSP PAs. It was assumed the GC land uses would operate during normal business hours and the BPI Development would operate 24 hours per day, seven days per week. The BPI industrial and warehouse operations would primarily be conducted within the enclosed buildings, except for traffic movement, parking, as well as loading and

unloading of trucks at designated loading bays. The GC and BPI on-site project-related noise sources could include a wide range of noise sources. Operational noise levels from these types of activities were used to estimate expected noise levels resulting from development and operation of the Modified Project. The reference noise level measurements represent typical noises from a range of operational activities including: loading dock activity, truck movements, roof-top air conditioning units, gas station activity, parking lot vehicle movements, drive-thru activity, trash enclosure activity, car wash tunnels and car wash vacuums. The projected noise levels assume a worst-case noise condition in which these noise activities were in operation continuously, although these sources of noise will likely vary throughout the day.

Noise level measurements were collected from existing noise activity locations to obtain reference noise levels. The resulting referenced noise levels used in the analysis of operational noise impacts are as follows:

- Loading Dock Activity: Reference noise level measurements were taken in the center of loading docks, and represent multiple concurrent noise sources resulting in a combined noise level of 65.7 dBA Leq at a uniform distance of 50 feet.

- Truck Movements: Truck movements reference noise level measurement were taken over a 15-minute period and represent multiple noise sources producing a reference noise level of 58.0 dBA Leq at 50 feet.

- Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units: The noise level measurements collected represent a single mechanical roof-top air conditioning unit, a Lennox SCA120 series 10-ton model packaged air conditioning unit. At the uniform reference distance of 50 feet, the reference noise level is 57.2 dBA Leq.

- Gas Station Activity: A noise level measurement was collected at a gas station that included six cars fueling at once, car doors closing, engines starting, fuel pump running, TV sounds, and background car pass-by events within a 3-minute period. At 50 feet from the gas station, a reference noise level of 48.2 dBA Leq was measured.

- Parking Lot Vehicle Movements: A 29-hour reference noise level measurement was collected in the center of warehouse distribution center staff parking lot of a. At 50 feet from the center, the parking lot produced a reference noise level of 56.1 dBA Leq

- Drive-Thru Activity. A noise level measurement was collected at drive-thru with speakerphones and vehicle activity. The noise sources included in the reference noise level measurement consisted of voices of the employees over the speakerphone, customers' voices ordering food, car engines idling, car radios playing music, and cars queuing in the drive-thru lane. At 50 feet from the speakerphone, a reference noise level of 51.5 dBA Leq was measured.

- Trash Enclosure Activity: The measured reference noise level at the uniform 50-foot reference distance is 57.3 dBA Leq for the trash enclosure activity. The reference trash enclosure activity included two metal gates opening and closing, metal scraping against concrete floors, dumpster movement on metal wheels, trash dropping into the metal dumpster, and background parking lot vehicle movements.

- Car Wash Tunnel: A reference noise level measurement was collected at a car wash to define typical noise from air blowers used in a car wash tunnel. A reference noise level of 74.3 dBA Leq was measured at a uniform distance of 50 feet. The reference noise level measurement includes an exposed five-unit air blower system with background pressure washer noise. The air dryers within were assumed to be operating continuously during the peak operating conditions. The car wash tunnel would be limited to daytime hours only.

- Car Wash Vacuum: A reference noise level measurement was collected at an express car wash, representing up to four vacuums operating simultaneously. At a uniform reference distance of 50 feet, the vacuum reference noise level was 54.6 dBA Leq. The car wash vacuum would be limited to the daytime hours only.

Using the reference noise levels described above, operations of the GC and BPI Development land uses would include noise from loading dock activity, truck movements, roof-top air conditioning units, gas station activity, drive-thru activity, trash enclosure activity, car wash tunnels and car wash vacuums. Based on the reference noise levels and their location within the GRRSP Planning Area, project-related noise level increases would be experienced at each of the sensitive receiver locations. Operational noise levels during the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. were estimated to range from 32.3 to 53.6 dBA Leq. Operational noise levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. were estimated to range from 30.6 to 49.6 dBA Leq.

Evaluation of project-only operational noise levels for compliance with the City's exterior noise level thresholds was conducted. As concluded in the Noise Study, the operational noise levels associated with full development of the GRRSPA described above would meet the City's 55 dBA Leq daytime and 50 dBA Leq nighttime exterior noise level standards at all the nearest receiver locations. Therefore, the operational noise impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Project operational noise level increases at the nearest receiver locations were compared to ambient conditions to evaluate the change in noise attributable to the Modified Project. The difference between the combined Project and ambient noise levels defines the Project noise level increase to the ambient noise environment. The Modified Project would generate operational noise level increases ranging from 0.0 to 4.2 dBA at the nearest receiver locations. Project-related operational noise level increases will satisfy the operational noise level increase significance criteria presented on Table 4.13-2. Therefore, the incremental increase in noise to the ambient environment attributable to the proposed Modified Project is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

As summarized previously, the 2001 EIR determined construction noise impacts from the Approved Project would remain significant and unavoidable to the residences within 200 feet of eastern/southern property line during grading even with implementation of mitigation. As detailed above, construction noise impacts attributable to the Modified Project were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater construction noise impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-8 – 4.13-14.)

2. Vibration

Threshold: Would the Project generate excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-14.)

Explanation:

Groundborne vibration and noise generated during the operational phase of a typical development project are barely perceptible beyond the boundary of a given project and rarely produce a nuisance to neighboring land uses. For this reason, the Noise Study analyzed potential construction vibration impacts associated with construction of the Modified Project.

Construction can result in varying degrees of ground vibration depending on the construction equipment and vehicles used, construction methods employed, distance to the affected location, and soil type. It is expected that ground-borne vibration from the Modified Project's construction activities would cause only intermittent, localized intrusion. Estimated construction equipment vibration estimated during construction of the Modified Project were calculated for the nearest receiver locations. At distances ranging from 246 feet to 986 feet from typical construction activities at the Modified Project site boundary, construction vibration levels were estimated to range from 0.0000 to 0.003 in/sec RMS at the nearest receiver locations. These vibration levels would not exceed the City's maximum acceptable vibration standard of 0.05 in/sec (RMS). Further, impacts at the site of the closest sensitive receiver are unlikely to be sustained during the entire construction period but will occur rather only during the times that heavy construction equipment is operating proximate to the Project site perimeter and construction would be restricted to daytime hours consistent with City requirements thereby eliminating potential vibration impact during nighttime hours. Vibration impacts associated with construction of the Modified Project are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater construction groundborne vibration impact would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-14 – 4.3-15.)

3. Airport Noise

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-15.)

Explanation:

The nearest airport to the GRRSP Planning Area is Corona Municipal Airport, located approximately three miles to the northeast. Since the Project is located more than two miles away from the nearest airport, potential impacts associated with exposure of people residing or working within the Modified Project area to excessive aircraft noise levels is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-15.)

L. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Population Growth

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.14-7.)

Explanation:

Since the preparation of the Draft SEIR, the Modified Project was revised. As originally proposed, GPA2020-0002 and SPA2020-0006 included 20.39 acres of Estate Residential and 83.34 acres of Open Space. The Applicant incorporated the Estate Residential land use acreage in order to include additional residential density. However, during the public review and hearing on the Project, the Planning and Housing Commission recommended that the Estate Residential land use designation be removed from the Project and replaced with the Open Space land use designation pursuant to SB 330 due to the Project's location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). The change to the Project resulted in the Open Space land use acreage increasing from 83.34 acres to 103.73 acres, and deleting all the originally proposed Estate Residential land use. The effects of these Project revisions are negligible, and do not require new or additional analysis in the SEIR because the Open Space land use is less impactful in comparison to the Estate Residential land use and housing is incompatible with the prior Estate Residential site.

In addition, the Modified Project would potentially add to the population indirectly with development of the 746,167 sf Business Park Industrial (BPI) Development and 19,600 sf of general commercial (GC) uses. The 746,167 sf BPI Development would produce approximately 995 employees (746,167 sf x one employee per 750 of building area). The 19,600 sf of GC use would produce approximately 130 employees (19,600 sf x one employee per 750 of building area). Combined, the BPI and GC uses would generate 1,125 total employees. Compared to the City's 2024 estimated population from DOF of 156,615, any additional residents that may be a portion those new employees is negligible. This increase would not be considered substantial population growth and would not induce substantial unplanned population, resulting in less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.14-7 – 4.4-8.)

2. Displacement of Housing

Threshold: Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.14-8.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project does not contain any existing housing that constitutes a community or neighborhood. Two residences are located in the lower elevations of PAs 1, 2, and 3 and remnants of the former horse boarding facilities are scattered around PAs 1, 2, and 3. These and all structures would be demolished and removed as part of Project construction. In addition, the St. James Christian Orthodox Monastery has been abandoned and would be demolished and removed. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not significantly displace existing people or housing and would not impact housing or housing options in the City or vicinity. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.14-8.)

M. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Fire Protection

Threshold: 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 fire protection?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the

Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-12.)

Explanation:

The City's General Plan EIR determined future facilities and infrastructure could be required to accommodate General Plan build-out. However, as discussed previously under Section 4.14, Population and Housing, Project buildout would generate a similar number of residents and would likely attract existing residents from the City. Moreover, future single-family homes of the Modified Project would be constructed within the smaller PA 5 footprint of 20.39 acres which is 77.81 acres smaller than the Approved Project's PA 6 of 98.2 acres. Therefore, the Modified Project's homes would be constructed in a more accessible configuration when compared to the Approved Project.

Additionally, implementation of the Modified Project including the BPI development would be required to adhere to the California Fire Code (CFC), as included in the City's Municipal Code Section 15.12.020, as part of the permitting process all project plans within the Modified Project would be reviewed by the City's Building Division to ensure that the plans of the BPI development and future projects meet the fire protection requirements. Furthermore, the Project applicant including future project applicants would be required to pay standard City development impact fees (DIF) (Municipal Code Section 16.23.040), which include a fee for fire service impacts as determined in the 2001 EIR.

Impact fees mitigate the overburdening of existing facilities, equipment, and levels of service. Provision of a new or physically altered fire station would not be required that could cause environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection services from the Modified Project would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-12 – 4.15-13.)

2. Police Protection

Threshold: 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 police protection?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-13.)

Explanation:

The City of Corona Police Department is located at 730 Public Safety Way, which is 6.1 miles east from the GRRSP Planning Area. The Police Department staff consists of 250 sworn officers and support personnel. Based on the previously stated population City of 156,615 (2024, DOF) for the City, the City has approximately 1.59 officers per 1,000 residents. As previously stated, the additional 1,104 residents/employees (113 ER residents + 991 BPI/GC residents), not previously considered to be a substantial population growth nor induce substantial unplanned population, the Modified Project would require 0.7 percent of an additional officer. Therefore, the Modified Project's incremental increase in demands on law enforcement services would not be significant when compared to the current demand levels.

As previously stated, the Project applicant including future project applicants would be required to pay standard City DIF, which include a fee for police service impacts as determined in the 2001 EIR. Impact fees mitigate the overburdening of existing facilities, equipment, and levels of service. Provision of a new or physically altered police station would not be required that could cause environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts related to police protection services from the Modified Project would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-13 – 4.15-14.)

3. Schools

Threshold: 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 schools?

Finding: The Modified Project result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-14.)

Explanation:

Development of the Modified Project would allow for up to 32 additional homes, resulting in an increase of 113 ER residents in the City of Corona served by CNUSD. The CNUSD estimates the number of students that will be generated by new residential development by using district-specific rates in order to plan for future facilities expansions or constructions. Specific to the Modified Project, CNUSD's student generation rates for single-family development are 0.3650 for elementary school (ES), 0.1136 for middle school (MS), and 0.2337 for high school (HS).

Buildout of the Modified Project would generate 11.68 ES students,3.64 MS students, and 7.5 HS students in the City of Corona. The CNUSD would have adequate capacity for students generated by the Modified Project.

As previously stated, the Project applicant for the ER component would be required to pay standard City DIF, which include a fee for CNUSD impacts as determined in the 2001 EIR. Impact fees mitigate the overburdening of existing facilities, equipment, and levels of service. Therefore, impacts related to school services from the Modified Project would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-14.)

4. Parks

Threshold: 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 parks?

Finding: The Modified Project result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-14.)

Explanation:

See Section 4.16 Recreation, Subsection 4.16.7 Impact REC-1 and REC-2, for a thorough discussion of the Modified Project's impacts associated with parks. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-14.)

5. Other Public Facilities

Threshold: 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 other public facilities?

Finding: The Modified Project result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-15.)

Explanation:

As previously summarized, the 2001 determined the Approved Project's incremental increase in demands for government services such as recreation facilities, libraries and social services was anticipated to be less than significant.

Any additional employees due to the implementation of the Modified Project, impacts can be

considered similar to those determined in the 2001 EIR. Because the GRRSP Planning Area is already served by other services and the Modified Project would result in a limited increase in population, the Modified Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered facilities to provide other services, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-15.)

N. RECREATION

1. Noise Standards

Threshold: 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?

Does 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.16-6.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project does not include development of a new or renovated off-site park or recreational facility that would result in an impact to the environment. Up to 32 ER residences would potentially be developed in PA 5, directly adding to the City's population. In addition, the Modified Project would potentially add to demand on parks and recreational facilities from employees working at the proposed 746,167 sf BPI Development and planned 19,600 sf of GC uses. As described previously in Section 4.14 Population and Housing, the 32 ER homes would accommodate approximately 113 residents, the 746,167 sf BPI Development would produce approximately 995 employees, and the 19,600 sf of GC use would produce approximately 130 employees. Even if 25% of the employees and their households were to move to the City, the resulting growth in population would be approximately 1,104 people. Compared to the City's 2024 estimated population from DOF of 156,615, the additional 1,104 residents would represent a less than one-tenth of one percent increase in population. This increase would not be considered substantial population growth and would not result in substantial increased demand on parks and recreational facilities. Construction of a new or renovated park or recreational facilities would not be required and impacts to the environment would not occur, resulting in a less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.16-6 – 4.16-7.)

O. TRANSPORTATION

1. Plans, Polices and Ordinances

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-9.)

Explanation:

The General Plan Circulation Element describes the circulation system within the City and contains policies mostly pertaining to the broader circulation system the Modified Project would not impact. Each increment of development associated with the Modified Project including the BPI Development would be required to comply with obligatory requirements of the Municipal Code that implement policies of the General Plan pertaining to all forms for circulation. Each phase of the Modified Project would be required to provide sidewalks on all driveways, adequate parking and parking stalls, and street and driveway sections that meet City design criteria and support all form of transportation.

Consistent with existing requirements of the Municipal Code and policies of the General Plan, the BPI Development component will construct several roadway improvements along the project frontages and nearby offsite locations. These improvements are summarized as follows.

- Prior to issuance of first occupancy permits in PAs 1, 2, and 3, the Developer of Pas 1, 2, and 3 shall install: a traffic signal at Street A/Green River Road; construct an eastbound right turn lane on Green River Road at the intersection approach with a minimum of 100-feet of storage; a westbound left turn lane on Green River Road at the intersection approach with 175-feet of storage; and a northbound left turn lane on Green River Road at the intersection approach with 150-feet of storage. For PA 4, the Developer of PA 4 will modify the signal to accommodate a northern leg with an eastbound left turn approach lane with a minimum of 150-feet of storage.

- Prior to issuance of first occupancy permits in PAs 1, 2, and 3, the Developer of Pas 1, 2, and 3 Construct Green River Road to its ultimate General Plan roadway cross- section as a Major Arterial along the Project frontage (right-of-way varies from 118- feet to as wide as 200-feet, ultimate width to be determined at the time of Precise Plan Implementation for the adjacent Planning Areas). The ultimate Green River Road improvement width is constrained near Fresno Road pursuant to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan to a width of 118-feet. Roadway, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and landscaping improvements on the south side of Green River Road to be installed by the developer of PAs 1, 2, and 3 and on the north side of Green River Road to be

installed by the developer of PA 4 shall be made as required by the final Conditions of Approval for the Project and applicable Specific Plan and City of Corona standards.

- Prior to issuance of first occupancy permits in PAs 1, 2, and 3, the Developer of Pas 1, 2, and 3 shall construct Street A as a private collector (89-foot right-of-way and 65- foot curb-to-curb width) consistent with the applicable Specific Plan and City of Corona standards or as required by the final Conditions of Approval for the Project. However, Street A will narrow to have a minimum 64-foot right-of-way with a 44-foot curb-to-curb width (will not include a raised median) and a 10-foot parkway. The 10- foot parkway will include a 5-foot-wide (minimum) sidewalk on either side of the street.

Impacts associated with conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-9 – 4.17-10.)

2. Design Hazards

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

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-11.)

Explanation:

Development of Modified Project would comply with existing development review procedures in accordance with the Municipal Code, Zoning Code, and the GRRSP that would reduce hazards (e.g., intersection design, roadway design, driveway design, etc.). The design of the Modified Project has been reviewed by the project traffic engineer and City's engineering and fire departments for inconsistencies with design standards and hazardous conditions, and none have been identified. The Modified Project would not create hazardous conditions or incompatible land uses resulting in a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-11.)

3. Inadequate Emergency Access

Threshold: Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: See Section 4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Subsection 4.9.7 Impact

HAZ-6, for a thorough discussion of the Modified Project's impacts associated with interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-11.)

P. UTILITIES / SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Wastewater Treatment Requirements

Threshold: Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-26.)

Explanation:

Water

As previously stated, water services including domestic water, irrigation, and fire suppression to the GRRSP Planning Area will be provided by the City of Corona CUD. A connection will be made to the existing underground water line located at the Project entrance on Green River Road. The tie-in would be designed and coordinated through CUD during the building permitting process to ensure the water distribution system meets peak flow rate and fire flow requirements. The new onsite water system would convey water supplies to the proposed development and landscaping through plumbing/landscaping fixtures that are compliant with the CalGreen Plumbing Code and the City's Municipal Code Section 17.70.070, Landscaping, and Chapter 13.14, Water and Sewer Regulations and would be reviewed for compliance by the City during Project plan check. The construction activities related to the onsite water infrastructure that would be needed to serve the proposed structures is included as part of the Modified Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this DSEIR. For example, construction emissions for excavation and installation of the water infrastructure is included in Sections 4.3, Air Quality and 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and noise volumes from these activities are evaluated in Section 4.13, Noise. In addition, Project implementation would not require off-site improvements. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new or expanded off-site water facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Wastewater Treatment

As stated in the Preliminary Wastewater Report, the City's 2005 Sewer Master Plan determined the existing 10-inch gravity sewer lines in Green River Road and Palisades Drive west of the existing SDO LS are identified as being deficient under existing conditions. Furthermore, the existing 10-inch gravity sewer lines in Green River Road and Palisades Drive west of the existing SDO LS are identified as being deficient under existing conditions.

In anticipation of the increased sewer flows associated with future developments throughout the City of Corona, the Preliminary Wastewater Report states the Department of Water and Power has proposed several Capital Improvement Projects to address current and future deficiencies in the existing sewer system. In addition, the City has plans to construct a new lift station at the intersection of Green River Road and Palisades Drive to replace and upgrade the existing SDO LS. The proposed lift station will accommodate flows from existing and future developments, which include the proposed sewer flows from the development of the Modified Project. The new lift station is included in the City's Fiscal Year 2021 through Fiscal year 2025 Capital Improvement Program and also includes 2,600 linear feet of 12-inch gravity sewer and 1,500 lineal feet of 12-inch force main. Such improvements would be required to be analyzed under current CEQA guidelines.

The Project would install 8-inch sewer lines within the BPI portion of the site that would connect to the existing sewer sub within an existing public utility easement. The construction activities related to installation of the onsite sewer infrastructure that would serve the Modified Project, is included as part of the Modified Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft SEIR. For example, analysis of construction emissions for excavation and installation of the sewer infrastructure is included in Section 4.3, Air Quality and 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and noise volumes from these activities are evaluated in Section 4.13, Noise. As the Modified Project includes facilities to serve the proposed development, it would not result in the need for construction of other new wastewater facilities or expansions, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Storm Water Drainage

As discussed subsequently in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality the Modified Project site would include development of approximately 36.65 acres of impermeable surfaces, which would be an increase from the existing undeveloped vacant impervious surface area. Project site existing drainages flow from the south to a low point within the northern portion of the site, ultimately conveyed into the existing drainage pipelines/culverts crossing Green River Road and to SR 91.

Use of the subsurface infiltration chamber would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. As discussed above, the Modified Project would not result in significant impacts related to water quality. In addition, the drainage facilities proposed for the BPI development have been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the proposed development and are consistent with the County drainage plans and MS4 permit requirements. The proposed oversized infiltration system would accommodate existing stormwater infrastructure capacity by holding the entire design capture volume in the chamber and allow high flows to discharge from the site at a reduced flowrate. The existing southerly drainage pattern is not maintained; however, times of concentration are preserved through the use of dual underground infiltration systems. With implementation of Modified Project, estimated stormwater flows will be adequately

accommodated. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new or expanded off-site storm water facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Electric Power

SCE would provide electrical service to the Modified Project. An on-site connection to the existing electrical supply and distribution network within the area surrounding the Project would be made during construction and operation. The existing electrical supply is underground and located at the south side of the Project entrance at Green River Road and tie-in would be identified prior to construction with proper mark out. Compliance with the existing building code and SCE construction and design regulations would ensure the Modified Project's connection to the existing electrical infrastructure is conducted safely and provides adequate service. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new or expanded off-site electrical facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required

Natural Gas

SoCalGas would provide natural gas services to the Project. Similar to the previous services mentioned, on-site connection to the existing nature gas infrastructure would be made during construction for operation. The existing gas line runs under Green River Road east to west and tie-in would be made at the Project entrance at Street A. Compliance with the existing building code and SoCalGas construction and design regulations would ensure the Modified Project's connection to the existing natural gas infrastructure is conducted safely and provides adequate service. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new or expanded off-site natural gas facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Telecommunications

Telecommunications facilities within the Project area are not owned by the City but are owned and operated by multiple service providers including AT&T and Time Warner Cable. As with buildout of the Modified Project including the proposed BPI development, 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 the need for construction of other new telecommunication facilities or expansions, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-26 – 4.19-29.)

2. Water Supplies

Threshold: Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the

project and reasonable foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-29.)

Explanation:

According to the City of Corona 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), CUD receives water supplies from treated surface water, untreated surface water, and desalinated brackish groundwater. Further, through a combination of these resources, the UWMP indicates that the City has the ability to meet current and projected water demands through 2045 during normal, historic single-dry and historic multiple-dry year periods (UWMP 2020).

The UWMP applied SCAG future population projections to estimate overall water demand from 2020 to 2045 throughout the City for all land use types (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.). However, according to the WSA prepared for the Modified Project, the water demand for the Modified Project was not explicitly accounted for in the 2020 UWMP. The UWMP only considered future demands associated with population growth and minor infill projects. For this reason, water demand for the Modified Project was calculated independently within the WSA.

According to the UWMP, projected normal 2025 water use in the City of Corona for Commercial/ Institutional uses was projected in the amount of 3,078 AF, Residential Single Family was 18,839 AF, and total water use was 37,555 AF (UWMP 2020). Furthermore, the projected normal 2045 total water use was 38,351, while the single dry year demand in 2025 was 39,358 and 40,192 in 2045. According to the UWMP, the total supply for water during normal and dry years is 46,222 AF.

As stated in the WSA, the Modified Project's water demand during normal years would be 104 AF per year. Furthermore, the WSA determined Based on the finding that there is sufficient supply under normal year, single dry year and multiple dry year conditions through 2045 due to the availability of water resources. Furthermore, the Modified Project would also limit water use by inclusion of low-flow plumbing and irrigation fixtures, pursuant to the California Title 24 requirements and would comply with City permits and fees as necessary. As a result, the Modified Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project, and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years, and impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-29 – 4.19-30.)

3. Wastewater Treatment Capacity

Threshold: Would the Project result in a determination by 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?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-31.)

Explanation:

No septic systems are proposed as part of the Modified Project. As discussed under the analysis of Threshold UTL-1, the Modified Project would be provided sanitary sewer service by the CUD. Impacts associated with the Modified Project's proposed sewer improvements are inherent to the Modified Project's construction phase, and impacts have been evaluated throughout this SEIR under the appropriate subject headings (e.g., air quality, biological resources, etc.). Where significant direct or cumulative impacts are identified, mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce the Project's impacts to the maximum feasible extent. There are no environmental impacts that would occur specifically related to the Project's proposed sewer improvements that have not already been addressed in pertinent sections of this SEIR. Additionally, the analysis of Impact UTL-1, demonstrates that the CUD would not need to expand any wastewater treatment facilities as a result of the proposed Project. As such, with the mitigation measures specified in this SEIR, Project impacts due to the proposed construction of sewer facilities would be less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-31.)

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project.

4. Solid Waste

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-31.)

Explanation:

Solid waste generated by the Modified Project would be disposed of at either the El Sobrante Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, or Badlands Landfill. As previously indicated, the El Sobrante Landfill is currently permitted to receive 16,054 tpd, while the average daily tonnage in December 2022 was 9,291.25 tpd. The Lamb Canyon Landfill is permitted to receive 5,000 tpd, while data from December 2022 shows that the Lamb Canyon Landfill received a daily average of approximately 1,890.14 tpd. The Badlands Landfill is permitted to receive 4,800 tpd, while in January 2023 the Badlands Landfill received an average of 3,166.88 tpd. (RCDWR, 2022a RCDWR, 2022b; RCDWR, 2023)

As stated in the City's 2020-2040 General Plan, in 2015, the latest year for which data was approved, the target disposal rates for Corona were 8.6 pounds per day (ppd) per resident, and 18.6 ppd per employee; actual disposal rates in 2015—6.7 ppd per resident and 15.5 ppd per employee—were below target rates and thus were consistent with AB 939 (CalRecycle 2019f).

As stated in Section 4.14, Population and Housing, the Modified Project would result in approximately 113 residents and approximately 1,125 total employees. The Modified Project's solid waste generation, buildout and occupancy of the Modified Project is estimated to produce approximately 10.92 tpd of solid waste, or approximately 3,986.3 tons per year (tpy). Compliance with AB 939, which applies to the Modified Project and the City, up to 50% of its solid waste would need to be diverted from area landfills. In conformance with the City's 2020- 2040 General Plan and AB 939, the Project Applicant is required to work with future contract refuse haulers to implement recycling and waste reduction programs for solid wastes.

Based on the average daily tonnage received at these landfills in June 2022, the Project's daily generation of solid waste would represent 0.1% of the tpd permitted to receive at the El Sobrante Landfill. Because the Modified Project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day as compared to the permitted daily capacities and average daily tonnage for the El Sobrante Landfill, it is anticipated that these regional landfill facilities would have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the Modified Project. As such, because regional solid waste facilities would have adequate capacity to handle solid waste generated by the Modified Project's construction and operational phases, impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-31 – 4.19-32.)

5. Solid Waste Laws

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-32.)

Explanation:

Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste generation, transport, and disposal are intended to decrease solid waste generation through mandatory reductions in solid waste quantities (e.g., through recycling and composting of green waste) and the safe and efficient transport of solid waste. The Modified Project solid waste needs would be served by a contract waste hauler that complies with State standards. Additionally, new development projects approved by the City of Corona pursuant to the 2020-2045 General Plan would contain storage areas for recyclable materials in conformance with California Public Resources Code Sections 42900 et

seq., and City of Corona Municipal Code Chapter 8.20, Collection of Refuse and Recyclable Materials. Furthermore, solid waste diversion programs in the City would continue operating and would have adequate capacity to accept all future wastes and recyclables to reduce landfilled waste including buildout of the Modified Project. With compliance to all applicable solid waste statutes and regulations, impacts related to solid waste statutes and regulations would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-32 – 4.19-33.)

Q. WILDFIRE

1. Pollutant Concentrations

Threshold: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-12.)

Explanation:

A wildfire will generally spread uphill due to preheating of the fuel and up-slope draft unless the prevailing wind is strong enough to overcome these two forces. The flames are closer to the fuel on the uphill side and they receive more radiant heat. This results in more preheating and faster igniting of the fuel. The heated air rises along the slope increasing the draft that further increases the rate of spread. As a result of winds blowing up-slope, more convective heat also reaches the fuel in front of the fire, and it is pre-heated more quickly to the ignition temperature. The opposite is true at night. When the slope becomes shaded, the surface generally loses heat rapidly and becomes cool. The air adjacent to the surface also cools and becomes denser thus heavier and it can begin to flow down-slope.

Historically, wildfires have occasionally burned into the City from the Cleveland National Forest often pushed by moderate west to southwest winds. Because a portion of the Modified Project site is located on the hillside of the Santa Ana Mountains impacted by these winds, and more importantly being located within a Very High FHSZ, the risk for the Modified Project site to exacerbate wildfire spreading is a potentially significant impact.

As identified in the 2001 EIR, future development resulting from the GRRSP would be required to prepare a Fuel Modification Program to be approved by the City prior to grading activities. As included in detail above in PDF FIRE-1, the FPP (Appendix X) addresses issues related to wildfire potential in the vicinity of the development of the BPI development in relation to the type of construction material and design, and landscaping and vegetation that would be allowed within the

BPI Project area (GRRSP PAs 1, 2, and 3). Moreover, the purpose of the FPP is to implement Fuel Modification Zones (PDF FIRE-2) to ensure all proposed structures are safe from future wildland fires to the maximum extent feasible, as shown in Figure 4.20-1.

