

**SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM PROJECT:  
ALCOA EMBANKMENT - PHASE II**

**County of Riverside, California**

**DRAFT  
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ADDENDUM**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**Los Angeles District**

**December 2020**

This page is intentionally left blank.

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Project Location .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Project Authority .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Previously prepared documents .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Objectives, Purpose and Need .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Comparison of Previously Approved Design and Proposed Action .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Alternatives Evaluated and Eliminated .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Project Alternatives (Alternatives Considered for Environmental Analysis).....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.4.1	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	12
2.4.2	Proposed Action .....	12
2.4.3	Staging Areas, Haul Routes, and Construction Activities .....	17
2.4.4	Utilities .....	18
2.4.5	Future Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation.....	21
<b>3</b>	<b>AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Air Quality .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Biological Resources .....</b>	<b>23</b>
3.2.1	General Setting .....	24
3.2.2	Vegetation .....	24
3.2.3	Special-Status Plant Species .....	25
3.2.4	Jurisdictional Habitats .....	28
3.2.5	Wildlife .....	28
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Water Resources and Hydrology.....</b>	<b>36</b>
3.3.1	General Setting .....	36
3.3.2	Temescal Wash and Santa Ana River.....	36
3.3.3	Groundwater .....	38
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Earth Resources .....</b>	<b>38</b>
3.4.1	Geology and Soils .....	39
3.4.2	Seismicity and Faulting .....	39
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Land Use.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Aesthetics.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Recreation .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Noise .....</b>	<b>42</b>
3.8.1	Noise Environment in the Proposed Project Area .....	43
3.8.2	Sensitive Receptors in the Proposed Project Area .....	43
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Socioeconomics .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Transportation.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Safety and hazards.....</b>	<b>46</b>

<b>3.12</b>	<b>Cultural Resources .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Public Services and Utilities.....</b>	<b>47</b>
3.13.1	Public Services.....	49
3.13.2	Utilities and Service Systems.....	49
<b>3.14</b>	<b>CERCLA Hazardous Substances and Other Pollutants.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Air Quality .....</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1.1	Proposed Action .....	52
4.1.2	Previously Approved Design.....	57
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Biological Resources .....</b>	<b>57</b>
4.2.1	Proposed Action .....	58
4.2.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	70
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Water Resources and Hydrology.....</b>	<b>70</b>
4.3.1	Proposed Action .....	71
4.3.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative.....	73
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Earth Resources .....</b>	<b>73</b>
4.4.1	Proposed Action .....	73
4.4.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	75
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Land Use.....</b>	<b>75</b>
4.5.1	Proposed Action .....	75
4.5.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	76
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Aesthetics.....</b>	<b>76</b>
4.6.1	Proposed Action .....	77
4.6.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative.....	78
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Recreation .....</b>	<b>78</b>
4.7.1	Proposed Action .....	79
4.7.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	79
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Noise .....</b>	<b>79</b>
4.8.1	Proposed Action .....	81
	Construction .....	81
	Future Maintenance .....	82
4.8.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	82
	Construction .....	82
<b>4.9</b>	<b>Socioeconomics .....</b>	<b>83</b>
4.9.1	Proposed Action .....	83
4.9.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	83
<b>4.10</b>	<b>Transportation.....</b>	<b>84</b>
4.10.1	Proposed Action .....	84
	Traffic Increase.....	85
	As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the following traffic guidelines would apply: .....	85
	Roadway Hazards.....	85
4.10.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative.....	86
	Traffic Increase.....	86
	Roadway Hazards.....	86

<b>4.11</b>	<b>Safety and hazards.....</b>	<b>86</b>
4.11.1	Proposed Action.....	87
4.11.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	87
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Cultural Resources .....</b>	<b>88</b>
4.12.1	Action.....	88
4.12.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative.....	89
<b>4.13</b>	<b>Public Services and Utilities.....</b>	<b>90</b>
4.13.1	Proposed Action.....	90
4.13.2	Previously Approved Design Alternative .....	92
<b>5</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Analysis of Cumulative Impacts .....</b>	<b>94</b>
5.2.1	Air Quality.....	94
5.2.2	Biological Resources .....	95
5.2.3	5.2.3 Water Resources and Hydrology .....	95
5.2.4	5.2.4 Earth Resources .....	95
5.2.5	5.2.5 Land Use .....	95
5.2.6	5.2.6 Aesthetics .....	96
5.2.7	5.2.7 Recreation .....	96
5.2.8	Noise.....	96
5.2.9	Socioeconomics .....	97
5.2.10	Transportation .....	97
5.2.11	Safety and Hazards.....	97
5.2.12	Cultural Resources .....	97
5.2.13	Public Services and Utilities .....	98
<b>6</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Environmental Commitments.....</b>	<b>99</b>
6.1.1	Air Quality.....	99
6.1.2	Biological Resources.....	101
6.1.3	Water Resources and Hydrology.....	103
6.1.4	Land Use .....	104
6.1.5	Noise.....	104
6.1.6	Cultural Resources.....	105
<b>7</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Relevant Federal, State, and Local Statutes, Laws, and Guidelines.....</b>	<b>106</b>
7.1.1	Federal Laws and Regulations .....	106
<b>7.2</b>	<b>State Regulations.....</b>	<b>109</b>
7.2.1	Air Quality.....	109
7.2.2	Biological Resources .....	109
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Local Regulations .....</b>	<b>110</b>
7.3.1	Air Quality.....	110

7.3.2	Biological Resources .....	111
7.3.3	Noise.....	114
<b>8</b>	<b>AGENCY COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS .....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>118</b>

#### LIST OF FIGURES

<b><u>Figures</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Figure 1-1 Project Location .....	4
Figure 2-1 Existing and Proposed Perimeter Dikes in Project Vicinity.....	8
Figure 3-1 Flood Risk Management Areas due to Proposed Project .....	10
Figure 4-2 Project Site Plan .....	15
Figure 5-2 Phase II Alcoa Dike Project Design .....	16
Figure 6-3 Phase I vs. Phase II Project Footprint.....	26
Figure 7-3 Phase I vs. Phase II Vegetation Communities.....	27
Figure 8-3 Jurisdictional Waters and Wetland within the Proposed Project Area.....	29
Figure 9-3 Least Bell’s Vireo and Critical Habitat Occurrence.....	34
Figure 10-3 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Occurrence .....	35
Figure 11-4 Change in Permanent and Temporary Impact Areas (P1 vs. P2) .....	60
Figure 12-4 Change in Vegetation Community Impact Areas (P1 vs. P2) .....	61

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Differences between Previously Approved Dike Design and the Dike Design if Proposed Action is adopted .....	11
Table 2-2 Differences between Preferred SCE Replacement and Alternative SCE Replacement .....	20
Table 3-1 Recreation Facilities and Amenities in Project Vicinity .....	42
Table 3-2 Demographic Data for the City of Corona .....	43
Table 3-3 Annual Average Daily Traffic on Selected Roadways in the Proposed Project Area .....	45
Table 3-4 .....	47
Table 3-5 Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction .....	49
Table 4-1 .....	53
Table 4-2 .....	54
Table 4-3 .....	55
Table 4-4 .....	56
Table 4-5 Incremental Impacted Cover Types Phase II Expanded Footprint .....	58
Table 4-6 Change in Permanent/Temporary Impact Areas (PI vs. PII) .....	59
Table 4-7 Changes in Impacts to Riparian Vegetation .....	63
Table 4-8 Additional Mitigation Acreages (PI vs. PII) .....	63
Table 4-9 Impacts to Jurisdictional Wetlands/Waters in Phase II Expanded Footprint .....	65
Table 4-10 Change in Impacts to Jurisdictional Wetlands/Waters (PI vs. PII) .....	66
Table 4-11 Typical Noise Levels for Construction Equipment .....	82
Table 5-1 Cumulative Projects in the Phase II Proposed Project Activity Area .....	93
Table 6-1 Original Mitigation Commitment from 1988 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and 2018 Final Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum .....	101

This page is intentionally left blank.



## **1 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report Addendum (Draft SEA/EIR Addendum) for the Alcoa Dike Phase II portion of the Prado Separable Element of the Santa Ana River Mainstem Flood Control Project (SARMP), has been prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) as a supplement to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and EIR for Prado Basin and Vicinity, dated November 2001. This SEA/EIR Addendum also supplements the August 2018 Alcoa Dike Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The Phase I document addressed the initial clearing and construction of the project area associated with Alcoa Dike, for which Phase I of construction was initiated in 2019. A contract for Phase II construction is anticipated to be awarded in 2021. This Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum includes more detail about associated road and utility modifications, addresses minor design modifications to the dike structure, and addresses inclusion of a segment of a regional bike trail and equestrian trail as a project betterment to satisfy requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The purpose of the SARMP is to reduce the risk of flooding to areas within the counties of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange, currently susceptible to flooding. The Corps is the lead agency for compliance with NEPA, and the OCFCD, the non-federal sponsor for the Prado Dam separable element, is the lead agency for compliance with CEQA. The OCFCD will be responsible for operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of the dike. Other agencies (i.e., cooperating, responsible, and trustee agencies) that may use this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum in the decision making or permit process will consider the information in this document along with other information that may be presented during the NEPA/CEQA process. Other responsible and trustee agencies were identified in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, and are listed again as follows:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (previously California Department of Fish and Game)
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- City of Corona, and
- Orange County Water District.

This Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum is necessary to document and evaluate the impacts of design refinements on environmental resources, and to document any changed conditions in the project area compared to the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Since the 2018 SEA, the following has been constructed or addressed by others and is not proposed to be changed: specifying thickness and placement method for the outer rip rap layer, an increase in the length and height of the dike, addition of two maintenance access roads, addition of two drainage structures extending through the main dike embankment, addition of two culverts extending through roadway embankments, three new ponding areas, addition of a single swing floodgate at Auburndale Street instead of a road relocation, realignment of the downstream end of the dike

westerly on Butterfield Drive, realignment of the upstream end of the dike to extend easterly along Rincon Street between Auburndale Street and Lincoln Avenue, raising of Rincon Street to match the elevation of the proposed dike, and road modification of Rincon Street to meet current design standards and realignment and reconstruct of Butterfield Drive. Phase II construction will complete the portion of the dike not constructed in Phase I, generally in the vicinity of road crossings including the south Lincoln tie-in near Butterfield Drive and the portions of the dike crossing Rincon Street and Auburndale Street.

Proposed design refinements and related actions for work not undertaken as part of or associated with Phase I construction include:

- An increase in the length of the dike alignment at the Lincoln Avenue tie-in adjacent to Temescal Wash and a drainage swale to Temescal Wash adjacent to and west of Lincoln Avenue to provide interior drainage behind the Dike. The Lincoln tie in was moved closer to Temescal Wash to avoid the sewer line within the Lincoln roadway embankment.
- Construction of two 36-inch drainage structure extending through the main dike embankment;
- An increase in the length of the dike alignment at the Lincoln Avenue tie-in adjacent to Temescal Wash
- Construction of one culvert with four concrete boxes extending through the Rincon Street roadway embankment;
- Redesign of the concrete v-ditch to an earthen contoured drainage ditch that conveys surface drainage to Temescal Wash;
- Construction of a fourth pond or detention basins with a total storage volume of 82 acre-feet for interior drainage behind the dike;
- A new borrow site and haul route were established for Phase II construction activities; and
- Butterfield Drive connector realignment to connect to Rincon Street on the reservoir side of the dike.

Phase II is also proposed to include the following roadway modifications for Lands, Easements, Rights-of-Way (LER) obligations:

- The Rincon roadway embankment would be raised to cross over the Alcoa Dike;
- A portion of Auburndale Street would be restored with slight grading improvements so water will drain away from where the gate crosses the road. The finished ground next to Auburndale Street would be hydroseeded.

Furthermore, other activities would be accommodated within and adjacent to the proposed new alignments of Rincon Road and Butterfield Drive.

- A segment of the proposed Santa Ana River Trail (SART) would be accommodated within and adjacent to the proposed new alignments of Rincon Road and Butterfield Drive. The Corps. authorization for right-of-way would be required for the construction, operations, and maintenance of the SART. This Phase II action covers the extension through the mitigation site along Butterfield Drive up to Temescal Wash.

The bike path segment (varying 14 to 16-foot-wide multi-use path) would be immediately adjacent to the road, while an equestrian trail would be offset but roughly parallel to that same alignment (10-foot-wide decomposed granite (DG) trail).

- The replacement of Southern California Edison transmission, distribution, and telecom poles/circuits by the owner.
- Real estate acquisition, specifically for the south tie-in area, and utility removal/replacement and protection;
- The temporary replacement and protection of a segment of the Inland Empire Brine Line by the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, to enable the Brine Line to withstand the additional load where it crosses under project features. The Corps. authorization for right-of-way would be required

## **1.2 Project Location**

The Alcoa Dike project area is located in the city of Corona, Riverside County (Figure 1-1, Project Location), adjacent to Temescal Creek. Phase I and Phase II features occur along the southeastern perimeter of Prado Basin (Figure 1-2). Alcoa Dike is one of several perimeter dikes or embankments that are being constructed around the Prado Basin as part of SARMP (Figure 1-3), as documented in the 2001 SEIS/EIR. The Alcoa Dike project is located south of the Corona National Housing Tract dike, east of the Corona Sewage Treatment Plant dike, and would cross over Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, and Auburndale Street. The feature was originally named for the Alcoa aluminum plant that at one time was located in this area of the basin. While that plant no longer exists in this location, the flood risk reduction that would be provided by this feature is still needed for other developments and private property in the area.




Figure 1-1 Project Location

### **1.3 Project Authority**

The SARMP is located along a 75-mile reach of the Santa Ana River in Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, California. The SARMP is a comprehensive flood risk management system that was authorized for construction by Section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986.

The recommended plan for the SARMP is contained in the Phase I General Design Memorandum (GDM) for the SARMP (Corps 1980) and included eight elements, which were subsequently reevaluated in the Phase II GDM (Corps 1988). The Phase II GDM modified the SARMP by redefining the authorized SARMP features and clarifying that the Standard Project Flood term referred in most cases to the 190-year flood event. Construction of the SARMP commenced in fiscal year 1989.

In 2001, the Corps prepared an SEIS/EIR that addressed additional and modified features or elements in the vicinity of Prado Dam. The Corps also prepared a Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) entitled Prado Dam Separable Element, Prado Basin & Vicinity, including Stabilization of Bluff Toe at Norco Bluffs Santa Ana River Basin, California, dated September 2001. This report was prepared pursuant to Section 309(a) of WRDA of 1996, which required the Corps to “review” the Prado Dam feature, a component feature of the SARMP. The LRR was approved by the Director of Civil Works on August 16, 2002. The LRR recognized, consistent with the Phase I GDM and Phase II GDM, that the purpose of the proposed Prado Dam improvements was to increase the reservoir storage capacity from 217,000 acre-feet to 362,000 acre-feet and to be able to release 30,000 cfs flows from Prado Dam into the downstream channels. In accordance with the determination in the LRR to construct Prado Dam as a separable element, the Prado Dam component was removed from the definition of the project in the Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) by a second modification to the LCA dated February 24, 2003. A Project Cooperation Agreement for the Prado Dam feature as a separable element was signed on February 11, 2003, with OCFCD as the non-Federal sponsor.

The specific feature of the Prado Basin and Vicinity addressed by this SEA/EIR Addendum is the Phase II Alcoa Dike project.

### **1.4 Previously prepared documents**

Below is a list of the relevant environmental documents that have been completed for the

SARMP. Throughout the analysis of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum, the following documents may be referenced:

- Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum for the Phase I Alcoa Dike portion of the Santa Ana River Mainstem Flood Control Project (SARMP), 2018.

- Formal Section 7 Consultation, Biological Opinion on the Santa Ana River Mainstem Flood Control Project at the Alcoa Dike, Corona Riverside California, FWS-WRIV-08B0408-18F1350, dated August 23, 2018.
- SEA/EIR Addendum, Santa Ana River Mainstem, Prado Dam Basin, Auxiliary Embankment and Floodwall Phase 2, Santa Ana River Flood Control Project, Riverside County, California, 2017.
- California Institution for Women's Dike SEA/EIR Addendum to EIS/EIR No 583, 2013.
- Prado Basin and Vicinity, Including Reach 9 and Stabilization of the Bluff Toe at Norco Bluffs SEIS/EIR, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 2001.
- Reinitiation of Formal Section 7 Consultation on the Prado Mainstem and Santa Ana River Reach 9 Flood Control Projects and Norco Bluffs Stabilization Project, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, 2012 BO Amendment (FWS-SB/WRIV/OR-08B0408-11F0551). The Service has issued a series of biological opinions (i.e., Service 1980, 1989, 2001, 2004, 2005, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2017) addressing the effects of constructing, operating, and maintaining the SARP on federally listed species and their designated critical habitat. The Alcoa Dike feature was originally evaluated in two amendments of the original SARP biological opinion dated June 22, 1989 (1-6-88-F-6) and December 5, 2001 (FWS-SB-909.6).
- Santa Ana River Mainstem including Santiago Creek. Phase II General Design Memorandum and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (GDM/SEIS), United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 1988.
- Upstream Dam Alternatives Supplemental EIR, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 1985.
- Phase I General Design Memorandum and Supplemental EIR, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 1980.
- Survey Report and EIR, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 1975.








Figure 2-1 Existing and Proposed Perimeter Dikes in Project Vicinity



## **2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

### **2.1 Objectives, Purpose and Need**

The federal objective of water and related land resources project planning is to contribute to national economic development (NED). Such contributions are considered increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services expressed in monetary units. These contributions are to be consistent with the protection of the nation's environment, pursuant to applicable executive orders and other federal planning programs, including the consideration of state and local concerns. The NED objective of the approved Santa Ana River Mainstem Flood Control Project (SARMP) is to provide flood risk management for portions of Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, while maximizing contributions to NED.

The Alcoa Dike feature is part of the Prado Dam separable element of the SARMP. The feature was analyzed in the 1988 Phase II GDM/SEIS and the design was further revised in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Alcoa Dike Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. During completion of the feature's Plans and Specifications, the design of the Phase II Alcoa Dike embankment (Proposed Action or proposed project) was further refined. The main objective of the Proposed Action would be the same as the originally approved Alcoa Dike embankment, which is to reduce the flood risk and thereby protect the lives and properties of public and privately owned development in the project area.

#### **Statement of Need**

Due to the planned increase in height of Prado Dam to provide additional flood risk reduction to the surrounding communities, all properties located between elevation 556 feet and elevation 566 feet behind the Dam would be within the expanded flood pool of the Basin, subject to inundation (Figure 2-1). Inundation of the basin area requires land acquisition and utility/facility replacements in the absence of a structural feature to prevent inundation of the area. In the subject area, heavily used roadways such as Rincon Road and Auburndale would be subject to removal or replacement in the absence of a structural feature.

This document addresses design refinements and other changes made to the temporary and permanent construction footprint since the 2001 SEIS/EIR. Modification to the design was deemed necessary to avoid environmental, cost, and timing consequences associated with inundation and temporarily diverting flows and construction of the embankment and raised spillway.

#### **Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide protection from predicted future inundation associated with the planned increased height of the Prado Dam spillway that would otherwise extend up to the 566-foot pool elevation in the project area.




Figure 3-1 Flood Risk Management Areas due to Proposed Project

## 2.2 Comparison of Previously Approved Design and Proposed Action

A comparison of the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action is shown below in Table 2.2-1.

**Table 2-1 Differences between Previously Approved Dike Design and the Dike Design if Proposed Action is adopted**

Previously Approved Design (dismissed)	Proposed Action-Adopted 2018 Final SEA/EIR	Phase II Proposed Action
Approximately 5,550 feet of bank protection. (project feature).	Approximately 7,530 feet of bank protection; minor design changes to embankment include height increase of 1.5 feet to 3 feet (project feature).	Approximately 3000 feet of bank protection is being constructed during phase II (project feature).
A ponding area for interior drainage behind the dike located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Rincon Street and Auburndale Street (project feature).	Three additional ponding areas or detention basins (total of four) with a total storage volume of 82 acre-feet for interior drainage behind the dike (project feature).	The addition of one pond or detention basins with a total storage volume of 82 acre-feet for interior drainage behind the dike (project feature).
--	Two 36-inch drainage structures extending through the main dike embankment, two other culverts extending through roadway embankments, a concrete v-ditch and 36 inch drainage pipe to Temescal Creek, a drainage channel from the main dike to Temescal Wash adjacent to and east of Auburndale Street, and a drainage channel from the main dike to Temescal Wash adjacent to and west of Lincoln Street (project feature).	Two 36-inch drainage structures through the dike embankment, one culvert with 4 reinforced concrete boxes extending through the Rincon roadway embankments between Pond I and II, and an earthen drainage swale from Pond IA to Pond I (project feature).
--	Two 20-foot maintenance access roads - one on each side of the toe of the embankment (project feature).	Two 7,730-foot long and approximately 20-foot wide maintenance access roads - one on each side of the toe of the embankment (project feature).
Raising of Auburndale Road (sponsor road relocation) to match the top elevation of proposed dike.	Horizontal swing floodgate at Auburndale Road and reinforced concrete floodwall on each side of the floodgate (project feature).	Horizontal swing floodgate at Auburndale Street and reinforced concrete floodwall on each side of the floodgate (project feature).
--		Extending the alignment of the dike to tie into Lincoln Avenue closer to Temescal Wash (project feature).
--	Raising of Rincon Street to match the elevation of the proposed dike, and road modification to Rincon Street to meet current design standards. (sponsor road relocation)	Raising of Rincon Street to match the elevation of the proposed dike, and road modification to Rincon Street to meet current design standards. (sponsor road relocation).
--	Road realignment of Butterfield Drive (City of Corona paid element – not a project feature or project-required relocation).	Road realignment of Butterfield Drive (City of Corona paid element).
		SAWPA utility Brine Line protect in-place, outgrant from the Corps.
		SART located within the existing footprint of the Phase II Alcoa Dike, outgrant from the Corps. (betterment)
		The replacement of Southern California Edison transmission, distribution, and telecom poles/circuits at owner cost, new outgrant from Corps.