Overall, the Modified Project, would be constructed in compliance with the CFC and CBC, along with being compliant with CFD requirements as reflected in the Project's FPP including the Fuel Modification Program. Additionally, with the implementation of standard conditions of approval PDF FIRE-1 and -2, the Project occupants would not be exposed to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire by exacerbating wildfire risks. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required in a similar manner as identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, P. 4.20-12 – 4.20-13.)

2. Infrastructure Risks

Threshold: 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 ongoing impacts to the environment?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-15.)

Explanation:

As previously discussed in Threshold FIRE-2, the Modified Project site is in a Very High FHSZ and as a standard condition of approval for the Approved Project, future development would be required to prepare a Fuel Modification Program to be approved by the City prior to grading activities. As part of the development of the BPI Project design, improvements outlined in the FPP and Fuel Modification Program (PDF FIRE-1) would be approved by the City to reduce fire risk to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, the BPI development would incorporate the four main FMZs (PDF FIRE-2) as identified in the FMP, previously shown in Figure 4.20-1, which include the augmentation and long-term maintenance of surrounding vegetation to reduce risks from wildfires to life and property to the maximum extent feasible. The FPP also requires Zone Markers, bright orange markers on steel fence posts to clearly mark the boundary between Zone 2 and wildland areas for easier maintenance and inspection. Furthermore, the FPP identifies the Modified Project's Open space areas within the Project area to be managed the Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority upon acquisition.

As a result, with implementation of the FPP and FMP as outlined in PDF FIRE-1 and -2, the proposed BPI development and balance of the Modified Project would not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required in a similar manner as identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-15.)

3. Runoff Risks

Threshold: 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?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-15.)

Explanation:

Vegetation is crucial in maintaining existing drainage patterns and the stability of soils on slopes and hillsides. Leaves, stems and branches capture and slow drainage, allowing it to more effectively percolate into the soil. Removal of surface vegetation reduces the ability of the soil surface to absorb rainwater and can allow for increased runoff that may include large amounts of debris or mud-flows. This risk is especially high under post-fire conditions as the rate of surface water runoff is increased as water percolation into the soil is reduced. This risk is especially high after wildfires, where fire-altered soil may repel water (become hydrophobic) and further reduce absorption. As shown in Figure 4.20-2, Wildfire History, since 1900 approximately one (1) to eight (8) fires have burned onto the Project site. The majority of the historic fires have burned on the undeveloped hillsides of the Santa Ana Mountains.

The Modified Project would be developed at the base of and on the hillsides of the Santa Ana Mountains. Under existing conditions, if a fire were to occur in the area, vegetation that stabilizes soils on the Project site could be burned and lead to increased erosion. As part of the Modified Project, a FPP would be drafted and approved by the City and CFD as required. Moreover, as included as PDF FIRE-1, the BPI development would implement the FPP requirements including the installation of FMZs (PDF FIRE-2) that incorporate defensible space zones to reduce wildfire impacts and improve erosion control on slopes. In the unlikely event of a fire, the BPI development construction materials and design, landscaping and vegetation area would lower rates of erosion and siltation of the slopes compared to pre-project conditions.

Once developed, the BPI development would be graded to a flat surface with manufactured slopes. As discussed previously in Section 4.6 Geology and Soils, although the Project area is susceptible to earthquake induced landslides, no history of landslides were identified as part of the site-specific geotechnical analysis. While vegetation thinning associated with the FMZ would reduce some of the vegetation in the sloped area south of the BPI Project, not all vegetation would be removed. This will allow root systems to remain and stabilize the slope. A fire burning through the area of thinned vegetation would burn at a lower intensity due to the reduced fuels available. This would result in a higher likelihood that root systems survive and continue to provide slope stabilization after the fire event. A fire burning through untreated fuels would burn at a higher intensity and possibly result in no vegetative matter remaining which would increase erosion potential. With the specific fire protection features designed for the BPI Project such as the water supply system, fire sprinklers, ignition resistant construction, fire access, and FMZ, it is unlikely that a fire would spread from the Project site to this vegetated area.

Soils on the Project would be stabilized during construction, including installation of infrastructure

for diverting stormwater, and would include thinning of vegetation fuels on the most prominent slope which would reduce fire intensity, giving existing plants the best chance to survive and continue to provide slope stabilization. Due to those factors, the Project would not expose people or structures to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-15 – 4.20-17.)

SECTION IV.
IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The City hereby finds that Mitigation Measures have been identified in the SEIR and these Findings that will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The following statutory finding applies to all of the impacts described in this Section (IV): Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project which mitigate the significant effects on the environment (to less than significant levels). (See Pub. Resources Code § 21081(a)(1); State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1).) The potentially significant impacts, and the Mitigation Measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level, are as follows

A. AESTHETICS

1. Light and Glare

Threshold: Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-37.)

Explanation:

As described in the Visual Impact Analysis, the entire Modified Project site (approximately 160 acres) is largely vacant and undeveloped with the exception of the disturbance from the prior equestrian uses and therefore contains no sources of artificial lighting. Implementation of the Modified Project would result in the introduction of new lighting elements to illuminate parking areas, truck docking areas, commercial signage, and building entrances. Lighting elements primarily would be associated with the General Commercial land uses and BPI Development proposed in the northern portions of the site in PAs 1 through 4. .

Lighting elements on site would be governed by applicable provisions of the City's Municipal Code (CMC). Specifically, Chapter 17.84 of the City's Municipal Code requires that "[a]ll areas of exterior lighting shall be designed to direct light downward with minimal spillover onto adjacent residences, sensitive land uses and open space." In addition, Chapter 17.76 of the City's Municipal

Code requires that "[a]ll outdoor lighting within parking areas shall be designed and arranged with the approval of the City Engineer to restrict to a minimum the effects of stray light on adjacent property and city streets." Such requirements were also stated in the previously certified mitigation measures MM 4.6.1M through MM 4.6.1O.

In order to show compliance with the CMC, the BPI Development's Precise Plan application materials include photometric plans showing anticipated lighting levels depicted on Figure 4.1-11, Site Photometrics – Building 1, and Figure 4.1-12, Site Photometrics – Buildings 2, 3, 4 and 5.

The photometric plans demonstrate that proposed lighting associated with the BPI Development would not expose neighboring properties to excessive lighting levels and would not generate lighting levels that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the local area. Photometric plans also would be required in the future prior to development within the General Commercial planned uses in PA 4, which would be required to demonstrate that lighting levels would not adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the local area. For this reason, the Modified Project's impacts due to the creation of new sources of substantial light that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area would be less than significant with implementation of the GRRSP.

With respect to glare, a majority of the building elements proposed for the BPI Development would consist of tilt-up concrete panels containing ancillary office uses with glass elements. Similarly, glass elements would be used in the planned General Commercial buildings eventual development in PAs 4 . While window glazing has a potential to result in minor glare effects, such effects would not adversely affect daytime views of surrounding properties, including motorists along adjacent roadways, because the glass elements for the proposed industrial buildings would be low-reflective. Areas proposed for window glazing also would be limited in the BPI Development, as proposed on the application materials and described previously as Project Design Feature, PDF AES-3. The potential for glare would also be further reduced due to landscaping and perimeter walls and fencing associated with the BPI Development. With implementation of PDF AES-3, and MM 4.1.6M through MM 4.1.6O and compliance with the CMC, glare impacts from proposed building elements would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to glare would occur with implementation of the proposed Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. The proposed Modified Project is consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.1-37 – 4.1-40.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.6.1A: Visual Intrusiveness of Development: The visual intrusiveness of development shall be minimized. Rather than relying on substantial land form modification to

create artificial building pads, new development shall be designed to fit quietly into the natural character of the area.

- Except within bedrock, where manufactured slopes in excess of 5 vertical feet cannot feasibly be avoided, they shall be landform graded. "Landform grading" is a contour grading method which creates artificial slopes with curves and varying slope ratios in the horizontal and vertical planes designed to simulate the appearance of surrounding natural terrain. Grading plans shall identify which slopes are to be landform graded and which are to be conventionally graded.
- Site design should utilize varying setbacks, structure heights, innovative building techniques, and retaining walls to blend structures into the terrain.
- Allow for different lot shapes and sizes, as well as the provision of split development pads, with the prime determinant being the natural terrain. Within the lower elevations of PA 5, allow flag lots in areas where it is demonstrated that the end result is the preservation of natural topography by minimizing grading, and if the lot can be designed to provide adequate visibility for emergency vehicle response.
- Structures shall be sited in a manner that will:
  a) fit into the hillside's contour and relate to the form of the terrain;
  b) retain outward views from the maximum number of units while maintaining the natural character of the hillside;
  c) preserve vistas of natural hillside areas and ridgelines from public places and streets; and
  d) preserve existing views and allow new dwellings access to views similar to those enjoyed from existing dwellings.
- Streets should follow the natural contours of the hillside to minimize cut and fill. Streets may be split into two, parallel one-way streets (thereby effectively functioning as a two-way street with a median) in steeper areas to minimize grading and blend with the terrain. Cul-de-sacs or loop roads are encouraged where necessary to fit the terrain. On-street parking and sidewalks may be eliminated, subject to City Engineer approval, to reduce required grading.
- Driveways which serve more than one lot (when approved by the Fire Department), as well as diagonal driveways running along contour lines, are encouraged as a means of reducing unnecessary grading, paving, and site disturbance.
- Clustered development is encouraged as a means of preserving the natural appearance of the hillside and maximizing the amount of open space. Under this concept, dwelling units are grouped in the more level portions of the site, while steeper areas are preserved in a natural state. The effect of permitted clustering is to enhance the environmental sensitivity of a development project, and facilitate the permanent protection of key features of the natural environment, such as steep slopes, biological habitats, ridgelines, and scenic areas, including the retention of protected open space areas. Clustering is not be used to increase the overall density of an area beyond that which is otherwise permitted by the Specific Plan, nor is

clustering to be used to create suburban style subdivisions within the Specific Plan area. All development, including clustered development is to be rural in character.

a) The location of clustered units is to be restricted to portions of a site with less than a 35 percent actual slope.
b) Clustered development must preserve open space in its natural state. Adequate legal provisions shall be made during additional environmental review of any clustered development projects to ensure the preservation of open space areas in perpetuity.

- The use of retaining walls and structures is encouraged when it significantly reduces site grading. Except where employed to facilitate construction of a residential dwelling, retaining structures shall be located and restricted to 4 vertical feet in height so that they do not become a dominating visual feature. When taller retaining structures are built to accommodate a single family dwelling unit, the retaining structure should be located behind the dwelling so as to be screened from view by the home.
- Where retaining walls face or will be visible from public streets, they should be faced with materials that help blend the wall into the natural character of the terrain.
    a) Large retaining walls in a uniform plane should be avoided. Break retaining walls into elements and terraces, and use landscaping to screen them from view.
    b) The overall scale and massing of structures shall respect the natural surroundings and unique visual resources of the area by incorporating designs which minimize bulk and mass, follow natural topography, and minimize visual intrusion on the natural landscape.
- Houses shall not be excessively tall so as to dominate their surroundings. Structures shall be a maximum of 30 feet in height, but may be constructed on split, flat pads contained within a limited envelope parallel to the finished grade, rather than "jutting out" over natural slopes.
- Building forms shall be scaled to the particular environmental setting so as to complement the hillside character and to avoid excessively massive forms that fail to enhance the hillside character.
- Building facades shall change plane or use overhangs as a means to create changing shadow lines to further break up massive forms.
- Wall surfaces facing towards viewshed areas shall be minimized through the use of homes placed on split pads, setbacks, roof pitches, and landscaping.
- Roof lines and elements shall reflect the naturally occurring ridgeline silhouettes and topographical variation, or create an overall variety, that blends with the hillside.
- Architectural style, including materials and colors, should be compatible with the natural setting. The use of colors, textures, materials and forms that will attract attention by not relating to other elements in the neighborhood is to be avoided.
- As part of submittal requirements for tentative tract and parcel maps within PA 5, require that building pads be identified for all proposed development, that tentative

maps identify the type of construction (e.g., slab-on-grade, post and beam, etc.), and that tentative maps establish a three-dimensional building envelope for each dwelling.

- Overhead utilities (e.g., electrical, telephone, etc.) should only be permitted under the following circumstances:

    a) within the right-of-way of roadways connecting development areas;
    b) within the rights-of-way of roadways where all lots are 5 acres in size or greater.

    In cases where aboveground utilities are permitted within the right-of-way of a roadway, connections to individual dwellings shall be underground. Utilities shall continue to be underground within subdivisions and parcel maps along roadways serving parcels smaller than 5 acres, as currently required. Where overhead utilities are permitted, their adverse visual impact on surrounding properties is to be mitigated through sensitive placement. Clear cutting of vegetation for an overhead utility corridor shall not be permitted.

MM 4.6.1B: The interface between new development and natural open space shall be designed to provide a gradual transition from manufactured areas into natural areas. By extending fingers of planting into existing and sculptured slopes, the new landscape should blend in with the natural vegetation. It is intended that the transition between manufactured areas and natural areas occur sufficiently beyond residential structures so as to permit the development to meet applicable Fire Department brush clearance requirements.

MM 4.6.1C: Planting along the slope side of development shall be designed to allow controlled views out, yet partially screen and soften the architecture. In general, 50 percent screening of new structures with plant materials should be accomplished.

MM 4.6.1D: Trees and shrubs are to be arranged in informal, randomly spaced masses, and shall be placed selectively to reduce the scale of long, steep slopes.

MM 4.6.1E: To protect the public health and safety, development within PAs 1, 5, and 6 shall ensure the ongoing maintenance of manufactured slopes.

MM 4.6.1F: Development within hillside areas shall be conditioned upon the following:

a) Where a manufactured slope over 5 feet in height is created in order to develop a single family dwelling, landowners should be required to record a deed restriction which provides an acknowledgment of the existence of the manufactured slope, requires that such slope be maintained by landowner, and indemnifies the City from damages should the slope fail in the future.
b) In the case of a parcel map or tentative tract map, a declaration of covenants,

conditions, and restrictions shall be prepared and recorded providing for the development and maintenance of manufactured slopes over 5 feet in height, and indemnifying the City from damages should the slope fail in the future.

MM 4.6.1G: In addition, the applicant for such a land division or subdivision shall include a program and/or make provision for staff for preventive maintenance of manufactured slope areas in excess of 5 feet in height. Such program must be approved prior to approval of a final map, and shall include homeowner slope maintenance requirements and guidelines to be incorporated into the declaration of covenants, conditions, and restrictions.

MM 4.6.1H: A minimum five-year revegetation monitoring and maintenance program is to be required for all development requiring slope bank and/or habitat vegetation. The revegetation monitoring program shall include monthly inspection for months 1 through 12, quarterly inspection for months 12 through 36, and semi- annual inspection for months 36 through 60. Inspections shall be performed by a qualified botanist subject to City approval.

MM 4.6.1I: Primary ridgelines should be protected from any construction activities including, but not limited to roads, structures, water tanks, antennae, utilities, etc. so as to maintain a natural skyline.

MM 4.6.1J: New parcels that have, as their only feasible building site, a primary ridgeline shall not be created. Where the only feasible building site within an existing parcel is on a primary ridgeline, the structure shall be sited at the lowest possible elevation on the site, and along the least visible portion of the ridge upon which a structure can feasibly be constructed.

MM 4.6.1K: Where development is proposed to occur adjacent to a primary ridgeline (a ridge which is visible against the sky as viewed from a public street), it should be set back a sufficient distance so as to be located below the ridgeline. The intent of this requirement is to maintain a natural skyline.

MM 4.6.1L: Planting shall be used along recontoured secondary (non-skyline) ridges to recreate a natural silhouette, and to act as a backdrop for structures. Trees shall be planted to create a continuous linear silhouette since gaps in the planting will not give the desired effect.

MM 4.6.1M: Sources of lighting within the Specific Plan area should be limited to the minimum standard to ensure safe circulation and visibility.

MM 4.6.1N: Street lighting should be limited to intersections and other locations needed to maintain safe access (e.g., sharp curves).

MM 4.6.1O: Exterior lighting for buildings should be of a low profile and intensity.

MM 4.6.2A: **Access**: Roadways within PA 5 should provide for minimum safe passage of two cars along a paved road section, except in limited circumstances. Within the upper elevations of PA 5, a further reduction in required roadway width for private roadways which will ultimately serve a maximum of four dwellings, based on the maximum allowable density permitted by the Specific Plan, and where not providing such a reduction would effectively preclude access may be permitted upon the approval of the City Engineer. For such roadways, a curb- to-curb width which does not allow for passage of two vehicles (minimum 16 feet, measured edge-to-edge) for a distance of up to 150 feet in any one segment may be permitted upon the approval of the City Engineer.

Where such a reduction in roadway width is permitted, owners whose land is served by such a roadway should be required to provide adequate assurance that the roadway will be kept properly maintained at all times. In addition, such landowners will be required to record a deed restriction that prohibits further subdivision of the property, and provides an acknowledgment of this special circumstance. Such owners will also be required to indemnify the City or any other service provider against any liability regarding emergency or non- emergency vehicle access.

MM 4.6.2B: Roadway grades and curves should accommodate safety and emergency vehicles. Existing roadway grade standards shall be applied to all proposed subdivisions and parcel maps. However, the City Engineer may grant exceptions to existing roadway standards for grades and curves where, in his judgement, existing or future access cannot reasonably meet such standards. These exceptions are to be limited to providing access to a single family dwelling on an existing lot of record along roadways which will ultimately serve a maximum of four dwellings, based on the maximum allowable density in the Specific Plan, and where not providing such an exception would effectively preclude access to an existing lot of record.

Where the City Engineer grants an exception to roadway grade standards, owners whose land is served by such a roadway will be required to provide adequate assurance that the roadway will be kept properly maintained at all times. In addition, such landowners and/or developer will be required to record a deed restriction at the time of tract map recordation that prohibits further subdivision of the property, and provides an acknowledgment of this special circumstance.

Such owners will also be required to indemnify the City or any other service provider against any liability regarding emergency or non-emergency vehicle access.

MM 4.6.2C: The provision of adequate flood control and/or erosion control measures for public and private roadways shall occur in a manner consistent with the rural character of

PA 5. Require the provision of concrete curbs and gutters to the portions of PA 5 area where they are needed to prevent erosion, as determined by the City Engineer. Within PA 5, rolled curbs are to be the preferred road edge along paved roads where such curbing will be adequate to contain drainage and prevent erosion.

MM 4.6.3A: Preservation of Open Space: Development projects are to be designed to protect habitat values and to preserve significant, viable habitat areas and habitat connections in their natural condition. Manufactured slopes shall be landscaped or revegetated with natural or naturalized, fire-resistant vegetation.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

B. AIR QUALITY

1. Sensitive Receptors

Threshold: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-22.)

Explanation:

Localized Impact Analysis

The AQIA includes a Localized Significance Threshold (LST) analysis based on SCAQMD methodology. The analysis quantified localized impacts (maximum daily emissions) for all nearest sensitive and non-sensitive receptors compared to the thresholds established by the SCAQMD. Consistent with LST Methodology, the LST emissions were calculated using an air dispersion model because the Project exceeds five acres.

During the peak phases of construction, the LST analysis determined no exceedances of SCAQMD thresholds would occur as shown in Table 4.3-5. Impacts would be less than significant. Notwithstanding, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1 would further reduce localized emissions in Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3.

The LST operational analysis generally includes on-site sources (area, energy, mobile, TRUs, and on-site cargo handling equipment). The Modified Project operational emissions would not exceed the numerical localized thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for any criteria pollutant as shown below in Table 4.3-6. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur for localized Project-related operational-source emissions, and no mitigation is required.

CO Hot Spot Analysis

The AQIA conducted a CO hot spot analysis to determine if the Modified Project's vehicular traffic additions would result in CO concentrations at nearby roadways and intersections that would result in a violation of ambient air quality standards. It has long been recognized that CO hotspots are caused by emissions from vehicles idling at congested intersections. As vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly stringent resulting in the replacement of older vehicles by newer vehicles in the vehicle fleet, plus the introduction of cleaner burning fuels, CO is now designated as attainment in the SCAB. The AQIA determined the Modified Project along with background and cumulative development would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hot spot based on empirical data derived from a 2003 Los Angeles hot spot study and based on representative Bay Area AQMD CO threshold considerations. Localized air quality impacts related to CO hot spots from the Modified Project's mobile-source emissions would therefore be less than significant.

Health Risk Analysis Impacts

The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) prepared for the Modified Project evaluated potential health risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors are the existing homes and residents to the east/southeast of the GRRSP Planning Area off Dominguez Ranch Road and workers associated with future development of the proposed Project. Health risk impacts result from exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) including diesel particulate matter (DPM) as a result of heavy-duty diesel trucks accessing the site. The analysis was conducting in accordance with the SCAQMD's *Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis*. DPM emissions concentrations were calculated using the EPA's AERMOD dispersion model using site specific, area climate, and Project inputs. Project data inputs include the detailed construction assumptions for each phase of the Modified Projects development contained in the AQIA. The phases analyzed were: Phase 1 = 746,167 sf of BPI uses in PAs 1, 2, 3; Phase 2 = Phase 1 plus 19,600 sf of GC uses in PA 4; Phase 3 = Phase 2 plus 32 ER DUs in PA 5.

The individual land use with the maximum exposure to emissions from a project is referred to as the maximally individual receptor (MEIR). The MEIR the proposed Project's construction and operational DPM source emissions was identified as the backyard of an existing residence on San Viscaya Circle approximately 246 feet east of PAs 1, 2 and 3. As shown in Table 4.3-5, the maximum incremental cancer risk at the MEIR attributable to the proposed Project construction and operational DPM source emissions is estimated at 5.14 in one million, which is less than SCAQMD's risk threshold of 10 in one million. Also shown in Table 4.3-5, noncancer risks were estimated to be 0.003 at the MEIR, which is less than SCAQMD's hazard risk threshold of 1.0. The Modified Project will not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent land uses as a result of construction and operational activity. All other receptors during construction and operational activity would experience less risk than what is identified for this location. Health risk impacts from the Modified Project's DPM emissions would therefore be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

As discussed previously, the 2001 EIR determined the Approved Project would not result in emissions that would affect sensitive receptors. The Modified Project would not result in CO hot spot impacts, construction-related LST impacts from NOx and PM10 emissions, or operational-related LST impacts from CO, ROC, and NOx emissions. In addition, the Modified Project would not result in health risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project.

Friant Ranch Case

The California Supreme Court held in 2018 that air quality analyses in an EIR must address the connection between identified air quality impacts to the human health consequences of the identified air quality impacts, or meaningfully explain why such an analysis cannot be provided given correlation of a project's criteria air pollutant emissions to specific health impacts is challenging. SCAQMD expressed at the time it may be "difficult to quantify health impacts for criteria pollutants," an important opinion coming from one of the State's are districts with the most sophisticated air quality modeling and health impact evaluation capabilities. Using O3 as an example, SCAQMD expressed why it is impracticable to determine specific health outcomes from criteria pollutants for all but very large, regional-scale projects. First, forming O3 "takes time and the influence of meteorological conditions for these reactions to occur, so ozone may be formed at a distance downwind from the sources." Second, "it takes a large amount of additional precursor emissions (NOX and VOCs) to cause a modeled increase in ambient ozone levels over an entire region," referencing a 2012 study showing that "reducing NOX by 432 tons per day (157,680 tons/year) and reducing VOC by 187 tons per day (68,255 tons/year) would reduce ozone levels at the SCAQMD's monitor site with the highest levels by only 9 parts per billion."

SCAQMD concluded it "does not currently know of a way to accurately quantify ozone related health impacts caused by NOX or VOC emissions from relatively small projects." The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) ties the difficulty of correlating the emission of criteria pollutants to health impacts to how ozone and particulate matter are formed, stating that "[b]ecause of the complexity of ozone formation, a specific tonnage amount of NOX or VOCs emitted in a particular area does not equate to a particular concentration of ozone in that area." Similarly, the quantity of particulate matter "emitted does not always equate to the local PM concentration because it can be transported long distances by wind," and "[s]econdary PM, like ozone, is formed via complex chemical reactions in the atmosphere between precursor chemicals such as sulfur dioxides (SOX) and NOX," meaning that "the tonnage of PM-forming precursor emissions in an area does not necessarily result in an equivalent concentration of secondary PM in that area." The disconnect between the amount of precursor pollutants and the concentration of ozone or PM formed makes it difficult to determine potential health impacts, which are related to the concentration of ozone and PM experienced by the receptor rather than levels of NOX, SOX, and VOCs produced by a source.

Most local agencies lack the data to do their own assessment of potential health impacts from criteria air pollutant emissions, as would be required to establish customized, locally specific

thresholds of significance based on potential health impacts from an individual development project. The use of national or "generic" data to fill the gap of missing local data would not yield accurate results because such data does not capture local air patterns, local background conditions, or local population characteristics, all of which play a role in how a population experiences air pollution. Because it is impracticable to accurately isolate the exact cause of a human disease (for example, the role a particular air pollutant plays compared to the role of other allergens and genetics in cause asthma), existing scientific tools cannot accurately estimate health impacts of the proposed Project's air emissions without undue speculation. Instead, readers are directed to the proposed Project's air quality impact analysis above, which provides extensive information concerning the quantifiable and non-quantifiable health risks related to the Project's construction and long-term operation.

The LST analysis above determined the proposed Project would not result in emissions exceeding SCAQMD's LSTs. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be expected to exceed the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards for emissions of CO, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5.

As the proposed Project's emissions will comply with federal, state, and local air quality standards, the proposed Project's emissions are not sufficiently high enough to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a basin-wide level and would not provide a reliable indicator of health effects if modeled. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-23 – 4.3-27.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM AQ-1: During grading of Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, all Construction Contractors shall ensure that offroad diesel construction equipment complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/CARB Tier 4 Interim emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications..

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Sensitive Species

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial 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 by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: New information that would result in new or more severe impacts from the Modified Project requiring revisions to the Prior EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-

32.)

Explanation:

Coulter's Matilija Poppy

Findings: As previously stated in the 2001 EIR, construction of the Approved Project would result in the loss of common plant species. One special status plant species was observed with the updated survey for the Modified Project and includes Coulter's matilija poppy. This species is a covered species under the MSHCP. This species is not a state or federally listed species, but is classified as Rank 4. As summarized in Table 3-1 of the Biological Study, Rank 4 species are currently thought to be limited in distribution or range whose vulnerability or susceptibility to threat is currently low. Given the low sensitivity of this species and the limited presence within the Modified Project site, impacts to the matilija poppy would be less than significant.

Southern California Rufous-Crowned Sparrow, Least Bell's Vireo and Yellow Warbler

Findings: Three special-status birds were observed during the updated biological surveys for the Modified Project including yellow warbler, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow and least Bell's vireo. The Project would impact habitat for the rufous-crowned sparrow, least Bell's vireo, and yellow warbler. Additionally, the Project would remove habitat with the potential to support white-tailed kite and would reduce the suitable foraging and/or nesting habitat (e.g., chaparral, coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, and scrub oak chaparral). The rufous-crowned sparrow is not listed and is not a California Species of Concern, but does have a S3 State Ranking, and therefore is marginally considered to have special-status. However, based on the relatively low sensitivity ranking, broad distribution, and limited impact by the Project compared to the large range of species and the Project's adjacency to MSHCP conservation areas to the south and to the west where proximate foraging habitat is available, impacts to the rufous-crowned sparrow would be less than significant.

Impacts to the least Bell's vireo and yellow warbler that would occur upon development of the Commercial component would be potentially significant. However, as the MSHCP provides coverage for both species, the Project's participation in the MSHCP through mandatory MSHCP fee payments and compliance with the biological requirements of the MSHCP ensures that any impacts to covered special status plants would be less than significant. In addition, the loss of habitat for the least Bell's vireo would require mitigation and the impacts would require the approval of a DBESP by the Wildlife Agencies.

Construction of the BPI Industrial Development would potentially impact least Bell's vireo, and as part of the JPR process for the development project RCA is requiring construction mitigation for such indirect impacts. This is considered to be a significant impact requiring mitigation. MM 4.7.3.A and MM 4.7.3.B (alternative) remain applicable to the Modified Project to reduce impacts to Migratory Birds to a less than significant level. With the inclusion of additional construction mitigation contained in MM BIO-1 for indirect impacts to the least Bell's vireo, impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

MM BIO-1: If construction will occur within 300 feet of potential vireo habitat between March 15 and September 30, a biologist shall determine whether vireo individuals are present within the adjacent habitat. If work will start prior to March 15 and continue into the vireo season, or will start between March 15 and April 30, the biologist shall survey the adjacent habitat weekly for eight weeks[1] starting on or around March 15 until vireo are detected, or until eight visits are completed and the vireo is confirmed absent. If construction work will start after April 30, then surveys will start on or around April 10 (the formal start of the vireo survey period), and surveys will follow the survey intervals as stated above. If vireo individuals are detected, the biologist will determine necessity and applicability of measures to address edge effects for construction activities occurring within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat to protect the vireo. At minimum the following are recommended.

1) Noise: Given the proximity of the vireo habitat to the existing Green River Road and the adjacent SR-91, there is already an existing noise baseline from heavy traffic use, and it is possible that construction noise would not exceed that baseline. The Project proponent will retain a qualified biologist to perform noise monitoring to determine the ambient noise level at the habitat edge without construction activities occurring within 300 feet of the habitat edge, and then determine noise levels while construction activities are occurring. If it is determined that with construction, the noise levels exceed the ambient levels, then noise attenuation measures may be implemented, including the construction of a temporary noise attenuation barrier (sound wall) along the disturbance limits north of Green River Road. If it is determined that noise levels cannot be attenuated, then the specific construction activities resulting in the noise will need to be temporarily ceased until August 31, or prior if it is determined through surveys that the vireo are no longer present.

2) Lighting: Any night lighting needed during construction within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat will be down shielded or directed away from the vireo habitat to prevent the illumination of the adjacent habitat.

3) Dust Emissions: The Project, as a part of standard best management practices (BMPs) pursuant to South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, will introduce dust control measures for the duration of construction activities to minimize any dust-related effect on adjacent vireos.

4) Trespassing: Prior to the start of construction activities along the northern side of Green River Road, the edge of the disturbance limits adjacent to the vireo habitat will be demarcated with orange construction fencing to prevent trespassing into the adjacent habitat. In addition, the Project proponent will implement an Environmental Awareness Training program prior to the start of construction to advise workers of sensitive biological areas adjacent to the development footprint, including the habitat areas north of Green River Ranch Road.

Crotch Bumble Bee – State Candidate Endangered Species

Findings: In 2019 the Crotch Bumble Bee was listed as a State Candidate Endangered (SCE)

Species. Crotch bumble bee was observed onsite during focused surveys for this species. The overall Study Area supports potentially suitable habitat for the Crotch bumble bee primarily within the non-native grasslands and within the scrub; however, this species is a habitat generalist as it will occur in a variety of plant communities throughout its range. Individuals were detected on the lower slopes in the southern portion of the Project's impact footprint where the grassland areas are less disturbed and native scrub vegetation is present. Furthermore, if Crotch bumble bee remains as a SCE or has otherwise been confirmed as a State Endangered species at the time of Project site disturbance, then an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) may be required prior to the disturbance of the occupied habitat. Impact would be considered potentially significant. The following mitigation measure which includes the conservation of 50.96 acres of scrub habitat and 26 acres of non-native grasslands and conservation of open space will offset impacts to the Crotch Bumble Bee and bring impacts to a less than significant level.

MM BIO-2: If the Crotch bumble bee is still a Candidate species or has been confirmed as a State listed species at the time of Project site disturbance, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit that would remove Crotch bumble bee habitat:

1) The Project proponent shall have conveyed or have an agreement to convey approximately 50.96 acres of various scrub habitats and 26 acres of non-native grassland in the southern portion of the Project site to the RCA, which constitutes avoidance of suitable habitat.

2) If the land to be conserved in the southern portion of the Project site has not been conveyed to the RCA and no agreement is yet in place to convey the property, the Project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW to address the extent of impacts and determine whether an ITP for Crotch bumble bee would be required. If an ITP were required, then mitigation may be required by CDFW as part of the ITP process, and the conservation of the comparable open space habitat would be presented to support the ITP.

This impact is new information or more severe impact as a result of the Modified Project, however, with the addition of Mitigation Measure MM BIO-2 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Plummer's Mariposa Lily and Intermediate Mariposa Lily

Findings: As identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project, suitable habitat occurs onsite for Plummer's mariposa lily and intermediate mariposa lily and they have a moderate potential to occur onsite. These species were not observed during the updated surveys for the Modified Project.

Many-Stemmed Dudleya and Brauton's Milk-Vetch

Findings: Many-stemmed dudleya and Brauton's milk-vetch have a low likelihood of occurring onsite. These species were not observed during the updated surveys for the Modified Project, therefore impacts remain similar to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project, which is less than significant.

Species Not on Federal or State Listings
Findings: Several sensitive wildlife species were observed on site during the updated surveys for the Modified Project. Several other sensitive wildlife species have at least a moderate potential to occur on site, identified within Appendix A and Append B of the Biological Technical Report. As identified within the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project, short-term impacts may occur to the species as a result of construction activities. These species are not protected by federal or state listings as threatened or endangered and any loss of individuals would not threaten their regional populations. Removal of their habitat represents a less than significant impact to regional populations of these species.

California Gnatcatcher
Findings: As identified within the 2001 EIR, implementation of the Approved Project would result in a direct loss of at least one California gnatcatcher and occupied live-in habitat for the species. While the loss of habitat for the species is now covered by the MSHCP, the Modified Project prohibits clearing occupied habitat during breeding season (March 1 through August 31). These impacts remain potentially significant for the Modified Project. MM 4.7.1.A remain applicable to the Modified Project to reduce impacts to California gnatcatcher to a less than significant level.

The 2001 EIR concluded implementation of the Modified Project would result in potential impacts to migratory birds and the nests. MM 4.7.3.A and MM 4.7.3.B (alternative) remain applicable to the Modified Project to reduce impacts to Migratory Birds to a less than significant level.

With the inclusion of the additional Mitigation Measure for the Crotch Bumble Bee, Impacts would be more severe impacts from the Modified Project requiring revisions to the Prior EIR. With the include of the additional Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 for the Crotch Bumble Bee, impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. (Draft SEIR, 4.4-32 – 4.4-35.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.1.A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction California gnatcatcher surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall identify mitigation for impacts to the California gnatcatcher consisting of acquiring and preserving California gnatcatcher habitat of equal or greater quality at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 (acquire at least 1 acre for each acre impacted). The Modified Project would impact 8 acres of habitat used by the California gnatcatcher; therefore, mitigation shall consist of the acquisition and preservation of at least 8 acres of occupied habitat. The acquired habitat shall be in a location that facilitates management for the species (i.e., currently supports the species and is contiguous with a larger area that will be managed for conservation of the species). Potential suitable locations include areas adjacent to

existing reserves (such as Stephens' kangaroo rat reserves) or within established mitigation banks for the California gnatcatcher.

Project impacts to the California gnatcatcher and its designated critical habitat may require consultation or other permitting for compliance with the federal ESA that may result in requirements for additional mitigation measures beyond those described above

MM 4.7.3A. Prior to the commencement of tree removal or grading on the proposed project site during the nesting season (March-July), all suitable habitat shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. In addition, a biologist shall be present on site to monitor the tree removal and grading to ensure that any nests detected during the initial survey are not disturbed.

MM 4.7.3B. (Alternative): Tree removal and grading shall be delayed until after the nesting season (March-July).

MM BIO-1: If construction will occur within 300 feet of potential vireo habitat between March 15 and September 30, a biologist shall determine whether vireo individuals are present within the adjacent habitat. If work will start prior to March 15 and continue into the vireo season, or will start between March 15 and April 30, the biologist shall survey the adjacent habitat weekly for eight weeks starting on or around March 15 until vireo are detected, or until eight visits are completed and the vireo is confirmed absent. If construction work will start after April 30, then surveys will start on or around April 10 (the formal start of the vireo survey period), and surveys will follow the survey intervals as stated above.
If vireo individuals are detected, the biologist will determine necessity and applicability of measures to address edge effects for construction activities occurring within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat to protect the vireo. At minimum the following are recommended.

1) Noise: Given the proximity of the vireo habitat to the existing Green River Road and the adjacent SR-91, there is already an existing noise baseline from heavy traffic use, and it is possible that construction noise would not exceed that baseline. The Project proponent will retain a qualified biologist to perform noise monitoring to determine the ambient noise level at the habitat edge without construction activities occurring within 300 feet of the habitat edge, and then determine noise levels while construction activities are occurring. If it is determined that with construction, the noise levels exceed the ambient levels, then noise attenuation measures may be implemented, including the construction of a temporary noise attenuation barrier (sound wall) along the disturbance limits north of Green River Road. If it is determined that noise levels cannot be attenuated, then the specific construction activities resulting in the noise will need to be temporarily ceased until August 31, or prior if it is determined through surveys that the vireo are no longer present.

2) Lighting: Any night lighting needed during construction within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat will be down shielded or directed away from the vireo habitat to prevent the

illumination of the adjacent habitat.

3) Dust Emissions: The Project, as a part of standard best management practices (BMPs) pursuant to South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, will introduce dust control measures for the duration of construction activities to minimize any dust-related effect on adjacent vireos.

4) Trespassing: Prior to the start of construction activities along the northern side of Green River Road, the edge of the disturbance limits adjacent to the vireo habitat will be demarcated with orange construction fencing to prevent trespassing into the adjacent habitat. In addition, the Project proponent will implement an Environmental Awareness Training program prior to the start of construction to advise workers of sensitive biological areas adjacent to the development footprint, including the habitat areas north of Green River Ranch Road.

MM BIO-2: If the Crotch bumble bee is still a Candidate species or has been confirmed as a State listed species at the time of Modified Project site disturbance, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit that would remove Crotch bumble bee habitat the following measures shall be implemented:

- The Project proponent shall have conveyed or have an agreement to convey approximately 50.96 acres of various scrub habitats and 26 acres of nonnative grassland in the southern portion of the Project site to the RCA, which constitutes avoidance of suitable habitat.

- If the land to be conserved in the southern portion of the Project site has not been conveyed to the RCA and no agreement is yet in place to convey the property, the Project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW to address the extent of impacts and determine whether an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for Crotch bumble bee would be required. If an ITP were required, then mitigation may be required by CDFW as part of the ITP process, and the conservation of the comparable open space habitat would be presented to support the ITP.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

2. Riparian

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulation or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the

Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-35.)

Explanation:

Under the Modified Project, a total of 2.10 acres of Regional Board jurisdiction would be permanently impacted (all non-wetland waters), including 2.07 acres onsite and 0.03 acre offsite.

A total of 3.66 acres of CDFW Jurisdiction would be permanently impacted as part of the BIP Development. This includes 2.51 acres of non-riparian streambed and 1.15 acres of riparian streambed.

As identified in the 2001 EIR of the Approved Project, a total of 1.76 acres of Corps/RWQCB jurisdiction and 9.81 acres of CDFW jurisdiction would be impacted as a result of the Approved Project implementation. Per the 2001 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7.2.A, impacts to riparian habitat would be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat at a minimum of 1.5:1 onsite or alternatively, or in combination with onsite crease, riparian or wetlands mitigation credits shall be acquired in an offsite mitigation bank at a replacement ratio of 2:1.

While RWQCB impacts have slightly increase for the Modified Project, these impacts are minor. Furthermore, impacts to CDFW jurisdiction as a result of the Modified Project has decreased significantly. Mitigation Measure 4.7.2.A remains applicable for the Modified Project with the clarification that impacts to the 3.66 acres of CDFW jurisdiction shall be mitigated at a greater than 3:1 ratio (11.14 acres). The Mitigation would be a combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and purchase of offsite mitigation bank (Riverpark Mitigation Bank). The onsite mitigation would consist of restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and preservation of 3.80 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The remaining balance of 4.68 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank. As such, Mitigation Measure 4.7.2.A would be clarified to include the following language.

> **MM 4.7.2A:** All riparian habitat impacted (i.e., removed) by the proposed project shall be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat of equal or greater quality. Permanent impacts to 3.47 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 1.96 acres of potential Corps/RWQCB jurisdiction) shall be mitigated through the combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and offsite mitigation (Riverpark Mitigation Bank: Should Riverpark Mitigation Bank become unavailable in the future, an alternative mitigation strategy through another mitigation bank within the MSHCP Plan Boundary shall be reviewed and approved by the RCA and Wildlife Agencies (CDFW and USFWS) prior to issuance of a grading permit). The onsite mitigation will consist of the restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and the preservation of 6.36 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The balance of mitigation would consist of 4.62 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank.
>
> It is anticipated that project construction will require permits or approvals from the CDFW (per Section 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code), and RWQCB (per Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act).

With the clarification language for the Modified Project, impacts would be less than significant within mitigation, as previously identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, 4.4-36 – 4.4-37.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.2A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction riparian area surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall identify all riparian habitat impacted (i.e., removed) by the proposed project and such impacted areas shall be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat of equal or greater quality. Permanent impacts to 3.47 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 1.96 acres of potential Corps/RWQCB jurisdiction) shall be mitigated through the combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and offsite mitigation (Riverpark Mitigation Bank: Should Riverpark Mitigation Bank become unavailable in the future, an alternative mitigation strategy through another mitigation bank within the MSHCP Plan Boundary shall be re-viewed and approved by the RCA and Wildlife Agencies (CDFW and USFWS) prior to issuance of a grading permit). The onsite mitigation will consist of the restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and the preservation of 6.36 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The balance of mitigation would consist of 4.62 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank.

It is anticipated that project construction may require permits or approvals from the CDFW (per Section 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code) and RWQCB (per Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

3. Wetlands

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-37.)

Explanation:

The biological studies prepared for the Modified Project determined the site does not support any wetlands. Consequently, no impact to state or federally protected wetlands would occur and no mitigation is required. Nonetheless, MM 4.7.2A is being imposed to reduce project-specific and cumulative impacts to biological resources with respect to jurisdictional waters, as specified above. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-37.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.2A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction riparian area surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall identify all riparian habitat impacted (i.e., removed) by the proposed project and such impacted areas shall be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat of equal or greater quality. Permanent impacts to 3.47 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 1.96 acres of potential Corps/RWQCB jurisdiction) shall be mitigated through the combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and offsite mitigation (Riverpark Mitigation Bank: Should Riverpark Mitigation Bank become unavailable in the future, an alternative mitigation strategy through another mitigation bank within the MSHCP Plan Boundary shall be re-viewed and approved by the RCA and Wildlife Agencies (CDFW and USFWS) prior to issuance of a grading permit). The onsite mitigation will consist of the restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and the preservation of 6.36 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The balance of mitigation would consist of 4.62 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank.

It is anticipated that project construction may require permits or approvals from the CDFW (per Section 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code) and RWQCB (per Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

4. Wildlife Movement

Threshold: 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?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-37.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project will impact the lower portions of north-south ridges and canyons that terminate at the flat portion of the property at Green River Road that support the local movement of wildlife.

As discussed above, the City is currently pursuing a Criteria Refinement through the RCA and Wildlife Agencies to formally relocated PCL-1 west to coincide with the B Canyon area. Additional information and environmental analysis of the Alternative Alignment of PCL-1 can be found in Section 5.0. The processing of the Criteria Refinement coincides with the RCA's recent acquisition of approximately 740 acres of lands located south and west of the Project site that

contain B Canyon. The RCA issued Criteria Refinement Review Findings (CR# 24- 01-10-01, dated February 20, 2024) in support of the Criteria Refinement stating approval of the realignment of PCL-1. The findings letter is included as Appendix D-4.

The formal relocation of PCL-1 removes the Modified Project site from the Linkage and thereby greatly reduces the relative importance of the Project site to facilitate wildlife movement and to connect Core A and Core B. In further support of the assembly of PCL-1, the Modified Project proponent is proposing to conserve 80.77 acres of land within the southern half of the site. The proposed conservation is contiguous with the lands recently acquired by the RCA for the MSHCP Reserve. The 80.77 acres of proposed conservation contains the structural topography and vegetative cover to facilitate regional wildlife movement. It aligns with the wildlife linkage/corridor conservation goals of the MSHCP.

The Modified Project includes the construction of a wildlife fence between the proposed MSHCP conservation areas and the of the Project. The fencing will be constructed along the western and southern edges of the Project site to direct wildlife to the west along the re- relocated PCL-1 Route in B Canyon. The fence will start at the eastern property boundary, extending west along the limits of the proposed MSHCP Conservation until the fence reaches the western boundary shared with the existing MSHCP Additional Reserve Lands. Then the fence will turn north along the property boundary to the terminus of Fresno Road, then northwest where the fence will terminate at the limits of Caltrans' easement for SR-91. The fence is proposed to be chain link (at least 8 feet tall) and will include one-way swing gates to allow for wildlife escape access to the open space to the south and west.

Temporary disturbances to wildlife movement may occur during construction; however, these disturbances would primarily occur during day-time hours during construction activities and would not interfere significantly with wildlife movement on a landscape level. The Project's consistency with the MSHCP and adherence to mandatory MSHCP requirements would reduce impacts to wildlife movement to a level of less than significant under CEQA.

Additionally, no native wildlife nursery sites were observed within the Project area and therefore, no impacts to wildlife nursery sites would occur.

The Project's construction activities have the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation is removed during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15). To avoid impacts to nesting birds, as identified within the 2001 EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7.3.A and Mitigation Measure 4.7.3.B (alternative) remain applicable to the Modified Project to reduce impacts to Migratory Birds to a less than significant level. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-37 – 4.4-38.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.3A. Prior to the commencement of tree removal or grading on the proposed project site during the nesting season (March-July), all suitable habitat shall be thoroughly surveyed for the

presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. In addition, a biologist shall be present on site to monitor the tree removal and grading to ensure that any nests detected during the initial survey are not disturbed.

MM 4.7.3B. (Alternative): Tree removal and grading shall be delayed until after the nesting season (March-July).

With the inclusion of the additional Mitigation Measure for the Crotch Bumble Bee, Impacts would be more severe impacts from the Modified Project requiring revisions to the Prior EIR. With the include of the additional Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 for the Crotch Bumble Bee, impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures 4.7.1A, 4.7.3A, 4.7.3B, BIO-1 and BIO-2 are required to reduce project-specific and cumulative impacts to biological resources and habitats. Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project which upon implementation would mitigate or avoid the potentially significant project-specific and cumulative impact to biological resources.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

5. Local Policies and Ordinances

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-39.)

Explanation:

The 2001 EIR identified 3.90 acres of coast live oak that would be impacted as a result of the Approved Project. Mitigation Measures 4.7.4.A through 4.7.4.E was included to mitigate for the impacts associated with coast live oak woodlands to a less than significant level.

The Modified Project would also implement Mitigation Measures 4.7.4.A through 4.7.4.E to reduce impacts to coast live oak. However, the Modified Project would impact 1.13 acres of coast live oak woodland, which is significantly less impacts than the Approved Project. Furthermore, the Modified Project would avoid and conserve 3.50 acres of coast live oak woodland. Therefore, the Modified Project reduces impacts to coast live oak woodland in comparison to the Approved Project.

While the City has no direct tree preservation ordinance, the City's 2020–2040 General Plan

includes several goals and policies relating to biological resources. The goals and policies of the General Plan are intended to support consistency with the MSHCP and to protect and preserve biological resources including plants and wildlife, vegetation communities, and wetlands and drainages.

Additionally, the Project – as modified at the recommendation of the City's Planning and Housing Commission – now includes the designation of 103.73 acres of Open Space land use. Such a designation promotes the protection of biological resources by ensuring these areas are managed in compliance with all local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources rather than set aside for development.

The Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The Project proponent is proposing permanent conservation of 80.77 acres of land within the southern half of the Study Area, and all development associated with the Modified Project will comply with the requirements of the MSHCP. The conservation of native land and compliance with the MSCHP in conjunction with avoidance, minimization, and mitigation will render the Project compliant with and not conflict with the biological resource policies of the City of Corona 2020–2040 General Plan. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7.4.A through 4.7.4.E, impacts are considered less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-39.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.4A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for PA 1, 2, 3, and 5, and 6, the project shall comply with the City's Hillside Development Overlay Ordinance. This mitigation was previously introduced as mitigation measure 4.6-1. This Ordinance promotes the use of residential clustering techniques and their measures to minimize impacts on hillside sites, typically areas containing oak trees. Home sites shall be clustered into the fewest number of acres possible to minimize the spread of impacts over a large portion of the property to reduce fragmentation of the remaining natural areas.

MM 4.7.4B: Prior to issuance of grading permits for PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, the applicant shall design an oak woodland management plan which includes the following:

- Provisions for ongoing maintenance, management, and construction impact practices for all oaks on site.
- Provisions for enhancing oak woodlands not within the development zone.
- Provisions for limiting human and vehicular access to existing oak woodland areas in order to preserve habitat quality.
- Limitations on the use of herbicides or pesticides within the oak woodland areas.

MM 4.7.4C: Prior to grading within PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, and 6, the applicant shall conduct a revised Tree Survey, based on the staking of the specific limits of grading, to assess opportunities for transplanting the oak trees.

MM 4.7.4D: Prior to issuance of building permits within PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, and 6, a qualified native plant horticulturist shall determine the sensibility and likelihood of survival of transplanting 10 percent of the oak trees.

MM 4.7.4E: Prior to certification of occupancy, the applicant shall replant 15- gallon size oaks at a ratio of 10 to 1 for all oaks lost but not transplanted. The location and methods for these plantings would be specified by a qualified native plant biologist/horticulturist.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

6. Habitat Conservation Plan

Threshold: 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-39.)

Explanation:

The Modified Project occurs within the MSHCP Temescal Area Plan, specifically in Subunit1 (Santa Ana River to Santa Ana Mountains), Criteria Cells 1702, 1704, 1811, and 1812 [Exhibit 5A – MSHCP Overlay Map]. Lands described for conservation within these Criteria Cells are intended support the assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 1 ("PCL-1") and Proposed Constrained Linkage 2 ("PCL-2") further to the east. The City is currently pursuing a Criteria Refinement through the RCA and Wildlife Agencies to formally relocate PCL-1 west to coincide with the B Canyon area. Additional information and environmental analysis of the Alternative Alignment of PCL-1 can be found in Section 5.0. The processing of the Criteria Refinement coincides with the RCA's recent acquisition of approximately 740 acres of lands located south and west of the Specific Plan Project that contain B Canyon. The RCA issued Criteria Refinement Review Findings (CR# 24-01-10-01, dated February 20, 2024) in support of the Criteria Refinement stating approval of the realignment of PCL-1. The findings letter is included as Appendix D-4.

The formal relocation of PCL-1 removes the Modified Project site from the Linkage and thereby greatly reduces the relative importance of the Project site to facilitate wildlife movement and to connect Core A and Core B. Even with the approval of the Criteria Refinement, i.e., the relocation of PCL-1, the Modified Project is still subject to JPR for the RCA to determine the Project's overall consistency with the MSHCP; however, the Modified Project would no longer be required to conserve lands in support of the original PCL-1 alignment. Regardless, the Modified Project would

conserve approximately 80.77 acres of land within the southern half of the site to contribute to the MSHCP Reserve. The conserved lands would be dedicated to the RCA and managed and protected in perpetuity.

The Modified Project would impact approximately 3.66 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, including 1.15 acres of riparian vegetation and 2.51 acres of unvegetated riverine areas. The functions of impacted MSHCP riparian areas must be replaced such that the resulting project is "biologically equivalent or superior" to the existing site conditions. A DBESP must be approved by the wildlife agencies (USFWS and CDFW) for the proposed Modified Project. Per the submitted DBESP prepared by GLA on January 17, 2022 and revised August 29, 2024 included as Appendix E-2, the modified Project avoids a total of 80.77 acres in the southern portion of the site, and protect in perpetuity 6.36 acres which contain 2.57 acres of riparian/riverine areas and 3.80 acres of coast live oak woodland.

In comparison, of the 3.66 acres of impacts to riparian/riverine areas, more than half of the impacts (2.07 acres) include drainage features in the northern portion of the Project site that have been disturbed through past land uses, with 1.01 acres mapped as disturbed or developed; 0.96 acre as supporting vegetation associated with ruderal areas, including non-native grasses and forbs; and 0.10 acre in areas mapped as residential/urban/exotic. These drainage features do not contain habitats described for conservation, nor do they contain habitat that support Section 6.1.2 species. However, the Project will impact 1.59 acres of riverine areas supporting native vegetation communities, including 1.12 acres of coast like oak woodland, 0.03 acre of elderberry stands, and 0.44 acre of native upland scrub. The coast live oak woodland and elderberry stands are classified as riparian communities.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.2.A, impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, with the realignment and conservation of PCL-1, the Project would conserve 80.77 acres of lands, which increases habitat for sensitive and listed species. These lands would be protected in perpetuity via the MSHCP Reserve to support Covered Species.

Lastly, the Project will conserve and protect 2.57 acres of riparian/riverine areas, including 3.80 acres of coast live oak woodland and 0.64 acre of native upland scrub communities(chaparral and Riversidean sage scrub. The Project will conserve habitat functions at a 2.5:1to nearly 3:1 ratio to the quantity impacted. In addition, the Project will further mitigate impacts to 3.66 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas through the onsite restoration of 2.57 acres of oak woodland and the additional purchase of 4.62 acres of mitigation credits at the Riverpark Mitigation Bank. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-39 – 4.4-41.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.7.2A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction riparian area surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall identify all riparian habitat impacted (i.e., removed) by the proposed project and

such impacted areas shall be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat of equal or greater quality. Impacts to 3.66 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 2.10 acres of potential RWQCB jurisdiction) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio (10.98 acres) through the combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and offsite mitigation (Riverpark Mitigation Bank). The onsite mitigation will consist of the restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and the preservation of 6.36 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The balance of mitigation would consist of 4.62 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank. It is anticipated that project construction may require permits or approvals from the CDFW (per Section 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code) and RWQCB (per Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

D. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Archaeological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Change in Circumstance or New Information Requiring Major or Minor EIR Revisions. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-7.)

Explanation:

The archaeological surveys conducted within the GRRSP Planning Area for the 2001 EIR revealed no archaeological or cultural resources. Similarly, the CRA prepared for the Modified Project (Appendix E) determined that no significant resources were identified within the GRRSP Planning Area boundary. However, the CRA states that given the prior disturbance and historic use of the Project site, and the proximity to multiple natural sources of water, unknown buried archaeological deposits may be encountered within the Planning Area during grading operations. Due to current best practices and the City's General Plan, it is understood that unknown resources may be encounter during development of the Modified Project may occur resulting in a significant impact.

As stated below in Mitigation Measure, MM CUL-1, all earthwork for development of the Modified Project would be required to be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and protocols within the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) are to be followed. As a result, with implementation of MM CUL-1 impacts to unknown archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant. However, no substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-7 – 4.5-8.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM CUL-1 Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources: Prior to issuance of grading permits, a Cultural Resources/ Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan CR/TCR-MMP shall be prepared by the Project archaeologist and submitted to the City for dissemination to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh), Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga), and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians (Soboba). All parties shall review be provided with an opportunity to comment upon, the plan in a reasonable time period as determined by the City prior to permitting for the Project. If consensus among the Project archeologist, the City and Tribe(s) about monitoring and treatment methods cannot be reached, the City shall make the determination in its best judgement regarding the appropriate measures for inclusion in the CR/TCR-MMP considering input and recommendations from archaeologist and the consulting Tribes. Any non-responsive party shall be assumed to have agreed to the plans without comment. Any and all findings of discovered resources will be subject to the protocol detailed within the CR/TCR-MMP.

This CR/TCR-MMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification in the form of a letter from the project archaeologist to the City stating that a certified archaeologist has been retained to implement the CR/TCR-MMP.

2) The project applicant shall provide Native American monitoring from the consulting Tribes on a rotating basis during all grading and ground disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall work in concert with the archaeological monitor to observe ground disturbances to fulfill the provisions of the CR/TCR-MMP.

3) The certified archaeologist and the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the CR/TCR-MM.

4) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources tribal cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the City at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) and City, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The City concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, the CR/TCR-MMP shall address culturally appropriate methods and treatment, including additional steps to mitigate impacts as determined by the City.

5) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, any cultural resources or tribal cultural resources that cannot be avoided and preserved in place shall be addressed though the methods and processes identified in the CR/TCR-MMP. The project archaeologist in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall identify the

methods for data recovery in the CR/TCR-MMP.

6) All cultural material collected shall be subject to the culturally appropriate treatment and mitigation standards outlined in the TCR-CRMP, which may include reburial on-site in an area that will be protected in perpetuity or relinquishment to the culturally affiliated consulting tribal government for culturally appropriate treatment.

7) A Phase 4 report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed, in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s), and submitted to the satisfaction of the City prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include DPR Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.

8) Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCR and) shall be curated at an institution meeting the State and federal standards for curation.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

2. Human Remains

Threshold: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-8.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, no changes in the location, size, or boundaries of the Specific Plan area have occurred since the 2001 EIR. In addition, the Modified Project would modify the size and boundaries of the GRRSP, however minimally. No evidence suggesting the area has been utilized in the past for human burials has been identified in the approved GRRSP Planning Area. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Modified Project construction should Project-related construction activities extend into previously undisturbed soils.

As stated in Mitigation Measure, MM CUL-2, in the unlikely event human remains are discovered during grading or construction activities within the area, compliance with State law (Health and Safety Code § 7050.5) (HSC § 7050.5) would be required. As stated in the City's General Plan, these requirements have been imposed on any construction activity in which human remains are detected after certification of the 2001 EIR. Therefore, the potential to encounter human remains would occur as a result of the Modified Project and implementation of MM CUL-2 would be required per State Law and render potential impacts to less than significant. However, no substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-8.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM CUL-2: If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within the period specified by law (24 hours). Subsequently, the NAHC shall identify the Most Likely Descendant. The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Paleontological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-19.)