## **2.3 Alternatives Evaluated and Eliminated**

### **No Construction Alternative**

The Alcoa Dike embankment as originally designed was approved for construction in the record of decision for the 2001 SEIS/EIR and 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum, and continues to be a required project feature to allow for operation of Prado Dam subsequent to raising of the dam height. Thus, not constructing this flood control improvement feature would not meet the project purpose and need. Therefore, the No Construction alternative has been removed from consideration and thus is not carried forward for further analysis.

## **2.4 Project Alternatives (Alternatives Considered for Environmental Analysis)**

Two alternatives have been carried forward for this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum. Also refer to 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum for detailed analysis. These alternatives are:

- Previously Approved Design Alternative, i.e. the No Action Alternative.
- Proposed Action

### **2.4.1 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

The Previously Approved Design Alternative is defined as constructing the Alcoa Dike embankment according to the plan presented by the Corps and the 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The proposed dike would reduce flood risk to the infrastructure, and private and public developments located just outside of the existing rights-of-way in the southeastern part of the Prado reservoir. The entire parcel (plus other privately owned development) is located within the proposed expanded Prado Basin reservoir inundation limit at elevation 566 foot. Studies indicate that it would be more economical to construct a dike between the reservoir and these properties than to acquire these properties for flood control purposes.

Operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRRR) actions under this Previously Approved Design Alternative will continue to be the same as identified in the 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum, Proposed Action Alternative, sub-section 2.5. With the exception of additional permitted removals/replacements for SART, roads, or utilities in the project footprint are the owner's responsibility to maintain.

### **2.4.2 Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative and associated local sponsor real estate actions including road and utility modifications, except for the changes identified in Table 2.2-1 above. This Phase II Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum addresses design modifications for construction, including adjustments to roadway and utility replacements. The Phase II Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR also evaluates outgrants and outgrant modifications for other utilities, roadways, and the Santa Ana River Trail (SART).

Similar to the previously approved design alternative, the Alcoa Dike Phase II Proposed Action would be located on federal land within the City of Corona in Riverside County and would be adjacent to the existing Smith Avenue and Rincon Street. The alignment of the proposed dike was adjusted to minimize impacts on existing facilities such as streets, utilities, percolation

ponds, and other industrial and commercial development. Despite the adjustments, the proposed dike would also have to cross over Rincon Street, Butterfield Drive and Auburndale Street. Both the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum and this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum design included modifications to incorporate a floodgate at Auburndale Street that would eliminate the need to reconstruct Auburndale Street, but Rincon Street would be modified to cross the dike at grade. The reservoir side of the slopes would be protected with 15 inches of stone over 12 inches of bedding. For Phase II of the Alcoa Dike Project, the alignment further extends in the northerly direction, across Butterfield Drive, approximately 1,800 feet on to Corps owned property until it crosses Rincon Street. The alignment continues in the easterly direction parallel to Temescal Wash for approximately 2,200 feet on land owned in fee by the City of Corona. (Figure 2-2). The City of Corona will maintain the Butterfield Drive connector.

Under the Proposed Action, Phase II construction consists of three 36-inch drainage structures extending through the main dike embankment (Figure 2-3); one culvert with 4 reinforced concrete boxes extending through the roadway embankments between Pond I and II; a drainage swale to Temescal Wash adjacent to and east of Auburndale Street; extension of the dike alignment to tie into Lincoln Avenue close to Temescal Wash, and a drainage swale to Temescal Wash adjacent to and west of Lincoln Avenue to provide interior drainage behind the Alcoa Dike. A single swing floodgate would be installed on Auburndale Street. Temporary detours would be provided as necessary during construction.

The same equipment as used for Phase I construction would be used assuming sequential construction (2018 Alcoa Dike Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum). Construction vehicles would access the site from Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, Smith Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue. Two approximate 20-foot wide maintenance access roads would be located along each side of the toe of the embankment. The staging area would be minimized to 2.045 acres during Phase II construction.

To provide for local drainage, Phase II would include the addition of one 36-inch drainage structure, for a total of three that would extend through the main dike embankment. Reinforced concrete boxes and an earthen drainage swale are proposed under the Rincon Street roadway embankment to replace the existing concrete v-ditch and a 36-inch drainage pipe. The earthen drainage swale would flow adjacent to and east of Auburndale Street and adjacent to and west of Lincoln Avenue that would drain water to Temescal Wash. The dimensions of the swale would include a 3-ft (foot) trapezoidal channel with 15-inch (in) thick riprap over 12-in. thick bedding, 10-ft trapezoidal channel with 15-in thick riprap over 12-in thick bedding, and 10-ft trapezoidal earthen channel.

Alcoa Dike Phase II crosses the SAWPA Inland Empire Brine Line at two intersections, the California Rehabilitation Center lateral line (15 in. /1 in.) along Auburndale Street and the Brine Line Reach IV (3 in.) parallel to Butterfield Drive. The proposed Brine Line Protection activities along Auburndale Street include removal of 80 linear ft. of existing Vitrified Clay Pipe / Ductile Iron Pipe, one manhole and one gate valve, and furnish and install 75 linear ft. of new 18 in. High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipe along the same alignment and elevation as the existing pipe. This will require the construction of one manhole at the downstream end of the pipe segment being replaced and furnishing and installation of a new gate valve along the same alignment. No bypass would be required considering the line is inactive. Temporary dewatering

may include two (2) wellheads, discharge piping and water treatment equipment if necessary, to meet discharge requirements. In addition, the proposed action parallel to Butterfield Drive would involve removal of 430 linear feet of existing RCP and furnish and install 411 linear feet of new 36" HDPE pipe along the same alignment and elevation as the existing pipe. Two additional new manholes at the upstream and downstream ends of the pipe segment being replaced would also be added along the same alignment. A temporary bypass of flow is required and consists of two (2) pumps and bypass piping. Temporary dewatering may include three (3) wellheads, discharge piping, and water treatment equipment if necessary to meet discharge requirements.

A portion of the proposed SART would be located within the existing footprint of the Phase II Alcoa Dike consisting of a 12-foot-wide asphalt bike trail and a 12-foot-wide DG Hiker Equestrian Trail. This Phase II SEA/EIR provides NEPA compliance for the possible future action of issuing an outgrant for the proposed segments of trail. Riverside County Parks and Recreation would maintain the trail per the outgrant. The trail passes through the Temporary Construction Easement (TCE) between the Alcoa Dike and the proposed Butterfield Betterment Drive and turns south at the terminus of Rincon Road and Butterfield Drive. The proposed SART would include 3H: 1V fill slopes to meet existing ground. The 2,900-foot long "connector" segment of bike and equestrian trails would extend along the edge of a Corps mitigation site that was restored to offset impacts of various Santa Ana River Mainstem Project features. Construction of the trail would begin after completion of the proposed Alcoa Dike. The trail project is not part of the flood control project but is mentioned in the context of potential future uses of the dike.






Figure 4-2 Project Site Plan





### **2.4.3 Staging Areas, Haul Routes, and Construction Activities**

The staging area would be modified to lessen the acreage footprint within the original footprint located at the reservoir side of the dike near the intersection of Rincon Street and Lincoln Avenue, and would be approximately 2 acres in size (Figure 2-2 Project Site Plan).

Haul roads, vehicular access roads, disposal site, source of material for the construction of the embankment would be associated with the borrow area approximately 7.7 miles to the northwest of the proposed project.

Construction of the Proposed Action would produce organic, inorganic, and unsuitable construction materials which must be disposed of in the manner and areas specified so that the proposed project site would be restored after completion of construction. Organic materials, trees, shrubs, and abandoned timber structures would be disposed of by hauling to a local commercial site. Topsoil containing organic material may not be disposed of at a commercial site but may be stockpiled and spread on embankment slopes or borrow areas as a part of site restoration. Disposal of these materials by burning or burying at the proposed project site would not be permitted. Inorganic materials would include, but are not limited to, broken concrete, rubble, asphaltic concrete, metal, and other types of construction materials. These materials would also be taken to a commercial landfill.

### **Material Source**

Approximately 35,400 tons of riprap and 31,100 tons of bedding would be required for the construction of the embankment. Riprap would be imported from a local quarry located approximately 2.5 miles west of the project site. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the nearest quarry would likely be used. Approximately 181,300 cubic yards (cy) of onsite excavation and approximately 836,000 cy of fill would be required. Approximately 836,000 cy of fill and approximately 90,000 cy clay material would be imported from the borrow site located approximately 7.7 miles northwest of the proposed project site (Figure 1-2).

### **Water Source**

The construction contractor would determine and acquire a water source for construction of the proposed project. The most likely source is reclaimed water at Butterfield Park (City of Corona). City of Corona requires the use of reclaimed water for construction purposes and will not authorize temporary potable water meters to existing fire hydrants for construction activities.

### **Construction Equipment**

Construction equipment would likely include a combination of concrete pumpers, manlift, 16 cy dump trucks, water trucks, waste trucks, haul trucks, scrapers, loaders, dozers, cranes, soil compactors, rollers, graders, vegetation chippers, hydroseed truck, and excavators.

### **Construction Duration and Phasing**

Construction is scheduled to commence in January 2021 and last approximately 24 months. The proposed project would be built in stages, with multiple start dates and construction periods for various sections depending on land acquisition, schedule for the utility replacements,

environmental windows and weather delays. Construction phasing may result in an extension of the overall project duration beyond winter 2022, i.e. beyond the approximate duration of 24 months. The proposed construction hours would be 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and occasionally Saturday. Occasional overtime work may be required to maintain the construction schedule but would be in compliance with local noise ordinances.

#### **2.4.4 Utilities**

This Phase II Proposed Action would include minor changes to the proposed project area utilities as with the 2018 Final SEA/ EIR. However, the proposed project will require protection in place of the utilities. As noted in 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum, the February 2010 Utility Investigation Report for Alcoa Dike prepared by AECOM for Orange County Public Works (aka Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD)), any utilities within the vicinity of the project limits would either be relocated or removed prior to or during construction (by the utility owner or local sponsor), or protected in place. Approximately 450 feet of the Brine Line would be protected in place (within the same footprint/alignment) to handle the increase load and settlement.

#### **Southern California Edison's Utility Replacement**

Southern California Edison plans to relocate transmission, distribution, and telecom poles/circuits for the Corps' Proposed Action. These facilities are located along W. Rincon Street, N. Smith Avenue, Butterfield Drive, and Auburndale Street, approximately 500 feet east of Corona Municipal Airport.

#### **Preferred SCE Replacement**

Up to 11 existing wood poles (Mira Loma-Cleargen 66 kV transmission circuit and Kingsford 12 kV distribution circuit) along W. Rincon Street (west of N. Smith Avenue) will be removed/relocated as a result of Alcoa Dike construction and the realignment/raising of W. Rincon Street. These circuits will be relocated to the south to follow existing Butterfield Drive and the new Butterfield Connection (which will be located west of the Alcoa Dike). Up to seven (7) existing wood distribution poles (Pulaski 12 kV; 45-70 feet tall) will be replaced with up to seven (7) new wood and/or steel poles (75-100 feet tall) along the south side of existing Butterfield Drive (from N. Smith Avenue to approximately 1,200 feet west) to carry the joint transmission/distribution relocated circuits. Up to 16 new wood and/or steel poles (50-85 feet tall) will be installed west of the new Butterfield Connection to carry the relocated 66 kV transmission circuit, and will be within/adjacent to the Proposed Santa Ana River Trail (SART). The relocated 12 kV distribution circuit will be installed underground beneath the new Butterfield Connection. This will include trenching of up to 3,000 feet and the installation of up to five (5) vaults. Furthermore, up to nine (9) existing wood poles along N. Smith Avenue will be topped to remove transmission elements and will contain distribution/telecom circuits only and two (2) new distribution poles will be installed.

Ground disturbance for Proposed Project work efforts will include the excavation by truck mounted auger/backhoe for existing wood pole removals and new wood pole installations, measuring approximately 2-3 feet in diameter and 5-12 feet deep. New steel poles will be installed in concrete footings and ground disturbance will be approximately 10 feet by 10 feet wide and up to 30 feet deep. Underground ground disturbance associated with trenching will be an approximate 3-foot wide, 6-foot deep trench and an approximate 12 foot by 18-foot-wide and up to 12-foot deep excavation will be needed for each vault. Work activities will take place within a 50-foot buffer around the Proposed Project elements and a 25-foot permanent impact area (vegetation clear zone) around each new pole installation will be required. The Proposed Project is accessible from W. Rincon Street, Butterfield Drive, and N. Smith Avenue. No trimming of trees or shrubs will be required for the replacement and helicopters will not be used to support the Proposed Project. Telecommunication facilities will transfer existing wires on the newly relocated poles.

Temporary access for the pole installations west of the new Butterfield Connection will consist of an approximate 14-foot wide, 3,000-foot-long route located in the footprint of the proposed SART alignment. Overland travel will be used to the maximum extent practicable along this route, however, some scarification, moisture conditioning, and compaction may be necessary depending on field conditions. Permanent access to these poles will be via the SART trail post-construction and a permanent turnaround area (up to 1,000 square feet) may be needed.

Temporary access for the pole replacements along existing Butterfield Drive will be achieved via existing Butterfield Drive. Permanent access to these poles will use the Prado Dam driveway approach off of the new Butterfield Connection and/or the existing Butterfield Drive (if pavement remains intact) or the footprint of existing Butterfield Drive (if pavement is removed) resulting in no additional permanent impacts. A permanent turnaround area (up to 1,000 square feet) may be needed along this access route if SCE vehicles cannot back up safely. Temporary access to the underground work efforts will occur within the new Butterfield Connection footprint and permanent access will be via the new Butterfield Connection, since this underground line will be under the road. Access to the existing pole removals will be achieved from existing W. Rincon Street, and access for the poles to be topped will occur via N. Smith Avenue.

### **Alternative SCE Replacement**

Up to 11 existing wood poles (Mira Loma-Cleargen 66 kV transmission circuit and Kingsford 12 kV distribution circuit) along W. Rincon Street (west of N. Smith Avenue) would be removed/relocated as a result of Alcoa Dike construction and the realignment/raising of W. Rincon Street. These circuits would be relocated to the south to follow existing Butterfield Drive and the new Butterfield Connector (which would be located west of the Alcoa Dike). Up to seven (7) existing wood distribution poles (Pulaski 12 kV; 45-70 feet tall) would be replaced with up to seven (7) new wood and/or steel poles (75-100 feet tall) along the south side of

existing Butterfield Drive (from N. Smith Avenue to approximately 1,200 feet west) to carry the joint transmission/distribution relocated circuits. Up to 16 new wood and/or steel poles (50-80 feet tall) would be installed west of the new Butterfield Connector to carry the relocated 66 kV transmission circuit. The relocated 12 kV distribution circuit would be installed underground beneath the new Butterfield Connector. This would include trenching of up to 3,000 feet and the installation of up to five (5) vaults. Furthermore, up to nine (9) existing wood poles along N. Smith Avenue would be topped to remove transmission elements and would contain distribution/telecom circuits only.

Ground disturbance associated with the proposed utility replacement would include the excavation by truck mounted auger/backhoe for existing wood pole removals and new wood pole installations, measuring approximately 2-3 feet in diameter and 5-12 feet deep. New steel poles would be installed in concrete footings and ground disturbance would be approximately 10 feet by 10 feet wide and up to 30 feet deep. Ground disturbance associated with trenching would include an approximate 3-foot wide, 6-foot deep trench and an approximate 5 foot by 20-foot-wide and up to 6-foot deep excavation for each vault. Work activities would take place within a 50-foot buffer around the proposed utility replacement elements. Access would be available from W. Rincon Street, Butterfield Drive, and N. Smith Avenue. No trimming of trees or shrubs or use of helicopters would be required for the proposed replacement. Telecommunication facilities would transfer existing wires on to the newly relocated poles.

**Table 2-2 Differences between Preferred SCE Replacement and Alternative SCE Replacement**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Facility Designation</b>	<b>Circuit Name</b>	<b>Access</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Existing Height* (above ground)</b>	<b>New Height* (above ground)</b>
Preferred and Alternative	Up to 11 Existing Wood Poles	Mira Loma- Cleargen 66 kV and Kingsford 12 kV	Existing paved road (W. Rincon St.)	Wood Pole Removal / Replacement for Alcoa Dike Project	45 (38.5) -75 (65.5)	N/A
Preferred and Alternative	Up to 7 Existing Wood Poles	Pulaski 12 kV (Existing)Mira Loma-Cleargen- Delgen 66 kV and Kingsford 12 kV (Relocated)	Existing paved road (Existing Butterfield Dr.)	Replace Existing Wood Poles with New Wood and/or Steel Poles	45 (38.5) -70 (61)	75 (65.5 wood, 75 steel) – 100 (88 wood, 100 steel)
Preferred Only		Mira Loma- Cleargen 66 kV	New Butterfield Connection (from W. Rincon St. or existing	Install New Wood and/or Steel Poles	N/A	

	Up to 16 New Wood and/or Steel Poles		Butterfield Dr.)			50 (43 wood, 50 steel) – 85 (74.5 wood, 85 steel)
Alternative Only	Underground (up to 3,000 feet of Trench and 3 Vaults)	Mira Loma-Cleargen 66 kV	New Butterfield Connection (from W. Rincon St. or existing Butterfield Dr.)	Install New Cable and Vaults	N/A	N/A
Alternative Only	Up to 4 New Wood and/or Steel Riser Poles	Mira Loma-Cleargen 66 kV	New Butterfield Connection (from W. Rincon St. or existing Butterfield Dr.)	Install New Wood and/or Steel Riser Poles	N/A	50 (43 wood, 50 steel) – 85 (74.5 wood, 85 steel)
Preferred and Alternative	Underground (up to 3,000 feet of Trench and 5 Vaults)	Kingsford 12 kV	New Butterfield Connection (from W. Rincon St. or existing Butterfield Dr.)	Install New Cable and Vaults	N/A	N/A
Preferred and Alternative	Up to 9 Existing Wood Poles	Mira Loma-Cleargen 66 kV and Kingsford 12 kV	Existing paved road (N. Smith Ave.)	Top Existing Wood Poles to Remove Transmission	65 (56.5) -75 (65.5)	Exact height unknown, but will be lower than existing)
Preferred and Alternative	Up to 2 New Wood Poles	Kingsford 12 kV	Existing paved road (N. Smith Ave.)	Install New Wood Poles	~80	New pole height will not exceed existing

\*Height in Feet

#### **2.4.5 Future Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation**

The OMRRR would follow the same guidelines set-forth in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, including routine inspections and minor repairs, of the Alcoa Dike embankment and its associated project features would be required after construction is completed. All permitted removals/replacements for trails, roads, or utilities in the project footprint are the owner's responsibility to maintain. The following activities may occur:

- Routine and special inspection and patrol with pickup trucks and sport utility vehicles weekly to daily during the flood season, and weekly to monthly during the non-flood season;

- Mobilizing dump trucks to haul stones and use of hydraulic excavators to place stones along eroded areas of the embankment to protect and reinforce the dike as necessary during flood fight activities;
- Periodic weeding and patching stone and asphalt maintenance road pavement;
- Periodic clearing of debris around drainage structures; and
- Periodic mending of fencing and painting metal gates.
- Repair of flood gates and floodwalls.
- Maintenance and repair of detention basins.

### 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

#### 3.1 Air Quality

The air quality conditions in this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum proposed project area remain similar to those described in the Corps' 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum for the Alcoa Dike portion of the Santa Ana River Mainstem, Prado Dam Basin (SARMP).

As previously stated in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the proposed project area is entirely within the Prado Flood Control Basin's Temescal Wash drainage area, which is part of the larger Prado Dam Reservoir Basin area, and is located in the central part of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) of California, an approximate 6,600 square mile (mi<sup>2</sup>) area encompassing Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. SCAB is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. Air quality in the SCAB is regulated by Federal, state, and regional control authorities.

As in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, this Phase II baseline air quality in the project area can be determined from ambient air quality measurements conducted by the SCAQMD at the Pomona and Rubidoux stations, which are the closest monitoring stations to the Prado Dam Reservoir. While both Federal and state air quality standards for several air pollutants continue to be exceeded, recent data indicates overall improvements in air quality. In addition, criteria pollutants and the levels at which they occur in the project area were re-evaluated based on the updated borrow and haul route information will not differ from the originally calculated standards given in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum report.

#### 3.2 Biological Resources

Biological resources within the vicinity of Alcoa Dike and other SARMP features were previously described in the 1988 GDM/SEIS, 2001 SEIS/EIR, 2012 Biological Opinion (BO) amendment, and the 2018 Alcoa Dike Phase I Final SEA/EIR. The Biological Resources Affected Environment Section as discussed in Section 3.2 of the Alcoa Dike Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum (2018) is hereby incorporated by reference. Any changes in impacts to biological resources from the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR are documented below.

Corps biologists and SAWA biologists have conducted numerous site surveys of the proposed project area and its vicinity to document existing biological resources and sensitive species over the past several years. Information from these surveys and a review of existing aerial imagery, literature, and databases was used to document biological resources in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Database and literature review included a review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), and various listed and sensitive species lists generated by the

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and California Native Plant Society (CNPS).

### 3.2.1 General Setting

The General Setting surrounding the project area was extensively described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The project region is located within the Santa Ana River (SAR) watershed in the western-most portion of Riverside County, California. More specifically, the project area is located in the City of Corona, adjacent to the Corona Municipal Airport, approximately 2.25 miles upstream of the Prado Dam embankment.

The proposed Phase II project footprint increased from the Phase I footprint in three small areas: downstream along Temescal Wash, northeast of Rincon Street; upstream along Temescal Wash immediately west of Lincoln Avenue, south of the bridge; and at the corner of the roadway at Rincon Street and Smith Avenue. (Figure 3.2.1-1). The project area decreased from the Phase I footprint in two large areas: adjacent to the Corona airport to the east and in the borrow area however both of these areas were already impacted by Phase I construction. Although the project area includes native riparian habitats, there has also been a variety of human disturbances including urban development, airport activities/traffic, water diversion, conveyance (pipelines and canals), spreading, and flood control activities.

### 3.2.2 Vegetation

A thorough description and analysis of vegetation communities throughout the Prado Basin was provided in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and refined in Section 3.2.3 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Aerial mapping and ground truthing were used to evaluate changes to vegetation communities from the latest 2017 survey. A 2020 site visit was also completed at the borrow area to map vegetation.

For consistency any descriptions of the plant communities in the project area follow those used in the 2001 SEIS/EIR. A total of four broad habitat categories were identified within the Phase I proposed project area, including native riparian, upland, non-native upland, and developed (Figure 3.2.2-1). Detailed descriptions of plant communities and plant species are included in Section 3.2.3 and Table 3.2.3 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum and are described briefly below.

**Native Riparian (Mulefat Scrub).** Riparian vegetation in the project area is dominated by mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) and is best classified as mulefat scrub. Other riparian species observed in this community include scattered Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), and black willow (*S. goodingii*). Giant reed (*Arundo donax*) is also present in this community. Riparian habitat supports a diversity of wildlife, including threatened and endangered species. In the Phase II project area, additional native riparian vegetation is found downstream along Temescal Wash, northeast of Rincon Street, and upstream immediately west of Lincoln Avenue, south of the bridge.



**Non-native Upland (Non-native grassland and woodland).** Non-native woodlands are dominated by invasive non-native, trees including Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), Chinese elm (*Ulmus parviflora*), Peruvian pepper trees (*Schinus molle*), and black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*). Non-native grasslands are dominated by weedy species such as brome grasses (*Bromus* spp.), barley (*Hordeum* spp.), and fescue (*Vulpia myuros*). In the Phase II project area, non-native grassland vegetation is found immediately west of Lincoln Avenue. Non-native grassland is also found in the eastern half of the borrow area.

**Developed.** Developed areas include landscaping, public parks, baseball fields, roads, and commercial business. Park areas are typically comprised of turf grasses with scattered trees such as Peruvian pepper and Brazilian pepper trees (*S. terebinthifolius*). In the Phase II project area, additional developed areas include the corner of the roadway at Rincon Street and Smith Avenue.

**Other (Agriculture).** This land cover type was used to map the western half of the borrow area. It appears to be dry-land farmed and was recently tilled at the time of the most recent site visit. This is a new cover type, not previously described in the Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

### 3.2.3 Special-Status Plant Species

Detailed descriptions of special-status plant species are included in Section 3.2.3.1 and Table 3.2.3.1-1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. No federal or State listed threatened or endangered species were identified in the proposed project area, and none are expected to occur based on a lack of suitable habitat, suitable soil types, and the recognized distributions of these species in the region.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS) ranked species observed or with potential to occur include Robinson's pepper-grass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*) (observed), chaparral sand verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*), paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica* var. *californica*), white-rabbit tobacco (*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*), and Coulter's Matilija poppy (*Romneya coulteri*).




Figure 6-3 Phase I vs. Phase II Project Footprint






Figure 7-3 Phase I vs. Phase II Vegetation Communities

### 3.2.4 Jurisdictional Habitats

Jurisdictional waters are described extensively in Section 3.2.4 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. A formal jurisdictional delineation of the Phase I project site was completed in February of 2018 to identify jurisdictional waters and wetlands within the project site. An informal jurisdictional delineation of the borrow area was complete in 2020 and the limits of the borrow area were altered to avoid impacts. In the Phase I project area, both Temescal Wash and the percolation ponds/basins south of Rincon Road support areas identified as potential wetland and non-wetland “waters of the U.S.” as well as “waters of the State” and CDFW jurisdictional waters. Several small ephemeral drainages are also present near the borrow area and along the haul route that are likely to meet the criteria as non-wetland “waters of the U.S.” as well as “waters of the State” and CDFW jurisdictional waters.

In the Phase II project footprint, additional jurisdictional waters were mapped in the riparian areas along Temescal Wash northeast of Rincon Road and immediately west of Lincoln Avenue, south of the bridge (Figure 3.2.3-1).

### 3.2.5 Wildlife

Detailed descriptions of wildlife species are included in Section 3.2.5 and Table 3.2.5-1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

The Prado Basin, which occurs adjacent to the project area, supports extensive riparian and aquatic habitats that support diverse assemblages of wildlife, including threatened and endangered species, and provide access to water, shade, and cover. Relatively disturbed areas that are adjacent to existing riparian vegetation can be important to a suite of common and sensitive wildlife. Of particular importance are riparian areas that provide potential habitat for the federally threatened Santa Ana sucker (*Catostomus santaannae*), federally and State endangered least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica*), and southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii exitmus*).

Temescal Wash and the adjacent riparian and upland habitats likely function as a movement corridor and/or dispersal habitat for a number of wildlife species. In some locations, natural lands adjacent to human disturbance have a lower species diversity.






Figure 8-3 Jurisdictional Waters and Wetland within the Proposed Project Area.

### 3.2.5.1 Common Wildlife

**Invertebrates.** It is expected that invertebrates in the project area are represented by a composition of insect species that commonly occur in southern California. These include representatives of various orders, such as Orthoptera (grasshoppers, crickets), Odonata (dragonflies, damselflies), Hemiptera (true bugs), Coleoptera (beetles), Diptera (flies), Hymenoptera (bees, wasps, ants), and Lepidoptera (butterflies, moths), among others.

**Fish.** During high flow events connectivity exists between Temescal Wash and the SAR. Two native fish species have been reported from the mainstem of the SAR, which occurs just west of the project area, including Santa Ana sucker (Federally Threatened (FT)), and the arroyo chub (*Gila orcutii*) (Federally Sensitive (S)). Due to the lack of perennial flows within the project area and suitable substrate within Temescal Wash these species have a low potential to occur. The three most abundant non-native fish include common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and western mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis*).

**Amphibians.** Commonly occurring amphibian species that are known or expected to occur include Pacific treefrog (*Pseudacris regilla*), California treefrog (*P. cadaverina*), the non-native African clawed frog (*Xenopus laevis*), western toad (*Bufo boreas*), arboreal salamander (*Aneides lugubris*), and garden slender salamander (*Batrachoseps major*). No amphibians were observed within the Phase I project area during 2018, and previous surveys in 2010 and 2011 surveys and habitat assessments.

**Reptiles.** Seven reptile species, including western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), common kingsnake (*Lampropeltis getulus*), and western rattlesnake (*Crotalus viridis*) were documented within the Phase I project area during 2018, 2010 and 2011 surveys. Other common reptile species known to occur include southern alligator lizard (*Elgaria multicarinata*), western skink (*Eumeces skiltonianus*), striped racer (*Masticophis lateralis*), western yellow-bellied racer (*Coluber constrictor*), California black-headed snake (*Tantilla planiceps*), and southern Pacific rattlesnake (*Crotalus viridis*) (USGS, 2004).

Two California Species of Special Concern were observed within the Phase I project area: western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*) and south coast garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*). It also supports suitable habitat for special-status reptiles covered under the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), including orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), coastal whiptail (*A. tigris stejnegeri*), and coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*).

**Birds.** Bird diversity and abundance are especially high in the Prado Basin and surrounding riparian habitat, where more than 200 species of birds have been recorded. Of these, approximately 95 to 100 breed nearby in the Prado Basin, and many are likely to occur in the project area. Further, there is a well-known change in use by “migrant” species between the breeding season in spring and summer and in the winter.

Raptors, waterfowl, riparian obligates as well as grassland species are regular inhabitants of the project area. Some of the common species observed include, but are not limited to, mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), lesser goldfinch (*Carduelis psaltria*), song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), bushtit (*Psaltiriparus minimus*), and black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*). Additional species known to use the vicinity of the project area include water birds such as great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), great egret (*A. alba*), and mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*).

Several raptor and vulture species were observed utilizing the vicinity of the project area for foraging, including turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), Cooper's hawk (*A. cooperii*), northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*).

Many special-status birds have been documented in the vicinity of the project site in recent years including least Bell's vireo, California gnatcatcher, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) (Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC)), northern harrier, and white-tailed kite.

**Mammals.** Twenty-three species of mammals, including three non-native species, have been observed in the nearby Prado Basin (Zembal et al., 1985). Two species of mammals, the California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) and coyote (*Canis latrans*), were observed within the Phase I project area during the 2018, 2010 and 2011 surveys. A variety of common small mammals, known from the Prado Basin, are likely to occur including the western harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys megalotis*), California vole (*Microtus californicus*), Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*), western brush rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*), and black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*). The only large native ungulate expected to occur in the project area is the mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*). Meso-predators known from the general area include gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), and long-tailed weasel (*Mustela frenata*). Top carnivores that could occur in the vicinity of the project area include bobcat (*Lynx rufus*) and mountain lion (*Puma concolor*).

Portions of the Phase I project area support suitable foraging habitat for a variety of bat species; however, roosting habitat is limited to the large non-native woodlands. Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*), and pocketed free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops femorasaccus*), all CDFW Species of Special Concern, are known to occur in the area.

### 3.2.5.2 Wildlife Movement

Linkages and corridors facilitate regional wildlife movement and are generally centered around waterways, riparian corridors, flood control channels, and contiguous upland habitat. Drainage ways generally serve as movement corridors because they are natural elements in the landscape that guide animal movement (Noss, 1991; Ndubisi et al., 1995; R. Walker and Craighead, 1997,

in Hilty et al., 2006). Corridors also offer wildlife unobstructed terrain for foraging and for dispersal of young individuals. Requirements for relative size and characteristic of movement corridors are different for each species that uses them. When human activities fragment landscapes, movement corridors may be altered or eliminated. Continued use of these features by wildlife depends on their ability to find adequate space, cover, food, and water, in the absence of obstacles or distractions (e.g., man-made noise, lighting) that might interfere with wildlife movements.

The SAR, Temescal Wash, and associated uplands are recognized as vital pathways for wildlife movement. Several migratory songbirds utilize the riparian vegetation within the SAR corridor for breeding, nesting, and foraging, or at a minimum, as transient rest sites during migration. In addition, large, wide-ranging animals, such as mountain lion, bobcat, and coyote have been documented within the SAR watershed and may utilize the SAR corridor and Temescal Wash in search of prey, water resources, or cover.

### **3.2.5.3 Special-Status Wildlife Species**

Detailed descriptions of special-status wildlife species and their potential to occur are included in Section 3.2.5, Table 3.2.5-2, and Figure 3.2-3 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Special-status wildlife include species listed as federally or State threatened or endangered, species proposed for listing, species of special concern, and those included in the Western Riverside MSHCP, with potential to occur within the proposed project area.

Two federal and/or State listed threatened or endangered species are known to occur in the project area: least Bell's vireo (FE, SE) and coastal California gnatcatcher (FT, CSC). Two federal and/or State listed threatened or endangered species have critical habitat overlapping the project footprint: least Bell's vireo (FE, SE) and western yellow-billed cuckoo (FT, SE). These species are discussed briefly below.

Other special-status species (FP, CSC, MSHCP) were identified within the project site including western pond turtle, San Bernardino ringneck snake, south coast garter snake, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, great blue heron, burrowing owl, Lawrence's goldfinch, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, coyote, bobcat.

A suite of special-status species, although not observed, have high potential to occur in the vicinity of the project area. These species are discussed extensively in Section 3.2.5 and Table 3.2.5-2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

***Least Bell's vireo FE, SE.*** The least Bell's vireo is listed as state and federally endangered and is a Western Riverside MSHCP covered species. This species occupies riparian woodlands (especially Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest, Southern Willow Scrub, and Mule Fat Scrub) in Southern California, with the majority of breeding pairs in San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Riverside counties (USFWS, 1998).



This species has been recorded breeding in the project area during numerous surveys conducted in the past, including during the 2017 nesting season (Figure 3.2.4-1). SAWA (2017) reported nine vireo territories within 200 feet of the Phase I project area, including two within the Phase I project area. Additional surveys by SAWA in 2019 reported six vireo territories within 200 feet of the Phase II project area (Figure 3.2.4-1). The Phase II project area encompasses about 72 acres of critical habitat as shown in Figure 3.2.4-1, of which approximately 3.26 acres are new impacts resulting from Phase II.

***Coastal California gnatcatcher FT, CSC.*** The coastal California gnatcatcher is listed as federally threatened, a CDFW California Species of Special Concern, and a Western Riverside MSHCP covered species. The coastal California gnatcatcher occupies Southern California coastal sage scrub habitats and sometimes occurs in adjacent habitats including grasslands, chaparral, and riparian habitat. In California, coastal California gnatcatcher is a year-round resident of scrub-dominated plant communities from southern Ventura County southward through Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego counties (Atwood, 1980).

This species was recorded in the project area during surveys conducted in 2017 (2017 SAWA), however nesting was not confirmed in 2018 or 2019 surveys (Figure 3.2.4-2). SAWA reported three pairs within 200 feet of the Phase I project area. One pair was observed within 200 feet of the Phase II project footprint, due to the reduced TCE around the borrow site. Marginally suitable coastal sage scrub habitat is present within the borrow site but is not present within the dike footprint. Suitable habitat does not occur

near the expanded Phase II footprint areas. Critical habitat for gnatcatcher occurs downstream of the Prado Basin in the vicinity of the Chino Hills and Santa Ana Mountains.

***Western yellow-billed cuckoo FT, SE.*** The western yellow-billed cuckoo is listed as federally threatened, State endangered, and a Western Riverside MSHCP covered species. It occupies extensive riparian woodlands dominated by cottonwood and willow and is a rare and localized summer migrant in California.

This species has historically been occasionally observed in the Prado Basin, as recently as 2011. Marginal riparian habitat is present in the project area, and the species may be seen migrating or foraging. The Phase I project area included 8.27 acres of proposed critical habitat near the edges of the Phase I borrow area footprint. The Phase II project area does not overlap with cuckoo critical habitat due to the reduced TCE around the borrow site.




Figure 9-3 Least Bell's Vireo and Critical Habitat Occurrence






Figure 10-3 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Occurrence

### **3.3 Water Resources and Hydrology**

The 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum provides information on the affected environment for water resources and hydrology in the proposed project area. For this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum the existing conditions for water resources and hydrology has not changed.

#### **3.3.1 General Setting**

The proposed project area is located entirely within the Prado Flood Control Basin's Temescal Wash drainage area. The Prado Flood Control Basin is a flood improvement project on the main stem of the SAR. The Prado Basin is located within the SAR Basin, which encompasses parts of Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties (the proposed project area is located in Riverside County). This area is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and is subject to management direction of the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Santa Ana Region.

The climate in this area is Mediterranean with hot, dry summers, and cooler, wetter winters. Most precipitation occurs between November and March, and is characteristically in the form of rainfall, although snow may occur at higher elevations. Under natural conditions, much of the SAR and its tributaries would be intermittent with little or no flow in the summer months, except in areas with high groundwater. The urbanization of the valley areas of the SAR Basin has significantly increased runoff into the river and tributaries. Rainfall occurring over an urbanized part of the basin generates higher peak discharges with a shorter peaking time and a greater volume than if it occurred over the natural basin (USACE, 1988 [p. IV-3]). Water from the upper SAR contributes to municipal and domestic supply, agriculture, groundwater recharge, hydropower generation, water contact and noncontact recreation, as well as fresh water and associated habitat

#### **3.3.2 Temescal Wash and Santa Ana River**

Temescal Wash, also known as Temescal Creek, originates in Lake Elsinore (Riverside County) as Elsinore Spillway Channel, flowing northwest for a length of 29 miles to its confluence with SAR in Prado Reservoir within the city of Corona, CA (Figure 3.3.2-1). It is the largest tributary to the SAR. The Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District develops the operating procedures for Lake Elsinore. According to the final report on these operating procedures developed in 1995, the maximum outflow into Temescal Wash allowed from the lake is 1,000-cfs.

Due to significant elevation differences within the Temescal Wash watershed, the nature of vegetation varies considerably within the watershed. In the upper reaches, i.e. above elevation 5,000-ft in the San Bernardino Mountains, pine, fir, juniper, and oak are found scattered throughout a chaparral cover of manzanita, scrub oak, and sage brush. At the lower elevations (foothills and lower slopes), scattered scrub oak, sagebrush, and annual range grasses dominate the vegetation type. The land use in the watershed also varies. Most of the watershed can be considered as agricultural or national forest, consisting mainly of dwarf shrub type vegetation. Commercial development covers the drainage area sparsely, primarily around Lake Elsinore and Corona. The dominant hydrologic soil group (HSG) is D which consists chiefly of clay soils with high runoff potential.

The SAR originates in the San Bernardino Mountains and travels southwest approximately 60 miles where it reaches the Pacific Ocean near Huntington Beach. Urban runoff and effluent from wastewater treatment plants, as well as naturally occurring high groundwater levels, contribute substantially to the perennial flow that occurs in the Prado Basin and in the proposed project area.

The SAR serves several major purposes to the economic well-being and environmental values of the region. It provides extremely important wildlife habitat and supports aquatic organisms and several endangered species. Key items of importance to the inhabitants of Orange County are the issues of flood control and water supply. All of these beneficial uses have influenced the design of projects that have been planned and constructed to manage the flows in the river.

Approximately half of the base flow of the SAR receives treatment using artificial wetlands upstream from Prado Dam to remove nitrogen and other contaminants. On average, approximately 200,000 acre-feet per year (afy) of natural stream flow passes through Prado Dam into Orange County. Much of this flow is diverted downstream to basins operated by the OCWD, for the purpose of recharging underlying groundwater basins which provide the local water supply in that area. Summer flows in the SAR normally reach the recharge basins downstream of the Imperial Highway Bridge and rarely flow beyond the basins to Burris Pit. Water in this portion of the river is a blend of highly treated wastewater effluent, irrigation runoff water, imported water purchased for groundwater recharge, and groundwater forced to the surface by underground barriers. During periods of rainfall, particularly during the winter months (December to March), storm runoff bypasses the recharge basins and is transported in the river channel to the ocean. Historically, the SAR has been considered one of the greatest flood hazards in the west due to the potential property damage that would occur in response to a levee breach. New flood protection improvements recently constructed and underway have aimed at reducing the risk of flooding. (USACE, 2001)

***Surface Water Quality.*** Surface water quality within and downstream of Prado Basin is determined by various contributors, including: Cucamonga Creek, Chino Creek, Temescal Creek, Santa Ana River, rising groundwater, municipal wastewater treatment plant effluent, mountain and lowland runoff, storm discharge, State Water Project discharges, and non-point sources such as urban and agricultural runoff. Per the National Water Quality Assessment (NWQA) Program, administered by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the quality of surface and ground water in the Santa Ana Basin becomes progressively poorer as water moves along “hydraulic flow-paths,” with the highest quality water associated with tributaries flowing from surrounding mountains and ground water recharged by these streams (NWQAP, 2011). Water quality may be altered by a variety of factors including but not limited to: consumptive use, importation of water high in dissolved solids, run-off from urban and agricultural areas, and the recycling of water within the basin.

Waterways in the SAR Basin are listed on the 2006 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments Requiring Total Maximum Daily Loads for the following pollutants: pathogens (Chino Creek, Reach 1 and Reach 2; Mill Creek, Prado Area; Santa Ana River, Reach 3; Prado Park Lake), high coliform count (Chino Creek, Reach 2; Cucamonga Creek, Valley Reach), and nitrate (Santa Ana River, Reach 3) (Santa Ana RWQCB, 2006). These

pollutants most likely originate from non-point agricultural and urban sources that commonly occur throughout the watershed.

### 3.3.3 Groundwater

Groundwater is the main source of water supply in the SAR watershed, providing about 66 percent of the consumptive water demand. Inland aquifers underlie roughly 1,200 square miles of the watershed upstream of Prado Dam, which coastal aquifers underlie roughly 400 square miles downstream of Prado Dam. Thickness of these aquifers ranges from several hundred to more than 1,000 feet. Depth to ground water ranges from several hundred feet below ground surface near the mountains to near land surface along rivers, wetlands, and in the coastal plain. (NWQAP, 2011)

The proposed project area is underlain by the Inland Santa Ana Basin Subunit (Inland Basin). As described in the *Phase I Final SEA Addendum*, this area contains upwards of 1,000 ft of mostly recent alluvial deposits covering the irregular bedrock floor. In the region around the City of Corona, where the proposed project area is located, alluvium has been derived mostly from the Santa Ana Mountains. The sediments were laid down on alluvial fans and plains by streams draining the highland areas and consist generally of stringers and lenses of sand and gravel separated by layers of silt and clay.

**Groundwater Quality.** The Inland Basin is characterized by an unconfined aquifer system in which high-quality recharge is distributed over a broad area near the mountain front. As groundwater moves toward areas of discharge, water quality is determined by overlying land use activities. Other factors that influence groundwater quality in this area include interaction with the SAR, discharge of recycled wastewater to the river, and use of imported water in the basin. (USGS, 2002)

## 3.4 Earth Resources

The Corps has conducted numerous geotechnical and field investigations in the Prado Basin since the 1930s and as recent as 2019, including mapping of the various geologic formations and exploring the subsurface to determine the nature and extent of soil and bedrock materials, as well as the character of local faults. Prado Basin is situated at the southwestern edge of the Upper Santa Ana Valley, a broad inland alluvial plain which is part of the larger South Coastal Basin of southern California. This area is bounded to the north and northeast by the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains, to the south by the San Timoteo Badlands, a series of granitic hills, and a low bedrock plateau, and to the west and southwest by the Chino Hills and Santa Ana Mountains.

The proposed project area is located entirely within the Prado Flood Control Basin of Riverside County, California. The proposed borrow area is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the proposed project area. Bedrock does not outcrop within the limits of the borrow areas, or along the Alcoa Dike alignment. Geotechnical investigations conducted in 1980 identified sandstone representative of the Sycamore Canyon member of the Puente Formation at an average depth of 35 ft, and up to 75 ft beneath the borrow area and at unknown depths along the Alcoa Dike alignment. Uplift of this region occurred during the past two- to three million years and deformed with Puente formation with extensive warping and faulting. Holocene (recent) alluvial

materials were present along active stream channels and associated floodplain deposits of the SAR, Temescal Wash, and other water courses including incised stream channels on the Corona compound alluvial fan. Older, generally Late Pleistocene-age alluvial sediments were present as terrace deposits along the northeastern flank of the Santa Ana Mountains and along the SAR, as well as alluvial fan deposits in the Corona area.