Explanation:

The Geotechnical Study identified the existence of very old alluvial fan sediments and sedimentary formations beneath the Modified Project that are considered to possess high paleontological resource sensitivity. Consequently, ground breaking activities during Project construction are considered to have a potential for impact to paleontological resources and therefore mitigation is required. Full-time paleontological monitoring shall be required in undisturbed fossil-bearing formations starting at the surface during surficial grading, excavation, or utility trenching activities associated with site preparation. This same conclusion was reached by the earlier investigations contained in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. For this reason, the Geotechnical Study recommended a draft PRIMP that would replace the PRIMP contained in MM 4.9.1A of the prior 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. The revised and updated PRIMP would be comparable to the Approved Project's mitigation, consistent with the provisions of CEQA, the City's GP policies regarding paleontological resources, and the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Upon implementation, the revised and updated PRIMP would mitigate any adverse impacts (loss or destruction) to potential nonrenewable paleontological fossil resources, if present, to less than significant. The updated and revise PRIMP acknowledges that paleontological monitoring may be reduced or halted if the excavations are unlikely to yield paleontological resources based upon the

observations and recommendations of the professional-level project paleontologist.

Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM PAL-1. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-19. – 4.7-20.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM PAL-1:

1) Monitoring of mass grading and excavation activities in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources by a qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor. Full time monitoring of grading or excavation activities should be performed starting from the surface in undisturbed areas of very old Quaternary (middle to early Pleistocene) alluvial fan deposits, and the Tertiary-aged Sespe, Vaqueros, Santiago, and Silverado formations within the project. Paleontological monitors will be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow for the removal of abundant or large specimens in a timely manner. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are not present in the subsurface, or if present, are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontological personnel to have a low potential to contain or yield fossil resources.

2) Paleontological salvage during trenching and boring activities is typically from the generated spoils and does not delay the trenching or drilling activities. Fossils are collected and placed in cardboard flats or plastic buckets and identified by field number, collector, and date collected. Notes are taken on the map location and stratigraphy of the site, and the site is photographed before it is vacated and the fossils are removed to a safe place. On mass grading projects, any discovered fossil site is protected by red flagging to prevent it from being overrun by earthmovers (scrapers) before salvage begins. Fossils are collected in a similar manner, with notes and photographs being taken before removing the fossils. Precise location of the site is determined with the use of handheld Global Positioning System units. If the site involves a large terrestrial vertebrate, such as large bone(s) or a mammoth tusk, that is/are too large to be easily removed by a single monitor, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (BFSA) will send a fossil recovery crew in to excavate around the find, encase the find within a plaster jacket, and remove it after the plaster is set. For large fossils, use of the contractor's construction equipment is solicited to help remove the jacket to a safe location before it is returned to the BFSA laboratory facility for preparation.

3) Particularly small invertebrate fossils typically represent multiple specimens of a limited number of organisms, and a scientifically suitable sample can be obtained from one to several five-gallon buckets of fossiliferous sediment. If it is possible to dry screen the

sediment in the field, a concentrated sample may consist of one or two buckets of material. For vertebrate fossils, the test is usually the observed presence of small pieces of bones within the sediments. If present, as many as 20 to 40 five-gallon buckets of sediment can be collected and returned to a separate facility to wet-screen the sediment. In the laboratory, individual fossils are cleaned of extraneous matrix, any breaks are repaired, and the specimen, if needed, is stabilized by soaking in an archivally approved acrylic hardener (e.g., a solution of acetone and Paraloid B-72).

4) Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including screen washing sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates, if necessary. Preparation of individual vertebrate fossils is often more time-consuming than for accumulations of invertebrate fossils.

5) Identification and curation of specimens into a professional, accredited public museum repository with a commitment to archival conservation and permanent retrievable storage (e.g., the Western Science Center, 2345 Searl Parkway, Hemet, California 92543). The paleontological program should include a written repository agreement prior to the initiation of mitigation activities.

6) Preparation of a final monitoring and mitigation report of findings and significance, including lists of all fossils recovered and necessary maps and graphics to accurately record their original location. The report, when submitted to the appropriate lead agency (City of Corona), will signify satisfactory completion of the project program to mitigate impacts to any paleontological resources.

7) Decisions regarding the intensity of the MMRP will be made by the project paleontologist based upon the significance of the potential paleontological resources and their biostratigraphic, biochronologic, paleoecologic, taphonomic, and taxonomic attributes, not upon the ability of a project proponent to fund the MMRP

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

F. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions / Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Threshold: Would the Project generate GHG emissions, either directed or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs?

Finding: Under changed circumstances the Modified Project results in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.8-18.)

Explanation:

As stated in the GHG Analysis, the Modified Project would result in direct and indirect emissions of CO2, CH4, N2O and Refrigerants. Direct Project-related GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities, area sources, and mobile sources, while indirect sources include emissions from electricity consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. Project-related GHG emissions were quantified with CalEEMod Version 2022.1, which relies upon vehicle trip rates and Project-specific land use data to calculate emissions. As shown below in Table 4.8-1, the Modified Project would result in a total of approximately 19,208.02 MTCO2e/yr.

As noted previously, instead of showing consistency with an adopted numeric threshold of significance for GHG emissions, the City's CAP utilizes a point system to show consistency through use of a point system. Calculation of the points is conducted using the CAP Screening Tables, which allocates points for specific features of a project or features that can be added to a project to obtain the necessary points. The points are based on the GHG reduction value of the feature. For this reason, the Modified Project's GHG emissions of 19,208.02 MTCO2e/yr, is not specifically evaluated because the CAP implements a project efficiency based determination of consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) by considering whether the Modified Project is consistent with applicable regulations or requirements adopted to implement a Statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The Modified Project shall show CAP consistency with the CAP through use of the Screening Table Measures to show the Project's GHG reduction features obtain a minimum of 100 points. The Modified Project would be consistent with the CAP's requirement to achieve at least 100 points for both the residential and non-residential portions of the Project and thus the Project would be considered to have a less than significant individual and cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions. The City shall verify incorporation of the identified Screening Table Measures within the Project building plans and site designs prior to the issuance of building permit(s) and/or site plans (as applicable).

As previously stated, a minimum of 100 points will be required for both the residential and non-residential portions of the Modified Project. The City shall verify incorporation of the identified Screening Table Measures within the Project building plans and site designs prior to the issuance of building permit(s) and/or site plans (as applicable). Projects that achieve a total of 100 points or more are considered to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on GHG emissions.

In order to ensure the appropriate GHG reduction features are implemented, new Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1, shall be required to ensure each phase of the Modified Project includes applicable measures from the CAP Screening Tables (Appendix C to the CAP) to achieve a minimum of 100 points for both the residential and non-residential portions of the Modified Project. Alternatively, specific measures may be substituted for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction, subject to City of Corona Building Division review.

As previously discussed, the Project would not generate significant GHG emissions, nor conflict

with any applicable plan, policy or regulation. Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected with mitigation measure MM GHG-1 incorporated.

Overall, the Modified Project implemented under changed circumstances would result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the Prior EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.8-18 – 4.8-20.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM GHG 1: Prior to issuance of a building permit for each increment of development in the GRRSP, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Corona Building Division demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to a building permit application include the measures from the CAP GHG Emissions Screening Tables (Appendix C to the CAP), as needed to achieve a minimum of 100 points for both the residential and non-residential portions of the Project. Alternatively, specific measures may be substituted for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction, subject to City of Corona Building Division review.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Waste Sites

Threshold: Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 67962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment ?

Finding: The Modified Project would result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the prior EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-18.)

Explanation:

The ESA prepared to assess hazardous conditions affecting the BPI Development and ER portions of the Modified Project found these properties do not appear on the hazardous database reports obtained for the assessment. There is one adjacent facility to the northeast listed on the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) Hazardous Waste, CERS TANKS, facility and Manifest Data (HAZNET), Underground Storage Tank (UST), and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) NonGen databases. This facility is listed Kaykel Investments Properties DBA Green River 76 located at 4350 Green River Road. The CERS Hazardous Waste and TANKS have CERS descriptions listed as "Hazardous Waste Generator" and "Underground Storage Tank", respectively. There are multiple violations described that have all been returned to compliance. The HAZNET listing lists the waste code as "aqueous solution with total organic residues less than 10 percent with the disposal method listed as "other recovery of reclamation for reuse including

acid regeneration". The UST database lists four tanks total. The RCRA Non-Gen database lists the classification as "non- generator" with a description of "handler: non-generators do not presently generate hazardous waste" with no violations found. There are 24 additional facilities listed on the database report within the various search distances specified by ASTM E 1527-13. Due to the status listings, distances and/or locations (hydro-geologically down-or crossgradient), these facilities do not represent an environmental concern to the Site. Therefore, the ESA determined no evidence exists of a recognized environmental condition in connection with the subject Site. However, the ESA noted that prior to demolition of any of the existing Site structures, existing federal and state regulations require asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) surveys be performed.

In addition, there is evidence of an environmental concern at the subject Site that is a common concern frequently found on properties with former historical agricultural use. The northern portion of the Site has historically been used for agricultural purposes from at least 1946 to at least 1953. Historically, some agricultural sites have utilized pesticides that are currently considered a health risk and no longer used and consideration should be given to performing limited site testing of near surface soils prior to site preparation and grading in order to test for elevated concentrations of these chemicals. This is significant impact requiring mitigation. Implementation of new Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Overall, the Modified Project implemented under changed circumstances would result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the Prior EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-18 – 4.9-19.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM HAZ-1: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for each phase of development requiring demolition and removal of onsite structures, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Corona Building Division demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to a demolition permit application include survey testing for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints (LBP) in accordance with existing federal and state regulations.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

H. HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

1. Water Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-21.)

Explanation:

Construction

Construction of the GRRSP Planning Area and the proposed BPI development would require grading and excavation of soils, which would loosen sediment and then have the potential to mix with surface water runoff and degrade water quality. Additionally, construction would require the use of heavy equipment and construction-related chemicals, such as concrete, cement, asphalt, fuels, oils, antifreeze, transmission fluid, grease, solvents, and paints. These potentially harmful materials could be accidentally spilled or improperly disposed of during construction and, if mixed with surface water runoff, could wash into and pollute waters.

Consistent with the 2001 EIR, short-term storm water pollutant discharges from each individual site within the GRRSP Planning Area would be prevented through compliance with the applicable NPDES permitting process. Coverage with applicable permits would prevent sedimentation and soil erosion through implementation of an SWPPP and periodic inspections by RWQCB staff. During the construction period, the development associated with the GRRSP would utilize a series of BMPs to reduce erosion and sedimentation consistent with those identified in the Certified EIR. To ensure that future development within the GRRSP Planning Area obtains coverage under the NPDES General Construction permit, implementation of the 2001 EIR Mitigation Measures 4.11.1A, 4.11.3A, 4.11.3.B, and 4.11.4A have been identified. As a result, with implementation of mitigation measures 4.11.1A, 4.11.3A, 4.11.3.B, and 4.11.4A the Modified Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, potential water quality degradation associated with construction activities would be minimized, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The Modified Project would include the proposed BPI development consisting of five industrial buildings totaling in approximately 746,167 square feet within the business industrial designation. The GRRSP Planning Area is comprised of approximately 160.0 acres of undeveloped vacant land, and has been modified for the future 5.5 acres general commercial parcel north of Green River Road and the 20.39 acres Estate Residential situated on the southern portion of the property.

Potential pollutants associated with the proposed uses include various chemicals from cleaners, pathogens from pet wastes, nutrients from fertilizer, pesticides and sediment from landscaping, trash and debris, and oil and grease from vehicles. If these pollutants discharge into surface waters, it could result in degradation of water quality.

Section 15.36 of the City's Municipal Code requires implementation of Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) based on the anticipated pollutants that could result from new development and redevelopment projects. The Project's WQMP was created to comply with the requirements of the City of Corona, the Riverside County Water Quality Management Plan, and the NPDES Areawide Stormwater Program. The BMPs would include pollutant source control features and pollutant treatment control features.

The source control BMPs would minimize the introduction of pollutants that may result in water quality impacts; and treatment control BMPs that would treat stormwater runoff. For the purposes of stormwater quality, an underground bioretention/biofiltration system is proposed. The proposed BPI development would include the project design features, PDF HYD-1, of which would consist of 10 Biotreatment Units (Modular Wetland System) and twounderground detention chambers to provide water quality treatment for Drainage Management Areas (DMA) 2 through DMA 11. DMA 1 was identified as a Self-Treating Area due to the lack of impervious surfaces and requires no BMP. The proposed biotreatment units and underground detention chambers would capture, treat, and slow stormwater runoff for the 10-year and 100-year storm events.

However, in order to prevent impacts to operational water quality, the Modified Project would be required to prepare a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to identify low-impact development storm water retention strategies and appropriate hydromodification controls to mitigate potential violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Consistent with the 2001 EIR, applicable Mitigation Measures 4.11.1.B, 4.11.2.A, 4.11.2B, 4.11.3.C, 4.11.3.D, and 4.11.4B have been identified. With implementation of PDF HYD-1, NPDES requirements and the WQMP, pursuant to the City Municipal Code, and City Council Ordinance No. 2291 and 2828 (included as 2001 EIR mitigation measures 4.11.1A, 4.11.1.B, 4.11.2.A, 4.11.2B, 4.11.3A, 4.11.3.B, 4.11.3.D, and 4.11.4A); which would be verified during the plan check and permitting process for the Modified Project, the Modified Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would occur with implementation of the proposed Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-21 – 4.10-23.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.11.1A: The project applicant shall obtain all required permits and clearances from the Corps, the RWQCB, and the CDFG prior to the disturbance of any existing drainage.

MM 4.11.1B: Drainage facilities within engineered slopes/fills shall be designed and installed in accordance with the City of Corona standards.

MM 4.11.2A: All proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the project. Drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.

MM 4.11.2B: On-site detention basins shall be constructed to accommodate storm flows from the project site. Such facilities shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to reduce on-site runoff to a level that can be accommodated by the existing culverts beneath Green River Road.

All required drainage structures shall be designed, installed, and maintained in accordance with applicable City of Corona standards

MM 4.11.3A: The construction and/or grading contractor shall establish and implement a construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and post- construction Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) in accordance with NPDES permit issued by the Santa Ana RWQCB.

MM 4.11.3.B: In accordance with issuance of a NPDES permit, the construction and/or grading contractor shall establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMP) at time of project implementation. Construction erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. BMPs to minimize erosion and/or sedimentation impacts shall include (but not be limited to) the following:

- Collection of runoff entering developing areas into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.
- Capture of runoff above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas and conveyance to nearby drainages.
- Conveyance of runoff generated on paved or covered areas via drains and swales to natural drainage courses.
- Revegetation of disturbed areas and vegetation of non-disturbed but highly erosive areas.
- Use of drought tolerant plants and irrigation systems which minimize runoff.
- Use of other erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, concrete lining, small check dams, etc. to reduce erosion in gullies and active stream channels.
- During the time that on-site soils are exposed, the soil surface shall be approximately 2 feet below the surrounding grade. Any storm water falling on exposed soils will infiltrate on site.
- To the maximum extent possible, on-site vegetation shall be maintained.
- Limit grading disturbance to essential project area.
- Limit grading activities during the rainy season.
- Balance and limit, to the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill.
- Water entering and exiting the site shall be diverted through the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.

- Water shall be sprayed on disturbed areas to limit dust generation.
- The construction entrance shall be stabilized to reduce tracking onto adjacent streets.
- Dikes, drains, swales or other features shall be used to divert and/or redirect runoff.

MM 4.113. C: Manufactured slopes shall be stabilized. Where appropriate, retaining wall designs shall include waterproofing and weep holes, subdrains or backdrains for relieving possible hydrostatic pressures.

MM 4.11.3.D : Manufactured slopes shall be revegetated to help ensure stability. Revegetation plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. Plant selection shall comply with the Plant Palette contained in Section 4.3.6 of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan.

MM 4.11.4A: Development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with applicable provisions of the NPDES permit and the applicable standards and regulations of responsible agencies.

MM 4.11.4B: Precast "stormceptors" shall be installed in parking areas and/or in areas where fuels, oils, solvents or other pollutants may enter the stormwater stream (i.e., gas stations, loading areas). Such devices shall be adequately maintained (including the cleaning/replacing of absorbent fiberglass "pillows" and periodic removal of accumulated sand and silt).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

2. Erosion or Siltation

Threshold: 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 surface, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-24.)

Explanation:

Although the GRRSP Planning Area does not include, a natural stream, river or other body of water, the Project site does contain several ravines (non-wetland waters) which convey natural drainage across the Modified Project site to off-site tributaries. Under existing conditions, development of the Modified Project would alter the course of a stream thereby impacting the existing drainage pattern.

As previously discussed, a SWPPP would be implemented during construction to control drainage

and maintain drainage patterns across the Modified Project (MM 4.11.3A). As discussed in the WQMP (Appendix K) existing drainage patterns would remain unchanged, which would result in a decrease in time of concentration due to increase in imperviousness. To address this increase, the BPI development, proposes a biofiltration system that would capture runoff prior to discharge off-site (PDF HYD-1). All storm water runoff will be carried via typical street sections and an onsite storm drain system. In addition, the Drainage Report determined, a 10-year storm event would be contained below the top of curb and a 100-year storm event would be protected from the industrial building pads. Additionally, the installation of onsite landscaping, a biofiltration system, and catch basins would be designed to accommodate the increased flow volume. Moreover, impacts from the erosion of existing natural downstream canyons and hillsides will be mitigated to a less than significant level by properly designed grading, detention basins, energy dissipators and erosion protection rip-rap pads at the outlet of storm drain system (MM HYD-1).

Additionally, according to the FEMA's FIRM Map #06065C0668G, #06065C0669G, and #06065C1335GG the Project site is zoned as Flood Zone X, area with minimal flood hazard. The City would review the Modified Project permit applications to ensure the proposed BPI and future development within the GRRSP would not be subject to significant flood hazard and structures would be floodproofed and would not impede or redirect flood flows. As such, with implementation of mitigation measures MM HYD-1, and 4.11.3A, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact on the existing drainage pattern.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-24 – 4.10-25.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.11.3A: The construction and/or grading contractor shall establish and implement a construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and post- construction Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) in accordance with NPDES permit issued by the Santa Ana RWQCB.

MM HYD-1: Erosion of existing natural downstream canyons and hillsides will be mitigated by properly designed grading, detention basins, energy dissipators and erosion protection rip-rap pads at the outlet of storm drain system.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

3. Flooding and Flood Flows

Threshold: 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 surface, in a manner which would

substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

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 surface, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-25.)

Explanation:

As discussed previously, the Modified Project site is classified as Flood Zone X, area of minimal flood hazard. In addition, the Modified Project site does not include, and is not adjacent to, a body of water such as a natural stream or river that would increase the potential for flooding. Also, as discussed previously, the Modified Project would introduce approximately 36.65 acres of impervious surfaces to the GRRSP Planning Area, which would increase stormwater runoff from the Project site. However, the Modified Project, consistent with the 2001 EIR, would implement mitigation to reduce flooding hazards on- or offsite impacts to a less than significant level. As detailed below, MM 4.11.2.A requires that all proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the Modified Project. In addition, the MM 4.11.2A also requires future development of the GRRSP Planning Area drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. As it relates to the proposed BPI development, as previously stated, will incorporate PDF HYD-1 for the proposed on-site storm drain system consisting of catch basin inlets and storm drain pipes proposed to convey the runoff across the site to the designated discharge points. In addition, 10 Biotreatment Units (Modular Wetland System) and two underground detention chambers will be installed to provide water quality treatment for the proposed Drainage Management Areas (DMA). PDF HYD-1 shall be constructed to accommodate storm flows from the site designed, installed and maintained in a manner to reduce on-site runoff to a level that can be accommodated by the existing culverts beneath Green River Road.

Adherence to the existing requirements and implementation of the post construction stormwater requirements would be confirmed during Project plan check prior to Project approval. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measure MM4.11.2A and project design PDF HYD-1, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact on flood flows and flooding hazards on- or offsite.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-25 – 4.10-26.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.11.2A: All proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the project. Drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

I. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Listed, Eligible or Defined Tribal Cultural Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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 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)?

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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 a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Finding: Change in Circumstance or New Information Requiring Major or Minor EIR Revisions. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.18-15.)

Explanation:

As determined in Section 4.5 Cultural Resources, the Modified Project site includes a board-formed concrete water tank, a concrete-lined reservoir, and a front-gabled cinderblock garage, however, does not contain resources eligible for listing on a register of historical resources. In addition, the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E) prepared for the Project included a records search for the Modified Project site and surrounding area was conducted through the Eastern Information Center at the University of California Riverside and did not identify any historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) on the site. However,

as previously stated in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, given the prior disturbance and historic use of the Project site, and the proximity to multiple natural sources of water, unknown buried archaeological deposits may be encountered within the Planning Area during grading operations. Due to current best practices and the City's General Plan, it is understood that unknown resources may be encounter during development of the Modified Project may occur resulting in a significant impact. As stated in Section 4.5.10, Mitigation Measure, MM CUL-1, all earthwork for development of the Modified Project would be required to be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and protocols within the Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CR/TCR-MMP) are to be followed.

Furthermore, the SLF search (Appendix E-2) completed by the NAHC to determine if recorded Native American sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance are present within a one-mile radius of the Project site, yielded negative results. Given that there are no known tribal cultural resources on or adjacent to the Modified Project site, there is a limited potential for the Project to impact tribal cultural resources. However, as part of the AB 52 and SB 18 consultation processes, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation) have indicated there is a high potential to impact TCRs during grading activities of the Modified Project due to the prehistoric activities that occurred within and around the GRRSP Planning Area. The Pechanga Band of Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians provide suggestions regarding the treatment and mitigation of cultural and tribal cultural resources during the CEQA public comment period on eh Draft SEIR. In consideration of the three tribes suggestions regarding mitigation, Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 and CUL-2 and MM TCR-1 thru TCR-2 would be included to reduce the potential impact to unknown Tribal Cultural Resource unearthed during grading construction activities. Thus, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of MM CUL-1, MM CUL-2, MM TCR-1 thru TRC-2. However, no substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.18-15.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor(s) Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities.

A. The Project applicant shall retain, via a monitoring agreement, a Native American Monitor(s) authorized to represent Kizh Nation, Pechanga, and Soboba on a rotating basis for all "ground-disturbing activities" in native soil and previously unexamined fill soils that occur within the proposed project area. The monitor(s) shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, all grading activities, archaeological investigations, demolition, pavement removal, subsurface testing of any kind, weed abatement, potholing,

auguring, clearing, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

B. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

C. The monitor(s) will complete daily monitoring activity logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural and Tribal Cultural Resource materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe(s). Tribal monitoring activity logs will be provided to the City and Applicant with any confidential information, as provided by law, not being subject to a Public Records Act Request.

D. On-site tribal monitoring for site preparation activities and for construction within each Planning Area shall conclude upon the sooner of (1) when the consulting Tribe(s)' monitor(s) confirms through a written confirmation that all grading and ground-disturbing activities are no longer within archaeological and cultural resources soils or (2) a determination by the City and written notification to the Tribal monitor(s) that soil-disturbing construction activities have concluded at the site.

MM TCR-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

A. If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within the period specified by law (24 hours). Subsequently, the NAHC shall identify the Most Likely Descendant ("MLD"). The MLD shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

B. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute, unless there are multiple Ancestral remains comprising a burial site, which may also be a Tribal Cultural Resource. In the event that funerary objects are located, additional treatment measures will be imposed and implemented pursuant to the provisions of a Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan

and after seeking recommendations from the MLD and the culturally affiliated consulting tribe(s).

C. Construction activities may resume in other parts of the project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or burial goods, if the City, after consulting with the project archeologist and after seeking recommendations from the named MLD and consulting Tribe(s), determines that resuming construction activities at that distance is acceptable.

D. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. If multiple Native American human remains are uncovered, additional treatment and measures will be required for the site as agreed upon by the project archeologist and the City, after seeking recommendations from the MLD and consulting Tribe(s).

E. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

MM CUL-1 Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources: Prior to issuance of grading permits, a Cultural Resources/ Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan CR/TCR-MMP shall be prepared by the Project archaeologist and submitted to the City for dissemination to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh), Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga), and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians (Soboba). All parties shall review and be provided with an opportunity to comment upon, the plan in a reasonable time period as determined by the City prior to permitting for the Project. If consensus among the Project archeologist, the City and Tribe(s) about monitoring and treatment methods cannot be reached, the City shall make the determination in its best judgement regarding the appropriate measures for inclusion in the CR/TCR-MMP considering input and recommendations from archaeologist and the consulting Tribe(s). Any non-responsive party shall be assumed to have agreed to the plans without comment. Any and all findings of discovered resources will be subject to the protocol detailed within the CR/TCR-MMP.

This CR/TCR-MMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification in the form of a letter from the project archaeologist to the City stating that a certified archaeologist has been retained to implement the CR/TCR-MMP.

2) The project applicant shall provide Native American monitoring from the consulting Tribe(s) on a rotating basis during all grading and ground disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall work in concert with the archaeological monitor to observe ground disturbances to fulfill the provisions of the CR/TCR-MMP.

3) The certified archaeologist and the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the CR/TCR-

MM.

4) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources tribal cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the City at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) and City, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The City must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, the CR/TCR-MMP shall address culturally appropriate methods and treatment, including additional steps to mitigate impacts as determined by the City.

5) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, any cultural resources or tribal cultural resources that cannot be avoided and preserved in place shall be addressed though the methods and processes identified in the CR/TCR-MMP. The project archaeologist in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall identify the methods for data recovery in the CR/TCR-MMP.

6) All cultural material collected shall be subject to the culturally appropriate treatment and mitigation standards outlined in the TCR-CRMP, which may include reburial on-site in an area that will be protected in perpetuity or relinquishment to the culturally affiliated consulting tribal government for culturally appropriate treatment.

7) A Phase 4 report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed, in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s), and submitted to the satisfaction of the City prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include DPR Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.

8) Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCR and) shall be curated at an institution meeting the State and federal standards for curation.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

J. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Storm Water Drainage

Threshold: Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the

Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, pp. 4.19-28 and 4.19-29.)

Explanation:

As discussed previously in Section IV. Impacts That Are Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, the Modified Project site is classified as Flood Zone X, area of minimal flood hazard. In addition, the Modified Project site does not include, and is not adjacent to, a body of water such as a natural stream or river that would increase the potential for flooding. Also, as discussed previously, the Modified Project would introduce approximately 36.65 acres of impervious surfaces to the GRRSP Planning Area, which would increase stormwater runoff from the Project site. However, the Modified Project, consistent with the 2001 EIR, would implement mitigation to reduce flooding hazards on- or offsite impacts to a less than significant level. As detailed below, MM 4.11.2.A requires that all proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the Modified Project. In addition, the MM 4.11.2A also requires future development of the GRRSP Planning Area drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. As it relates to the proposed BPI development, as previously stated, will incorporate PDF HYD-1 for the proposed on-site storm drain system consisting of catch basin inlets and storm drain pipes proposed to convey the runoff across the site to the designated discharge points. In addition, 10 Biotreatment Units (Modular Wetland System) and two underground detention chambers will be installed to provide water quality treatment for the proposed Drainage Management Areas (DMA). PDF HYD-1 shall be constructed to accommodate storm flows from the site designed, installed and maintained in a manner to reduce on-site runoff to a level that can be accommodated by the existing culverts beneath Green River Road.

Adherence to the existing requirements and implementation of the post construction stormwater requirements would be confirmed during Project plan check prior to Project approval. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measure MM4.11.2A and project design feature PDF HYD-1, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact from the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The proposed Modified Project's impacts are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged from that cited in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-28 – 4.19-29.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.11.2A: All proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the project. Drainage plans shall be

submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

K. WILDFIRE

1. Emergency Response Plan

Threshold: Would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-10.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the City has prepared an EOP to ensure the most effective allocation of resources for the maximum benefit and protection of the civilian population in time of emergency. In addition, the City's LHMP is designed to identify local hazards and provide mitigation measures to address these hazards. Although the proposed GRRSP Amendment includes adjustments to land use dedication and acreages, implementation of the Modified Project would not result in substantial changes to the circulation patterns or emergency access routes as previously analyzed in the 2001 EIR or as envisioned in the current EOP. As previously identified, the Project site is within the response area of Corona Fire Department, Fire Station 5, within a Local Responsibility Area designated as a Very High FHSZ.

Construction

Development of the Modified Project includes development of the proposed BPI development and off-site utilities and roadway improvements. Construction of the BPI development in PA's 1, 2, and 3 includes five (5) light industrial buildings totaling 746,330 square feet. The off-site improvements to roadways and utilities would occur in public rights-of-way and along the Project frontage. During construction activities, temporary full or partial lane closures may be necessary, especially for Green River Road widening and utility and roadway improvements at the Palisades Drive and Green River Road connection. The full or partial lane closures could result in the redistribution of traffic along adjacent and surrounding roadways. As construction progresses, access for emergency vehicles could be impaired as result of reduced roadway widths (or capacity) and increased volumes of construction-related traffic or redistributed traffic. As a result, construction could impair or physically interfere with adopted Emergency Response Plans or Emergency Evacuation Plans.