#### **3.4.1 Geology and Soils**

Soils in the Prado Basin are largely derived from the alluvial materials that dominate the valley floor and slopes. Consequently, they are generally light, sandy, highly permeable, and easily eroded. As such, the alluvium which characterizes the streambed of the SAR has been laid down over periods of river meandering and floodplain functions. The upper portions of the SAR streambed are rocky, with soils consisting of finer sands and silts throughout the middle and lower portions of the river. Soils of the coastal plain are similar to those of the middle and lower portions of the SAR. Soils in the project area are derived from the alluvial materials that dominate the valley floor and slopes. These soils are not considered prime farmland within the project area. (USACE, 2001)

Groundwater was encountered at elevation 533 ft, approximately 11 ft below ground surface. The sandy clay is medium stiff above the water table with SPT blow counts ranging from zero to 16, with an average of eight. Below the water table, the sandy clay is very soft to soft, with SPT blow counts ranging from zero to six, with an average of three blows/ft.

#### **3.4.2 Seismicity and Faulting**

Seismic faults are plane-like surfaces on which movement of the earth's rock formations and soils can occur. Faults generally cut through multiple stratigraphic formations at angles. When movement occurs on fault planes, propagation of seismic waves occurs; such seismic events introduce a certain risk of infrastructure damage due to earthquakes that are caused by the fault movements.

The seismic environment in southern California is largely defined by the San Andreas Fault, which trends in a northwest-southeast alignment. Land to the west of the San Andreas Fault is drifting north, which builds stresses throughout the region. These stresses are eventually relieved by movement along the San Andreas and other southern California faults. The regional stress accumulated is not equally distributed among faults, as some move more frequently than others. Other major northwest-southeast trending faults in the area include the San Jacinto, Whittier-Elsinore, and Newport-Inglewood. Many smaller and considerably less active or apparently inactive faults exist among the aforementioned larger faults. The seismic environment relevant to the Proposed Action is dominated by two fault zones, the San Andreas and the Whittier-Elsinore. The project area is located within a zone of potential surface fault offsets and ground cracking that could be triggered by an event along the Whittier-Elsinore fault zone.

Research into earthquake probabilities by the Corps determined that important seismic characteristics of the Whittier fault zone include the following:

- Maximum probable earthquake is 6.9 M (earthquake magnitude);
- Could cause up to 19 feet of horizontal offset;

- Maximum site acceleration from an earthquake estimated is 0.55 g (g is the force of gravity; an acceleration of 1 g is equal to a force of 32 feet/second/second); and
- Maximum measured site acceleration was 0.08 g (USACE, 2001).

Overall, the proposed project area has a 10 percent probability in 50 years of exceedance of 0.5 to 0.6 g from an earthquake event of M 6.8. Such an event most likely would occur on either the Whittier or Chino-Central Avenue Faults.

Although the project is located in a seismically active region, this area is generally characterized by diffuse and non-significant, low-magnitude seismicity. The *1988 Phase II GDM/SEIS* describes that four ancient landslides have been identified along the eastern slopes of the Chino Hills, located at the western edge of Prado Basin. These landslides are fairly limited in size, varying from 200 – 800 ft in width and 300 – 800 ft in length.

### 3.5 Land Use

The majority of the proposed project area currently consists of vacant land that consists of non-native grasslands, non-native woodlands, and riparian scrub; and the southwest end of the proposed project area would traverse Butterfield Park, which is 43.5 acres and consists of nine baseball fields, a soccer field, a jogging course, a picnic area, playground equipment, and restrooms. The Corona Municipal Airport is located immediately west of the proposed project area. Other existing land uses surrounding the proposed project area include light industrial development directly south, and single-family residential development ranging from 500 to 1,200 ft. to the north.

The proposed project area is located entirely within the City of Corona. The majority of the site is within the Open Space/General (OS/G) land use designation of the City's General Plan. This designation applies to "...lands permanently committed or protected for open space purposes due to their value as habitat, topography, scenic quality, public safety (e.g., flood control channels), or comparable purpose" (Corona, 2007). The southwest end of the proposed project area is within the Park land use designation and the southeast end is within the Light Industrial land use designation. The City's General Plan considers the Park designation as part of the Public and Institutional designation, which also includes schools and various civic facilities. The Light Industrial designation "...accommodates various low intensity, nonpolluting types of manufacturing operations, research and development, e-commerce, wholesale activities, and distribution facilities... intended to provide an employment base for Corona's residents" (Corona, 2007).

The majority of the proposed project area is within the Agricultural zone of the City of Corona's Zoning Ordinance. The southwest end of the proposed project area is within the Open Space zoning designation, and the southeast end is within the Light Industrial zoning designation. In addition, the entire site is within the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) 100 Year Flood Zone. (Corona, 2012)

The staging area along the southeast portion of the proposed project area would affect vacant land at the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Rincon Street. There is light industrial development south of the proposed staging area, and a riparian area that would separate the staging area from single family residential development located approximately 600 ft to the north and east.



The proposed project area is also within the boundaries of *Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)*, which is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional plan focusing on conservation of species and their associated habitats in the western portion of the County. The MSHCP is one of several large, multi-jurisdictional habitat-planning efforts in southern California with the overall goal of maintaining biological and ecological diversity within a rapidly urbanizing region, and is intended to allow the County and its cities to better control local land-use decisions and maintain a strong economic climate in the region while addressing the requirements of the State and federal Endangered Species Acts.

The City owns three parcels north of Rincon Street and west of Auburndale Street reserved as a mitigation site for work performed on the City's Foothill Parkway Extension project. The City proposed to exchange these sites for other county-owned properties in the vicinity that will meet the City's obligations. Per communication between the City of Corona, Orange County Public Works and USFWS during July 17-19, 2018, the city's proposed replacement mitigation sites have been approved by all parties.

### **3.6 Aesthetics**

The proposed project area is in the vicinity of the Temescal Creek and the Lower SAR in Riverside County. Temescal Creek is approximately 29 miles in length, originating in Lake Elsinore and flowing northwest until its confluence with SAR in the Prado Flood Control Basin. The SAR is an approximately 100-mile long waterway that runs from the San Bernardino Mountains to Huntington Beach in southern California. These rivers and associated riparian habitats provide visual relief from the urbanization of the surrounding cities of Yorba Linda, Anaheim Hills, Corona, and unincorporated Riverside County. The Lower SAR runs from Prado Dam, in Riverside County, to its terminus approximately 30 miles downstream, at Huntington Beach, Orange County.

The proposed project would be located within the City of Corona. The greater project area is surrounded by the Prado Flood Control Basin to the west, single family residential development to the northeast, and light industrial development south of the proposed project area. The aesthetics within the project area are focused on views from Butterfield Park, Prado Regional Park, and the residential development.

Remnant aesthetically pleasing areas within the vicinity of the proposed project area include the undeveloped riparian areas along the river, Prado Regional Park, and Chino Hills State Park located approximately 3.5 miles west of the project site.

### **3.7 Recreation**

Recreational resources and opportunities available in the proposed project area are generally dispersed recreation such as walking, biking, and outdoor enjoyment, while recreational uses that occur in the vicinity of the proposed project area include the Corona Municipal Airport, Butterfield Park, Clearwater Sports Fields, Auburndale Park, Fairview Park, Stagecoach Park, River Road Park, Contreras Park, San Bernardino County's Prado Regional Park and the planned Santa Ana River Trail & Parkway.

In addition to the resources listed above, the city of Corona is currently planning a xx-mile multi-use recreational trail called the Santa Ana River Trail. As recommended by the Santa Ana River

Trail (SART) project team, the proposed alignment for this trail would utilize the Alcoa Dike for part of the planned trail. As described in Section 2.4.2 of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum, the City's proposed plans include a 12-foot wide paved bicycle trail that would traverse from east to west along the top of the Alcoa Dike, as well as a 12-foot wide unpaved hiking/equestrian trail that would traverse from east to west along the toe of the dike. The trail would not be constructed by the Corps and is not included as part of the previously approved project or the modifications included under the Proposed Action.

Construction of the trail would require grading of the slope that extends down into the mitigation site from the edge of the road, to provide flat ground for the trails. This would permanently affect 0.56 acres of the mitigation site, and temporarily affect another 1.76 acres, although vegetation is sparse in this area. This area is not occupied by least Bell's vireo or any other listed species. After construction, the modified topography would allow for establishment of additional riparian habitat, and Riverside County Parks would be responsible for replanting or restoring sufficient acreage within the mitigation site to fully offset any temporary and permanent vegetation impacts, after which the SARMP sponsors would continue to maintain the mitigation site in perpetuity. Therefore, there would be no net loss of native habitat acreage or suitability for listed species.

Table 3.7-1 lists the amenities available at each of the parks and recreation facilities listed above in the vicinity of the proposed project area.

**Table 3-1 Recreation Facilities and Amenities in Project Vicinity**

Facility	Amenities
Corona Municipal Airport	Recreational airport with no commercial flights. Home to 350-400 general aviation aircraft. Top of the dike (571.5 ft elevation) was designed to be well below the minimum required elevation (583 ft) with regards to flight paths to and from the airport.
Butterfield Park	Baseball fields, soccer field, jogging course, barbecue, covered shelters, playground equipment, picnic areas, restrooms, drinking fountains.
Clearwater Sports Fields	Sports field.
Auburndale Park	Tennis courts, basketball court, swimming pool, barbecue, covered shelter, picnic area, restrooms.
Fairview Park	Baseball field, basketball court, barbecue, covered shelter, playground equipment, picnic area, restrooms, drinking fountain.
Stagecoach Park	Playground equipment.
River Road Park	Barbecue, covered shelter, playground equipment, picnic area, restrooms, drinking fountains, bicycle rack.
Contreras Park	Basketball court, horseshoe pit, barbecue, picnic area, drinking fountain.
Prado Regional Park	Fishing, camping, hiking, biking and nature trails, disc golf, picnic facilities, meeting room, two 18-hole golf courses, Olympic shooting range, horseback riding, archery, playground with water play park, horseshoe pits, restrooms.
Santa Ana River Trail & Parkway	Environmental work completed February 2012. Construction began in 2019.

### 3.8 Noise

### 3.8.1 Noise Environment in the Proposed Project Area

The area surrounding the Alcoa Dike site is characterized by a wide variety of ambient noise sources. Along the southern periphery of the basin where commercial and industrial facilities as well as freeways are found, noise levels are generally high. These levels drop off substantially towards the central portions of the Alcoa Dike site, which is open space. Residential use to the north is expected to typically generate noise levels associated with personal vehicle and outdoor use activities. The primary noise sources within the Alcoa Dike project area includes: airport noise from Corona Municipal Airport located approximately 2,000 ft west of the site; rail traffic from Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe (AT&SF) Railroad lines bordering the site to the south; traffic on SR-91 to the south; traffic on Smith Avenue to the west and Lincoln Avenue to the east; and industrial development in the City of Corona to the south.

### 3.8.2 Sensitive Receptors in the Proposed Project Area

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to elevated noise levels because of the purpose and intent of the use. Places where people are meant to sleep, or places where a quiet environment is necessary for the function of the land use, are normally considered sensitive. For instance, residential areas, schools, places of worship, and hospitals are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Alcoa Dike site include residential development approximately 600 ft north of the site. Additional sensitive receptors are located north of this residential area, including Auburndale Intermediate School, George Washington Elementary School, and Victress Bower School for Exceptional Students, which are located approximately 2,000 ft north of the site.

## 3.9 Socioeconomics

The proposed project area would be located within the City of Corona. For the purposes of this discussion of Socioeconomics, demographic data for the City is presented below, in Table 3.9-1.

**Table 3-2 Demographic Data for the City of Corona**

	Subject	2010 Estimate
Population	Total Population	161,614 (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Average Family Size	3.26 (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Median Age	34.4 (2016 ACS 1-year estimate)
Housing	Total Housing Units	51,331(2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Vacant Housing Units	2,224
	Average Household Size	3.27
Employment and Income	Unemployment Rate	4.6% (City of Corona website)
	Median Household Income	\$72,309 (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)

	Subject	2010 Estimate
Ethnicity	White	69.9% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Black or African American	4.8% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	American Indian and Alaska Native	0.5% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Asian	11.5% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.5% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Two or more races	4.3% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)
	Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin	43.2% (2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate)

Source: US Census, 2010, unless otherwise noted

The data presented above was collected by the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) 1-year estimates and 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates of the U.S. Census. These estimates are based on data collected between 2008 and 2016, and do not represent a single point in time.

### ***Population***

The City of Corona has an estimated population of 161,614, representing 6.8 percent of the Riverside County population. In addition, the median age in the City is 34.4, which is slightly lower than the County median age of 35.3 (2016 American Community Survey 1-year estimate). This difference may be attributable to the larger number of family aged persons (children under 18 and parents between the ages of 25 and 44) residing in the City of Corona.

#### ***3.9.1.1 Housing***

The 2012-2016 ACS estimated that 51,331 housing units were located in the City of Corona, while a total of 39,271 housing units were noted in the 2000 Census. This represents a 30.7 percent increase in housing units since 2000.

#### ***3.9.1.2 Employment and Income***

The unemployment rate for the City of Corona is estimated to be 4.6 percent. In comparison, the Riverside County unemployment rate is 5.6 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics). The median household income is \$72,309 in the City, as opposed to the County's median which is \$57,972. The lower unemployment rate and higher median income suggest that the City of Corona is more affluent than Riverside County as a whole. (US Census, 2010)

#### ***3.9.1.3 Ethnicity***

According to the 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimate, the ethnic makeup of the City consists of Whites at 69.9 percent and Hispanics at 43.2 percent. These totals are greater than 100 percent because Hispanics may be of any race, and therefore, are also included in other applicable race categories. Otherwise, the ethnic makeup of the City consists of Asians at 11.5 percent, African Americans at 4.8 percent, American Indian and Alaskan Native at 0.5 percent, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander at 0.5 percent.

### **3.10 Transportation**

Major roadways providing regional access to the Alcoa Dike project area include State Route 91 (SR-91) and Interstate 15 (I-15). These roadways are maintained by Caltrans. Local access to the site would be provided by Lincoln Avenue, which has on/off ramps to SR-91 directly south of the Alcoa Dike area. Construction vehicles would access the site from Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, Smith Avenue, Lincoln Avenue and River Road. These local roadways are maintained by the City of Corona, with the exception of the River Road Bridge over Temescal Creek, which is maintained by Riverside County Transportation Commission. The following summarizes the lane configurations and directional configuration of roadways providing both regional and local access to the Alcoa Dike project area:

- **SR-91** is a fourteen lane east-west freeway along the southern border of the proposed project site.
- **I-15** is an eight lane north-south freeway merging with SR-91 to the east of the proposed project site.
- **Lincoln Avenue** is a four lane north-south roadway located directly east of the proposed project site and travels from SR-91 northward where it veers east past the site and connects with River Road and dead ends at Hamner Avenue just west of I-15.
- **Butterfield Drive** is a two-lane east-west roadway connecting with Smith Avenue and providing access to the western portion of the site.
- **Rincon Street** is a two-lane roadway traveling northwest-southeast and connects Smith Avenue to Lincoln Avenue, providing central access to the site. Rincon Street travels further west of Smith Avenue, through the proposed dike alignment, up to Corydon Street.
- **Auburndale Street** is a two-lane roadway traveling southwest-northeast and bisects the site, connecting with Rincon Street.
- **Smith Avenue** is a two-lane roadway traveling southwest-northeast and connects Butterfield Drive to Rincon Street, providing central access to the site.

Annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes measured for State Routes and local roadways in the vicinity of the Alcoa Dike project area are presented in Table 3.10-1.

**Table 3-3 Annual Average Daily Traffic on Selected Roadways in the Proposed Project Area**

Location	2010 AADT
SR-91 west of I-15	233,000
I-15 junction with SR-91	158,000
Lincoln Avenue north of SR-91	25,225 <sup>1</sup>
Butterfield Drive west of Smith Avenue	1,776 <sup>1</sup>
Rincon Street west of Lincoln Avenue	9,278 <sup>2</sup>
Auburndale Street north of Rincon Street	2,033 <sup>1</sup>
Smith Avenue south of Rincon Street	19,808 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Year 2015 AADT, <sup>2</sup> Year 2017 ADT

Source: Caltrans 2016, City of Corona 2015 and 2017

Other transportation related land uses in the vicinity include Corona Municipal Airport located approximately 2,000 ft west of the site, and the AT&SF Railroad lines aligned east-west directly adjacent to the southernmost border of the site. Besides freight operations, Metrolink commuter trains also utilize this rail line. The proposed project is located roughly equidistant from two Metrolink stations – West Corona Metrolink Station approximately 1.3 miles west of the western terminus of the proposed Alcoa Dike, and the Metrolink North Main Corona Station at 250 East Blaine Street approximately 1.1 miles east of the eastern terminus of the proposed Alcoa Dike. This rail line is also currently used by Amtrak commuter carrier's Southwest Chief train, although the train does not stop at either of these stations. According to the Riverside County General Plan, no designated bike paths or pedestrian facilities are currently located within or adjacent to the proposed project area (Riverside County, 2015), although the City of Corona is currently planning a 22-mile multi-use recreational trail segment of the regional "crest to coast" Santa Ana River Trail in the vicinity.

### **3.11 Safety and hazards**

This section focuses on existing public health and safety issues with regard to existing flooding potential and problems and recreational safety. FEMA is the Federal agency that advises jurisdictions on floodplain management issues and its mission is to reduce loss of life and property, and protect the nation's critical infrastructure from all types of hazards through a comprehensive, risk-based, emergency management program of mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. When the Prado Spillway is raised and the dam's water control manual is modified to allow water storage to extend up to 566 ft elevation, this area would have the potential to be inundated during extreme flood events, even though much of the area is currently prone to flooding, has been flooded historically as well, and the proposed project area is within the 100 year floodplain. Plugged and abandoned dry oil and gas borehole(s) may be present within the proposed project area. There are no geothermal wells within the project site and in the surrounding area. The nearest geothermal wells to the project site are more than 125 miles away near Salton Sea in Imperial County.

### **3.12 Cultural Resources**

Cultural resources are locations of past human activities on the landscape. The term generally includes any material remains that are at least 50 years old and are of archaeological or historical interest. Examples include archaeological sites such as lithic scatters, villages, procurement areas, resource extractions sites, rock shelters, rock art, shell middens; and historic era sites such as trash scatters, homesteads, railroads, ranches, and any structures that are over 50 years old. Under the National Historic Preservation Act, federal agencies must consider the effects of federal undertakings on cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP are referred to as historic properties.

The Alcoa dike project is just one aspect of the larger SARMP. Federal preservation laws require that the agency define the area of potential effect (APE) for an undertaking. The APE is the geographic area within which historic properties may be directly or indirectly affected by an undertaking. In this case, the Corps consulted with the California State Historic Preservation

Officer regarding the APE for the entire SARMP. The entire APE was surveyed for the presence of historic and prehistoric resources in 1985 by ECOS Management Criteria, Inc. (Brook and Langenwaller, 1985). This survey identified and inventoried NRHP resources along the Santa Ana River from Prado Dam Flood Control Basin all the way to the Pacific Ocean. Beyond the 1985 survey, several additional cultural resource investigations have specifically occurred within the Alcoa Dike project area.

A total of eight (8) cultural resources have been recorded within the boundaries of the proposed project area or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. Seven of these sites fall within or near the boundaries of the proposed borrow pit location and the final site is located within the dike footprint. Of these resources, four (4) have been determined to be eligible for inclusion on the NRHP. Two of these eligible sites, CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044, were excavated in the early 2000s in anticipation of the area being used as a borrow site and are no longer extant.

**Table 3-4**

Site Number	Description	NRHP Status	Comment
CA-RIV-3694	Rincon/Pomona	Eligible (D)	Partial Excavation (Foster et al 1995)
CA-RIV-1039	Ashcroft Ranch	Eligible (D) and mitigated	Excavated (Sternier et al. 2004)
CA-RIV-5523	Remnants of farm	Not Eligible	Tested in 1995 (Foster et al. 1996)
CA-RIV-5524	Homestead	Not Eligible	Tested in 1995 (Foster et al. 1996)
CA-RIV-2802	Adobe Structure	Eligible and mitigated	Excavated (Foster et al. 1995)
CA-RIV-1044	Pate/Carrillo Farm	Eligible (D) and mitigated	Excavated (Sternier et al. 2004)
CA-RIV-3372	Rincon Cemetery	Not Eligible	
CA-RIV-5521	Historic artifact scatter associated with destroyed farmstead	Not Eligible	Tested in 1995 (Foster et al. 1996)

### **3.13 Public Services and Utilities**

Due to the proposed project's location in the City of Corona the project area includes the typical array of municipal public services and utilities that support residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Public services and utilities serving the area include:

- Fire protection
- Police protection
- Schools
- Natural gas
- Electricity
- Water
- Wastewater
- Waste disposal and recycling



### 3.13.1 Public Services

#### *Fire Protection*

The City of Corona Fire Department provides a full range of fire protection services to the citizens of Corona. There are currently 7 fire stations located within the City of Corona. Corona Fire Station #3, located at 790 S. Smith Street is the closest to the proposed project area.

#### *Police Protection*

The City of Corona provides complete law enforcement to the City population with the Corona Police Department. The Corona Police Department is commanded by a Chief of Police. The Department has 174 sworn officers, 62 full-time support personnel, 9 animal control officers, and approximately 70 volunteers. In order to provide the community with the highest level of service available, the Police Department is administratively divided into three divisions, including: Investigation, Support Services, and Field Services.

#### *Schools*

The Corona-Norco Unified School District serves the school needs for the City of Corona. The School District has 47 schools (K-12) and has over 53,000 students enrolled. None of these schools are located within the proposed project area.