As previously stated, the City has several policies regarding public safety related to emergencies, including those found in the General Plan Safety Element, the EOP and the LHMP. The Modified Project would be required to comply with all of these policies. In addition, current construction best practices as implemented by MM HAZ-1 in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials,

would require the preparation and implementation of a Construction Traffic Control Plan that would allow for access for emergency vehicles to be maintained at all times. Furthermore, the plan would require that police, fire, and emergency services be notified of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities that could hinder or delay emergency access through the construction period. As a result, compliance of City plans, policies, and incorporation of Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1, construction- related impacts would be reduced to less than significant in a similar manner as identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project.

Operation

Once constructed, the proposed circulation improvements around and within the Project site would provide additional access for potential movement of emergency equipment. Improvements such as widening of Green River Road and provision of emergency access locations would improve the ability of emergency personnel to access the site while the interior roadways constructed to CFD fire apparatus access standards would improve their ability to navigate within the site. Due to the circulatory improvements associated with the Project, it can be determined that implementation of the Modified Project would improve emergency access to the Project site and nearby uses and would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required in a similar manner as identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-10 – 4.20-11.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM HAZ-1: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for each phase of development requiring demolition and removal of onsite structures, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Corona Building Division demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to a demolition permit application include survey testing for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints (LBP) in accordance with existing federal and state regulations.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant

SECTION VI.
IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE FULLY MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The City hereby finds that, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(3), despite the incorporation of Mitigation Measures or Program Alternatives identified in the SEIR and in these Findings, the following environmental impacts cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level:

A. AIR QUALITY:

1. Air Quality Plans and Air Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: The Modified Project result in new or more severe impacts requiring revisions to the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-16.)

Explanation:

Projects are considered consistent with the AQMP if the growth in socioeconomic factors (e.g., population, employment) is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP. The future emissions forecasts are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by SCAG. Thus, demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories developed by SCAG in their current 2020-2045 RTP/SCS were in turn used to estimate future emissions by SCAQMD in their current 2022 AQMP (SCAQMD 2022).

Pursuant to SCAQMD's consistency analysis guidelines contained in their CEQA Air Quality Handbook, consistency with the AQMP is affirmed when a project: (1) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation; and (2) is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP.

AQMP Consistency Criterion 1: The Modified Project would result in long-term operational pollutant emissions that exceed CEQA significance emissions thresholds established by SCAQMD, as demonstrated below; therefore, the proposed Modified Project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. A detailed discussion of this conclusion follows. As shown below in Table 4.3-1, the Modified Project construction-source emissions would exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds for NOX emissions. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure, MM AQ-1 as presented in Section 4.3.10, the Modified Project construction source emissions impacts would be reduced to less than significant as shown in Table 4.3-2. Implementation of MM AQ-1 requires that all grading construction contractors ensure offroad diesel construction equipment complies with EPA/CARB Tier 4 Interim emissions standards or equivalent and ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. As a result, the Modified Project would not exceed the applicable regional significance thresholds for construction activity with mitigation incorporated. Thus, construction activities related to the Modified Project would be consistent with the first criterion.

As shown below in Table 4.3-3, the Modified Project's long-term operational activities would exceed summer VOC emissions thresholds and NOX emissions thresholds for both summer and winter. As a result, the Modified Project has the potential to exceed the applicable regional

significance thresholds during operational activities. The Modified Project is required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 2305, the Warehouse Indirect Source Rule, which requires owners and operators associated with warehouses 100,000 square feet or larger are required to directly reduce NOX and PM emissions, or to otherwise facilitate emission and exposure reductions of these pollutants in nearby communities. As such, the Modified Project would be required to incorporate Mitigation Measures, MM AQ-2 through MM AQ-4 to reduce operational-related emissions, specifically designed to improve truck efficiency. However, the estimated long-term operational emissions generated under full buildout of the Modified Project would exceed the SCAQMD's regional operational significance thresholds. In addition, Project operational-source VOC emissions during summer cannot be definitively reduced below applicable SCQMD thresholds and therefore would therefore exceed regional operational significance thresholds.

The proposed Project's main operational-source emissions source would be generated by passenger cars and trucks accessing the Modified Project, and no feasible mitigation beyond the measures to be implemented exist that would reduce Project operational-source VOC and NOX emissions to levels that are less than significant. As a result, the Modified Project would conflict with the AQMP according to this criterion.

AQMP Consistency Criterion 2: The Modified Project would not exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP. The 2022 AQMP demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the district are provided to SCAG, which develops regional growth forecasts, which are then used by SCAQMD to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP. The Approved Project land uses are consistent with the City's GP and are therefore consistent with the AQMP growth projections. The Modified Project's land uses are less intense than the Approved Project, and therefore are also consistent with the AQMP growth projections.

Per the City's General Plan, PAs 1, 2, and 3 are designated for MU2 and GC uses, and PAs 4 and 5 are designated for MU2 and ER in accordance with the Approved Project. The MU2 land use designation allows for light industrial and commercial uses. The GC land use designation allows for the development of supermarkets, department stores, apparel stores, theaters, and nonretail uses such as offices and banks. The ER land use designation includes the development of single-family homes, light agriculture uses, and accessory buildings. The Modified Project's proposed uses and development would be consistent with the land use designation intensities stated in the General Plan and the Approved Project (i.e., the GRRSP.)

The Project would exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for operational-source activity for emissions of summer VOC and NOX. Even with implementation of feasible mitigation, this threshold exceedance is considered significant and unavoidable. Thus, the Modified Project would have the potential to conflict with the second criterion.

As previously discussed, Modified Project operational-source emissions would exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for summer VOC and NOX with mitigation incorporated. In addition, the Project's proposed land use designation for the GRRSP Planning Area would potentially affect the development intensities. As a result, the Project would conflict

with the AQMP and result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

In summary, the Modified Project would result in a new increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. The Modified Project would result in new or more severe impacts in comparison to those identified for the Approved Project in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-16 – 4.3-18.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.3.1A: The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

MM 4.3.1B: The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric or diesel-powered equipment in lieu of gasoline-powered engines where feasible.

MM 4.3.1C: The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period should be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.

MM 4.3.1D: The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.

MM 4.3.1.E: The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.

MM 4.3.1F: Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below:

a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.

b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.

c. After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated immediately by pickup of the soil until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.

d. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

e. Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin

MM 4.3.1G: The Construction Contractor shall utilize as much as possible precoated/natural colored building materials, water-based or low-VOC coating, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray method, or manual coatings application such as paint brush, hand roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge.

MM 4.3.2A: The project shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations established by the Energy Commission regarding energy conservation standards. The project applicant shall incorporate the following in building plans:

- Planting trees to provide shade and shadow to building
- Solar or low-emission water heaters shall be used with combined space/water heater unit.
- Refrigerator with vacuum power insulation.
- Double-pained glass or window treatment for energy conservation shall be used in all exterior windows
- Energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights shall be used.

MM 4.3.2B: Use of transportation demand measures (TDM) such as preferential parking for vanpooling/carpooling, subsidy for transit pass or vanpooling/carpooling, flextime work schedule, bike racks, lockers, showers, and on-site cafeteria shall be incorporated in the design of the commercial land uses.

MM 4.3.2C: The project proponent shall determine with the City and the electrical purveyor if it is feasible to pre-wire houses for electrical charges for EV cars and/or opticfibers for home offices. If feasible, install EV charges and/or optic-fibers per the electrical purveyor's direction prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

MM AQ -1: During grading of Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, all Construction Contractors shall ensure that offroad diesel construction equipment complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/CARB Tier 4 Interim emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all

construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

MM AQ-2: Legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable CARB anti- idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than five (5) minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the CARB to report violations. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Lead Agency (City of Corona) shall conduct a site inspection to ensure that the signs are in place.

MM AQ-3: Prior to tenant occupancy for Planning Areas 1, 2 and 3, the Project Applicants or successors in interest shall provide documentation to the Lead Agency (City of Corona) demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation on funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, that provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.

MM AQ-4: The minimum number of automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations required by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 shall be provided. Final designs of Project buildings shall include electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

2. Cumulatively Considerable Pollutant Emissions

Threshold: Would the Project result in 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: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-18.)

Explanation:

The CAAQS designate the Modified Project area as nonattainment for O3, PM10, and PM2.5 while the NAAQS designates the Modified Project area as nonattainment for O3 and PM2.5. As presented in the AQIA , the analysis assumes that individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which SCAB is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.

Construction Impacts

As detailed in the AQIA , the estimated maximum daily construction emissions without mitigation are summarized on Table 4.3-1 below. Under the assumed scenarios, emissions resulting from the Modified Project construction will exceed thresholds established by the SCAQMD for emissions of NOX during construction activity. The exceedance is a result of on-site equipment operations occurring during the 2024 grading activities.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions with mitigation are summarized on Table 4.3-2 below. As presented above in Impact AQ-1, implementation of MM AQ-1 would be required to reduce the severity of the impacts from construction equipment. As a result, construction-source emissions would be reduced below the applicable SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, with implementation of MM AQ-1, Modified Project construction-source emissions would be less than significant with mitigation.

Operation Impacts

Operational activities associated with the Project will result in emissions of VOCs, NOX, SOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. Operational emissions are expected from the following primary sources:

- Area Source Emissions
- Energy Source Emissions
- Mobile Source Emissions
- On-Site Cargo Handling Equipment Emissions
- Transportation Refrigeration Unit (TRU) Emissions
- Gasoline Dispensing Emissions

As shown in Table 4.3-3, the Modified Project's operational-source NOX emissions will exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds without implementation of mitigation resulting in a significant impact requiring mitigation.

As previously stated in Impact AQ-1, the Modified Project would be required to incorporate Mitigation Measures, MM AQ-2 through MM AQ-4 to reduce operational-related emissions. The estimated maximum daily operational emissions with mitigation are summarized on Table 4.3-4 below.

As shown in Table 4.3-4, the Modified Project's operational-source NOX emissions will exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds with implementation of mitigation resulting in a significant impact requiring mitigation. As stated in the AQIA, no feasible mitigation beyond the measures to be implemented exist that would reduce Project operational-source VOC and NOX emissions to levels that are less than significant. As a result, the Modified Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

As discussed previously, the 2001 EIR determined the Approved Project would produce construction-related impacts from NOx and PM10 emissions and operational-related emissions from CO, ROC, and NOx that would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Therefore, no new impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. However, additional mitigation measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-4 have been identified for the Modified Project to reduce impacts from construction and operations of the Modified Project to the fullest extent feasible. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-18 – 4.3-22.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM AQ -1: During grading of Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, all Construction Contractors shall ensure that offroad diesel construction equipment complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/CARB Tier 4 Interim emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

MM AQ-2: Legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable CARB anti-idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than five (5) minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the CARB to report violations. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Lead Agency (City of Corona) shall conduct a site inspection to ensure that the signs are in place.

MM AQ-3: Prior to tenant occupancy for Planning Areas 1, 2 and 3, the Project Applicants or successors in interest shall provide documentation to the Lead Agency (City of Corona) demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation on funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, that provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.

MM AQ-4: The minimum number of automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations required by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 shall be provided. Final designs of Project buildings shall include electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

B. TRANSPORTATION:

1. Consistency with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3(b)

Threshold: Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Eliminated, Reduced, or No Changes to Impacts and No Changes to the Prior EIR are Required. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-10.)

Explanation:

Based on the results of the VMT Study, the Modified Project's retail component (GC uses in PA 4) meets the local serving screening criteria. However, the remaining BPI Development and ER components do not meet any available screening criteria and therefore the VMT Study included a detailed VMT analysis. The VMT analysis was conducted consistent with the City VMT Guidelines.

The Modified Project's VMT per service population was calculated to be 62.0. With a baseline City threshold VMT per service population of 40.6, the Modified Project would exceed the City's impact threshold by 52.7%. Consequently, the Modified Project would result in a significant impact requiring mitigation. CEQA requires that feasible mitigation measures be implemented to reduce a project's level of impact.

The VMT study determined mitigation of the BPI Development and ER VMT impact should involve development and implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that are considered feasible and will contribute to reducing project generated VMT. Features to promote the use of alternative transportation modes such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and bicycle racks would be included as part of the BPI Development. As part of the TDM Plan, property owner associations and/or building occupants would be required to implement a TDM Plan to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips for employees and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, transit, walking, and biking. Mitigation Measure MM TRA-1 defined in section 4.17.10 would reduce VMT impacts associated with the BPI and ER components of the Modified Project. Sufficient TDM reduction strategies do not exist to reduce the project's daily VMT per service population by 52.7% as required to fully mitigate the impact. Consequently, even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, VMT service population thresholds would not be met resulting in a significant and unavoidable transportation impact. As concluded in the 2001 EIR, the Approved Project would result in significant and unavoidable transportation impacts. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. However, the Modified Project requires implementation of new Mitigation Measure MM TRA-1. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.17-10 – 4.17-11.)

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4.17.1 / MM TRA-1: Prior to the issuance of building permits for the BPI Development in PA 1, 2 and 3 , separate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans shall be prepared to reduce project VMT. Applicable trip reduction strategies may include but are not limited to the following:

- Implement voluntary local hiring programs.
- Mark preferred parking spaces for vanpools and carpools.
- Provide on-site secured bike parking facilities.
- Provide information on carpooling and vanpooling opportunities to employees.
- Provide an on-site message board in each building or other comparable system to encourage and provide information about public transit, carpooling, and vanpooling, and carpool and vanpool ride-matching services.

The TDM Plan shall include an estimate of the vehicle trip reduction anticipated for each strategy proposed based on published research such as California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity (December 2021) (CAPCOA Handbook).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

SECTION VII.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

C. AESTHETICS

The cumulative aesthetics study area for the Project is the viewshed from public areas that can view the Project alignment and locations that can be viewed from the Project alignment. As previously determined, the proposed realignment does not require any new development or any temporary construction activities, therefore implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any impacts to a scenic vista, scenic highway, nor would it degrade the existing visual character or create glare. In addition, there are no cumulative projects identified within the vicinity of proposed Project as identified in Section 2.0 that would contribute to development that is consistent with planned uses in the Project area. The Project would result in no impact associated with scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, and lighting. Consequently, the proposed Project would result in no impacts associated with aesthetics and no mitigation is required. (Draft

SEIR, p. 4.1-43.)

D. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The Approved Project's cumulative impacts associated with agricultural and forestry resources was not specifically addressed in the 2001 EIR. However, the cumulative effect of development in the region was already resulting in the conversion of agricultural lands to non- agricultural uses at the time the 2001 EIR was certified. It can be inferred both the Approved and Modified Project would not result in any cumulative impacts associated with farmland and forestry resources because there is no farmland or forestry zoned properties or operations within or near the GRRSP Planning Area. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in a change in cumulative impacts that would require further analysis and the level of impact would remain the same as can be inferred from the time the 2001 EIR was certified.(Draft SEIR, p. 4.2-10.)

E. AIR QUALITY

As stated within the AQIA, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable. Due to the Modified Project's construction-source air pollutant emissions not resulting in exceedances of regional thresholds with implementation of mitigation, cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant. Alternatively, the Modified Projects operational-source NOX emissions would exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds. Per SCAQMD significance guidance, these impacts at the Project level are considered cumulatively significant and would persist over the life of the Project. The 2001 EIR determined the Approved Project would result in cumulatively considerable construction impacts from emission of NOx that would contribute to regional ozone formation. The 2001 EIR determined both long-term stationary (on-site energy consumption) and mobile (vehicular traffic) sources would contribute to regional criteria pollutant emissions, resulting in a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, no new or substantially greater cumulative impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.3-28.)

F. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Cumulative impacts are defined as the direct and indirect effects of a proposed project which, when considered alone, would not be deemed a substantial impact, but when considered in addition to the impacts of related projects in the area, would be considered potentially significant. "Related projects" refers to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, which would have similar impacts to the proposed Project.

Anticipated cumulative impacts are addressed by the MSHCP, which, as currently adopted, addresses 146 "Covered Species" that represent a broad range of habitats and geographical areas within western Riverside County, including threatened and endangered species and regionally- or locally-sensitive species that have specific habitat requirements and conservation and management needs. The MSHCP addresses biological impacts for take of Covered Species within the MSHCP

area. Impacts to Covered Species and establishment and implementation of a regional conservation strategy and other measures included in the MSHCP are intended to address the federal, state, and local mitigation requirements for these species and their habitats.

Impacts to the special-status vegetation communities could be potentially cumulatively significant, prior to mitigation. These vegetation communities are Coast Live Oak Woodland, Coastal Sage Scrub, Elderberry Savannah, and Riparian/Riverine resources for the Modified Project. For those non-riparian/riverine vegetation communities, the MSHCP provides full mitigation for proposed impacts. For the proposed impacts to riparian/riverine resources, the MSHCP requires equivalent or superior preservation that is detailed in a DBESP. As presented above, the Modified Project would mitigate 3.04 acres of riparian/riverine resources (1.11 acres of riparian and 1.93 acres of unvegetated streambed). This would mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant under CEQA and would be consistent with MSHCP requirements in that equivalent or superior preservation is provided.

The proposed BPI Project would remove several Coulter's matilija poppy, a non-listed special status plant species that is covered and adequately conserved by the MSHCP. The removal of Coulter's matilija poppy by the Modified Project would not pose a cumulatively considerable contribution to the regional decline of this species.

Impacts to the following animal species would be potentially cumulatively significant, prior to mitigation, as a result of the loss of potential habitat for these species: Crotch's bumble bee, least Bell's vireo, Cooper's hawk, yellow warbler, southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, western mastiff bat, western yellow bat, coast horned lizard, coast patch-nosed snake, coastal whiptail, orange throat whiptail, red-diamond rattlesnake, and southern California legless lizard.

Some of these species are fully covered species under the MSHCP and as such any proposed impacts would be fully mitigated under the MSHCP. For others such as the bat species, impacts would be potentially cumulatively significant, however the Project is proposing permanent natural land conservation in the southern portion of the Project site. With implementation of Project mitigation in combination with the Project's proposed design feature of open space conservation, the potential for the Project to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the regional decline of any of these species would not occur.

With implementation of the Modified Project's open space and in combination with Mitigation Measure 4.7.1.A for impacts to California gnatcatchers, Additional information and environmental analysis of the Alternative Alignment of PCL-1 can be found in Section 5.0. for Crotch bumble bee, Mitigation Measure 4.7.2.A for mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional features, Mitigation Measure 4.7.3.A for nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 for least Bell's vireo, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 for Crotch's bumble bee, Mitigation Measure 4.7.4 through 4.7.4.E for oak woodlands mitigation, the Modified Project would have a less than significant with mitigation cumulative impact regarding biological resources. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.4-41 – 4.4-42.)

G. CULTURAL RESOURCES

As stated in the 2001 EIR, the cumulative impact area for cultural resources is the City of Corona. Similar to the Modified Project, the 2001 EIR determined no significant prehistoric or historic archeological resources were located within the Project area. Moreover, the previously identified concrete culvert located at the north end of the Project area was evaluated for consideration as a historic resource is not considered a historic resource and is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register. Therefore, as determined in the 2001 EIR, there are no cumulative impact anticipated by the implementation of the Modified Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.5-9.)

H. ENERGY

Development of the proposed BPI Development would be required to comply and be consistent with obligatory energy efficiency requirements in the City's General Plan and Development Code as well as all obligatory State-level energy programs and requirements. Similarly, as future development projects within PAs 4 and 5 of the GRRSP are received and reviewed by the City in subsequent years, those projects would also be reviewed for compliance consistency with the General Plan and Development Code and all relevant State-level energy programs and requirements. All development associated with the Modified Project would implement the most current version of Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, as required by State law. Consistency with the General Plan, Development Code and other mandatory State-level programs would ensure that the Modified Project's contributions to inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary energy use would be less than significant. Moreover, as identified above, implementation of the Modified Project would not be expected to cause an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources nor conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. As a result, the Modified Project's incremental contribution to cumulative energy impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable requiring no mitigation. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.6-21 – 4.6-22.)

I. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Future development within the Modified Project vicinity would result in the potential for loss of paleontological resources. However, each development project is required to implement appropriate mitigation during earth moving activities in the same manner as identified for the Modified Project (prior EIR MM 4.9.1.4 and new MM PAL-1). For this reason, cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to below a level of significance in the same manner as concluded in the 2001 EIR. Pursuant to local paleontological protection measures contained in the County of Riverside's and City's GPs, and the provisions of CEQA, impacts to paleontological resources from projects within the cumulative impact area that require discretionary action by a public agency would be assessed. Similar to the conclusion reached in the prior EIR, it is reasonable to assume appropriate mitigation would be required for all cumulative projects and impacts would be reduced to less than significant on a project and cumulative level. Therefore, no new or substantially greater cumulative impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.7-20.)

J. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

GHG emissions impacts are assessed in a cumulative context, since no single project can cause a discernible change to climate. Climate change impacts are the result of incremental contributions from natural processes, and past and present human-related activities. Therefore, the area in which a proposed project in combination with other past, present, or future projects, could contribute to a significant cumulative climate change impact would not be defined by a geographical boundary such as a project site or combination of sites, city or air basin. Even though the emissions of GHGs cannot be defined by a geographic boundary and are effectively part of the global issue of climate change, CEQA places a boundary for the analysis of impacts at the state's borders. Thus, the geographic area for analysis of cumulative GHG emissions impacts is the State of California. Therefore, the Modified Project would generate GHG emissions that would contribute to cumulative emissions in California.

The Modified Project would not generate significant GHG emissions, nor conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation with mitigation measure MM GHG-1 incorporated resulting in a less than significant impact. As a result, with the implementation of mitigation and GHG reduction strategies, the Modified Project's cumulative GHG emissions would be considered less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.8-20.)

K. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Project-specific hazardous material impacts resulting from individual future development projects will be mitigated via application of applicable regulations or addressed separately in future CEQA documents. Anticipated future development will contribute through increases in population and the number of outlets that transport or dispose of hazardous materials, to a cumulative increase in risk for hazardous material incidents. Although each project has unique hazardous materials considerations, future cumulative projects would comply with the local, State, and Federal regulations and requirements as these are required for all development projects. As a result, cumulative impacts associated with hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Cumulative aircraft hazard impacts consist of future development within the boundaries of applicable Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) accident potential zones. The risk to or from each future project is based on the specific accident potential zone. The risks associated with development in these accident potential zones can only be reduced through conformance with land use guidelines and policies identified by the ALUP. Because the surrounding cities as well as the County of Riverside have implemented comprehensive land use plans that incorporate applicable ALUP recommendations, it is anticipated cumulative development within the accident potential zones would in a less than significant cumulative impact associated with aircraft accident hazards.

Similar to the conclusions for the Approved Project contained in the 2001 EIR, the Modified Project would be required to comply with local, State, and Federal regulations and requirements related to hazardous materials. With adherence to these measures, the Modified Project's impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in a change in cumulative impacts that would require further analysis and the level of impact would remain the same as can be inferred from the time the 2001 EIR was certified. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.9-21 – 4.9-22.)

L. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

As concluded in the preceding analysis, the Modified Project would not change the significance of Hydrology and Water Quality impacts as compared to the prior 2001 EIR.

The geographic scope for cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality includes the Santa Ana River Watershed. Implementation of the Modified Project would include compliance with all required laws, permits, ordinances, and plans, such as the MS4 Permit, and Construction General Permit requirements, that would reduce incremental effects to hydrology and water quality. The Modified Project would result in an increase of impervious surfaces within the watershed and is required to include pervious surfaces to retain storm water drainage on site. This increase in impervious surfaces with implementation of the proposed BMPs (PDF HYD-1) as required by the MS4 Permit would not lead to an increase in surface runoff or significant pollutant loadings.

Other future developments within the urban and developed subwatershed would have similar effects as the Modified Project. The areas surrounding the Modified Project area are of similar urban nature, and any future development would also include compliance with all required laws, permits, ordinances, and plans, such as the MS4 Permit, and Construction General Permit requirements, in order to meet runoff requirements. This would help reduce impacts to water quality and retain runoff and ensure that the incremental effects of individual projects do not cause a substantial cumulative impact related to water quality. For example, each related project would be required to develop a SWPPP (for construction), a WQMP (for operation), and a hydrology report, and would be evaluated individually to determine appropriate BMPs and treatment measures to reduce impacts to surface water quality and hydrology. In addition, cities review all development projects on a case-by-case basis to ensure that sufficient local and regional drainage capacity is available. Furthermore, the analysis in a Project's hydrology report is cumulative in nature due to the project and existing developments impact on storm drainage within the watershed area.

Combined impacts to water quality, to the storm drain system, and from the creation of flooding hazards from past, present, and future projects would be less than significant cumulatively. Therefore, because water quality, drainage, and flooding would not be adversely affected by the Modified Project, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.10-28 – 4.10-29.)

M. LAND USE AND PLANNING

As discussed under Impact LU-1, the Modified Project would not physically divide an established community. Similarly, the Modified Project was found to be consistent with applicable Connect SoCal and General Plan land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Lastly, as detailed in Section 4.3 of this SEIR, the Modified Project was found to be consistent with the WR-MSHCP. The Modified Project's impacts associated with these three topics were determined to be less than significant. All three of these topics are inherently cumulative in nature, and therefore the Modified Project's cumulative impacts are less than significant. The Modified Project's impacts associated with land use and

planning are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.11-22.)

N. MINERAL RESOURCES

As discussed under Impact MIN-1 and MIN-2, the Modified Project would not result in the loss of or availability of a locally or regionally significant mineral resource. Consistency with the City's General Plan goals regarding mineral resource protection and adherence to the Municipal Code's obligatory requirements regarding mineral resource protection, all development projects within the City will ensure mineral resources are adequately protected. Therefore, the Modified Project's effect on mineral resources are cumulatively less than significant. The Modified Project's cumulative impacts associated with mineral resources are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.12-4 – 4.12-5.)

O. NOISE

The cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Modified Project are all located more than 1,000 feet away from the GRRSP Planning Area, and therefore would not contribute substantially to cumulative noise and vibration impacts at receptors near the proposed GRRSP during short- term construction or long-term operational activities. Noise naturally attenuates at 6 dB every doubling of distance of the reference noise source. Most construction equipment has a reference noise source of 50 feet. Therefore, at 500 feet noise will have naturally attenuated over 20 dB, which also does not account for other natural attenuation such as topography, vegetation, or other structures. As a result, the Modified Project's potential to contribute to any noise or vibration- related cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.13-15.)

P. POPULATION AND HOUSING

As discussed under impact POP-1 and POP-2, the Modified Project would not result in growth inducement or displacement of people or housing. The Modified Project is located at the western edge of the City and areas further to the west are unlikely to develop, and therefore development of the Modified Project and associated infrastructure connections would not induce growth by removing an impediment to growth. The Modified Project's cumulative impacts associated with population and housing are consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR and the level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.14-8 – 4.14-9.)

Q. PUBLIC SERVICES

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts with regards to public services is the local service area within the City for fire and police services, schools, and libraries. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this DEIR, cumulative development in the City and surrounding would be minimal. Past and present development has resulted in increased population, which in turn has resulted in an increase in demand for all public services. Growth in the City to date has been consistent with the growth projections in the City's 2020-2040 General Plan. In addition, each of

the public service providers conducts an annual budgeting process where future facility/staffing needs are identified. Because past and present development is consistent with growth identified in the City's 2020-2040 General Plan and there are mechanisms in place to ensure provision of adequate service, there would be no significant cumulative environmental impact on public services from implementation of the Modified Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.15-15.)

R. RECREATION

As discussed under impact REC-1 and REC -2, the Modified Project does not propose construction of a new or renovation of an existing park or recreational facility that would result in and impact to the environment. Cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities are mitigated by City park fees paid by residential development and City DIF fees paid by all development. These monies are collected and used to fund future park and recreational facilities subject to environmental review. Therefore, the Modified Project's cumulative impacts are considered less than significant and consistent with the impacts identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. The level of impact (less than significant) remains unchanged. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.16-7.)

S. TRANSPORTATION

As discussed previously, VMT traffic impacts associated with the Modified Project were determined to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all feasible mitigation. The VMT metric is inherently a cumulative analysis, because VMT baselines are directly related to the land use pattern of a given area. Also discussed previously, the Approved Project's impacts associated with LOS impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. Therefore, no new or substantially greater cumulative traffic impact would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR for the Approved Project. (Draft SEIR, p 4.17-12.)

T. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The cumulative study area for tribal cultural resources includes the City of Corona region, which contains the same general tribal historic setting. Other projects throughout the City that would involve ground disturbances could reveal buried tribal cultural resources.

Cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced by compliance with applicable regulations and consultations required by SB 18. As described above, the GRRSP Planning Area is not known to contain tribal cultural resources; however, Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and TCR-1 thru TCR-2 would be implemented to ensure that impacts would not occur in the case of an inadvertent discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource.