### 3.13.2 Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project area is served by utility and service systems located in Riverside County and within the City of Corona. A variety of local purveyors in these areas provide and maintain utility and service system facilities associated with electricity, water, stormwater and wastewater, solid waste, and natural gas. Municipally operated lines provide sewer services in the area. Similarly, stormwater flows are conveyed by the flood control facilities within the City of Corona. Underground Service Alert (also known as USA or “Dig Alert”), a non-profit organization supported by utility firms, provides specific information on the location of underground utilities to contractors upon request, prior to construction. Table 3.13-1 summarizes the utilities providers serving the proposed project area.

**Table 3-5 Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Utility or Service System Provider</b>
City of Corona	<b>Natural Gas</b> – Southern California Gas Company <b>Electricity</b> – City of Corona Utilities; Southern California Edison <b>Water</b> – City of Corona Utilities <b>Wastewater</b> – City of Corona Utilities <b>Solid Waste and Recycling</b> – Waste Management <b>Landfills Used</b> – El Sobrante Landfill

Data on location of utilities within the project vicinity was collected by the Corps in 2020 or as referenced in the Phase I 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Entities were coordinated with, including Southern California Edison (SCE). Any utilities within project limits such as the Brine Line, will either need to be protected in place, replaced, or relocated prior to or during construction.

### **3.14 CERCLA Hazardous Substances and Other Pollutants**

A HTRW Survey Report of the Alcoa Dike PED Project was prepared, dated August 2018. A limited site investigation and sampling event was also conducted of the former City of Corona Wastewater Treatment Ponds in June of 2018. The 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum summary of observations from the reports is applicable to this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum:

**Sediment:** Sediment/soil sampling was conducted within the existing percolation ponds to determine the presence or absence and/or extent of potential contamination within these areas due to former percolation pond operation. The sediment within the ponds was sampled and tested for presence of pesticides and metals that were the most likely contaminants to reside on the property due to the pond activities/operations. Observations and chemical testing laboratory results indicated that the sediment was determined to be not classified as a hazardous waste and not to be a risk to human health during construction and long-term maintenance activities for the Alcoa Dike structure. Sediment and or soils from the ponds can be excavated and disposed of offsite as non-hazardous waste and used for typical landfill cover or used onsite as construction fill.

**Groundwater:** Groundwater at the adjacent Corona Municipal airport is contaminated with residual petroleum contamination due to leakage into the soils from former underground fuel storage tanks (USTs). Because the USTs have long since been removed and the main source of soil contamination removed, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board's environmental contamination case files for this property are closed. However, residual groundwater contamination remains in the unconfined aquifer in the area and is still being monitored on a long-term basis by sampling at various groundwater monitoring wells located on the airport's property. Also, there are two other contaminant properties (areas) of concern (former Alcoa Aluminum Plant and City of Corona Golf Course) that are located in close proximity to the Dike and that have a potential environmental contamination concern. These, along with the Airport site have been identified as ASTM equivalent Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs) according to the findings in the HTRW Survey Report (shown in Appendix A of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum). Alcoa Aluminum Plant has potential residual contaminants of Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (VOCs) in soil and groundwater. The Golf Course was a former area of a removed Underground Storage Tank (UST) that has left behind petroleum hydrocarbon contamination in soil and groundwater. The potential for groundwater media contamination at all three sites is greater than that of soil media. Also, because of the residual contamination and its close proximity to the Dike footprint/alignment, there is a greater possibility of encountering petroleum/volatile hydrocarbons in the groundwater at the construction site, especially during excavation and dewatering activities.

The Phase II Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative of the 2018 Phase I Final Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum and associated sponsor real estate actions except for the changes identified in Table 2.2-1. Features constructed by Phase I are unchanged. For Phase II, a new or different impact would only occur if it is associated with the project modifications discussed in Section 2, or as a result of a changed environmental condition discussed in this Section. This section discusses environmental consequences for the as-yet-

unconstructed work. Effects to various environmental aspects are addressed more specifically to provide an updated accounting of potential effects. The information is based on recent surveys, literature review, and coordination with regulatory agencies and technical experts.

## 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### 4.1 Air Quality

The affected environment for air quality is presented in Section 3.1 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the previous project was approved.

As described in Table 2.2-1, the Proposed Action includes the following primary design features that are modifications from the previously approved design contained in the 2018 Phase I Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum, as relevant to air quality for the estimated two year construction duration of Phase II: modified an increase in the length of the dike alignment at the Lincoln Avenue tie-in adjacent to Temescal Wash; addition of a 36-inch drainage structure extending through the main dike embankment for a total of 3 (three), 36-inch drainage structures; addition of one culvert with four concrete boxes extending through the Rincon Street roadway embankment; and re-design of a concrete and rip-rap trapezoidal swale to an earthen contoured drainage ditch that conveys surface drainage to Temescal Wash and a new borrow and haul route location. In addition, the Phase II project will complete the portions of the dike not constructed in Phase I, including the south Lincoln tie-in near Butterfield Drive; the portions of the dike crossing Rincon Street and Auburndale Street. For the purposes of the Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential air quality impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action and the previously approved design is provided below.

#### Significance Threshold

Impacts would be considered significant if the alternative:

- Exceeds General Conformity Rule *de minimis* thresholds; and
- Exceeds SCAQMD daily construction thresholds.

#### 4.1.1 Proposed Action

The following assumptions were used in the analysis of impacts to air quality for the previously approved Phase I project and are the same for the Proposed Action:

- Project area for proposed dike construction would involve approximately 217 acres.
- Emissions were estimated based on both on-road and off-road equipment using EMFAC 2007 emission factors. The daily emissions were based on the 52-week (650 days) work duration. However, since the General Conformity Applicability Rates are calculated on an annual basis, the total estimated emissions for the project were equally divided by two years (estimated duration for project construction and site restoration) and compared to the General Conformity Applicability Rates.
- Over an approximate 2-year work period (January 2021 through January 2023) covering approximately 650 workdays. Daily construction assumed a workday during daylight hours with a 6-day (Monday through Saturday) work week. The project would be completely in place and completely operational in year 2023.

- Phases of work would include Site Preparation, Clearing and Grubbing, Grading, Construction, Concrete work, Road and Utility Relocation. Construction equipment for the proposed project would likely include a combination of water trucks, dump trucks, 16cy dump trucks, scrapers, tractors/loaders, dozers, cranes, spreaders, scrapers, rollers, graders, excavators, a man lift, brush clippers, hydroseed truck, Hwy 6x4 trucks, and pick-up trucks. The Brine Line and SCE work would include additional equipment including an excavator, a loader, a mounted auger/backhoe, a water truck, two (2) pickups and a welding machine for HDPE pipe.

The CalEEMod 2016.3.2 program was used to calculate estimated emissions for the previously approved Phase I project (2018 Final Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum). These estimated emissions also apply to the Phase II Proposed Action. Emission calculations include maximum daily emissions, in units of pounds per hour (lbs/hr), and maximum annual emissions, in units of (tons per year), for criteria pollutants (ROG); NO<sub>x</sub>; CO; SO<sub>2</sub>; PM<sub>10</sub>; PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and annual greenhouse gas (GHG/CO<sub>2</sub>e) in units of Metric Tons/yr (MT/yr). CalEEMod uses sources such as the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) AP-42 emission factors, and California Air Resources Board (ARB) vehicle emission models. The summer lbs/day emissions for the proposed project are typically higher in air pollutant air emissions when compared to the winter lbs/day and therefore, the summer lbs/day are referenced as the maximum lbs/day instead of the winter lbs/day. The CalEEMod air quality calculations can be found in Appendix B of the 2018 Final Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum and are incorporated into this document by reference.

Emissions from equipment that generally stays on-site would constitute off-road emissions. On-road emissions would include emissions from haul trucks and water trucks as well as the workers' vehicles (pickup trucks).

The proposed project would result in air quality impacts from daily construction and during each year of construction. See Table 4.1-1 and 4.1-2 below for comparison of estimated daily emissions (maximum daily construction lbs/day) to SCAQMD threshold and comparison of estimated annual emissions (maximum construction tons/year) to Federal threshold.

Daily construction emissions are shown in Table 4.1-1 above. Estimated construction emissions are below the SCAQMD thresholds

**Table 4-1  
Comparison of Proposed Project Daily Construction Emissions to SCAQMD Lbs/Day**

Construction	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	GHG/CO <sub>2</sub> e (MT/yr.)
Proposed Project Maximum Daily lb/day	4.8528	54.7202	34.2888	0.0646	22.6585	12.4028	6,449.9785

Comparison of Proposed Project Daily Construction Emissions to SCAQMD Lbs/Day

Construction	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	GHG/CO2e (MT/yr.)
SCAQMD Daily lb/day	75	100	550	150	150	55	No criteria unless industrial facilities; 10,000 MT/yr CO2eq for industrial facilities

Table 4-2

Comparison of Proposed Project Annual Construction Emissions to General Conformity *de minimis* Thresholds

Construction	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	GHG/CO2e (MT/yr)
Proposed Project,  Average Ton/Year	0.5659	5.7923	3.8394	0.007	1.0957	0.6663	614.1535
Federal Ton/Year	100	100	100	100	70	100	See note below.*

\*Recommends that agencies quantify a proposed agency action's projected direct and indirect GHG emissions, taking into account available data and GHG quantification tools that are suitable for the proposed agency action.

Annual construction emissions are shown in Table 4.1-2 above. Estimated construction emissions are below General Conformity *de minimis* Thresholds.

Based on the above, the proposed project construction daily emissions for all air criteria pollutants and GHG/CO2e would be below the SCAQMD significant threshold and would result in less than significant impacts. Furthermore, the proposed project construction annual emissions are below General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds and would result in less than significant impacts. With the implementation of air quality (AQ) Environmental Commitments AQ-1 through AQ-22 and Best Management Practices (BMPs), potential daily and annual air quality construction emission impacts would be reduced. Impacts from emissions would be temporary and would return to pre-project conditions following completion of construction. Based on the above, impacts from daily and annual construction emissions would be less than significant.

Operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRRR) work for the proposed project would more than likely occur only after a major storm or major flood event. Reseeding activities associated with OMRRR work would not likely require recurring restoration work. Based on the above, the proposed project would result in negligible air quality OMRRR impacts for daily and annual emissions. See Table 4.1-3 and 4.1-4 below for comparison of estimated daily emissions (maximum daily operation lbs/day) to SCAQMD threshold (Table 4.1-3) and comparison of estimated annual emissions (maximum operation tons/year) to Federal threshold (Table 4.1-4).

**Table 4-3  
Comparison of Proposed Project Daily OMRRR Emissions to SCAQMD Lbs/Day**

O&M	ROG/VOC	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	GHG/CO2e (MT/yr)
Proposed Project Maximum Daily lb/day	Negligible	Negligible	negligible	negligible	Negligible	negligible	negligible
SCAQMD Daily lb/day	55	55	550	150	150	55	No criteria unless industrial facilities; 10,000 MT/yr CO2eq for industrial facilities

Daily O&M emissions are shown in Table 4.1-3 above. Estimated OMRRR emissions are negligible and below the SCAQMD thresholds for all air emission criteria pollutants and GHG/CO2e. With the implementation of Environmental Commitments AQ-1 through AQ-22 and BMPs, potential daily air OMRRR emission impacts would be reduced. Impacts from emissions would be temporary and would return to pre-project conditions following completion of OMRRR. Based on the above, impacts to daily OMRRR emissions would be less than significant.

**Table 4-4**  
**Comparison of Proposed Project Annual OMRRR Emissions to General Conformity *de minimis***  
**Thresholds**

O&M	ROG/VOC	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	GHG/CO2e (MT/yr)
Proposed Project Average Ton/Year	negligible	negligible	negligible	negligible	negligible	negligible	negligible
Federal Ton/Year	100	100	100	100	70	100	See note below.*

\*Recommends that agencies quantify a proposed agency action's projected direct and indirect GHG emissions, taking into account available data and GHG quantification tools that are suitable for the proposed agency action.

Estimated annual OMRRR emissions are below General Conformity *de minimis* Thresholds. With the implementation Environmental Commitments AQ-1 through AQ-22 and BMPs, potential annual air OMRRR emission impacts would be reduced. Impacts from emissions would be temporary and would return to pre-project conditions following completion of OMRRR. Based on the above, impacts to annual OMRRR emissions would be less than significant.

Based on the calculations from the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, the Phase II proposed project daily construction and OMRRR emissions for all air criteria pollutants and GHG/CO2e would continue to be below the SCAQMD significant threshold and would result in less than significant impacts. Furthermore, proposed project annual construction and OMRRR emissions are below General Conformity *de minimis* thresholds and would result in less than significant impacts. With the implementation of Environmental Commitments AQ-1 through AQ-22 and BMPs, potential daily and annual air construction emission impacts would be reduced. Impacts from emissions would be temporary and would return to pre-project conditions following completion of construction. Based on 2018 Phase I SEA/EIR calculations, impacts to daily and annual construction emissions would be less than significant.

**Future Maintenance.** The Proposed Action Alternative would include routine inspections and minor repairs, of the Alcoa Dike embankment and its associated features after construction is completed (see Section 2.4 for a detailed list of future maintenance activities). Use of maintenance vehicles and equipment would impact air quality, however impacts are expected to be nominal given routine inspections would typically occur monthly, except during flood fighting events. During flood fighting events vehicles and equipment may be needed more frequently, and inspections could occur up to daily. During more severe flood events, launch stone may need to be replaced, which would require additional maintenance equipment outside



of what would be used for routine inspections and minor repairs. The number and type of maintenance equipment needed during severe flood events would be dependent on repairs needed. Because these events are expected to occur infrequently, effects on air quality from future maintenance activities would be less than significant.

#### **4.1.2 Previously Approved Design**

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, project modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented, and the project would be constructed as described in 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Construction and OMRRR-related emissions would be the same as the Proposed Action and would not result in significant impacts to air quality.

## **4.2 Biological Resources**

A detailed impacts analysis for biological resources is included in Section 4.2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum and is incorporated by reference. Any incremental impacts identified herein are in addition to those identified in the previous document and are addressed accordingly.

### **Significance Threshold**

An impact to biological resources would be considered significant if any project alternatives result in:

- A direct adverse effect on a population of a threatened, endangered, or candidate species or the unmitigated loss of designated critical habitat for a listed or candidate species, to the extent that the regional population is diminished.
- An unmitigated, net loss in the habitat value of a sensitive biological habitat or area of special biological significance.
- Substantial impedance to the movement or migration of fish or wildlife.
- Substantial loss to the population of any native fish, wildlife, or vegetation.
- Substantial loss in overall diversity of the ecosystem.

An evaluation of whether an impact to biological resources would be substantial must consider the resource in its regional or ecological context. While an impact may be locally significant, it may not substantially diminish or result in the permanent loss of an important resource in a regional or ecological context.

Direct impacts would occur when biological resources are altered, disturbed, destroyed, or removed during construction. Direct impacts would result from such activities as clearing, grading, or brushing of vegetation, or mechanical crushing from equipment and vehicles. Other direct impacts may include loss of foraging, nesting, or burrowing habitat for wildlife species, and soil disturbance that results in the introduction of exotic invasive species.

Potential indirect impacts may include increased erosion and sedimentation, changes to hydrology, or long-term degradation of natural vegetation communities. These changes may result in long term degradation of vegetation communities, habitat, and sensitive species.

Both direct and indirect impacts can be classified as either temporary or permanent, depending on the duration of the impact. Temporary impacts may be considered to have reversible effects on biological resources, where impacted areas would recover or be restored after the completion of project activities. Permanent impacts occur in areas that are dedicated to project use, resulting in the irreversible removal of biological resources in that area.

The following analysis considers direct and indirect impacts associated with construction, operation and maintenance. Impacts would primarily occur at and adjacent to the Phase I project site, previously analyzed, and the Phase II expanded project footprint.

Construction-related environmental commitments from the 1988 GDM/SEIS and the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR, and additional commitments developed for the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, will be implemented. A full list of environmental commitments can be found in Section 6 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Any additional commitments resulting from the expansion of the project footprint for Phase II are included below.

#### **4.2.1 Proposed Action**

##### ***Vegetation***

Vegetation impacts from Phase II are similar to those described in Section 4.2.2.1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Implementation of the Phase II project would result in temporary and permanent impacts to native and non-native riparian vegetation, native and non-native upland vegetation, and developed areas in the expanded project footprint (Table 4.2.2.1-1). The additional loss of vegetated areas would be minor in the expanded Phase II project footprint, given the minimal acreage, the abundance of riparian habitat in the vicinity of the Prado Basin, and the existing low habitat quality in impacted areas.

**Table 4-5 Incremental Impacted Cover Types Phase II Expanded Footprint**

Cover Types	Impact Type (Acres)		
	Temporary	Permanent	Total
Native Riparian (Mulefat Scrub)	1.83	0.01	1.84
Non-native Upland (Non-native grassland)	0.75	0.00	0.75
Developed	0.3	0.06	0.36
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>2.95</b>

Additional temporary and permanent impacts beyond the Phase 1 footprint would occur to native riparian and non-native upland habitat along Rincon Street, adjacent to Temescal Wash (Figure 4.2.2.1-1).

Approximately 18.87 acres of additional permanent impacts would also occur within the footprint previously analyzed in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum (Table 4.2.2.1-2, Figure 4.2.2.1-1). This includes 5.28 acres of new permanent impacts to native riparian vegetation. These areas were previously considered as temporary impacts and would become permanent impacts with implementation of Phase II. These additional permanent impact areas occur in portions of the existing percolation ponds/basins just west of Smith Avenue, which are frequently mowed, and the open area adjacent to Butterfield Drive; and at the easternmost end of

the Phase 1 project area, west of Lincoln Avenue and south of the bridge. Habitat in these areas is primarily mapped as non-native upland, with riparian habitat mapped along Rincon Street.

Approximately 36.33 acres of permanent impacts previously analyzed in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum have been changed to temporary impacts as a result of refined project designs (Table 4.2.2.1-2, Figure 4.2.2.1). This includes a reduction of 0.74 acres of native riparian vegetation from permanent impacts to temporary impacts.

Approximately 105 acres of previously considered temporary impacts in Phase I, occurring adjacent to the Corona airport to the east and in the borrow area, will no longer be impacted as part of the Phase II project activities (Figure 4.2.2.1-1). Habitat near the airport was primarily mapped as non-native upland. A new borrow area totaling 93.78 acres was mapped as non-native upland (43.27 acres) and other (50.52 acres) which included agricultural lands (Figure 4.2.2.1-2).

**Table 4-6 Change in Permanent/Temporary Impact Areas (PI vs. PII)**

Cover Types	Phase I	Phase II (PI + expanded/ reduced footprint)	Change in Acres
	Perm/Temp	Perm/Temp	Perm/Temp
Native Riparian	5.4 / 29.7	9.9 / 6.7	+4.5 / -23.0
Non-native Upland	61.0 / 126.4	40.7 / 96.2	-20.3 / -30.2
Native Upland	0 / 12.8	0 / 0	0 / -12.8
Developed	7.9 / 8.6	6.2 / 7.1	-1.7 / -1.5
Other (Agriculture)	0 / 0	0 / 50.5	0 / +50.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>74.3 / 177.5</b>	<b>56.8 / 160.5</b>	<b>-17.5 / -17.0</b>

Direct impacts to vegetation would result from ground disturbing project activities such as clearing and grading for the construction of the dike, access roads, ponding areas, road crossings, staging areas, stockpiling, and construction site access. Vegetation may also be crushed by equipment and vehicles.

Construction activities may also temporarily reduce habitat value in adjacent areas due to construction noise, dust, increased human presence, and increased vehicle traffic.

Indirect impacts to vegetation could include alterations in existing topography and hydrology regimes; more forceful surface runoff and increased erosion that may damage vegetation within and outside the project area; accumulation of fugitive dust; disruptions to native seed banks from ground disturbance; and the colonization of nonnative/invasive plant species.

The riparian plant communities in the proposed project area are considered sensitive habitat types for their role in the ecological function of the SAR corridor and the wildlife species inhabiting it. While non-native annual grasslands are not a protected community, they provide important foraging and refugia habitat for a variety of plant and wildlife species.

One Corps existing mitigation site occurs adjacent to the project area, encompassing the two northwesterly percolation ponds/basins west of Smith Avenue. A detailed description of this mitigation area is included in Figure 4.2.2.1-1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The proposed project has been designed to avoid impacts to this mitigation site. Neither the footprint of the dike, nor the proposed widening/raising of Rincon Road will directly affect the adjacent mitigation site. In addition, the proposed Santa Ana River Trail and associated




Figure 11-4 Change in Permanent and Temporary Impact Areas (P1 vs. P2)






Figure 12-4 Change in Vegetation Community Impact Areas (P1 vs. P2)

equestrian trail will also not directly impact the adjacent mitigation site. Hydrology in the area would not be affected.

Construction activities may also temporarily reduce habitat value in adjacent areas due to construction noise, dust, increased human presence, and increased vehicle traffic.

Indirect impacts to vegetation could include alterations in existing topography and hydrology regimes; more forceful surface runoff and increased erosion that may damage vegetation within and outside the project area; accumulation of fugitive dust; disruptions to native seed banks from ground disturbance; and the colonization of nonnative/invasive plant species.

The riparian plant communities in the proposed project area are considered sensitive habitat types for their role in the ecological function of the SAR corridor and the wildlife species inhabiting it. While non-native annual grasslands are not a protected community, they provide important foraging and refugia habitat for a variety of plant and wildlife species.

One Corps existing mitigation site occurs adjacent to the project area, encompassing the two northwesterly percolation ponds/basins west of Smith Avenue. A detailed description of this mitigation area is included in Figure 4.2.2.1-1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The proposed project has been designed to avoid impacts to this mitigation site. Neither the footprint of the dike, nor the proposed widening/raising of Rincon Road will directly affect the adjacent mitigation site. In addition, the proposed Santa Ana River Trail and associated equestrian trail will also not directly impact the adjacent mitigation site. Hydrology in the area would not be affected.