These mitigation measures ensure that the Modified Project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of tribal cultural resources. Therefore, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant. However, no substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the Modified Project when compared to those identified in the 2001 EIR. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.18-16.)

U. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The cumulative study area used for the analysis of water and wastewater includes areas within CUD's service area for water and wastewater services, and is based on the buildout of the City's 2020-2040 General Plan and the general plans of cities within CUD service area. The cumulative study area for solid waste comprises western Riverside County, as all areas of western Riverside County are served by WMIE, and is based on the buildout of the City's 2020-2040 General Plan and the general plans of cities within western Riverside County. For the remaining issue areas, the cumulative impact analysis considers development of the Project in conjunction with other development projects and planned development in the vicinity of the GRRSP Planning Area.

As discussed under the analysis of Impact UTL-1, the Modified Project would require a number of improvements related to water, wastewater treatment, and storm drainage systems, although such improvements are inherent to the Modified Project's construction phase as discussed in the 2001 EIR. Cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with Modified Project construction activities have been evaluated throughout this SEIR, and where necessary mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the Modified Project's cumulatively- considerable effects to the maximum feasible extent. There are no components of the Modified Project's proposed water, wastewater, or storm drainage systems that could result in impacts not already evaluated by other sections of this SEIR. Accordingly, impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, and stormwater drainage systems would be less than cumulatively considerable.

The analysis of Impact UTL-2. demonstrates that the CUD would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project as well as other reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The City's UWMP and the Modified Project's WSA (Appendix Q) evaluate the water demands of both the Modified Project and other cumulative developments within CUD's service area, and the Modified Project is well below the growth assumptions utilized in the CUD for the Project site. Because the UWMP demonstrates that the CUD has the capacity to serve future development within its service area, cumulatively-considerable impacts to water supply would be less than significant.

As discussed under the analysis of Impact UTL-3. And UTL-4, the Modified Project would require a number of improvements to provide sewer service to the Project site, although impacts associated with such improvements are inherent to the Modified Project's construction phase. Cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with Modified Project construction activities have been evaluated throughout this SEIR, and where necessary mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the Modified Project's cumulatively-considerable effects to the maximum feasible extent. There are no components of the Modified Project's proposed wastewater improvements that would result in impacts not already evaluated by other sections of this SEIR. Accordingly, impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment conveyance facilities would be less-than-cumulatively considerable.

The Modified Project's wastewater generation would not result in or require the expansion of the existing facilities. Although the Project and other cumulative developments ultimately would

contribute to the need for expanded capacity, impacts associated with such expansion would be subject to CEQA once plans for such expansion have been prepared by the CUD. As no such plans are currently available, it would be speculative to evaluate potential cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with the proposed expansion (CEQA Guidelines § 15145). As such, Modified Project impacts due to wastewater capacity would be less-than-cumulatively considerable.

As previously discussed in the analysis provided under Impact UTL-5, solid waste generated by construction and operation of the Modified Project would represent nominal proportions of the daily disposal capacity at the El Sobrante Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, and/or Badlands Landfill. The landfills are currently projected to remain open until as far into the future as 2051 (El Sobrante Landfill) and have sufficient daily capacity to handle solid waste generated by the Modified Project and other cumulative developments both during construction and long- term operation. The Modified Project would not directly result in the need for expanded solid waste disposal facilities, as the El Sobrante Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, and Badlands Landfill have sufficient existing capacity to handle solid waste generated by the Modified Project. Rather, the Modified Project's incremental contribution to solid waste generation may contribute to an ultimate need for expanding the solid waste disposal facilities that would serve the Modified Project and/or the construction of additional solid waste disposal facilities. Moreover, it is possible that as other developments in the region are proposed, the WMIE may opt to construct new solid waste disposal facilities to serve those developments, and such facilities may or may not receive solid waste generated by the Modified Project. Although the Modified Project has the potential to cumulatively contribute to the demand for new or expanded solid waste disposal facilities, the construction of which could significantly impact the environment, it is too speculative for evaluation in the absence of a proposed expansion or development plan (CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR § 15145). Therefore, the Modified Project's cumulatively-considerable impacts to solid waste disposal facilities are evaluated as less than significant.

The Modified Project would adhere to regulations set forth by local and State regulations (including AB 341 and AB 939) during both construction and long-term operations. Other cumulative developments would also be required to comply with such regulations. As such, the Modified Project as well as other cumulative developments in the area would not result in cumulative impacts with respect to compliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes. Impacts would be less-than-cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impacts associated with the provision of facilities for electricity, natural gas, communications systems, stormwater drainage, street lighting, maintenance of facilities, construction of off-site sewer and water lines, and other governmental services are inherent to the Project's construction phase and have been evaluated throughout the appropriate issue areas in this EIR. In all cases, where cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with any Project component are identified, mitigation measures have been imposed to reduce such impacts to the maximum feasible extent. Accordingly, cumulatively-considerable impacts associated with the provision of utility facilities to serve the proposed Project would be less than significant. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.19-33 – 4.19-35.)

V. WILDFIRE

The Project will have a less than significant impact directly or indirectly to an emergency response or evacuation plan and mitigation is not required. The nearest Fire Station is less than a mile from the Project site and would adequately provide emergency services during construction and once in operation. As discussed in Threshold A (i), Section 3.2.4, Public Services, the Project's incremental impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant due to the proposed Project's approximate population increase of less than one-tenth of one percent of the City's current population. The Project includes design features, such as a Fire Protection Plan and Fuel Modification Plan conditionally approved by the City and CFD. Those design features minimize the Project's potential to exacerbate fire danger within the surrounding area, as well as post-fire flooding or landslides. Although the surrounding area to the north and west is generally built out and was developed under different provisions of the CFC, CBC, and CFD all future cumulative projects within the Project area including nearby properties located in the VHFHSZ would be required to adhere to current provisions of the CFC, CBC and CFD to reduce impacts from wildfire. With implementation of the Project's design features PDF FIRE-1 and -2 in combination with cumulative project compliance with the CFC, CBC, and CFD requirements, the Project would have a less than significant cumulative wildfire impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 4.20-19.)

SECTION VIII.
RELOCATION OF PCL-1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. AESTHETICS

1. Aesthetic Impacts

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 damage scenic resources, including, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-4.)

Explanation:

According to the WR-MSHCP, a Constrained Linkage is a constricted connection expected to provide for movement of identified Planning Species between Core Areas, where options for assembly of the connection are limited due to existing patterns of development and land use. As summarized in Section 3.0, Project Description, the WR-MSHCP designated a wildlife corridor named PCL-1 to provide a constrained connection between the wildlife habitats located in Core

Area A to the north (Prado Basin/Santa Ana River) and Core Area B to the south (Cleveland National Forest). There have been discussions about relocating PCL-1 to alternative and superior yet still constrained locations for the past 20 years, including the most recent proposal in 2016 that wasn't approved due to various limitations. However, there is agreement among relevant authorities that a new alignment in B Canyon as envisioned by the proposed Relocation of PCL-1 would be more beneficial for wildlife movement.

Consequently, the proposed realignment would not result in and does not require any new development or any temporary construction activities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any impacts to a scenic vista, scenic highway, nor would it degrade the existing visual character or create glare. No mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-4.)

2. Cumulative Impacts – Less Than Significant

The cumulative aesthetics study area for the Project is the viewshed from public areas that can view the Project alignment and locations that can be viewed from the Project alignment. As previously determined, the proposed realignment does not require any new development or any temporary construction activities, therefore implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any impacts to a scenic vista, scenic highway, nor would it degrade the existing visual character or create glare. In addition, there are no cumulative projects identified within the vicinity of proposed Project as identified in Section 2.0 that would contribute to development that is consistent with planned uses in the Project area. The Project would result in no impact associated with scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, and lighting. Consequently, the proposed Project would result in no impacts associated with aesthetics and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-5.)

B. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

1. Farmland Conversion

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-7.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats within the WR-MSHCP. It can be anticipated that all of the realignment would be used for wildlife movement and not to support existing farmland, Prime Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the proposed realignment does not require any new development or any temporary construction activities that

would otherwise impact farmland.

According to the current FMMP map, the approximately 711.28-acre Project alignment consists of Grazing Land and Other Land designations. Consequently, there are no Prime and Unique Farmland within the Project alignment. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-7 – 5-8.)

2. Agricultural Zoning

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-8.)

Explanation:

As stated in the City's General Plan EIR, there are no Williamson Act contracts in the City. Therefore, no conflicts with Williamson Act contract lands would occur. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-8.)

3. Forestland Zoning / Loss of Forest Land / Conversion of Farmland or Forestland S

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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))?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-8.)

Explanation:

As stated in the Criteria Refinement Analysis (Appendix Q), the Project alignment is heavily vegetated with coastal sage scrub, chaparral, non-native grasslands, coast live oak woodland, and riparian forest located within the Santa Ana Mountains of the Cleveland National Forest. According to CALFIRE, there are no current or planned fixed commercial timber operations

subject to a Timber Harvesting Plan in southwest Riverside County. As stated in the City's General Plan EIR, there are no timber production or agricultural zones in the City or its SOI. Moreover, the proposed Project does not require any new development or any temporary construction activities, nor would the Project include any new the land use designations. Consequently, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in loss or conversion of timberland to non-forest uses, or the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. In addition, the implementation of the proposed Project will not result in the conversion of any land to municipal or agricultural uses. As such, there would be no changes in the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-8.)

4. Cumulative Impacts

Agricultural Resources

The cumulative study area for agricultural resources is the City and the County of Riverside as these resources are regularly assessed on the countywide level as part of the state's FMMP. Throughout the County, numerous development projects exist that would result in the additional conversion of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to nonagricultural uses. There are no agricultural uses, Williamson Act contracts, or agricultural zones within the immediate vicinity of the Project alignment and within the peripheries of the City. As previously discussed, implementation of the proposed Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the Project would not cumulatively contribute to agricultural resource impacts. Thus, cumulative impacts related to agricultural resources would not occur. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-8 – 5-9.)

Forest Resources

The cumulative study area for forestry resources is the City and the County of Riverside. There are no forest resources or woodland vegetation within the immediate vicinity of the Project site and limited lowland woodlands within the peripheries of the City. As discussed above, Project implementation would not directly impact forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the Project would not cumulatively contribute to forest resource impacts. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-9.)

C. AIR QUALITY

1. Air Quality Plan and Air Quality Standards / Pollutant Concentrations / Other Pollutants

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-11.)

Explanation:

Land use development projects must conform with the AQMP and other regulations under the SCAQMD. As previously stated, the proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats within the WR-MSHCP and no new development is proposed. Consequently, no construction or operational emissions would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of any air quality plan, nor result in any increase of a criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or result in other emissions. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-11.)

2. Cumulative Impacts – No Impact

The SCAQMD 2022 AQMP evaluates regional conditions within the Basin and sets regional emission significance thresholds for both construction and operation of development projects that apply to project-specific impacts and cumulatively-considerable impacts. Therefore, per SCAQMD's methodology, if an individual project would result in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceeds the SCAQMD's thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants.

As described above, no new development is proposed by the Project, therefore no construction or operational emissions will occur. Construction and operational emissions would not be generated by the Project and therefore impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

In addition, the Project would not result in human health or cancer risk to adjacent land uses because no construction or operational emissions would be generated. Therefore, impacts on human health risks would not be cumulatively considerable.

Furthermore, the Project would not expose surrounding uses to objectionable odors. Thus, there is no potential for odors from the Project to combine with odors from surrounding development Projects and expose nearby sensitive receptors to offensive odors. Therefore, the Project would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to odors. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-11 – 5-12.)

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Sensitive Species and Sensitive Natural Communities

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-26.)

Explanation:

As part of the Criteria Refinement, a total of 378.44 acres of native vegetation will be included within the new limits of PCL-1. The alternate PCL-1 alignment would result in removal of 82.8 acres of described lands, specifically 11.5 acres of residential/urban/exotic, 2.0 acres of coastal sage scrub, 37.4 acres of chaparral, 30.3 acres of non-native grassland, 1.1 acres of coast live oak woodland, and 0.5 acres of riparian. alternate PCL-1 would conserve 465.8 acres of Undescribed Replacement Land, specifically, 16.0 acres of residential/urban/exotic (increase of 4.5 acres), 51.6 acres of coastal sage scrub (increase of 49.6 acres), 332.9 acres of chaparral (increase of 295.5 acres), 54.2 acres of non-native grasslands (increase of 23.9 acres), 10.4 acres of coast live oak woodland (increase of 9.3 acres), and 0.7 acres of riparian (increase of 0.2 acres).

The additional acreage of native vegetation communities includes coastal sage scrub, chaparral, non-native grasslands, coast live oak woodland, and miscellaneous riparian habitat. These habitats are identified as suitable habitat for special status species known in the area. Furthermore, proposed alternative alignment of PCL-1 would support nesting, foraging, and live-in habitat for mountain lion, bobcat, Cooper's hawk, and coastal gnatcatcher which are identified within Section 3.2.3 of the MSHCP.

In addition to the four MSHCP Planning Species identified above, with the increase of habitat and realignment of PCL-1, suitable habitat would potentially increase for other MSHCP Covered Species. These include Narrow Endemic Plant Species (MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.3), as identified by the NEPSSAs; Criteria Area Plant Species (MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.3.2) identified by the CAPSSAs; animals species (burrowing owl, mammals, amphibians) identified by survey areas (MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.3.2); and species associated with riparian/riverine areas and vernal pool habitats, i.e., least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, western yellow-billed cuckoo, and designated fairy shrimp (MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.2).

Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-26 – 5-27.)

2. Wetlands

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-27.)

Explanation:

With the alternative PCL-1 alignment, there will be no impacts to state or federally protected wetlands. In additional, the alternate PCL-1 would increase conserved land of these features. Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-27.)

3. Wildlife Movement

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-27.)

Explanation:

The alternate PCL-1 would provide connection to Prado Basin and the Chino Hills and exceed the minimum conservation goal for the combined independent Cells but would also exceed the high-range goal of the targeted conservation range. Furthermore, the alternative conservation configuration would shift conservation to the west and would still functionally contribute to PCL-1. The existing and alternate PCL-1 alignments do not each represent distinctly separate alignments. Moreover, 245.5 acres are shared between the two alignments, with 82.7 acres being removed from the northern portion of the existing PCL-1 alignment and 465.7 acres being added in replacement, mostly to the west and connecting to the B Canyon Undercrossing at SR- 91. According to the CRA, the alternate PCL-1 alignment is superior to the existing PCL-1 alignment in achieving connection between the Santa Ana Mountains and the Chino Hills. The reasons for this superiority are because it is not impacted by the high volume of traffic on Green River Road; it crosses SR-91 rather than running alongside the freeway for a stretch of approximately 1,200 feet; wildlife would navigate the BNSF railroad line from SR-91 instead of navigating both obstacles sequentially; wildlife could use the existing footbridge across the Santa Ana River; and it leads to Aliso Canyon, which is the largest canyon in Chino Hills State Park, and therefore is a

natural travel corridor for mountain lions (Puma concolor), bobcats (Lynx rufus), and other wildlife. Therefore, this conservation configuration would provide superior biological value in comparison to the existing alignment of PCL-1 through further enhancement of the movement of wildlife. Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-27 – 2-58.)

4. Local Policies

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-28.)

Explanation:

Alternate PCL-1 will not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-28.)

5. Habitat Conservation Plan

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?s?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-28.)

Explanation:

The MSHCP states that individual public and private projects within the Plan Area are expected to be designed and implemented in accordance with the Criteria for each Area Plan presented in Volume I, Section 3.2 of the MSHCP document. The goal of the MSHCP is to have a total Conservation Area in excess of 500,000 acres, including approximately 347,000 acres on existing Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands, and approximately 153,000 acres of Additional Reserve Lands (ARL) to be acquired within the MSHCP Criteria Area. Projects located within the Criteria Area must be evaluated to determine if lands within those properties are described to contribute to Reserve Assembly. Criteria Refinements may be initiated by Local Permittees, or at the request of private entities to Local Permittees if agreed to by the applicable Local Permittee, either for purposes of correcting minor discrepancies or inaccuracies or for evaluating alternative conservation proposals involving single or multiple landowners and jurisdictions that are of equivalent or superior benefit to Covered Species. Such Criteria Refinements may involve changes to Cores and Linkages as long as it is demonstrated that the Refinements would clearly benefit Covered Species and would be consistent with MSHCP policies and species conservation goals. A Criteria Refinement can be approved with lesser conservation in one or more Cells provided

that the decrease is made up with other lands in the Criteria Area not described by the Criteria that satisfy the goals for Covered Habitats, Covered Species, etc., or with lands outside of the Criteria Area that similarly satisfy the goals.

As described above, although the current alignment of PCL-1 is unconstrained to the south, there are a number of existing land uses that constrain PCL-1 at its northern terminus, including SR-91, the BNSF railroad line and Green River Road. The CRA (Appendix Q) analyzed the effectiveness of the existing PCL-1 in comparison to the effectiveness of an alternative PCL-1 alignment in meeting the stated MSHCP goals for PCL-1, including the potential to connect with the Prado Basin and the Chino Hills. Several wildlife movement studies were conducted in 2006 and 2007 for the properties that contain a majority of both the existing PCL-1 and alternate PCL-1 alignments, referred to at that time as the "Corona 850" property. The Study documented areas of wildlife movement from the Cleveland National Forest through the Corona 850 property and to SR-91. Furthermore, the movement patterns of bobcat and coyote after the widening of California State Route (SR 71) near SR-91 included analysis of camera data for other underpasses in the vicinity, including the underpass at B Canyon (u17) within the alternate PCL-1 route.

The proposed Criteria Refinement presents the alternate alignment for PCL-1, which will be made up existing MSHCP Conserved Lands and lands that have been acquired by the RCA. A total of 711.28 acres of land will be assembled for the alternate PCL-1, consisting of ten parcels. The alternate PCL-1 alignment is located immediately west of the existing PCL-1 alignment. The existing alignment begins at the boundary with Core B (Cleveland National Forest) and extends north across undeveloped land, Green River Road, and SR-91, terminating just north of SR- 91. The alternate alignment would also begin at the boundary with Core B and extend across undeveloped land before terminating at SR-91 (Figure 3.3). Approximately 538.45 acres of the 711.28-acre total will be associated with the six Criteria Cells, with approximately 172.83 acres associated lands located outside of, but adjacent to, the Criteria Area.

Of the approximately 328.30 acres described for conservation based on the existing Cell Criteria, approximately 82.75 acres of the described lands would not be part of the alternate PCL-1, as these lands represent the northernmost part of the existing alignment that would be removed as part of the Criteria Refinement. As required by the MSHCP, all lands to be proposed as replacement via a Criteria Refinement must not be described for conservation by the current Cell Criteria. In place of those lands to be removed, approximately 292.90 acres of land would be added in alternate locations of the six Criteria Cells, i.e., areas not described for conservation, in addition to the 172.83 acres of lands to be conserved that are not in Criteria Cells.

The proposed Criteria Refinement will have a positive effect on PCL-1 by designating a superior, alternate alignment to connect Core A with Core B, thereby supporting the goal of PCL-1. The alternate PCL-1 alignment is less constrained for wildlife movement than the existing PCL-1; is more conducive to the north-south movement needed to support the connectivity goals of PCL-1; and contains a greater amount of habitat types applicable to the Planning Species for PCL-1, including coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grassland, coast live-oak woodland, and riparian habitats.

The proposed Criteria Refinement will have a positive effect on the MSHCP Conservation Area

by conserving a greater amount of high-quality habitat that will support the intended functions of PCL-1, including connectivity between Core A and Core B, and live-in habitat for the PCL-1 Planning Species. As noted above, the new lands proposed for the alternate alignment will include habitats (i.e., coast live oak woodland) not characterized in the Cell Criteria for the assembly of PCL-1. The total amount of lands to be conserved for PCL-1 will increase by more than 382 acres, with most gains consisting of chaparral vegetation, but also including coastal sage scrub, grassland, and the coast live oak woodland. Furthermore, the alternate PCL-1 alignment is less constrained for wildlife movement when compared with the existing alignment, is more conducive to north-south wildlife movement, and contains a greater amount of habitat to support the Planning Species, as discussed previously.

Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed Project and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-28 – 5-30.)

6. Cumulative Impacts

Volume I, Section 6.5 (Criteria Refinement Process [CRP]) of the MSHCP states that individual public and private projects within the Plan Area are expected to be designed and implemented in accordance with the Criteria for each Area Plan presented in Volume I, Section 3.2 of the MSHCP document. In cases where refinements to the Criteria are desirable to facilitate Reserve Assembly, resulting in adjustments to the Criteria, the CRP described in Volume I, Section 6.5 shall apply. Such Criteria Refinements may involve changes to Cores and Linkages as long as it is demonstrated that the Refinements would clearly benefit Covered Species and would be consistent with MSHCP policies and species conservation goals. Furthermore, the CRP cannot be used for Criteria changes that would result in reductions in the Criteria Area.

As discussed previously, PCL- 1 is intended to connect Existing Core A (Prado Basin/Santa Ana River) with Existing Core B (Cleveland National Forest) to the south and is intended to provide live-in/dispersal habitat for four Planning Species (mountain lion, bobcat, coastal California gnatcatcher, and Cooper's hawk). The northern portion of the existing PCL-1 alignment is severely constrained and the topography of the existing PCL-1 alignment is not ideal to facilitate north to south wildlife movement. The northern portion of the alignment is topographically oriented north to south along ridgelines and canyons, while the southern portion of the alignment bisects steep east-west ridgelines and canyons causing wildlife to move west and east perpendicular to the intended alignment for PCL-1.Lastly, the habitat types located within the existing alignment, though mostly native, are dominated by chaparral, which is not suitable for two of the MSHCP Planning Species (coastal California gnatcatcher and Cooper's hawk).

The alternate PCL-1 location is heavily used by wildlife, with documented and extensive movement of large to medium-size mammals from the National Forest Boundary to the SR-91 undercrossing. Lands within the alternate alignment are topographically oriented north to south from the National Forest boundary to the freeway, including multiple access roads, ridgelines, and canyon routes. Furthermore, the habitat types within the alternate PCL-1 alignment have a greater suitability for the Planning Species, including habitats dominated by coastal sage scrub vegetation, as well as a greater riparian component.

The Alternative Alignment of PCL-1 would result in net gain of 382.98 acres of Conserved Land compared with the existing PCL-1 alignment, with 465.73 acres of lands offsetting the 82.75 acres of lands to be removed from the northern portion of the existing alignment.

In conclusion, the proposed Project would result in a superior MSHCP Conservation Area configuration compared with the existing PCL-1 alignment. The re-alignment would result in an increase in conservation lands for the MSHCP Reserve, including an increase in native habitat types benefitting Covered Species. The alternate PCL-1 alignment will indirectly benefit the existing Core Areas (A and B) by providing a less-constrained connection between the Core Areas. Overall, the proposed Refinement would support the goals of the MSHCP as it applies to linking the Cleveland National Forest to the Prado Basin, Santa Ana River, and the Chino Hills. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-30 – 5-31.)

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historical Resources / Archaeological Resources / Human Remains

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-33.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats within the MSHCP. No development is proposed by the Project and consequently, no construction or groundbreaking activities would occur. Thus, the proposed Project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Since no development is proposed as part of the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment, the potential for encountering human remains during grading, excavation, or construction activities is non-existent. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-33.)

2. Cumulative Impacts – No Impact

Historic Resources: The proposed PCL-1 alignment would not result in groundbreaking activities

nor new development. Therefore, Project implementation would have no potential to contribute towards a significant cumulative impact to historical sites and/or resources.

Archaeological Resources: The proposed PCL-1 alignment would not result in groundbreaking activities nor new development. Therefore, Project implementation would have no potential to contribute towards a significant cumulative impact to archaeological sites and/or resources.

Disturbance of Human Remains: The proposed PCL-1 alignment would not result in groundbreaking activities nor new development and therefore no potential to uncover or disturb human remains would occur. Therefore, Project implementation would have no potential to contribute towards a significant cumulative impact to human remains. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-33.)

F. ENERGY

1. Wasteful Use of Energy

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-34.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats within the MSHCP and no new development is proposed. Therefore, the Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. No impacts would occur relative to the proposed Project and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-34.)

2. Local Plan

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-35.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats within the MSHCP and no new development is proposed. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The proposed Project only involves the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment and does not authorize any new development and no impacts would occur. No mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-35.)

3. Cumulative Impacts

As previously stated, the proposed Project would not result in construction or operational energy consumption as no new development or construction activities are proposed. Therefore, energy consumption would not occur in a cumulatively wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-35.)

G. GEOLOGY / SOILS

1. Adverse Geological Impacts

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 directly or indirectly cause potential 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?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-38.)

Explanation:

There are mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within the City limits associated with the Chino Fault and Glen Ivy segment of the Elsinore Fault. As previously stated, the proposed Project alignment is located within the Elsinore Fault Zone, although not within a Alquist-Priolo.

Earthquake Fault Zone. No new development or construction activities would result from the proposed Project. Consequently, the Project area would remain vacant and undeveloped, therefore no impact would occur.

Other geologic hazards include earthquake liquefaction and landslides. The western portion of the Project alignment adjacent to SR-91 is located within an area with moderate liquefaction susceptibility. Due to the Project's location and topography, the hillsides or steep slopes may result in landslides from heavy rain, erosion, removal of vegetation, seismic activity, or combinations of these and other factors. As previously stated, the Project area would remain vacant and undeveloped, therefore no impact would occur and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-38 – 5-39.)

2. Septic Tanks

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-39.)

Explanation:

Septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are not proposed as part of the Project. No impacts related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur from implementation of the proposed Project. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-39.)

3. Paleontological Resource

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-39.)

Explanation:

Although the Project site located within an area of which may have high Paleontological sensitivity, the Project proposes the relocation of PCL-1 alignment and does not involve earth moving and/or construction of new development. As a result, no impacts would occur., and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-39.)

4. Cumulative Impact – No Impacts

Geology and Soils: The Project proposes the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment and does not involve construction of new development. No impacts associated with geologic resources would occur.

Paleontological Resources: The proposed Project does not involve earth moving and/or construction of new development that would otherwise impact such resources. No impact to palaeontologic resources would occur. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-39.)

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions / Plans, Policies and Regulations

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-41.)

Explanation:

The Project proposes the relocation of PCL-1 alignment and does not involve construction of new development. The proposed Project alignment area would remain vacant and undeveloped. Therefore, the Project will not indirectly or directly generate GHGs that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-41.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in this section, the proposed Project would not result in new development resulting in construction or operational GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to cumulative GHG emissions in California. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-41.)

I. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Hazards

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project consists of the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment. No physical improvements or additional construction activities would occur which could include the use or storage of hazardous substances. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

2. Waste Site

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites that is 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the Project area does not contain facilities and/or sites that are identified as meeting the Cortese List requirements. In addition, there is no construction or groundbreaking activities as a result of the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

3. Airports

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 be 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 for people residing or working in the project area?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

Explanation:

The Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 3.75 miles northeast of Project alignment. Consequently, the Project site is not within two miles of an airport. In addition, the Project

alignment is not located within any land use compatibility zone for the nearest airport, nor is it within an airport safety zone. Although the Project proposes no construction or operational activities, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project areas, and no impacts would occur. No mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-44.)

4. Emergencies

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-45.)

Explanation:

The Project will not construct any physical barriers or disturb any roadways. The Project would not interfere with implementation of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan, and there would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-45.)

5. Wildland Fires

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-45.)

Explanation:

Although the Project alignment is within a Very High Hazard Fire Severity Zone (CALFIRE), there would be no new construction as a result of the proposed Project that would otherwise expose people or structures to significant risk involving wildland fires. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-45.)

6. Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in construction of any new development. As a result, no cumulative impacts associated with hazardous materials, emergency response, wildland fires, and airport safety hazards would result. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-45.)

J. HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

1. Water Quality

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 violate any water quality standards or waste

discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-47.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project alignment lies within Temescal Wash Sub-watershed, which drains to the Santa Ana River and eventually drains to the Pacific Ocean in Orange County. The watershed is under the authority of the Santa Ana RWQCB. The proposed Project does not consist of any new development and therefore will not require earth moving, construction, or operational activities and therefore will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-47 – 5-48.)

2. Groundwater

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-48.)

Explanation:

The relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include new development, and thus, will not have a direct impact on substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-48.)

3. Drainage

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-48.)

Explanation:

The relocation of PCL-1 alignment would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area because the proposed Project does not include new development. The proposed Project would not result in the addition of impervious 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 offsite, or 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. No impacts would occur. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-48.)

4. Flood Hazard

Threshold: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the relocation of PCL-1 risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-49.)

Explanation:

According to FEMA's National Flood Layer Viewer, the Project alignment is classified as Flood Zone X, area of minimal flood hazard. The Project alignment is located approximately 26 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the Project alignment is not located within a tsunami zone. Similarly, a seiche is the sloshing of a closed body of water from earthquake shaking. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water. The nearest body of water is the Prado Reservoir, approximately 1.2 miles to the north. According to the City's General Plan, the Project site is not within a dam inundation zone, nor in the vicinity of any impounded bodies of water; therefore, the Project is not at risk of a seiche. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-49.)

5. Water Quality Control Plan

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-49.)

Explanation:

The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable ground water management plan because the proposed Project does not include new development. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-49.)

6. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed previously, the proposed Project would not require construction or operational activities. Consequently, compliance with obligatory construction and development related hydrology and water quality related procedures is not required. The proposed Project alignment would not result in an increase of impervious surfaces within the watershed, nor increase surface runoff or significant pollutant loadings and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-49.)

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Established Community

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 physically divide an established community?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-50.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project alignment is comprised of undeveloped lands with dirt access roads, and heavily vegetated with access roads and canyon routes. The existing zoning for the proposed Project alignment overlays Residential Rural (R-R) (Riverside County) and Rural Mountainous (SOI) land uses; however, the Project does not propose any new development. The Project proposes to improve wildlife linkage with a superior corridor by connecting wildlife habitats while conserving additional lands. The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment would not physically divide an established community. As a result, there would be no impact, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-50.)

2. Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-51.)

Explanation:

The Project proposes the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment. The existing zoning for the proposed Project alignment overlays Residential Rural (R-R) (Riverside County) and Rural Mountainous (SOI) land uses. Although residential development would be allowed within the Project alignment, the Project does not propose any new development. Therefore, future development will conform with the City's 2020-2040 General Plan and any policies or regulations that the City has adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-51.)

3. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed under Impact LU-1, the proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. Similarly, the proposed Project was found to have no impact with applicable General Plan land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Lastly, as detailed in Section 5.4 of this section, the proposed Project was found to be consistent with the MSHCP. All three of these topics are inherently cumulative in nature, and therefore the proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-51.)

L. MINERALS

1. Mineral Resources and Mineral Resource Recovery

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-53.)

Explanation:

The Project alignment is located within an area classified as the MRZ-1 and MRZ-3. MRZ-1 and MRZ-3 classifications do not include mineral resources of statewide, regional, or local significance. The proposed Project does not include any new development, nor require construction or groundbreaking activities. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of know mineral resources that would be of value to the region, the state, or the local community. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-53.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of or availability of a locally or regionally significant mineral resource. Therefore, the proposed Project's effect on mineral resources would have no cumulatively impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-53.)

M. NOISE

1. Ambient Noise and Groundbourne Vibration

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 generate of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-55.)

Explanation:

The Project proposes the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment. The Project does not include any new development, and therefore, does not involve any grading or construction of new buildings and/or facilities. The proposed Project will not generate a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or produce excessive ground borne noise levels. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-55.)

2. Airports

Threshold: 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 Relocation of PCL-1 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-55.)

Explanation:

As previously discussed, the Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 3.75 miles northeast of Project alignment. The Project does not include any new development. Therefore, the proposed relocation of the PCL-1 alignment would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project alignment. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation

measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-55.)

3. Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in short-term construction or long-term operational noise generating activities as no new development is proposed. As a result, the proposed Project's potential to contribute to any noise or vibration- related impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-55.)

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Unplanned Population Growth

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-56.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would not involve the construction of any homes, business, or other uses that would result in population growth. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-56.)

2. Displacement

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-57.)

Explanation:

As discussed above, the Project alignment is comprised of vacant undeveloped land and the existing environment will remain intact. Although residential uses are allowed within the Project alignment, the Project does not propose any development. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-57.)

3. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in growth inducement or displacement of people or housing because no development is proposed and no residences would be removed. As a result, impacts related to cumulative growth would be less than significant and not

cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-57.)

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools and Parks

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 fire protection?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 police protection?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 schools?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 parks?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 other public facilities?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-60.)

Explanation:

As stated in this section, the proposed relocation of the PCL-1 alignment would not result in new development and the existing vacant undeveloped environment would remain as such.

The proposed PCL-1 alignment would not result in any development. The public services provided by the City would not be impacted with implementation of the relocation of PCL-1. Thus, public services would continue provide such services under the same conditions resulting in no demand increase on public services. Consequently, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts to the environment associated with the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-60.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in environmental impacts from increased demand on public services because no development is proposed. Cumulative impacts related to construction of new or renovated public facilities would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-60.)

P. RECREATION

1. Park Use and Park Expansion

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-62.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project consists of the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment. The Project does not propose any new development; therefore, Project implementation would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The Project does not propose any recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-62.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed under impact REC-1 and REC -2, the proposed Project does not propose new development nor the construction of a new or renovation of an existing park or recreational facility that would result in and impact to the environment. Therefore, the proposed Project would result

in no cumulative impacts associated with recreation. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-62.)

Q. TRANSPORTATION

1. Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policies / CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3(b) / Design Features / Emergency Access

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-64.)

Explanation:

No new construction would occur as part of the Project, thus construction or operational traffic related impacts would not occur. Therefore, the Project will not have an impact with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Additionally, the Project would not design or construct any new roadways, and there would be no sharp curves or dangerous intersections along local roadways used for the Project that would increase traffic safety hazards. With implementation of the proposed PCL-1 alignment, there would be no temporary road closures that could result in inadequate emergency access, nor would the Project induce large volumes of traffic which could pose a roadway restriction. As a result, transportation related impacts would not occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-64.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As discussed previously, transportation impacts would not occur with implementation of the Project as construction and operational activities would not occur. Therefore, no cumulative transportation impacts would occur. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-64.)

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Park Use and Park Expansion

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 in a significant impact if the Project would 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 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)?

Would the Relocation of PCL-1 in a significant impact if the Project would 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 resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-66.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the proposed Project would relocate the PCL-1 alignment to improve connectivity between designated wildlife habitats defined by the MSHCP. No development is proposed by the Project and no construction or groundbreaking activities would occur. Since no development ore construction is proposed as part of the relocation of the PCL-1 alignment, the potential for encountering tribal cultural resources would not occur. The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource resulting in no impact and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-66.)

2. Cumulative Impacts

As described above, the proposed Project would not result in the disturbance of known or unknown tribal cultural resources, as ground disturbance activities would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of tribal cultural resources. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-66.)

S. UTILITIES / SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Relocation or Construction

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-69.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project consists of the relocation of PCL-1 alignment, and does not propose any new development; thus, the Project will not utilize any utilities or require connection to utilities. Therefore, the Project will not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-69.)

2. Water Supplies

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-69.)

Explanation:

The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include any new development. The DWP currently serves the Project vicinity. Due to the lack of development proposed by the Project, no water supplies are needed to support the Project nor the existing undeveloped conditions. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-69 – 5-70.)

3. Wastewater

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing comments?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

Explanation:

The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include any new development. The relocation of the alignment would not result in activity which will demand wastewater treatment

services that exceed the adequate capacity of providers. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

4. Solid Waste

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

Explanation:

The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include any new development. Thus, the Project would not generate solid waste in excess of or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

5. Solid Waste Management

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

Explanation:

The proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include any new development. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70.)

6. Cumulative Impacts

Water
As described previously, the proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment does not include any new development. As discussed above, the Project would not result in an increase in water demand. Thus, potential cumulative impacts would not occur.

Wastewater
As described previously, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an increase flow impacting the sewer system and wastewater treatment plant capacity as no development is proposed. Cumulative impacts would not occur.

Stormwater
As described above, the proposed Project would not result in new development and would not include installation of a storm drain system. Thus, no increase in offsite stormwater flows would occur.

Solid Waste
As stated, the proposed Project would not result in construction or operational activities that would result in the generation of solid waste. Thus, impacts associated with solid waste would not occur and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Dry Utilities
As stated, no development would result from implementation of the proposed relocation of PCL-1 alignment. Therefore, cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the provision of utility facilities to serve the proposed Project would not occur. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-70 – 5-71.)

T. WILDFIRE

1. Emergency Response Plan

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73.)

Explanation:

As previously stated, the Project alignment and the vicinity is located in a Very High FHSZ. The Project proposes no construction or development and would therefore not interfere with any public evacuation plans and would have no impact on police or fire services. The proposed Project would relocate a wildlife corridor and does not include any new development. No new construction that would require closure of nearby roadways that might otherwise block or affect evacuation routes would occur. Therefore, the Project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73.)

2. Pollutant Concentrations

Threshold: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the Relocation of PCL-1 exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would relocate a wildlife corridor and does not include any development. Although the vacant undeveloped 711.28-acre Project alignment is within a Very High FHSZ, the proposed Project would relocate a wildlife corridor and does not include any new development.

The Project will not exacerbate wildfire risks, and will not expose project occupants or visitors to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Thus, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73.)

3. Infrastructure

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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 ongoing impacts to the environment?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would relocate a wildlife corridor and does not include any development. The proposed relocation of the wildlife alignment does not 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. Thus, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-73 – 5-74.)

4. Landslides and Runoff

Threshold: Would the Relocation of PCL-1 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?

Finding: No Impact. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-74.)

Explanation:

The proposed Project would relocate wildlife corridor and does not include any development. The Project would not expose people or structures to any more risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, than is currently present within the Project area. Thus, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-74.)

5. Cumulative Impacts

The proposed Project would not result in new development and would not result in impacts directly or indirectly to an emergency response or evacuation plan and mitigation is not required. The nearest Fire Station is approximately a mile from the Project vicinity and would continue to adequately provide emergency services to the area. As discussed in Section 5.14, Public Services, the Project would not result in impacts on fire protection services. Thus, impacts would not occur

and would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft SEIR, p. 5-74.)

SECTION IX.
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, require that an EIR address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the Project be implemented. Generally, a Project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of the following would occur:

- The Project would involve a large commitment of non-renewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of the Program would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The Program involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents; or
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified.

The Modified Project would NOT involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources in a way that would make their nonuse or removal unlikely.

The Modified Project would not involve the utilization of nonrenewable resources in a manner that would make their nonuse or removal unlikely. Nonrenewable resources associated with the development of the Modified Project site would include fossil fuels. Fossil fuels would serve as energy sources during both construction and operations of the Modified Project. Fossil fuels would act as transportation energy sources for construction vehicles and heavy equipment during the construction period and by vehicles and equipment used during project operations.

Though the Modified Project would endeavor to utilize fossil fuels efficiently, their use would be vital for construction and operations activities, making their nonuse unlikely. However, the Modified Project would not require the continued use of fossil fuels at the end of its operational life. By nature of being a nonrenewable resource, fossil fuels, once consumed, cannot be replaced. Those fuels, once spent, may be transformed into another form of matter such as exhaust or smoke. Standard vehicles and equipment used by the Modified Project in both construction and operational phases would likely utilize fossil fuels. Some construction and operational equipment such as forklifts may be electrified and therefore not rely on fossil fuels. Energy-efficient equipment would be utilized according to their availability and in order to comply with energy regulations and policies for the Modified Project as a whole as it pertains to residential, office, hospitality, and commercial uses.

The Modified Project proposes the potential development of a fueling station; however such operations are highly regulated and would not likely store significant amounts of fossil fuels. Fossil fuels on-site

would be stored in a manner that would make their removal unlikely. No infrastructure is proposed to store fossil fuels in large amounts or without the ability of removal. The Modified Project would also require the commitment of land on which the Modified Project would be developed for a mixed-use of residential, office, hospitality, and commercial uses. Similarly, land is a finite resource in that once developed and in active use it removes the ability for that land to be used for other purposes. However, development of the Modified Project site would not eliminate the possibility of redevelopment in the future.

a) The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses.

Impacts associated with the Modified Project are largely less than significant with mitigation applied. The majority of identified impacts, not adequately covered by the previous EIR, were anticipated to create a less than significant impact or no impact, with the exception of air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Once development of the proposed Modified Project occurs, it would not be feasible to return the developed land to its existing (pre-project) condition. In addition, the redevelopment is proposed with the intent to last a long time. However, because the project site is already developed with urban uses, redevelopment under the Modified Project would not represent a substantial change in land use.

The Modified Project's development is anticipated to produce significant and unavoidable impacts based on analyses conducted in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Section 4.17, Transportation. These impacts would also affect the surrounding environment.

The use of materials considered hazardous waste would be minimal; mostly used for cleaning, landscaping, and operational maintenance. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that the usage and storage of any hazardous materials and waste would be completed in the safest and most efficient manner. Similarly, the Modified Project would comply with any federal, state, and local air quality and water quality regulations to further ensure the least amount of environmental impact. The mixed-use nature of the Modified Project is unlikely to lead to impacts that would commit future generations and developments to similar uses. Therefore, the Modified Project would not influence future development in that land area as the existing land use designations would be unchanged.

b) The project would NOT involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.

The Modified Project is intended to develop warehouse, commercial, hospitality, office and residential facilities and is not anticipated to release hazardous material into the environment. Construction and operation of the Modified Project would utilize chemical substances common with typical construction, landscaping, and cleaning activities and do not generally pose a significant hazard to the public or environment. However, in the event that hazardous materials are either used or stored on the project site, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Occupational Safety and

Health Administration (OHSA) requirements would both reduce the significance of any impacts and ensure the Modified Project's compliance with any Federal, State, and local policy regarding hazardous materials and accidents.

c) The proposed consumption of resources is justified (e.g., the project does NOT involve the wasteful use of energy).

The Modified Project would comply with any applicable federal, state, and local regulations and laws regarding the use of resources during both construction and operations. As established in Section 4.8, Utilities and Service Systems, development of the Modified Project would not significantly impact water, electricity, solid waste, and telecommunications resources. It was found that the Easter Municipal Water District (EMWD), the water supplier for the City and project site, is able to meet the Modified Project's expanded demand. Further, development of the Modified Project would include the use of energy-efficient design and materials in accordance with the most recent Federal, State, and local regulations. Therefore, resources used for the Modified Project, including energy, would be done in an efficient, justifiable manner.

SECTION X.
GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a Draft EIR to discuss the ways the Program could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e), a Program would be considered to have a growth-inducing effect if it would:

- Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment;
- Remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., construction of an infrastructure expansion to allow for more construction in service areas);
- Tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

A project's potential to induce growth does not automatically result in growth. Growth can only happen through capital investment in new economic opportunities by the private or public sectors. Under CEQA, the potential for growth inducement is not considered necessarily detrimental nor necessarily beneficial, and neither is it automatically considered to be of little significance to the environment. This issue is presented to provide additional information on ways in which the Modified Project could contribute to significant changes in the environment, beyond the direct consequences of implementing the Modified Project examined in the preceding sections of this Draft SEIR.

Direct Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Surrounding Environment

Growth inducement can be defined as the relationship between a project and growth within the surrounding area. This relationship is often difficult to establish with any degree of precision and cannot be measured on a numerical scale because there are many social, economic, and political factors associated with the rate and location of development. Accordingly, the CEQA Guidelines instruct that an EIR should focus on the way's growth might be induced. This relationship is sometimes looked at as either one of facilitating planned growth or inducing unplanned growth. Both types of growth, however, should be evaluated. Potential growth- inducing effects are examined through analysis of the following questions:

1. Would the project directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing?

NO. The Modified Project, when implemented, would directly induce population growth in the City through the development of 32 new dwelling units and commercial uses. The Modified Project would result in a similar level of development intensity as the Approved Project. Although the Modified Project would directly and indirectly induce economic and population growth, this growth is consistent with the City's local plans including the existing GRRSP as well as regional planning documents and is therefore not considered a significant impact.

2. Would the project remove obstacles to population growth?
NO. The Modified Project is located at the edge of the City's limits, and adjacent to US National Forest land and unincorporated areas of Riverside County with limited development potential. Development of the Modified Project would not complete infrastructure gaps that impede development. For these reasons, the Modified Project would not remove an impediment to growth.

3. Would the project require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects?

NO. As discussed in Draft SEIR Section 4.19, Utilities and Service Systems, the construction of utilities to the Modified Project site would result in a less than significant impact on the environment. The Modified Project is not anticipated to require new or expanded off-site facilities that would result in significant environmental impacts.

4. Would the project encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

NO. Refer to Sections 4.1 through Section 4.20 of this Draft SEIR, which discusses reasonably foreseeable potential impacts of the Modified Project during construction and operation.

SECTION XI.
ALTERNATIVES

A. BACKGROUND

The Draft EIR analyzed three alternatives to the Program as proposed and evaluated these alternatives for their ability to avoid or reduce the Program's significant environmental effects while also meeting the majority of the Program's objectives. The Agency finds that it has considered and rejected as infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and described below. This section sets forth the potential alternatives to the Program analyzed in the EIR and evaluates them in light of the Program objectives, as required by CEQA.

Where significant impacts are identified, section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to consider and discuss alternatives to the proposed actions. Subsection (a) states:

(a) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Subsection 15126.6(b) states the purpose of the alternatives analysis:

(b) Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

In subsection 15126.6(c), the State CEQA Guidelines describe the selection process for a range of reasonable alternatives:

(c) The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The EIR shall include

sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Program. Alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Program. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Program.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the Projects:

- To provide for the orderly and efficient development of the Green River Ranch property.
- To implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Corona General Plan.
- To develop land uses which reflect sound economic, market, and financial consideration.
- To develop uses which will generate additional revenue for the City of Corona, and establish a strong tax base for the City.
- To sprovide convenient commercial and industrial services for the community, in addition to similar services for freeway oriented and generated visitors.
- To promote organized and well-planned development within the Specific Plan area.
- To provide guidance and direction for the future development of this property.
- To create an aesthetically pleasing western gateway into the City of Corona.

C. 2001 EIR ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

In the 2001 EIR, the following alternatives to the Approved Project were fully described and a qualitative analysis was provided for each environmental issue area evaluated in the 2001 EIR. The following development scenarios were identified as potential alternatives to implementation of the Approved Project. The following provides a summary of each alternative including determination of the Environmentally Superior Alternative as analyzed in the 2001 EIR.

1. 2001 EIR Alternative 1: No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the Approved Project site would remain in its existing condition. Under this Alternative, the 2001 EIR concluded that although the Project-related roadway improvements that would benefit existing and non-Project travel on Green River Road and access to and from Green River Road at the SR-91 ramps would no longer occur, impacts associated with

the Approved Project would be avoided, especially the Approved Project's significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality after mitigation.

Conclusion

The No Build Alternative would prohibit additional development, existing on-site uses would remain, and no further modification of topography or disturbance of existing biological, cultural, paleontological, or visual resources would be required. This Alternative would dramatically reduce the number of daily vehicle trips in the vicinity of the Project site, resulting in a corresponding reduction in construction and operational emissions, and noise. In addition, this Alternative was determined that it would neither alter existing geologic and hydrologic conditions nor require the implementation of mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with these issues. Moreover, the 2001 EIR concluded the No Build Alternative would not achieve the stated objectives of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan. Thus, this Alternative was rejected in the 2001 EIR.

2. 2001 EIR Alternative 2: No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Approved Project as proposed would not occur, nor the improvements to the SR-91 ramps at Green River Road or Green River Road along the Project frontage. Consequently, this was determined to eliminate the areawide benefit that these roadway improvements would provide for existing and non-project travel on Green River Road and access to and from Green River Road at the SR-91 ramps. This alternative would result in development under the existing underlying County zoning at the time in place resulting in the potential for scattered residential development over the bulk of the Approved Project property.

Conclusion

Under this Alternative, the 2001 EIR determined impacts related to land use, traffic, air quality, and noise would be reduced, while impacts related with public service/utilities and visual resources would increase. In addition, impacts related to biological, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, and hydrology would be similar to those identified with the Approved Project.

This Alternative would not achieve the stated objectives of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan and would not provide the same level of infrastructure, such as roadway improvements to Green River Road. Thus, this Alternative was rejected in the 2001 EIR.

3. 2001 EIR Alternative 3: Commercial-Industrial Alternative

Under this Alternative, development of residential uses in PA 6 would not be implemented and development of approximately 520,900 square feet of mixed (commercial and industrial) uses and 150 hotel rooms would continue under this Alternative in the same manner as the Approved Project.

Conclusion

The scale and intensity of commercial-industrial development under this Alternative would be similar to that detailed for the Approve Project. The elimination of 32 residential units would incrementally reduce traffic, air quality, noise, and geologic impacts, and significantly reduce impacts related to the provision of public services and utilities. Furthermore, impacts related to all other issues would be similar to those identified with the Approved Project. Under the Commercial-Industrial Alternative, the Project site would be developed with the same intensity of commercial and industrial uses in PAs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 while PA 6 would remain undeveloped, and this Alternative would achieve the stated objectives of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan. This Alternative was considered as an Environmentally Superior Alternative in the 2001 EIR

4. 2001 EIR Alternative 4: Residential

Under this Alternative, the 167.8-acre Project site would be developed with residential uses. This Alternative would develop PA 6 as stated in the Specific Plan with 32 single-family residential units on lots minimally sized at 3.0 acres each, while the northern 69.6 acres of the Project site would be developed with single-family residential units at a density of 2 dwelling units per acre, resulting in 139 dwellings. Thus, implementation of this Alternative would result in the development of 171 single-family dwelling units on the 167.8-acre project site.

Conclusion

The 2001 EIR determined impacts related to traffic and air quality would be reduced, while impacts related to noise, public service/utilities and visual resources would increase; however, impacts related to other issues would be similar to those identified with the Approved Project. In addition, under the Residential Alternative, the Project site would be developed with single-family dwelling units, therefore this Alternative was determined to not achieve the stated objectives of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan. Thus, this Alternative was rejected in the 2001 EIR

5. 2001 EIR Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Build Alternative was the Environmentally Superior Alternative since no development would occur on the Project site; however it would not achieve the approved GRRSP objectives. Thus, this Alternative would not result in traffic, air quality, or noise impacts, nor would this Alternative disturb the current on-site biological, cultural, paleontological condition of the site, or alter existing on-site topography and drainage.

In accordance with CEQA (Section 15126(d)(4), if a "No Build" Alternative is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, another must be selected from the remaining alternatives. The 2001 EIR identified the Commercial-Industrial Alternative as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Although the Commercial-Industrial Alternative would only incrementally reduce average daily trips and the amount of mobile source emissions, air pollution emissions, and associated impacts to transportation facilities and air quality, this Alternative would not generate noise or public service/utility impacts. In addition, this Alternative would also achieve the basic objectives of the Approved Project. Based on the preceding analysis as summarized in the 2001 EIR, the 2001 EIR identified the Commercial- Industrial Alternative as the Environmentally

Superior Alternative. However, the City found that although the Commercial-Industrial Alternative was considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project, it was determined to be infeasible because it failed to meet all Project objectives.

D. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

As stated above, the analysis of alternatives from the 2001 EIR is part of the "range of reasonable alternatives" to be considered per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a). In addition to the alternatives evaluated under the 2001 EIR, the following alternatives are evaluated in this Draft SEIR:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative**: Under this Alternative, the undeveloped site would remain vacant and unoccupied.

- **Alternative 2: Mixed Use Alternative**: Under this Alternative, PA 1 through 5 and PA 7 would be developed for mixed (commercial and industrial) use purposes only per the existing GRRSP design guidelines. This Alternative would require a specific plan amendment.

- **Alternative 3: Residential Alternative**: Under this Alternative, development of the Project site would be residential uses only per the existing GRRSP. PA 6 would be developed as stated in the Specific Plan with 32 single-family residential units on lots minimally sized at 3.0 acres each. The northern portion of the Project site would be developed with single-family residential units at a density of 2 dwelling units per acre, resulting in 139 dwellings. Thus, implementation of this Alternative would result in the development of 171 single-family dwelling units on the Project site.

Further details on these alternatives, and an evaluation of environmental effects relative to the Modified Project, are provided below. The analysis of these alternatives adds to the overall range of alternatives considered for the Modified Project as well as satisfying the State CEQA Guidelines requirements that the "no project" alternative be considered (CCR Section 15126.6[e]). The Modified Project itself is an Alternative approach to implementing the Approved Project and the analysis of environmental effects provided in Section 4.0 of which provides a detailed comparison of impacts under this "Modified" vs. the Approved Project in 2001. Therefore, the analysis of the Modified Project provided in Section 4 of this SEIR can be considered part of the overall evaluation of alternatives for the Approved Project.

1. Alternative 1: No Project/ No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition. Potential impacts associated with the Modified Project would be avoided.

Under this Alternative, however, the Modified Project offer to widen Green River Road to a full six lane section along the Project frontage would not be provided. These Project- related roadway

improvements would benefit existing and non-Project travel on Green River Road and access to and from Green River Road at the SR-91 ramps.

Environmental Considerations

Continuation of the site as vacant and unoccupied would result in all environmental impacts being less than the Modified Project. There would be no changes to any of the existing conditions and there would be no impact to each of the 20 CEQA Checklist evaluation topics. The No Project/No Build Alternative by definition would not meet the objectives of the Modified Project that were discussed earlier in this chapter.

Conclusion

The No Project/No Build Alternative would result in no development on the Project site. The existing vacant on-site setting would remain. No further modification of topography or disturbance of existing biological, cultural, paleontological, or visual resources would be required. This Alternative would dramatically reduce the number of daily vehicle trips in the vicinity of the Project site, resulting in a corresponding reduction in construction and operational emissions, and noise. This Alternative would neither alter existing geologic and hydrologic conditions nor require the implementation of mitigation to reduce potential impacts associated with these issues. The No Project/No Build Alternative by definition would not meet the objectives of the Modified Project that were discussed earlier in this chapter. Therefore, this Alternative is rejected.

2. Alternative 2: Mixed-Use Alternative

Under the Mixed Use Alternative, PA 1 through 5 and PA 7 would be developed for mixed (commercial and industrial) use purposes only per the existing GRRSP design guidelines. Similar to the Modified Project, this Alternative would develop all but the 98.2 acres of residential uses per the existing GRRSP. Because PA 1 (16.7 acres), PA 2 (10 acres), and PA 7 (4.8 acres) are zoned for commercial-industrial uses, a Specific Plan Amendment would be required to change the existing land uses within PA 3 Commercial-General (2.9 acres), PA 4 Commercial-General (2.1 acres), and PA 5 Hotel/Mixed Use Office (5.8 acres) to Mixed Use. This Alternative would allow development of 42.3 acres according to the relevant policies stated in the GRRSP. Therefore, the industrial use acreage is reduced by approximately 7.22 acres when compared to the Modified Project's 49.31 acres of BPI.

Environmental Considerations

As previously mentioned, this Alternative would create a less intensive industrial design when compared to the Modified Project, thereby would likely reduce impacts related to air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emission, noise, and transportation. While most of the environmental issues associated with this Alternative would be similar to those of the Modified Project, this Alternative does likely increase impacts to the following areas:

- Aesthetics: This Alternative would maintain residential development within 98.2-

acre PA 6, thereby eliminating the proposed 83.34 acres of Open Space. Although PA 6 would be designed and built according to the GRRSP guidelines, this Alternative would significantly change the hillsides that is part of the western gateway into the City of Corona. The impacts to aesthetics would be increased.

- Biological Resources: As previously stated, this Alternative would maintain residential development within PA 6. As such, the potential residential development throughout the 98.2 acres would result in an increased potential to impact observed and unknown biological resources during construction. In addition, this Alternative would permanently eliminate the proposed 83.34 acres of Open Space designated for the MSHCP of which would support the local biological habitat. The impacts to biological resources would be increased.

- Cultural Resources / Paleontological Resources / Tribal Cultural Resources: As previously stated, this Alternative would maintain residential development within PA 6. As such, the potential residential development throughout the 98.2 acres would result in an increased potential to uncover unknown resources during construction activities. Due to the increased acreage in development, impacts to unknown sensitive resources would be increased.

- Wildfire: As previously stated, this Alternative would maintain residential development within PA 6. As such, the potential residential development throughout the 98.2 acres would result in an increased potential to expose people or structures to the risk of wildfire. Although this Alternative would be designed built with the appropriate fire design elements and approved by the Corona Fire Department, impacts to Wildfire would increase.

Conclusion

The GRRSP establishes objectives that will guide development of the Project site. These objectives include providing for the efficient and orderly development of the Project site; developing land uses which reflect sound economic, market, and financial considerations; developing uses that will generate revenue for the City of Corona; and providing convenient commercial and industrial services for the local and regional consumers. Under the Mixed Use Alternative, the Project site would be developed with less intensity of commercial and industrial uses in PAs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 while PA 6 would remain undeveloped for residential uses. This Alternative would achieve the stated objectives of the existing GRRSP, however it would not meet all the basic goals of the proposed GRRSP (i.e., Modified Project).

3. Alternative 3: Residential Alternative

Under this Alternative, the 160-acre Project site would be developed with residential uses and maintain the proposed Open Space. PA 5 would be developed as stated in the proposed GRRSPA with 32 single-family residential units, similar to the approved GRRSP. The northern 55.02 acres within the proposed PA 1 through 4 of the Project site would be developed with single-family

residential units at a density of 2 dwelling units per acre, resulting in 110 dwellings. The 83.34 acres of PA 6 would maintain the proposed designated Open Space. Thus, implementation of this Alternative would result in the development of 142 single-family dwelling units within 76.85 acres and designate 83.34 acres Open Space within the 160-acre Project site.