The 2001 SEIS/EIR, 2001 BO, and 2012 BO Amendment included a series of mitigation measures and environmental commitments that would be implemented to compensate for impacts to vegetation communities during construction of Santa Ana River Project features. These include measures to mitigate for temporary and permanent effects to aquatic, riparian, and upland habitats.

For Prado Basin projects, many of the anticipated permanent impacts had previously been mitigated following requirements in the 1988 GDM/SEIS and the 1989 BO. However, since impacts to riparian and wetland habitats at the Alcoa Dike project area would exceed those that were anticipated in 1988, the Corps will compensate for temporary and permanent impacts to these habitat types following the precepts in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and 2012 BO (as amended), including removing *Arundo donax* and other non-native vegetation from off-site mitigation areas.

An additional 0.01 acres of permanent impact and 1.83 acres of temporary impact to riparian habitat would occur beyond the Phase 1 analysis, which would be mitigated for in an off-site mitigation area. This off-site mitigation area was identified and analyzed as part of the 2018 Phase 1 SEA/EIR (Section 4.2.2.1, Figure 4.2.2.1-2). In addition to the additional impacts

discussed above, 0.74 acres of the Phase 1 permanent impacts have changed to temporary and 5.28 acres of the Phase 1 temporary impacts have changed to permanent (Table 4.2.2.1-3).

Project design changes and an expanded project footprint will result in a net increase of 4.55 acres of permanent impacts to riparian vegetation and a net decrease of 2.71 acres of temporary riparian vegetation (Table 4.2.2.1-3). These net changes of Phase II impacts result in 20.04 acres of additional mitigation acres for a total combined requirement of 76.45 acres (Table 4.2.2.1-4).

In compliance with the 2012 BO Amendment, the Corps will restore (through *Arundo donax* and other non-native removal) one acre of riverine habitat for each acre of wetland/riparian habitat temporarily impacted (1:1), and five acres for each acre of permanently impacted (5:1).<sup>1</sup> The Corps will also maintain temporarily impacted non-riparian areas free of exotic invasive species for 8 years. Changes to mitigation acres from the Phase I project are shown in Table 4.2.2.1-4.

**Table 4-7 Changes in Impacts to Riparian Vegetation**

MITIGATION	Phase II (Expanded Footprint)		Phase II (Change of Impact Type)		Phase II (Net Change)	
	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent
Riparian/Wetland Habitat	+1.83	+0.01	+0.74/-5.28	-0.74/+5.28	-2.71	+4.55

**Table 4-8 Additional Mitigation Acreages (PI vs. PII)**

MITIGATION	Phase I			Phase II (Net Change)		
	Temporary (1:1)	Permanent (5:1)	Total Acres Mitigation	Temporary (1:1)	Permanent (5:1)	Total Acres Mitigation
Riparian/Wetland Habitat	29.66	5.35	56.41	26.95	9.90	76.45

Mitigation related to presence of coastal California gnatcatcher in the project's borrow area is documented in Section 4.2.2.1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. No additional impacts to gnatcatcher habitat would occur with implementation of Phase II.

The Corps will implement environmental commitments as documented in Sections 4.2 and 6.0 of the 2018 Phase 1 Final SEA/EIR Addendum to minimize and mitigate impacts from the Phase II project. These commitments include provisions for avoidance of nesting season, pre-

<sup>1</sup> The 1:1 mitigation requirement for temporary impacts assumes that the restored area will be actively maintained for the life of the project. The Corps also has the option of compensating for temporary impacts to riparian/wetland habitat by restoring three acres in an off-site location for each acre affected (3:1) and maintaining the restored area for a period of five years.



construction surveys, monitoring, environmental training, permits and concurrences, spill prevention plans, BMPs, sound walls, revegetation and weeding of temporarily impacted areas, off-site mitigation for impacted riparian areas, and cowbird trapping.

For a full list of environmental commitments, see Section 6.0 of this SEA/EIR addendum.

No additional environmental commitments would be required for Phase II.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures would minimize impacts to less-than-significant levels.

### ***Special-Status Plant Species***

A detailed description of impacts to special-status plants is included in Section 4.2.2.1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. No federal or State listed threatened or endangered species were identified in the proposed project area, and none are expected to occur based on a lack of suitable habitat, suitable soil types, and the recognized distributions of these species in the region. CNPS ranked species observed in the vicinity or with potential to occur include Robinson's pepper-grass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*) (observed), chaparral sand verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*), paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica* var. *californica*), white-rabbit tobacco (*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*), and Coulter's Matilija poppy (*Romneya coulteri*).

Implementation of the proposed project could result in both direct and indirect effects to special-status plant species that may occur in the project area. Direct impacts could occur as a result of the removal or crushing of vegetation during construction activities.

Indirect impacts could occur from the accumulation of fugitive dust, the introduction and proliferation of non-native invasive plants, and increased soil compaction, erosion, or sedimentation. Noxious weeds may permanently degrade rare plant and wildlife habitats, and their proliferation as a result of project activities could adversely affect special-status plant species if they are present. Excessive dust can decrease or limit plant survivorship by decreasing photosynthetic output, reducing transpiration, and adversely affecting reproductive success. Soil compaction, erosion, and sedimentation resulting from project activities can also indirectly impact rare plants, if present.

Project related impacts to special-status plant species were previously analyzed in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. No additional impacts to special-status plant species are expected, and environmental commitments as previously described would be implemented. For a full list of environmental commitments, see Section 6.0 of this Phase II SEA/EIR addendum.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures would minimize impacts to special-status plants, if present, to less-than-significant levels.

*Jurisdictional Habitats*

Potential impacts to jurisdictional resources were analyzed in Section 4.2.2.1 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Additional impacts to jurisdictional waters would occur in the expanded Phase II project footprint downstream along Temescal Wash northeast of Rincon Road, and immediately west of Lincoln Avenue, south of the bridge (Table 4.2.2.1-5, -6). However, this provides more than enough acreage for the increases documented in this SEA/EIR as demonstrated below.

Jurisdictional areas occurring within the borrow area, will be completely avoided and no new impacts are expected.

Direct impacts to jurisdictional waters would include the loss of habitat due to construction activities. Indirect impacts could include alterations in existing topography, disruptions to native seed banks from ground disturbance, and the colonization of non-native, invasive plant species. Temporary impacts to jurisdictional waters would be short-term and would be minimized with the implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1 (Environmental Commitments) and summarized below. EC-BR-5 (Spill Prevention and Contingency Plan), EC-BR-9 (avoid water containing mud, silt or other pollutants from entering the stream, EC-BR-11 (Avoidance of all impacts to the low-flow channel of Temescal Creek), EC-WR-1 (Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan), and EC-WR-3 (Water Quality Permits). These measures will reduce erosion and would minimize impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Table 4.2.2.1-5 provides the updated impact acreages for WOUS. The project will permanently impact additional WOUS (1.54 perm/0.04 temp) and Waters of the State (1.83 perm/0.00 temp). The 401 Cert and 404b1 accounted for an additional 3.5 acres of impacts (3.0 permanent and 0.5 temporary) beyond what was included in the Phase I SEA. This provides more than enough acreage for the increases documented in this SEA/EIR. A new 401/404b1 will not be needed.

**Table 4-9 Impacts to Jurisdictional Wetlands/Waters in Phase II Expanded Footprint**

Federal, State Jurisdictional Habitat (Joint Jurisdiction)			
Impact Type	Incremental Impact to Jurisdictional Waters (Acres)		Incremental Impact to Jurisdictional Wetlands (Acres)
	State	Federal	Federal
Permanent	1.83	1.54	0
Temporary	0.00	0.04	0
<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 4-10 Change in Impacts to Jurisdictional Wetlands/Waters (PI vs. PII)

Federal and State Jurisdictional Habitat (Joint Jurisdiction)								
	Jurisdictional Waters (Acres)				Difference		Federally Jurisdictional Wetlands (Acres)	Difference
Impact Type	Phase I		Phase II		State/Federal		Phase I	Phase II
	State	Federal	State	Federal				
Permanent	7.25	0.49	9.08	2.03	+1.83 / +1.54		0.01	0.01
Temporary	19.38	2.94	6.13	1.55	-13.25 / -1.39		0.02	0.02
<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>26.63</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>15.21</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>-11.42 / +0.15</b>		<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>

### Wildlife

Impacts to wildlife are described extensively in Section 4.2.2.2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Implementation of the Phase II project would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to wildlife in the expanded project area.

Direct impacts may result from crushing or burial of individuals, vegetated habitat, nests, and burrows during construction. Indirect impacts may include construction noise, dust, human presence, and an increase in opportunistic predators that may disturb or harass wildlife or impact their movement corridors.

No additional impacts to wildlife are expected to occur beyond those analyzed for the Phase I project.

The Corps will implement environmental commitments as documented in Sections 4.2 and 6.0 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum to minimize and mitigate impacts from the Phase 2 project. These commitments include provisions for avoidance of nesting season, pre-construction surveys, monitoring, environmental training, permits and concurrences, spill prevention plans, BMPs, sound walls, native reseeding and weeding of the temporary disturbance areas, off-site mitigation for impacted riparian areas, and cowbird trapping.

For a full list of environmental commitments, see Section 6.0 of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum.

No additional environmental commitments would be required for Phase II.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures would minimize impacts to wildlife to less-than-significant levels.

***Wildlife Movement***

The SAR, Temescal Wash, and associated uplands are recognized as vital pathways for wildlife movement. Several migratory songbirds utilize the riparian vegetation within the SAR corridor for breeding, nesting, and foraging, or at a minimum, as transient rest sites during migration. In addition, large, wide-ranging animals, such as mountain lion, bobcat, and coyote have been documented within the SAR watershed and may utilize the SAR corridor and Temescal Wash in search of prey, water resources, or cover.

The proposed Alcoa Dike will be a linear feature constructed roughly parallel to Temescal Wash and will not be a physical impediment to or block any known movement pathways along this corridor. Further, several existing infrastructure features, such as Prado Dam, State Routes 91 and 71, and Highway 15 are already in place and currently contribute significantly as impediments to regional wildlife movement, including movement through the SAR corridor where the project area is located. The proposed project would contribute little, if any, long-term effects to wildlife movement through the region.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as previously described, would minimize impacts to wildlife movement to less-than-significant levels.

***Special-Status Wildlife***

Impacts to special-status wildlife are extensively described in Section 4.2.2.2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Habitat in the vicinity of the proposed project area has the potential to support several federally and State listed wildlife species, and there is designated critical habitat overlapping the project footprint.

Two federal and/or State listed threatened or endangered species are known to occur in the project area: least Bell's vireo (FE, SE) and coastal California gnatcatcher (FT, CSC). Two federal and/or State listed threatened or endangered species have critical habitat overlapping the project footprint: least Bell's vireo (FE, SE) and western yellow-billed cuckoo (FT, SE). These species are discussed briefly below.

Other special-status species (FP, CSC, MSHCP) were identified within the Phase I project site including western pond turtle, San Bernardino ringneck snake, south coast garter snake, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, great blue heron, burrowing owl, Lawrence's goldfinch, turkey vulture, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, coyote, bobcat.

A suite of special-status species, although not observed, have high potential to occur in the vicinity of the project area. These species are discussed extensively in Section 3.2.5 and Table 3.2.5-2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

No additional impacts to special-status species beyond those described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum are expected to occur, except for least Bell's vireo where additional riparian habitat would be impacted in the expanded Phase II footprint.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as previously described, would minimize impacts to special-status wildlife to less-than-significant levels.

***Least Bell's vireo FE, SE.*** Least Bell's vireo has been recorded breeding in the project area during numerous surveys conducted in the past, including during the 2017 nesting season. SAWA (2017) reported nine vireo territories within 200 feet of the Phase 1 project area, including two within the Phase I project area. Additional surveys by SAWA in 2019 reported nine vireo territories within 200 feet of the Phase II project area, including the new borrow area.

The Phase II project area encompasses about 134.94 acres of critical habitat including 34.02 acres of critical habitat that will be permanently impacted and 100.92 acres that would be temporarily impacted by the Phase II. Approximately 4.07 acres of permanent impacts and net decrease of 25.73 acres of temporary impacts to critical habitat are new impacts that will result from Phase II and were not previously analyzed for Phase I. Approximately 74.15 acres of the temporary impacts to critical habitat are from the new borrow area which is vegetated by non-native upland vegetation (non-native grasslands) and agricultural areas that do not provide the primary constituent elements for least Bell's vireo.

Construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. In the absence of specific measures to mitigate habitat loss, and abate noise, light, and fugitive dust during construction, as many as 8 vireo territories within 200 feet of the project area could be adversely affected, including 1 territory within the project footprint.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, including avoidance of construction during the nesting season, pre-construction surveys, monitoring, environmental training, permits and concurrences, spill prevention plans, BMPs, sound walls, reseeding and weeding of temporarily impacted areas, off-site mitigation for impacted riparian areas, and cowbird trapping, would minimize and mitigate impacts to least Bell's vireo from construction of the Phase II project. Environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as outlined in the 2001 SEIS/EIR, 2001 BO, and 2012 and 2018 BO Amendments, are described extensively in Sections 4.2 and 6.0 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, and in Section 6.0 of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum.

**Conclusion:** The proposed project may affect least Bell's vireo and its critical habitat. With the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures described herein, the effects would be less than significant.

**Coastal California gnatcatcher FT, CSC.** Coastal California gnatcatcher was recorded within the Phase I borrow area in 2017 (2017 SAWA), however nesting has not been confirmed as of 2018 and 2019 surveys (Figure 3.2.4-2). Marginally suitable coastal sage scrub habitat is present within the borrow area. Project impacts already addressed in the Phase I SEA accounted for the loss of two territories within the borrow area. The project no longer poses a risk to these territories because they have already been removed. No additional territories are known within 200 feet of the Phase II project footprint. Suitable habitat does not occur near the expanded Phase II footprint areas.

Critical habitat for gnatcatcher occurs downstream of the Prado Basin in the vicinity of the Chino Hills and Santa Ana Mountains, and would not be impacted by the proposed project.

Construction would result in temporary loss of suitable habitat for resident gnatcatcher and disturbance during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. In the absence of specific measures to mitigate habitat loss, and abate noise, light, and fugitive dust during construction, gnatcatcher could be adversely affected.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as previously described, would minimize and mitigate impacts to gnatcatcher from construction of the Phase II project. Environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as outlined in the 2001 SEIS/EIR, 2001 BO, and 2012 and 2018 BO Amendments, are described extensively in Sections 4.2 and 6.0 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, and in Section 6.0 of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum.

**Conclusion:** The proposed project may affect the coastal California gnatcatcher. With the implementation of avoidance and minimization measures described herein, the effects would be less than significant.

**Western yellow-billed cuckoo FT, SE.** No cuckoos have been observed within the project footprint; however, marginally suitable riparian habitat is present, providing a low probability that this species may pass through or forage in the project area. Due to the reduction in TCE around the Phase I borrow area, critical habitat for cuckoo, as described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, would no longer be impacted by the proposed project. The proposed project is not expected to affect occupied or suitable nesting habitat for this species.

Implementation of environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as previously described, would minimize and mitigate any potential impacts to cuckoo from construction of the Phase II project. Environmental commitments and mitigation measures, as outlined in the

2001 SEIS/EIR, 2001 BO, and 2012 and 2018 BO Amendments, are described extensively in Sections 4.2 and 6.0 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, and in Section 6.0 of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum.

**Conclusion:** The proposed would have no effect on the western yellow-billed cuckoo.

**Future Maintenance.** Future maintenance activities may include routine inspections and monitoring of project structures by using access roads constructed for this project, periodic weeding, patching grouted stone, vegetation free/asphalt road maintenance, periodic clearing of debris around drainage structures; and, periodic repairs to fencing and gates.

Most inspections and minor repairs would be confined to paved maintenance and access roads. Impacts to native vegetation and wildlife would be minimal.

During inspections and repairs, nesting birds and other wildlife could be disturbed by noise, human activity, and fugitive dust from driving on unpaved access roads. However, these impacts are expected to be minimal, short term, and would not directly affect adjacent habitat. If repairs are required, potential effects to nesting birds and wildlife would be similar to those described for construction of the proposed project, but would be of a smaller magnitude as repair activities would not generally include substantial ground disturbance and would be completed over a short time period (usually one day to one week of minor construction activity).

Impacts due to implementation of future maintenance would be less than significant.

#### **4.2.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, the design modifications included under the Phase II Proposed Project would not be implemented, and the Alcoa Dike would be constructed as previously approved. Impacts would be as described under the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The SART and utilities and Brine Line relocation would not occur, resulting in a decrease of approximately 1.58 acres including 0.22 acres of permanent impacts and 1.36 acres of temporary impacts. Potential effects to biological resources included short-term construction impacts and long-term operational impacts. Mitigation measures were proposed to compensate for potential significant effects to wildlife species and movement. Therefore, potential effects to biological resources were considered less than significant.

### **4.3 Water Resources and Hydrology**

The affected environment for water resources and hydrology is presented in Section 3.3 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Phase I Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved.

As described in Table 2.2-1 (Comparison of Previously Approved Designs, the Proposed Action), the following are the primary differences between the previously approved Alcoa Dike, the Phase I Action (2018), and Phase II Proposed Action, as relevant to water resources and hydrology: approximately 2,000 additional feet of bank protection; reduction in the size of the



ponding area for interior drainage (northwest corner of Rincon Street and Auburndale Street); and a total of four ponding areas for interior drainage (Smith Avenue between Rincon Street and Butterfield Drive, and northeast corner of Rincon Street and Auburndale Street). In addition, modifications to structures extending through the main dike embankment and Lincoln tie-in extension of the dike alignment. For the purposes of this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential water resources and hydrology impacts associated with project modifications under the Proposed Action is provided below.

### **Significance Threshold**

Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Substantially alter drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff;
- Cause or result in substantial flooding;
- Substantially alter stream flow within the Santa Ana River or Temescal Creek;
- Substantially degrade water quality; and/or
- Interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 

#### **4.3.1 Proposed Action**

Proposed modifications to the previously authorized project were reviewed to determine if they would affect water resources or hydrology differently or to an extent not previously addressed. The discussion below addresses whether the proposed modifications to the previously approved Alcoa Dike flood control improvements would significantly impact the nature or magnitude of hydrology and water resources. All environmental commitments identified in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum are applicable to the Proposed Action.

- *Substantially alter drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff.* As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum Section 2.2, the Proposed Action would include flood control improvements to protect privately owned and public property and development in the project area. During a storm event, the proposed Phase II Alcoa Dike would inhibit flows representing the Probable Maximum Flood water surface elevation from flooding this area; the dike would not substantially alter overall drainage patterns of the area. As referenced in Section 3.3.2 of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum (Temescal Wash and Santa Ana River), the rate of surface water runoff in the Santa Ana Basin is largely affected by urbanization throughout the area, and associated impermeable surfaces that result in higher peak discharges with a shorter peaking time and a greater volume than the same flows in an undeveloped area. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not substantially alter the rate and amount of surface runoff in the area. No significant impact would occur.
- *Cause or result in substantial flooding.* The alignment of the proposed Phase II Alcoa Dike would interrupt stormwater flows to protect public and private property in the area from flooding-related impacts. Construction of the proposed Alcoa Dike would include the control and diversion of impounded water in the Prado Dam reservoir as well as local runoff from the

drainage area south of the dike. As described in 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum ongoing construction activities that occur during the winter months would be subject to runoff from the drainage area south of the dike; however, culverts under the embankment would be installed prior to winter construction and would provide sufficient protection against adverse flooding effects. This Phase II Proposed Action modifications will include the removal of the 1200-foot long 12 ft wide concrete v-ditch drainage path to Temescal Creek. Three 36-inch drainage structures would extending through the main dike embankment. In addition, as described above, the Proposed Action would include a total of four ponding areas; these features are for the purpose of interior drainage behind the dike and would not cause or result in substantial flooding. The Proposed Action would not cause or result in substantial flooding, and the proposed Alcoa Dike would not result in significant flooding impacts.

- *Substantially alter stream flow within the Santa Ana River or Temescal Creek.*

As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum construction of the proposed Phase II Alcoa Dike would also not occur within the flows of the Temescal Creek or Santa Ana River. Interior drainage will be ponded in proposed Ponds IA, I, II and the addition of pond III which will be connected by culverts sized to convey the standard project flood (SPF) flow with minimal flooding to the bordering roadways. There will be minimal excavation of the existing ground within the designated ponding areas. No substantial changes in drainage patterns would result from implementation of the proposed Phase II Alcoa Dike, and no alterations to stream flow within the Temescal Creek or Santa Ana River would occur as also stated in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

- *Substantially degrade water quality.* This Phase II construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Alcoa Dike would also include soil-disturbing activities that could result in soil erosion and sedimentation that may subsequently cause and/or contribute to water quality degradation, particularly if a precipitation event occurs while soils are actively disturbed. The potential also exists for impacts to surface and groundwater quality to result from accidental leaks or spills of potentially hazardous materials, including fuels and lubricants required for operation of construction vehicles and equipment. This Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) requirements found in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

The contractor for this Phase II Proposed Action is required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect the quality of storm water runoff. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, included as part of the SWPPP, would identify BMPs to minimize the potential for surface runoff to pick up loose soils and transport them downstream. Such BMPs may include but are not limited to the following:

- Limit the amount of exposed areas during construction activities;
- Excavate only when water flow is absent or minimal; and
- Divert water away from construction activities.

The SWPPP would also contain a spill prevention plan to identify proper storage locations and provide remediation measures for clean-up of accidental spills and leaks of hazardous materials, as necessary. BMPs set forth in the SWPPP would be applied to all areas disturbed by construction activities, including the site-specific locations of the proposed Alcoa Dike, construction staging area(s), transportation route(s), and borrow area (s). Implementation of

the required SWPPP and associated BMPs would minimize and/or avoid potential water quality impacts; the Proposed Action would not substantially degrade water quality. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

**Future Maintenance.** Section 2.5 (Future Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation) describes that future maintenance would include routine inspections and minor repairs, as needed. Future maintenance activities would not alter the overall hydrology or drainage patterns of the area but may introduce potential water quality impacts associated with the use of motorized vehicles and equipment. Modifications included under the Phase II Proposed Action would not introduce new maintenance requirements or associated impacts to hydrology and water resources; all maintenance-related impacts would be less than significant.