Environmental Considerations

As previously stated, this Alternative would designate a majority of the site to open space and develop all the proposed industrial uses of the Modified Project with residential. Therefore, this Alternative would likely reduce impacts with the following environmental issues:

- Air Quality / Greenhouse Gases / Transportation: It is estimated the Modified Project will generate 4,370 two-way average daily trips, 429 A.M. peak hour trips, and 386 P.M. peak hour trips. Based on generation factors included in Trip Generation, 6th Edition, this Alternative would generate 1,339 average daily trips, 99 A.M. peak trips, and 134 P.M. peak trips. This represents a reduction of 65, 71, and 61 percent (respectively) in the number of ADT, A.M. peak trips, and P.M. peak trips. Such a decrease in traffic volumes would be anticipated to substantially reduce traffic related impacts from those identified with the Modified Project. As a result of the reduced traffic related impacts, it is likely that the fewer number of vehicle trips would generate less air quality and greenhouse gas impacts. Therefore, impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation are reduced.

- Noise: Because this Alternative envisions development of the Project site with residential uses only, noise impacts resulting from parking areas, loading docks, manufacturing processes, drive-through, and other sources are not anticipated. Although short-term noise impacts are anticipated during construction of residential units, but the duration, intensity, and extent of this noise is not anticipated to be significant. It should be noted, the residential uses on the north side of the site adjacent to SR-91 would be designed with features to mitigate the freeway noise to less than significant levels. Impacts related to noise would be reduced.

Although this Alternative would reduce such environmental issues when compared to those of the Modified Project, this Alternative does likely increase impacts to the following areas:

- Population / Public Services / Utilities and Service Systems: This Alternative will result in the development of 142 single-family residential units. Based on an average of 3.42 persons per dwelling unit (Department of Finance), development of the Project site under this Alternative would result in a population increase of approximately 486 persons. This population increase would increase demand on sewer, water supplies, solid waste facilities, and school facilities. Impacts related to public services and utilities and service system requirements for this Alternative would increase.

Conclusion

Under this Alternative, impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation would be reduced, while impacts related to public services, utilities and service systems would increase. Impacts related to other issues would be similar to those identified with the Modified project.

The GRRSP establishes objectives that will guide development of the Project site. These objectives include providing for the efficient and orderly development of the Project site; developing land uses which reflect sound economic, market, and financial considerations; developing uses that will generate revenue for the City of Corona; and providing convenient commercial and industrial services for the local and regional consumers. Under this Alternative, the Project site would be developed with single-family dwelling units and designated open space. This Alternative would not achieve the basic stated objectives of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan and is, therefore, rejected

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed Program shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. Based on the alternatives analysis contained within the Draft SEIR the Mixed-Use Alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the proposed project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (CEQA Guidelines 15093(a)). CEQA requires the agency to state, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final SEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines 15093(b)).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City Council finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen many of the significant effects identified in the Final SEIR for the GRRSP Amendment and BPI Development Project. However, significant impacts to air quality and transportation are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The Final SEIR provides detailed information regarding these impacts.

The City Council finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR within the purview of the City will be implemented with the proposed Project, and that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based upon the facts set forth above, the Draft SEIR, and the record, because implementation of the GRRSP Amendment and **BPI** Development Project will:

- Implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the current City of Corona General Plan because it protects 103.73 acres of Open Space that will provide residents with opportunities to enjoy the natural environment, provide visual relief from urban development, protect significant plant and animal habitats and protect development from natural environmental hazard (Goal LU-16) and support wildlife conservation and wildlife habitat according to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conversation Plan; develop 49.31 acres for business park land uses that will promote a strong and diversified economic base by attracting quality businesses and encouraging existing businesses to expand their sales, facilities and employment (Goal ED-1), and facilitate the retention and expansion of existing job generating industries within existing and planned industrial areas to such industries to remain in Corona (Policy ED-1.5).

- The average daily vehicular trips will be reduced from 11,207 trips to 4,370 trips, a 61% reduction, when compared to the original project and thereby result in fewer vehicles traveling to the Project site on Green River Road and State Route 91.

- Provide convenient commercial and industrial/business park opportunities for the community by providing employment and shopping opportunities to existing Corona residents without having to travel to other jurisdictions, supporting the City's labor and retail markets and

sales and property tax revenues that sustain the services provided by the City for its residents and service population.

- Create an aesthetically pleasing western gateway into the City of Corona because the project will utilize quality building materials, architectural elements, and an abundance of onsite landscaping that enhance the appearance of the Project site from Green River Road and Dominguez Ranch Road while preserving the natural hillsides located south of the business park development within the Open Space land use.

Considering all factors, the City Council finds that each and every one of the above benefits individually and collectively outweigh each and every one of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts; therefore the City is approving the Project.

EXHIBIT "B"

UPDATED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

[SEE ATTACHED 34 PAGES]

UPDATED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM CHECKLIST

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
AESTHETICS						
4.6.1M: Sources of lighting within the Specific Plan area should be limited to the minimum standard to ensure safe circulation and visibility.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
4.6.1N: Street lighting should be limited to intersections and other locations needed to maintain safe access (e.g., sharp curves).	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Encroachment Permits	Review of street improvement plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Encroachment Permits
4.6.1O: Exterior lighting for buildings should be of a low profile and intensity.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
AIR QUALITY						
4.3.1A: The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building and Development Services Divisions	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits
4.3.1B: The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric or diesel-powered equipment in lieu of gasoline-powered engines where feasible.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
4.3.1C: The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period should be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building and Development Services Divisions	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.3.1D: The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.	City of Corona, Public Works Department and Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading and Building Permits	Review of traffic control plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permit, Building Permit, and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.3.1E: The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
4.3.1F: Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below: a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease. b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Review of construction documents and on-site inspection.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the later morning and after work is completed for the day, and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour. c. After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated immediately by pickup of the soil until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. d. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. e. Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.						
4.3.1G: The Construction Contractor shall utilize as much as possible precoated/natural colored building materials, water-based or low-VOC coating, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency, such as high volume low pressure (HVLP) spray method, or manual coatings application such as paint brush, hand roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	The City shall provide the applicant and the construction contractor(s) the relevant information.		Withhold Building Permit

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.3.2A: The project shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations established by the Energy Commission regarding energy conservation standards. The project applicant shall incorporate the following in building plans: • Planting trees to provide shade and shadow to building. • Solar or low-emission water heaters shall be used with combined space/water heater unit. • Refrigerator with vacuum power insulation. • Double-pained glass or window treatment for energy conservation shall be used in all exterior windows. • Energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights shall be used.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
4.3.2B: Encourage use of transportation demand measures (TDM) such as preferential parking for vanpooling/carpooling, subsidy for transit pass or vanpooling/carpooling, flextime work schedule, bike racks, lockers, showers, and on-site cafeteria in the design and operations of the commercial land uses.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building and Planning Divisions	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to issuance of Building Permit	Review of construction documents and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.3.2C: The project proponent shall determine with the City and the electrical purveyor if it is feasible to pre-wire houses for electrical charges for EV cars and/or optic fibers for home offices. If feasible, install EV charges and/or optic-fibers per the electrical purveyor's direction prior to Certificate of Occupancy.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
AQ-1: During grading of Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, all Construction Contractors shall ensure that offroad diesel construction equipment complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/CARB Tier 4 Interim emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Review of construction documents and on-site inspection.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
AQ-2: Legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable CARB anti-idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than five (5) minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the CARB to report violations. Prior to the issuance of a	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
certificate of occupancy, the Lead Agency (City of Corona) shall conduct a site inspection to ensure that the signs are in place.						
AQ-3: Prior to tenant occupancy for Planning Areas 1, 2 and 3, the Project Applicants or successors in interest shall provide documentation to the Lead Agency (City of Corona) demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation on funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, that provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Occupancy Permits
AQ-4: The minimum number of automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations required by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 shall be provided. Final designs of Project buildings shall include electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
4.7.1A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction California gnatcatcher surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall	City of Corona, Planning and Development	Prior to Grading and during grading and	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City California gnatcatcher pre-construction surveys		Withhold Grading Permit and/or

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
identify mitigation for impacts to the California gnatcatcher consisting of acquiring and preserving California gnatcatcher habitat of equal or greater quality at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 (acquire at least 1 acre for each acre impacted). The Modified Project would impact 8 acres of habitat used by the California gnatcatcher; therefore, mitigation shall consist of the acquisition and preservation of at least 8 acres of occupied habitat. The acquired habitat shall be in a location that facilitates management for the species (i.e., currently supports the species and is contiguous with a larger area that will be managed for conservation of the species). Potential suitable locations include areas adjacent to existing reserves (such as Stephens' kangaroo rat reserves) or within established mitigation banks for the California gnatcatcher. Project impacts to the California gnatcatcher and its designated critical habitat may require consultation or other permitting for compliance with the federal ESA that may result in requirements for additional mitigation measures beyond those described above.	Department, Planning Division	construction operations.		and other proof of documentation as necessary, demonstrating that mitigation measure has been met.		Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.2A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each increment of development, applicable pre-construction riparian area surveys shall be conducted and a survey report approved by the City. The report shall identify all	City of Corona, Planning and Development	Prior to Grading and during grading and	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City riparian area pre-construction surveys, mitigation bank		Withhold Grading Permit and/or

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
riparian habitat impacted (i.e., removed) by the proposed project and such impacted areas shall be replaced through creation of new riparian habitat of equal or greater quality. Impacts to 3.66 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 2.10 acres of potential RWQCB jurisdiction) shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio (10.98 acres) through the combination of onsite restoration and preservation, and offsite mitigation (Riverpark Mitigation Bank). The onsite mitigation will consist of the restoration of 2.57 acres of riparian oak woodland and the preservation of 6.36 acres of oak woodlands and streams. The balance of mitigation would consist of 4.62 acres would be purchased at a Mitigation bank. It is anticipated that project construction may require permits or approvals from the CDFW (per Section 1601/1603 of the Fish and Game Code) and RWQCB (per Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act).	Department, Planning Division	construction operations.		receipts, and proof of documentation showing compliance with CDFW, RWQCB permits and regulations, as applicable.		Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.3A: Prior to the commencement of tree removal or grading on the proposed project site during the nesting season (March-July), all suitable habitat shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. In addition, a biologist shall be present on site to monitor the tree removal and grading to ensure	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City nesting bird pre-construction surveys.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
that any nests detected during the initial survey are not disturbed.						
4.7.3B: (Alternative) Tree removal and grading shall be delayed until after the nesting season (March-July).	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.4A: Prior to issuance of grading permits for PA 1, 2, 3, and 5, the project shall comply with Chapter 17.59 of the Corona Municipal Code. This mitigation was previously introduced as mitigation measure 4.6-1. This Ordinance promotes the use of residential clustering techniques and their measures to minimize impacts on hillside sites, typically areas containing oak trees. Home sites shall be clustered into the fewest number of acres possible to minimize the spread of impacts over a large portion of the property to reduce fragmentation of the remaining natural areas.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Review of construction and grading plans and on-site inspection.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.4B: Prior to issuance of grading permits for PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, the applicant shall design an oak woodland management plan which includes the following:	City of Corona, Planning and Development	Prior to Grading and during grading and	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City an oak woodland management plan.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
• Provisions for ongoing maintenance, management, and construction impact practices for all oaks on site. • Provisions for enhancing oak woodlands not within the development zone. • Provisions for limiting human and vehicular access to existing oak woodland areas in order to preserve habitat quality. • Limitations on the use of herbicides or pesticides within the oak woodland areas.	Department, Planning Division	construction operations.				Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.4C: Prior to grading within PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, the applicant shall conduct a revised Tree Survey, based on the staking of the specific limits of grading, to assess opportunities for transplanting the oak trees.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City a tree survey.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
4.7.4D: Prior to issuance of grading permits within PAs 1, 2, 3, and 5, the applicant shall obtain a qualified native plant horticulturist to determine the sensibility and likelihood of survival of transplanting 10 percent of the oak trees.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Submit to the City a report prepared by a qualified native plant horticulturist.		Withhold Grading Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.7.4E: Prior to certification of occupancy, the applicant shall replant 15-gallon size oaks at a ratio of 10 to 1 for all oaks lost but not transplanted. The location and methods for these plantings would be specified by a qualified native plant biologist/horticulturist.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Review of landscape plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Occupancy Permits
BIO-1: If construction will occur within 300 feet of potential vireo habitat between March 15 and September 30, a biologist shall determine whether vireo individuals are present within the adjacent habitat. If work will start prior to March 15 and continue into the vireo season, or will start between March 15 and April 30, the biologist shall survey the adjacent habitat weekly for eight weeks[1] starting on or around March 15 until vireo are detected, or until eight visits are completed and the vireo is confirmed absent. If construction work will start after April 30, then surveys will start on or around April 10 (the formal start of the vireo survey period), and surveys will follow the survey intervals as stated above. If vireo individuals are detected, the biologist will determine necessity and applicability of measures to address edge effects for construction activities occurring within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat to protect the vireo. At minimum the following are recommended.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City a vireo habitat survey.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
1) Noise: Given the proximity of the vireo habitat to the existing Green River Road and the adjacent SR-91, there is already an existing noise baseline from heavy traffic use, and it is possible that construction noise would not exceed that baseline. The Project proponent will retain a qualified biologist to perform noise monitoring to determine the ambient noise level at the habitat edge without construction activities occurring within 300 feet of the habitat edge, and then determine noise levels while construction activities are occurring. If it is determined that with construction, the noise levels exceed the ambient levels, then noise attenuation measures may be implemented, including the construction of a temporary noise attenuation barrier (sound wall) along the disturbance limits north of Green River Road. If it is determined that noise levels cannot be attenuated, then the specific construction activities resulting in the noise will need to be temporarily ceased until August 31, or prior if it is determined through surveys that the vireo are no longer present. 2) Lighting: Any night lighting needed during construction within 300 feet of occupied vireo habitat will be down shielded or directed away from the vireo habitat to prevent the illumination of the adjacent habitat.						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
3) Dust Emissions: The Project, as a part of standard best management practices (BMPs) pursuant to South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, will introduce dust control measures for the duration of construction activities to minimize any dust-related effect on adjacent vireos. 4) Trespassing: Prior to the start of construction activities along the northern side of Green River Road, the edge of the disturbance limits adjacent to the vireo habitat will be demarcated with orange construction fencing to prevent trespassing into the adjacent habitat. In addition, the Project proponent will implement an Environmental Awareness Training program prior to the start of construction to advise workers of sensitive biological areas adjacent to the development footprint, including the habitat areas north of Green River Ranch Road.						
BIO-2: If the Crotch bumble bee is still a Candidate species or has been confirmed as a State listed species at the time of Modified Project site disturbance, then prior to the issuance of a grading permit that would remove Crotch bumble bee habitat the following measures shall be implemented:	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Submit to the City a Crotch bumble bee survey and proof of documentation showing compliance with the RCA and CDFW permits and		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
• The Project proponent shall have conveyed or have an agreement to convey approximately 50.96 acres of various scrub habitats and 26 acres of nonnative grassland in the southern portion of the Project site to the RCA, which constitutes avoidance of suitable habitat. • If the land to be conserved in the southern portion of the Project site has not been conveyed to the RCA and no agreement is yet in place to convey the property, the Project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW to address the extent of impacts and determine whether an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for Crotch bumble bee would be required. If an ITP were required, then mitigation may be required by CDFW as part of the ITP process, and the conservation of the comparable open space habitat would be presented to support the ITP.				regulations, as applicable.		
CULTURAL RESOURCES						
CUL-1: Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural Resources - Prior to issuance of grading permits, a Cultural Resources/ Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan CR/TCR-MMP shall be prepared by the Project archaeologist and submitted to the City for dissemination to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Provide evidence to the City that a qualified archeologist(s) monitor has been retained, and that the		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
– Kizh Nation (Kizh), Pechanga Band of Indians (Pechanga), and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians (Soboba). All parties shall review and be provided with an opportunity to comment upon, the plan in a reasonable time period as determined by the City prior to permitting for the Project. If consensus among the Project archeologist, the City and Tribe(s) about monitoring and treatment methods cannot be reached, the City shall make the determination in its best judgement regarding the appropriate measures for inclusion in the CR/TCR-MMP considering input and recommendations from archaeologist and the consulting Tribes. Any non-responsive party shall be assumed to have agreed to the plans without comment. Any and all findings of discovered resources will be subject to the protocol detailed within the CR/TCR-MMP. This CR/TCR-MMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions: 1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification in the form of a letter from the project archaeologist to the City stating that a certified archaeologist has been retained to implement the CR/TCR-MMP. 2) The project applicant shall provide Native American monitoring from the consulting Tribes on a		construction operations.		monitor will be present during all grading and other significant ground-disturbing. Provide the City a copy of the executed tribal agreement between the applicant and Native American tribe(s) who consulted on the project. A report of findings shall be submitted to the City 30 days of the end of monitoring activities.		

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
rotating basis during all grading and ground disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall work in concert with the archaeological monitor to observe ground disturbances to fulfill the provisions of the CR/TCR-MMP. 3) The certified archaeologist and the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the CR/TCR-MM. 4) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources tribal cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the City at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the tribal monitor(s) and City, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The City must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, the CR/TCR-MMP shall address culturally appropriate methods and treatment, including additional steps to mitigate impacts as determined by the City.						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
5) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, any cultural resources or tribal cultural resources that cannot be avoided and preserved in place shall be addressed though the methods and processes identified in the CR/TCR-MMP. The project archaeologist in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s) shall identify the methods for data recovery in the CR/TCR-MMP. 6) All cultural material collected shall be subject to the culturally appropriate treatment and mitigation standards outlined in the TCR-CRMP, which may include reburial on-site in an area that will be protected in perpetuity or relinquishment to the culturally affiliated consulting tribal government for culturally appropriate treatment. 7) A Phase 4 report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed, in consultation with the consulting tribal monitor(s), and submitted to the satisfaction of the City prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include DPR Primary and Archaeological Site Forms. 8) Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCR and) shall be						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
curated at an institution meeting the State and federal standards for curation.						
CUL-2: Human Remains - If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within the period specified by law (24 hours). Subsequently, the NAHC shall identify the Most Likely Descendant." The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	On-site inspection.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order
GEOLOGY AND SOILS						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
PAL-1: 1) Monitoring of mass grading and excavation activities in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources by a qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor. Full time monitoring of grading or excavation activities should be performed starting from the surface in undisturbed areas of very old Quaternary (middle to early Pleistocene) alluvial fan deposits, and the Tertiary-aged Sespe, Vaqueros, Santiago, and Silverado formations within the project. Paleontological monitors will be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow for the removal of abundant or large specimens in a timely manner. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are not present in the subsurface, or if present, are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontological personnel to have a low potential to contain or yield fossil resources. 2) Paleontological salvage during trenching and boring activities is typically from the generated spoils and does not delay the trenching or drilling activities. Fossils are collected and placed in cardboard flats or plastic buckets and identified by field number, collector, and date	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Grading and during grading and construction operations.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	Provide the City proof of documentation that a qualified paleontological monitor(s) has been retained, and that the monitor will be present during all grading. If paleontological resources are found during grading and construction, a final monitoring and mitigation report shall be submitted to the City.		Withhold Grading Permit and/or Issuance of a Stop Work Order

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
collected. Notes are taken on the map location and stratigraphy of the site, and the site is photographed before it is vacated and the fossils are removed to a safe place. On mass grading projects, any discovered fossil site is protected by red flagging to prevent it from being overrun by earthmovers (scrapers) before salvage begins. Fossils are collected in a similar manner, with notes and photographs being taken before removing the fossils. Precise location of the site is determined with the use of handheld Global Positioning System units. If the site involves a large terrestrial vertebrate, such as large bone(s) or a mammoth tusk, that is/are too large to be easily removed by a single monitor, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (BFSA) will send a fossil recovery crew in to excavate around the find, encase the find within a plaster jacket, and remove it after the plaster is set. For large fossils, use of the contractor's construction equipment is solicited to help remove the jacket to a safe location before it is returned to the BFSA laboratory facility for preparation. 3) Particularly small invertebrate fossils typically represent multiple specimens of a limited number of organisms, and a scientifically suitable sample can be obtained from one to several five-gallon buckets of fossiliferous sediment. If it is possible to dry screen the sediment in the field, a concentrated sample may consist						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
of one or two buckets of material. For vertebrate fossils, the test is usually the observed presence of small pieces of bones within the sediments. If present, as many as 20 to 40 five-gallon buckets of sediment can be collected and returned to a separate facility to wet-screen the sediment. In the laboratory, individual fossils are cleaned of extraneous matrix, any breaks are repaired, and the specimen, if needed, is stabilized by soaking in an archivally approved acrylic hardener (e.g., a solution of acetone and Paraloid B-72). 4) Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including screen washing sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates, if necessary. Preparation of individual vertebrate fossils is often more time-consuming than for accumulations of invertebrate fossils. 5) Identification and curation of specimens into a professional, accredited public museum repository with a commitment to archival conservation and permanent retrievable storage (e.g., the Western Science Center, 2345 Searl Parkway, Hemet, California 92543). The paleontological program should include a written repository agreement prior to the initiation of mitigation activities.						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
6) Preparation of a final monitoring and mitigation report of findings and significance, including lists of all fossils recovered and necessary maps and graphics to accurately record their original location. The report, when submitted to the appropriate lead agency (City of Corona), will signify satisfactory completion of the project program to mitigate impacts to any paleontological resources. 7) Decisions regarding the intensity of the CRMMRP will be made by the project paleontologist based upon the significance of the potential paleontological resources and their biostratigraphic, biochronologic, paleoecologic, taphonomic, and taxonomic attributes, not upon the ability of a project proponent to fund the CRMMRP.						
GREENHOUSE GASES AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE						
GHG-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit for each increment of development in the GRRSP, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Corona Building Division demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to a building permit application include the measures from the CAP GHG Emissions Screening Tables (Appendix C to the	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
CAP), as needed to achieve a minimum of 100 points for both the residential and non-residential portions of the Project. Alternatively, specific measures may be substituted for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction, subject to City of Corona Building Division review.						
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						
HAZ-1: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for each phase of development requiring demolition and removal of onsite structures, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Corona Building Division demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to a demolition permit application include survey testing for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints (LBP) in accordance with existing federal and state regulations.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building Division	Prior to Demolition	Prior to issuance of demolition permits	Review of demolition plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Demolition Permits
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
4.11.1A: The project applicant shall obtain all required permits and clearances from the Corps, the RWQCB, and the CDFG prior to the disturbance of any existing drainage.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department,	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading Permits	Submittal of copy of Notice of Intent (NOI) to City filed with the RWQCB, and evidence of		Withhold Grading Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
	Development Services Division			compliance with applicable Corps and CDFW permits.		
4.11.1B: Drainage facilities within engineered slopes/fills shall be designed and installed in accordance with the City of Corona standards.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits
4.11.2A: All proposed storm drain facilities and equipment shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to convey peak flows estimated for the project. Drainage plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits
4.11.2B: On-site detention basins shall be constructed to accommodate storm flows from the project site. Such facilities shall be designed, installed and maintained in a manner to reduce on-site runoff to a level that can be accommodated by the existing culverts beneath Green River Road. All required drainage structures shall be designed, installed, and maintained in accordance with applicable City of Corona standards.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.11.3A: The construction and/or grading contractor shall establish and implement a construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and postconstruction Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) in accordance with NPDES permit issued by the Santa Ana RWQCB.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Precise Grading Permit
4.11.3B: In accordance with issuance of a NPDES permit, the construction and/or grading contractor shall establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMP) at time of project implementation. Construction erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. BMPs to minimize erosion and/or sedimentation impacts shall include (but not be limited to) the following: • Collection of runoff entering developing areas into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages. • Capture of runoff above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas and conveyance to nearby drainages. • Conveyance of runoff generated on paved or covered areas via drains and swales to natural drainage courses.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Precise Grading Permit

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
• Revegetation of disturbed areas and vegetation of non-disturbed but highly erosive areas. • Use of drought tolerant plants and irrigation systems which minimize runoff. • Use of other erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, concrete lining, small check dams, etc. to reduce erosion in gullies and active stream channels. • During the time that on-site soils are exposed, the soil surface shall be approximately 2 feet below the surrounding grade. Any storm water falling on exposed soils will infiltrate on site. • To the maximum extent possible, on-site vegetation shall be maintained. • Limit grading disturbance to essential project area. • Limit grading activities during the rainy season. • Balance and limit, to the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill. • Water entering and exiting the site shall be diverted through the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices. • Water shall be sprayed on disturbed areas to limit dust generation. • The construction entrance shall be stabilized to reduce tracking onto adjacent streets.						

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
• Dikes, drains, swales or other features shall be used to divert and/or redirect runoff.						
4.11.3C: Manufactured slopes shall be stabilized. Where appropriate, retaining wall designs shall include waterproofing and weep holes, subdrains or backdrains for relieving possible hydrostatic pressures.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Building and Development Services Divisions	Prior to grading and construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading and Building Permits	Review of grading and building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building and Grading Permits
4.11.3D: Manufactured slopes shall be revegetated to help ensure stability. Revegetation plans shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. Plant selection shall comply with the Plant Palette contained in Section 4.3.6 of the Green River Ranch Specific Plan.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Divisions	Prior to construction.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading and Landscape Permits	Review of grading and landscape plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Precise Grading and Landscape Permit
4.11.4A: Development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with applicable provisions of the NPDES permit and the applicable standards and regulations of responsible agencies.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
4.11.4B: Precast "stormceptors" shall be installed in parking areas and/or in areas where fuels, oils, solvents or other pollutants may enter the stormwater stream (i.e., gas stations, loading areas). Such devices shall be adequately maintained (including the cleaning/replacing of absorbent fiberglass "pillows" and periodic removal of accumulated sand and silt).	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits
HYD-1: Erosion of existing natural downstream canyons and hillsides will be mitigated by properly designed grading, detention basins, energy dissipators and erosion protection rip-rap pads at the outlet of storm drain system.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Development Services Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Review of grading plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Grading Permits
TRANSPORTATION						
4.17.1: Prior to the issuance of building permits for the BPI Development in PA 1, 2 and 3 and the Estate Residential uses in PA 5, separate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans shall be prepared to reduce project VMT. Applicable trip reduction strategies may include but are not limited to the following: • Implement voluntary local hiring programs.	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to Construction (once)	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Review of building plans and on-site inspection		Withhold Building Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
• Mark preferred parking spaces for vanpools and carpools. • Provide on-site secured bike parking facilities. • Provide information on carpooling and vanpooling opportunities to employees. • Provide an on-site message board in each building or other comparable system to encourage and provide information about public transit, carpooling, and vanpooling, and carpool and vanpool ride-matching services. The TDM Plan shall include an estimate of the vehicle trip reduction anticipated for each strategy proposed based on published research such as California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), *Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity* (December 2021) (CAPCOA Handbook).						
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES						
TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities A. The Project applicant shall retain, via a monitoring agreement, a Native American Monitor(s) authorized to represent Kizh Nation, Pechanga, and Soboba on a	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading Permits	Submit to the City a copy of an executed tribal monitoring agreement between the project applicant		Withhold Precise Grading Permit

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
rotating basis for all "ground-disturbing activities" in native soil and previously unexamined fill soils that occur within the proposed project area. The monitor(s) shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, all grading activities, archaeological investigations, demolition, pavement removal, subsurface testing of any kind, weed abatement, potholing, auguring, clearing, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. B. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity. C. The monitor(s) will complete daily monitoring activity logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural and Tribal Cultural Resource materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe(s).				and Native American Monitor(s).		

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
Tribal monitoring activity logs will be provided to the City and Applicant with any confidential information, as provided by law, not being subject to a Public Records Act Request. D. On-site tribal monitoring for site preparation activities and for construction within each Planning Area shall conclude upon the sooner of (1) when the consulting Tribe(s)' monitor(s) confirms through a written confirmation that all grading and ground-disturbing activities are no longer within archaeological and cultural resources soils or (2) a determination by the City and written notification to the Tribal monitor(s) that soil-disturbing construction activities have concluded at the site.						
TCR-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains A. If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)	City of Corona, Planning and Development Department, Planning Division	Prior to grading for any development.	Prior to the Issuance of Grading Permits	On-site inspection and submittal of a report prepared by the project archaeologist documenting the unanticipated discovery of human remains, mitigation measures (if any) and final treatment and		Withhold Occupancy Permits

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
shall be contacted within the period specified by law (24 hours). Subsequently, the NAHC shall identify the Most Likely Descendant ("MLD"). The MLD shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. B. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute, unless there are multiple Ancestral remains comprising a burial site, which may also be a Tribal Cultural Resource. In the event that funerary objects are located , additional treatment measures will be imposed and implemented pursuant to the provisions of a Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and after seeking recommendations from the MLD and the culturally affiliated consulting tribe(s). C. Construction activities may resume in other parts of the project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or burial goods, if the City, after consulting with the project archaeologist and after seeking recommendations from the named MLD and consulting Tribe(s), determines that resuming				disposition of the remains.		

Project File Name: GRRSP Amendment & BPI Development **Date: January 2025**

Mitigation Measure No. / Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Monitoring Frequency	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/ Initials	Sanctions for Non-Compliance
construction activities at that distance is acceptable. D. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. If multiple Native American human remains are uncovered, additional treatment and measures will be required for the site as agreed upon by the project archeologist and the City, after seeking recommendations from the MLD and consulting Tribe(s). E. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.						