#### **4.3.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

The Previously Approved Design Alternative is defined as constructing the Alcoa Dike flood control improvements for public and privately owned development in the project area according to the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Potential impacts to water resources and hydrology under the Previously Approved Design Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action. Overall, potential impacts to water resources and hydrology would be less than significant. The SART, utility relocation, and Brine Line work would not occur, resulting in a decrease of approximately 1.58 acres including 0.22 acres of permanent impacts and 1.36 acres of temporary impacts.

#### **4.4 Earth Resources**

The affected environment for earth resources is presented in Section 3.4 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the 2018 Phase I Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum previously approved.

The Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative, except for the changes identified in this Phase II Table 2.2-1 above. Therefore, a new impact would only occur if it is associated with the project modifications, or as a result of a changed environmental condition.

##### **Significance Threshold**

Impacts would be significant if the Phase II Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Cause substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation;
- Expose people or structures to major geologic hazards; and/or
- Result in unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructure.

##### **4.4.1 Proposed Action**

Proposed modifications to the previously authorized project were reviewed to determine if they would affect earth resources to an extent not previously addressed. The discussion below addresses whether the proposed modifications to the previously approved Alcoa Dike flood

control improvements would alter the nature or magnitude of earth resources impacts 2018 Phase I Final SEAEIR Addendum.

- *Cause substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation.* As described in Section 4.3 (Water Resources and Hydrology), the Proposed Action would not result in significant flooding impacts. Design aspects of the previously-authorized Alcoa Dike that would serve to prevent flooding include additional culverts that would be installed under the embankment prior to winter construction, and would provide sufficient protection against flooding, as well as grading of the bottom of the borrow pit (following completion of construction) to drain to existing water courses and prevent ponding of water. In addition, the borrow pit and other temporary work areas used during construction of the Alcoa Dike would still be re-seeded following completion of construction, thereby minimizing and/or avoiding potential erosion- or siltation-related effects associated with soil disturbance. Additionally, as described in Section 4.3 (Water Resources and Hydrology) of this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, a SWPPP including BMPs and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan would be developed and implemented prior to and during construction. The Proposed Action would result in no earth resources and geology impacts associated with substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation.
- *Expose people or structures to major geologic hazards.* As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the proposed Alcoa Dike has been designed in accordance with the requirements of ER 1110-2-1806, "Earthquake Design and Analysis for Corps of Engineers Projects". There is potential for an earthquake or other geologic hazard to occur during the lifetime of the dike potentially causing flood risk. To minimize this risk, the dike would be designed in accordance with Corps requirements for earthquake design and development. To minimize potential effects to earth resources in the area, the dike would be designed with highly compacted materials that would maintain strength and stability during seismic activities. The Proposed Action would not cause substantial earth resources and geology impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to major geologic hazards.
- *Result in unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructure.* The foundation of the proposed Alcoa Dike may exhibit a small amount of settling during the construction period. Total estimated post-construction settlement of the embankment and foundation is expected to be less than 24 inches (USACE, 1988 [Appendix B, p.B-XV-3]), and would not be considered significant. The Proposed Action would result in no earth resources and geology impacts associated with landslides. The Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts associated with unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructure, including as related to settlement and landslides.

As described above and in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, the Proposed Action would not cause substantial earth resources and geology impacts.

**Future Maintenance.** Section 2.5 (Future Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation) of the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum and this SEA/EIR describes that future maintenance would include routine inspections and minor repairs, as needed. Future maintenance activities would not alter the overall geologic characteristics of the area, and is not expected to cause substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation; expose people or structures to major geologic hazards; or result in unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructure. No significant geologic impacts would result from the Proposed Action.

#### **4.4.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

The Previously Approved Design Alternative is defined as constructing the Alcoa Dike flood control improvements according to the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. The Proposed Action differs from this alternative primarily in the design alignment to accommodate 3 percolation ponds (total of 4), and additional bank protection. The SART and utilities and Brine Line relocation would not occur, resulting in a decrease of approximately 1.58 acres including 0.22 acres of permanent impacts and 1.36 acres of temporary impacts. Potential impacts to earth resources would be similar to those described above for the Proposed Action and would be less than significant.

#### **4.5 Land Use**

The affected environment for land use is presented in Section 3.5 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved. The on-site land uses include vacant land that consists of non-native grasslands, non-native woodlands, and riparian scrub, while the southwest portion of the Proposed Action would traverse Butterfield Park. Existing land uses surrounding Alcoa Dike project site include the Corona Municipal Airport, light industrial development, and single-family residences.

As described in Table 2.2-1, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to land use: expansion of the TCE in the southern portion of the project and relocation of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential land use impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

#### **Significance Threshold**

Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to:

- be incompatible with existing land uses; or
- conflict with applicable plans or policies.

#### **4.5.1 Proposed Action**

The Phase II Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative and associated sponsor real estate actions except for the changes identified in Table 2.2-1 of this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum. All land use identified in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum are applicable to the Proposed Action.

*Incompatible with existing land uses.* As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum construction of these flood control improvements would interfere with recreational activities within Butterfield Park since the temporary work limits of the proposed project included areas within the park. These impacts would be short term. The easternmost baseball field and the adjacent portion of parkland would be removed from future use, however, recreational use would be available within the rest of the park. Additionally, Butterfield Park is located on Corps land intended for flood control purposes and effects from the revised ponding area design of the Proposed Action would be similar to those described in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and would not be considered significant. The purpose of the proposed project is to

provide flood protection to the City of Corona; therefore, the Proposed Action would be beneficial for the other surrounding lands uses including the SART, Brine Line replace and protection in place, SCE pole relocation, residential development, and other privately owned development in the project area.

*Conflict with applicable plans or policies.* As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the City of Corona General Plan has identified goals for development within the City limits. The majority of the proposed project site is within the Open Space General designation, which "...applies to lands permanently committed or protected for open space purpose due to their value as... public safety (e.g., flood control channels), or comparable purpose" (Corona, 2007). In addition, Chapter 4 (Infrastructure and Public Services) of the City's General Plan includes policies requiring infrastructure for flood control. Therefore, this Phase II proposed project would not be inconsistent with the City's General Plan.

The City of Corona's zoning designations that apply to the proposed project site are Agricultural, Light Industrial, and Open Space. The Agricultural and Light Industrial designations do not specifically prohibit or permit flood control facilities; and the Open Space designations allows for "...flood control channels and land devoted to water storage" (Corona, 2012). The proposed project site is also within the FEMA's 100-year flood zone, which requires implementation of federal, State, and City flood control regulations and maintenance practices as appropriate. Therefore, the objective of the Phase I and Phase II Alcoa Dike proposed project to provide flood protection complies with the City's flood control policies.

In order to be consistent with the *Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)*, and to ensure that impacts to invertebrate species covered under the MSHCP are avoided or minimized, a series of mitigation measures from the 2001 SEIS/EIR and environmental commitments developed in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum and for this document would be implemented. Refer to Section 4.2 (Biological Resources) for details of the proposed mitigation.

**Future Maintenance.** Future maintenance of the proposed Alcoa Dike Embankment would include routine inspections and minor repairs of the embankment and its associated features after construction is completed (see Section 2.5 for a detailed list of future maintenance activities). Routine inspections and minor repairs would not alter the overall land use characteristics of the area. These activities may temporarily interfere with recreational activities but would not be permanently incompatible with existing on-site or surrounding land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### 4.5.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, project modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented, and the project would be constructed as described in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Construction of this alternative would also interfere with Butterfield Park; and therefore, would result in the same incompatibilities with existing land uses as the Proposed Action. However, the land that would be occupied by this alternative is designated for flood control, and therefore, would not be inconsistent with local plans and policies.

## 4.6 Aesthetics

The affected environment for aesthetics is presented in Section 3.6 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved. Approximate size and configuration of the Proposed Action would be consistent with the Previously Approved Design.

As described in **Error! Reference source not found.** the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to aesthetics: alignment modifications of the project and decreased acreage of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential aesthetics impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

### Significant Threshold

Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings;
- or create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

#### 4.6.1 Proposed Action

*Substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.* As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the project area contains a variety of views and perspectives which reflect the diversity of land uses found from the recreation and open space of the Butterfield Park south of the project site, the Corona Municipal Airport west of the site, light industrial development lining the southern boundary of the project site, and single family residential development located north and west of the site. With the exception of the surrounding open space, the existing visual character of the region is low and does not provide for a particularly pleasing viewscape given the pervasive development surrounding the majority of the proposed project site.

Most of the development of the project was completed during Phase I of the project and the construction activities will be minimized during Phase II of the proposed project. Construction activities and facilities include completing the construction of the dike (approximately 7,553 feet in length) and four ponding areas; staging area located at the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Rincon Street; road improvements along Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, Smith Avenue, and Butterfield Drive; a smaller borrow area and approximate 1.5-mile haul route located west of the proposed project site. The staging area and equipment associated with the construction would be adjacent to Butterfield Park, the open space to the north, and the light industrial development to the south. Therefore, construction activities would still be visible to recreationalists, pedestrians, and employees and patrons of the light industrial facilities. However, given that construction activities are temporary, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

The proposed project would not permanently impinge on a scenic vista or degrade the visual character of the site since the proposed project site consists of the borderland between open space and light industrial development. As such, although development of the Alcoa Dike embankment would permanently change the conditions or views of the proposed project site



from the existing conditions, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

The closest officially designated State scenic highway is Route 91 from Route 55 to the east end of the City of Anaheim, which is approximately five miles east of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts on a State scenic highway or other scenic roadway.

*Substantial light or glare.* Artificial light may be necessary but is anticipated to be rarely used during the construction period since the proposed construction hours would be 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. In addition, the proposed project site is immediately surrounded by open space and light industrial development. Therefore, any impacts associated with light and glare would be temporary and would not affect the surrounding residential areas. Impacts would not be considered significant.

**Future Maintenance.** Future maintenance of the Proposed Action would include routine inspections, flood risk assessment, and minor repairs of the embankment and its associated features after construction is completed (see Section 2.5 for a detailed list of future maintenance activities). Routine maintenance of the embankment would not alter the visual character of the site, flooding, erosion, or siltation, nor would such activities degrade the visual quality of the site.

#### 4.6.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, project modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented, and the project would be constructed as previously approved. Impacts due to this alternative would be the same as described in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. As with the proposed project, construction of this alternative would alter the visual character of the site but would not substantially degrade an area with valuable scenic resources. As a result, impacts were considered less than significant.

### 4.7 Recreation

The affected environment for recreation is presented in Section 3.7 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved. Approximate size and configuration of the Proposed Action would be consistent with the Previously Approved Design.

As described in **Error! Reference source not found.**, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to recreation: alignment modifications of the project and decreased acreage of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential recreation impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

#### Significant Threshold

Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- be incompatible with surrounding or on-site uses;
- be inconsistent with plans and policies;

- substantially affect the long-term provision of, or access to, recreational uses within the area; or
- prevent existing land uses from continuing in substantially the same manner.

#### 4.7.1 Proposed Action

As described in Section 3.7, a variety of parks and recreational facilities are located in the vicinity of the Alcoa Dike Project. Butterfield Park would be located within the temporary work limits of the proposed project and an approximately 400-foot section of dike and a ponding area would permanently replace a portion of Butterfield Park and the eastern-most baseball field within the park. Impacts to recreation during construction would be temporary and short-term, and recreational uses will be available at Butterfield Park after construction is complete. The project footprint would include a portion of the Santa Ana River Trail & Parkway, which is being incorporated into and will be consistent with the overall Phase II design. This segment of the trail is being developed to coordinate with the Alcoa Dike Project and will provide long-term recreation opportunities for the area. The modifications to the previously approved project would not introduce new recreation impacts to the parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the Proposed Action.

Additionally, because the parkland affected by the Proposed Action has always been planned for flood control purposes, the Proposed Action would not be incompatible with surrounding or on-site uses or be inconsistent with plans and policies, and its effect on long-term provision of, or access to, recreational uses within the area would be less than significant. As well, since the remaining portion of the park would remain as is without loss of functionality, the Proposed Action would allow existing land uses to continue in substantially the same manner, and its effects would be less than significant.

Section 3.7 states that the proposed Santa Ana River Trail is not part of the flood control project; therefore, construction of the proposed trail is not analyzed as part of the Proposed Action. However, modifications to the previously approved project included under the Proposed Action would not prevent or inhibit the proposed trail from being aligned along the top and toe of the Alcoa Dike. These proposed project modifications would not prevent or inhibit the proposed 10-foot wide bicycle trail and hiking/equestrian trail from being aligned along the top and toe of the dike, respectively.

**Future Maintenance.** As described in Section 2.5 (Future Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation) of this SEA/EIR Addendum, future maintenance would include routine inspections, minor repairs, and potential flood fighting activities, as needed.

Modifications included under the Proposed Action would not introduce new maintenance requirements or associated impacts to recreation. All maintenance-related impacts to recreation would be less than significant, as described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

#### 4.7.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, the Alcoa Dike would be constructed without the project modifications included under the proposed project. Potential impacts of the Previously Approved Design Alternative would be less than significant, as described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

### 4.8 Noise

The affected environment for noise is presented in Section 3.8 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved.

As described in Table 2.2-1, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to noise: alignment modifications of the project and decreased acreage of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential noise impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

The 2015 Riverside County General Plan includes the following applicable noise policies (Riverside County 2015):

- Noise Element Policy N.12.1. Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses within acceptable practices.
- Noise Element Policy N.12.2. Ensure that construction activities are regulated to establish hours of operation in order to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas.
- Noise Element Policy N.12.4. Require that all construction equipment utilizes noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

### **Riverside County Municipal Code**

The Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 9.52 (Noise Ordinance 847 § 2, 2006) specifies sound level standards by land use type. Per Article 9.52.020 (Exemptions), noise from construction within one-quarter of a mile of an occupied residence is exempt from these standards if it occurs between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (June through September) or between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (October through May).

### **City of Corona Municipal Code**

The City of Corona Municipal Code provides exterior/interior noise standards and specific noise restrictions, exemptions, and variances for exterior point and stationary noise sources (City of Corona, 2012). Those requirements applicable to the proposed project are identified below.

Section 17.84.040 (c) – Noise Standards. The noise ordinance provides noise standards for two separate types of noise sources: mobile and stationary. The noise standards for stationary noise sources are identified in **Table 4.8.1-1** below.

### **Significance Threshold**

As described in 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Conduct construction outside of allowable hours per the County of Riverside Municipal Code without obtaining a variance or exemption.

- Conduct construction outside of allowable hours per the City of Corona Municipal Code without obtaining a variance or exemption.

#### **4.8.1 Proposed Action Construction**

As discussed in Section 2.0 (Proposed Action and Alternatives), construction of the Proposed Action is scheduled to commence in January 2021 and last approximately 24 months, ending in January 2023. It is possible that the Proposed Action would be built in stages, with multiple start dates and construction periods for various sections of the project depending on land acquisition schedule, environmental windows and weather delays. Construction phasing may result in an extension of the overall project duration beyond January 2023. Construction of the Proposed Action will require approximately 150 combined maximum daily haul trips for fill material which will be hauled from a borrow area located 2.5 miles west of the Alcoa Dike site (refer to Figure 1-2) and for rip rap from a local quarry. Construction vehicles would access the site from Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, Smith Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue. These trips would result in only short-term periodic increases in noise levels during normal construction hours and would not travel through any residential neighborhood locations north of the site where sensitive receptors are located. However, as long as construction activities occur during 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, which are the exempted time periods per County of Riverside Municipal Code and City of Corona Municipal Code, the proposed construction would be in compliance with local (city and county) noise ordinances; any changes to that schedule, including occasional overtime work, would require obtaining a variance from local authorities. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur from construction equipment noise generated during construction of the Proposed Action.

Noise from construction equipment attenuates over distance because of spreading losses, absorption of the intervening terrain, and reflection off any intervening walls or berms. Spreading losses account for an attenuation factor of 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For “line-of-sight” noise in the absence of any intervening terrain, an estimated average peak 92 dBA level is projected at 15 m (50 ft) would be reduced to 86 dBA at 30 m (100 ft), 80 dBA at 60 m (200 ft), 74 dBA at 120 m (400 ft), etc. is utilized for evaluating stationary construction noise associated with Alcoa Dike construction.

This project is not creating or establishing a new, permanent source of noise. Noise associated with the recreational use of the SART would not increase above ambient noise levels and therefore impacts would be considered less than significant. Any other noise impacts occurring after construction would be related to future maintenance activities. See section below. Long-term impacts will not occur from the operational characteristics of the proposed project. However, short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activity associated with the Alcoa Dike project.

While local ordinances do not limit the decibel level of construction that occurs during authorized time periods, information on anticipated noise levels that could be experienced by nearby residents, recreationists and wildlife in the vicinity is provided as follows. Noise levels for typical pieces of construction equipment (at 50 feet) are listed in Table 4.8.2-1.

Table 4-11 Typical Noise Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	dBA at 50 Feet
Backhoe	80
Cranes (movable)	85
Dozers	85
Loader	80
Graders, Scrapers	85
Trucks	88
Excavator	85
Roller, Spreader	85
Tractor	84
Pick-up truck	55

Source: FHWA Construction Noise Handbook, 2006

As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum noise levels from the Proposed Action construction site would be in compliance with both the Riverside County general plan, municipal code and Corona municipal code noise regulations. Construction equipment noise impacts during construction of the Proposed Action are considered less than significant. Any changes to the construction schedule that would conflict with the noise regulations, including occasional overtime work, would require obtaining a variance from Riverside County and the City of Corona.

**Future Maintenance** As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, maintenance of the Proposed Action for Phase II would be required to ensure that the embankment protection remains functional and to inspect the dike structure after each major storm. Any damage may require immediate repair. Maintenance operations and repairs would require temporary access to and within the Alcoa Dike and may involve on-site activities that generate noise. Routine and special inspection and patrol with pickup trucks and sport utility vehicles weekly to daily during the flood season, and weekly to monthly during the non-flood season would occur.

Additionally, mobilizing dump trucks to haul stones and use of hydraulic excavators to place stones to protect and reinforce the constructed embankment as necessary during flood fight activities are part of routine operation and maintenance. Similar to construction of the Proposed Action, these activities could result in temporary short-term periodic noise from construction equipment use. Duration of these activities would be 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Due to the short-term nature of maintenance and repair activities, and due to construction activities being exempt if conducted within the indicated time periods, potential noise impacts from future maintenance activities are considered less than significant.

#### 4.8.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative Construction

Construction of the Previously Approved Design Alternative as described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum is assumed to require the same or similar daily haul trips for fill

material to that of the Proposed Action for Phase II. Therefore, the analysis of construction noise would be similar or identical to that provided above for the Proposed Action. With construction occurring within the exempted daily hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, construction equipment noise impacts of the Previously Approved Design Alternative are considered less than significant.

#### **4.9 Socioeconomics**

The affected environment for socioeconomics is presented in Section 3.9 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved.

As described in Table 2.2-1, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to socioeconomics: alignment modifications of the project and decreased acreage of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential socioeconomic impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

The significance of population and expenditure impacts are assessed in terms of their direct effect on the local economy and related effect on other socioeconomic resources (e.g., housing).

##### **Significant Threshold**

Impacts would be significant if the Phase II Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- result in substantial shifts in population trends or adversely affect regional spending and earning patterns.

##### **4.9.1 Proposed Action**

As Described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum, construction of the Alcoa Dike under the Proposed Action for Phase II would be short-term and would not attract a long-term worker population to the project area. The majority of the construction-related jobs are expected to be filled by both currently employed and unemployed labor force participants from the surrounding area, and construction of the proposed project would not increase the region's population. Implementation of the Proposed Action would neither place a demand on employment opportunities or housing, nor would it create significant new employment opportunities or housing in the region. In addition, minority or low-income communities would not be disproportionately affected by implementation of the proposed project. In addition, local populations would directly benefit from construction of the Alcoa Dike through the provision of reduced flood risks. The Proposed Action would have no adverse impact to socioeconomics.

**Future Maintenance.** The routine inspections and minor repairs of the Alcoa Dike and associated features included under future maintenance activities would not have the potential to result in substantial shifts in population trends; adversely affect regional spending and earning patterns; or introduce overwhelming demand for public services or utilities. Therefore, no socioeconomic impacts would occur as a result of future maintenance.

##### **4.9.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, project modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented and the Alcoa Dike would be constructed as previously approved. Socioeconomic impacts would be the same as described in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Much of the information described in this section is similar to information provided in the analysis. Potential effects to socioeconomics would be similar to those described for the Proposed Action, and construction of this alternative would result in socioeconomic impacts that are considered less than significant.

#### 4.10 Transportation

The affected environment for transportation is presented in Section 3.10 and does not include any substantially different conditions than were present when the Alcoa Dike Project was previously approved.

As described in Table 2.2-1, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to transportation: modified composition of the embankment to include v-ditches, 4 catch basins, and box culverts to assist drainage; decrease in acreage of construction staging area; and the addition of a temporary access ramp at the southern end of the project. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential transportation and traffic impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

##### Applicable Regulation

Caltrans has jurisdiction over State highways and sets maximum load limits for trucks and safety requirements for oversized vehicles that operate on highways. The following Caltrans regulations apply to potential transportation and traffic impacts of the proposed project:

- **California Vehicle Code (CVC), division 15, chapters 1 through 5 (Size, Weight, and Load).** Includes regulations pertaining to licensing, size, weight, and load of vehicles operated on highways.
- **California Street and Highway Code §§660-711, 670-695.** Requires permits from Caltrans for any roadway encroachment during truck transportation and delivery, includes regulations for the care and protection of State and county highways and provisions for the issuance of written permits, and requires permits for any load that exceeds Caltrans weight, length, or width standards for public roadways.

##### Significant Threshold

Impacts would be significant if the Phase II Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses.

##### 4.10.1 Proposed Action



### **Traffic Increase**

As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the following traffic guidelines would apply:

Construction Traffic. The Proposed Action would result in temporary, short-term increases in local traffic as a result of construction-related vehicle trips. Specifically, construction of the Proposed Action will require approximately 150 combined maximum daily haul trips for fill material which will be hauled from a borrow area located 2.5 miles west of the Alcoa Dike site (refer to Figure 1-2) and for rip rap material from a local quarry. Construction vehicles would access the site from Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, Smith Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue.

Based on the above, it is assumed construction-related traffic would be dispersed amongst SR-91 and I-15 for regional access to the Proposed Action area, and Lincoln Avenue, Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, and Smith Avenue for site access. Therefore, these roadways would likely experience the majority of Proposed Action related traffic. Table 3.10-1 shows the most recently published annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes on the segments of these roadways nearest the Proposed Action site. Given the high volume of existing traffic on these roadways (as shown in Table 3.10-1), the anticipated maximum construction related traffic of approximately 150 daily trips would account for a minimal increase of existing average daily traffic volumes along utilized roadways. This short-term increase in daily traffic volumes is considered unlikely to exceed the capacity of these roadways or exceed any applicable Riverside County General Plan performance standard (refer to Section 3.10). Therefore, temporary construction related traffic impacts to the existing traffic load and capacity of the utilized roadway system would be less than significant.

Maintenance Traffic. As discussed in Section 2.0 (Proposed Action and Alternatives), routine and special inspection and patrol with pickup trucks and sport utility vehicles weekly to daily during the flood season, and weekly to monthly during the non-flood season would occur. Additionally, mobilizing dump trucks to haul stones and use of hydraulic excavators to place stones to protect and reinforce the constructed embankment as necessary during flood fight activities are part of routine operation and maintenance. Based on these likely maintenance activities, it is assumed operation would result in approximately 150 vehicle trips monthly, likely resulting in more trips during the winter months and less in summer. Similar to construction traffic, these trips would be dispersed amongst I-15 and SR-91 for regional access, and utilize Lincoln Avenue, Butterfield Drive, Rincon Street, Auburndale Street, and Smith Avenue to access the Alcoa Dike site. As that total number of maintenance related trips is per month, this permanent increase in traffic would account for a negligible increase to average daily trips along utilized roadways (per traffic volumes shown in Table 3.10-1). No impacts to roadway capacity would occur from Proposed Action maintenance related traffic.

### **Roadway Hazards**

As described in the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum the following roadway hazard guidelines would apply:

During construction, the primary staging area for the Proposed Action would be located in the northeast portion of the site off Lincoln Avenue immediately to the north of Rincon Street, approximately 600 feet south of the nearest residential receptor (refer to Figure 2-2). In the event any oversize loads would occur during construction on public roadways, they must comply with

Caltrans regulations regarding oversize load limits and permits (refer to Section 4.10.1). Additionally, all site access points will be clearly designated and would likely have controlled entrance, thus eliminating roadway hazards. Therefore, less than significant safety impacts would occur to local roadways during construction. As discussed above, maintenance related traffic would account for a negligible increase of daily trips along utilized roadways (per traffic volumes shown in Table 3.10-1). It is also assumed that once the Proposed Action is operational, site access would be gate controlled. No impacts to roadway hazards would occur from Proposed Action maintenance related traffic.

**Future Maintenance.** The Proposed Action would include routine inspections and minor repairs, of the Alcoa Dike embankment and its associated features after construction is completed (see Section 2.5 for a detailed list of future maintenance activities). These activities would not create impacts to public safety

#### **4.10.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative Traffic Increase**

Construction Traffic. Construction of the Previously Approved Design Alternative is assumed to require the same or similar daily construction related trips to that of the Phase I Proposed Action. Therefore, the analysis of construction related traffic generation would be similar or identical to that provided above for the Proposed Action. Less than significant impacts would occur from construction vehicle trips of the Previously Approved Design Alternative.

Maintenance Traffic. Operational and maintenance of the Previously Approved Design Alternative is assumed to require the same or similar monthly trips to that of the Phase I Proposed Action. Therefore, the analysis of operational related traffic generation would be similar or identical to that provided above for the Proposed Action. No significant impacts would occur from maintenance vehicle trips of the Previously Approved Design Alternative.

#### **Roadway Hazards**

Both construction and operation of the Previously Approved Design Alternative is assumed to require the same or similar daily trips and site access control features to that of the Phase I Proposed Action. Therefore, the analysis of construction and operational related traffic hazards would be similar or identical to that provided above for the Proposed Action. No traffic safety hazards impacts would occur from construction and operation of the Previously Approved Design Alternative.

#### **4.11 Safety and hazards**

The affected environment for safety and hazardous materials is presented in Section 3.11. As described in Table 2.2-1, the following are the primary differences between the Previously Approved Design and the Proposed Action, as relevant to hazardous materials: alignment modifications of the project and decreased acreage of the construction staging area. For the purposes of the SEA/EIR Addendum, analysis of potential public services and utilities impacts associated with project modification under the Proposed Action is provided below.

#### **Significant Threshold**

Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Create a potential public health hazard involving the use, production, or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people or animal or plant populations in the area affected; or
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable incident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

#### 4.11.1 Proposed Action

The proposed project activities would not require long-term storage, treatment, disposal, or transport of substantial quantities of hazardous materials.

However, small quantities of hazardous materials would be stored, used, and handled during the proposed project activities, including petroleum hydrocarbons and their derivatives (e.g., diesel, gasoline, oils, lubricants, and solvents) to operate the construction equipment. These materials would be contained within vessels engineered for safe storage. Storage of substantial quantities of these materials along the dike is not anticipated. Furthermore, construction vehicles may require on-site fueling, or routine or emergency maintenance that could result in the release of oil, diesel fuel, transmission fluid or other materials; however, the materials would not be used in quantities or stored in a manner that would pose a significant hazard to the public or the workers themselves. Therefore, impacts from construction activities would be less than significant.

The potential for an accidental release of toxic materials from construction vehicles (e.g., oil and diesel fuel) would be mitigated by the fueling and servicing of construction vehicles in protected areas so that fluids would be contained within an isolated or impervious area a safe distance from the active flow path. Spills or leaks would be cleaned up immediately, and any contaminated soil would be disposed of properly.

As standard Corps practice to alleviate fire hazards, a water truck would always be present during construction activities. In addition, Corps construction projects must comply with the fire prevention and protection practices set forth in the Corps' Safety and Health Requirements Manual (EM 385-1-1). The provisions of EM 385-1-1 are incorporated into all Corps construction specifications, and the contractor is required to prepare a fire prevention and protection plan for the construction project.

The Proposed Action would require use, storage and handling, of small quantities of hazardous materials during construction, however BMPs would be implemented to reduce the risk of safety and health hazards. Hazardous materials would be properly stored, and the potential for an accidental release of toxic materials from construction vehicles would be mitigated by fueling and servicing construction vehicles in protected areas. Spills or leaks would be cleaned up immediately, and any contaminated soil would be disposed of properly. Therefore, potential effects related to hazardous materials would be considered less than significant.

**Future Maintenance.** Future maintenance of the proposed project would include routine inspections and minor repairs, of the Alcoa Dike embankment and its associated features after construction is completed (see Section 2.5 for a detailed list of future maintenance activities). These activities would not create impacts to public safety.

#### 4.11.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, the design modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented, and the Alcoa Dike embankment would be constructed as previously approved. Impacts on safety and hazards through the implementation of this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Action, and no impacts to public safety would occur.

#### **4.12 Cultural Resources**

Under NEPA, significance is determined based on ‘context’ and ‘intensity’. For cultural resources, context is often viewed in terms of how important the resource may or may not be, while intensity is viewed in terms of the severity of the impacts to the resource. While cultural resources that are not eligible for the NRHP are still considered as part of the NEPA review, once that resource fails to meet the criteria for eligibility for inclusion on the NRHP its ‘context’ is found to be lacking. The phrase “adverse effect” (used in the NHPA) and “significant impact” (used in NEPA) are not equivalent terms but are similar in concept. Under the NHPA, impacts to cultural resources are typically examined in terms of how the project would affect the characteristics that make the property eligible for the National Register. Such impacts are referred to as adverse effects in the NHPA’s implementing regulations (36 CFR 800.5).

The Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative and associated sponsor real estate actions except for the changes identified in Table 2.2-1. Therefore, a new impact would only occur if it is associated with the project modifications, or as a result of a changed environmental condition. Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- The undertaking would result in a substantial adverse effect to a historic property such that the implementation of the alternative would result in the destruction of a historic property or the loss of a property’s eligibility.

##### **4.12.1 Action**

Impacts to cultural resources under the proposed action would be the same as under the previously approved design alternative except that the proposed action would include impacts to one additional cultural site, CA-RIV-5521. Cultural resources are geospatial resources that are most clearly impacted by ground disturbing activities. The proposed action includes a slightly larger footprint than the previously approved design alternative. The Corps, in consultation with the SHPO, determined that archaeological site CA-RIV-5521 was not eligible for the NRHP in 1995.

Under the proposed action, the impacts to the remaining seven resources would be the same as previously analyzed. Four (4) of these sites have been determined to be eligible for the NRHP (CA-RIV-3698, 1039, 1044, 2802) and the two remaining archaeological sites were determined to be ineligible for the NRHP in 1995 (CA-RIV-5523, 5524). One of these sites, CA-RIV-5523, has already been entirely removed as part of the use of the borrow area for other nearby embankment construction projects. The final site, known, as CA-RIV-3372, is the Rincon cemetery. The cemetery is not considered eligible for the NRHP. In general, cemeteries are excluded from eligibility as a criteria consideration (36 C.F.R. 60.4). The cemetery has been fenced off and is not in direct impact corridor of the borrow area or the levee alignment.

The proposed borrow area was first identified in the 1980's as a material source as part of the analysis for the larger SARM project. In anticipation of the borrow area being utilized the feature was extensively investigated for cultural resources. This body of work includes historical and archaeological investigations of site CA-RIV-3698 (Greenwood et al. 1987); test excavations at CA-RIV-2802 and CA-RIV-3698 (Greenwood and Foster 1987); data recovery at CA-RIV-2802 and 28 features within CA-RIV-3698 (Foster et al. 1995); the subsurface testing of 11 historical period sites within the Basin including CA-RIV-5521, CA-RIV-5523, CA-RIV-5524, CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044 (Foster et al. 1996); and finally large scale data recovery at CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044 (Sterner 2004).

Following data recovery in 2004, the borrow area was used as a material source area for other embankment/levee construction projects within the basin. The current project would involve expanding the previously used boundaries of the borrow area location by removing roughly an additional 480,000 cy. The ineligible site CA-RIV-5523 has already been excavated out for previous levee construction projects and no longer exists. The currently proposed borrow area configuration would remove CA-RIV-5524, CA-RIV-1039 and portions of CA-RIV-1044. CA-RIV-5524, Metherell Ranch, is not eligible for the National Register under any criteria.

In consultation with the SHPO, both CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044 were fully mitigated prior to the use of the borrow area and the resources are no longer treated as eligible properties. The proposed project would avoid directly impacting the NRHP eligible site CA-RIV-3698 and CA-RIV-2802. An archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's qualifications would monitor any ground disturbing activities near CA-RIV-3698 and CA-RIV-2802 to ensure it is avoided. Direct impacts to the Prado/Rincon cemetery, CA-RIV-3372, would also be avoided.

In the 2001 SEIS/EIR, the destruction of NRHP eligible sites, CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044 were identified as significant adverse impacts under NEPA. Under the proposed project configuration, the impacts would still be significant since the project would be impacting CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044; however, both of these sites have previously been mitigated and no further consultation with SHPO would be required.

Proposed action also includes the authorization for outgrant for SART installation within and adjacent to the proposed new alignments of Rincon Road and Butterfield Drive. The Corps has separately consulted with the SHPO on the creation of the trail. The Corps has found that the creation of the trail would result in no adverse effect to historic properties and the SHPO has concurred.

**Future Maintenance.** Minor repairs may include, but are not limited to, inspections via access roads, measures necessary to preserve the integrity of the dike such as small mammal burrow control and removal of potentially detrimental vegetation. Passive methods such as filling in burrows and repairing holes in the grouted stone structure would be used whenever possible. These activities would not create impacts to cultural resources.

#### **4.12.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

Under Previously Approved Design Alternative, project modifications included under the Proposed Action would not be implemented and the Alcoa Dike would be constructed as previously approved. Cultural Resources impacts would be significantly adverse as described in

the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR. Sites CA-RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044 have previously been mitigated and no additional coordination or consultation with the SHPO would be required under this alternative.

#### **4.13 Public Services and Utilities**

The Proposed Action is similar to the previously approved design alternative and associated sponsor real estate actions except for the changes identified in Table 2.2-1 including the addition of the Santa Ana River Trail (SART), SCE replacement of transmission, distribution, and telecom poles/circuits and SAWPA Brine Line utility replace and protection in place.

Therefore, a new impact would only occur if it is associated with the project modifications, or as a result of a changed environmental condition. Impacts would be significant if the Proposed Action would cause one or more of the following conditions to occur:

- Existing utility systems would be adversely affected by the proposed embankment construction activities.
- There is any unplanned disruption of utility service or physical impact to existing utility lines.
- There is an increase to the size of the population and geographic area served, the number and type of calls for service, physical development, or an increase in demand for service that could result in capacity constraints to existing public service and utilities providers.

##### **4.13.1 Proposed Action**

**Public Services.** The Proposed Action would not substantially change any public service impacts compared to the original design described in the 2001 Final SEIS/SEIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Construction activities would result in an increase in the potential of fire hazards and could increase the need for police service due to accidents caused by construction personnel or equipment. The presence of construction equipment (vehicles, generators, tools, etc.) may increase the likelihood of a fire. Vegetation present in or near the construction areas could be ignited by a spark or heat-related incident due to the operation of construction equipment or construction activities. In addition, the presence of construction personnel increases the potential for fires through the increase of human influenced ignition (i.e., smoking, use of flammables, etc.). Therefore, construction of the proposed project could have the potential to result in a temporary increase in police and fire service calls. However, this increase would be short term and would not result in a significant permanent demand on fire or police facilities serving the proposed project area. In addition, implementation of the Alcoa Dike Project would not affect the long-term capacities of fire or police services. This potential increase in risk is considered short-term and temporary, only occurring during the limited construction phase of the proposed project.

Because of the large available labor pool in Riverside County and nearby areas, few construction workers are expected to temporarily relocate to the area and no new workers would be required for operation and maintenance of the dike. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the proposed project is expected to result in an increase in the local population, leading to long-term demands to local public services. Because no new operational employees would be needed, operation and maintenance of the embankment would not generate any additional population that could exceed the capacity of local public service providers. Therefore, the proposed project

would not increase any demands on schools or lower the level of service for fire protection or police protection in the long term. There would be no operational impacts to existing schools, fire, or police department service capabilities. The proposed project is not expected to result in any long-term hazards that would place increased demands on emergency service providers.

**Water.** Alteration of the design of the Alcoa Dike Project would not substantially change any water supply impacts compared to the original design described in the Final 2001 SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Water would be required during project construction for dust abatement and cleaning of construction equipment. The amount of water required depends on the length of access roads, weather conditions, road surface conditions, and other site-specific conditions. Reclaimed water for construction use will be available at Butterfield Park. Reclaimed water would be used for dust control. Water use would also include water necessary to make the soil cement used during project construction as well as for any revegetation activities. However, water use for the proposed project would not change the ability of the City of Corona in serving the proposed project area demands.

**Wastewater.** Alteration of the design of the Alcoa Dike Project would not substantially change any wastewater impacts compared to the original design described in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Wastewater generated during the proposed project construction would be limited to that generated by project personnel and would be accommodated by portable toilets brought to staging areas for construction crews. These portable toilets would be emptied into septic tanks or municipal sewage systems. Because this increase would be short-term and temporary, wastewater generated during project construction is not expected to significantly impact the capacity of the City of Corona in providing wastewater services to the project area.

**Solid Waste.** Alteration of the design of the Alcoa Dike Project would not substantially change any solid waste impacts compared to the original design described in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and the 2018 Phase I Final SEA/EIR Addendum. Organic materials, trees, shrubs, and abandoned timber structures would be disposed of by hauling to a commercial site. Topsoil containing organic material would not be disposed of at a commercial site but would be stockpiled and spread on embankment slopes or borrow areas as a part of site restoration. Disposal of these materials by burning or burying at the proposed project site would not be permitted. Inorganic materials would include, but are not limited to, broken concrete, rubble, asphaltic concrete, metal, and other types of construction materials. Where possible, soil from excavation would be screened and separated for use as backfill materials at the site of origin to the maximum extent possible. Spoils unsuitable for backfill use would be disposed of at appropriate disposal sites. As identified in Table 3.13.3-1, the project area is served by the El Sobrante Landfill. Because the exact amount of material recycling is unknown, the total amount of waste requiring landfill disposal is unknown. Recycling activities would greatly reduce the quantity of construction-related materials transported to local landfills. It is assumed that the amount of construction waste would be a small percentage of the maximum daily throughput for El Sobrante. Therefore, construction waste generated by the proposed project would not substantially affect the remaining capacities of local landfills to serve local demands.

**Temporary Disruption.** The utilities currently existing on the proposed project site require some replacement and protection for this Phase II proposed project. The agencies and utilities located in the project area are listed in Table 3.13.3-1. Various utilities such as sewer, water,



underground telecommunications, and overhead power will be impacted by the project. The utility owners include City of Corona, SAWPA, Southern California Edison and AT&T. The design of the protection or replacement of the utilities that cross the prism of the Dike will be based on guidance provided by the Corps in a *Memorandum for Record, Subject: Process for Approval of Utility Relocations at Alcoa Dike*, dated 15 February 2012.

Specific to this Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum:

- SAWPA replace and protection in place for the Brine Line which crosses at two locations including the CRC Lateral (15"/16") along Auburndale and Reach IVB parallel to Butterfield Drive.
- Southern California Edison's replacement of transmission, distribution, and telecom poles/circuits located along W. Rincon Street, N. Smith Avenue, Butterfield Drive, and Auburndale Street, approximately 500 feet east of Corona Municipal Airport.

The Corps will coordinate with the appropriate jurisdictions prior to and during construction to ensure that only temporary disruptions occur to the services provided by the utilities mentioned above. Any affected utilities would be replaced or sufficiently protected to avoid long-term disruption. Therefore, this alternative would have no significant impacts to public services or utilities.

**Future Maintenance.** Periodic regular maintenance, as well as required maintenance following flood and scour events would require relatively small amounts of material and would typically occur for only short periods of time. Consequently, any increases in fire or police calls would similarly be temporary and not substantially alter the level of service of these providers. Demands on utilities during maintenance would also be temporary and relatively minor. As such, future maintenance is not expected to result in any significant impacts to public services and utilities.

#### **4.13.2 Previously Approved Design Alternative**

Under the Previously Approved Design Alternative, construction and OMRRR related impacts or temporary increases in public services or utilities demand would occur, similar to the proposed project. Potential impacts to public services, water, wastewater, and solid waste would be similar to the representative scenario provided above for the proposed project. Therefore, temporary public services and utilities impacts associated with construction and OMRRR of the Previously Approved Design Alternative would not result in any significant impacts.

## 5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

### 5.1 Introduction

A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time in the proposed activity area. Those actions could be undertaken by various agencies (federal, State, or local) or private entities. A discussion of cumulative impacts resulting from actions and projects that are proposed, under implementation, or reasonably anticipated to be implemented in the near future is required.

Cumulative environmental impacts are most likely to arise when a relationship exists between a proposed activity and other projects expected to occur in a similar location, time period, and/or involving similar actions. Projects in proximity to the Phase II Proposed Project activities would be expected to have more potential for a relationship that could result in potential cumulative impacts than those more geographically separated.

This cumulative impact discussion analyzes cumulative projects located within approximately five miles of the Alcoa Dike project area that could have the ability to combine with impacts from the Proposed Action.

**Table 5-1 Cumulative Projects in the Phase II Proposed Project Activity Area**

Project Name	General Location	Description
City of Corona Santa Ana River Trail	Southern end of Prado Basin (crosses through the Phase II Proposed Project area)	The 22-mile Santa Ana River Trail is divided into three sections: Lower, Middle, and Upper, and includes bicycle trails and hiking/equestrian trails. The Middle section consists of proposed trail alignments that would cross the Spillway Flood Plain, Auxiliary and Alcoa Dikes, Area between Auto Center Drive and the Wastewater Treatment Dike, Clearwater Drive, and Area Adjacent to Rincon Street. <i>Project is ongoing and will end after completion of all features in the Prado Dam construction, currently anticipated to be 2025.</i>
Santa Ana River Mainstem Reach 9 BNSF Bridge Pier Protection Project	Southwest of the Phase II Proposed Project	Protect the piers of the existing BNSF Railroad bridge over Santa Ana River from planned high flow releases of up to 30,000 cfs from Prado Dam reservoir. <i>Project construction began in 2017 – ongoing.</i>
City of Corona Department of Water and	North of Railroad,	Construct a 90-ft high lattice telecommunications tower at the city's Water Reclamation Facility No. 1 (WRF 1).

Project Name	General Location	Description
Power CUP2018-0011	northeast of Yorba St.	<i>Application 03/21/19. Conditional use permit application to construct a 90-foot high lattice telecommunications tower within the City of Corona.</i>
City of Corona Grade Separation Project	Southeast of the Phase II Proposed Project	McKinley Street, just south of Highway 91 in Corona, currently crosses the BNSF rail line. The City of Corona is developing plans to build a grade separation at McKinley Street and Sampson Avenue/BNSF Railroad crossing, which will allow vehicles to avoid having to cross railroad tracks. <i>Project in planning stages currently (no decision made as of August 21, 2019 City Council Meeting)</i>
City of Corona Dept. of Water & Power CUP2018-0008	1138 W. Rincon St.	Construct an electric energy substation for the City. <i>Project in progress</i>

The assessment below focuses on addressing the following: (1) the area(s) in which the effects of the Proposed Action would be felt; (2) the effects that are expected in the area(s) from the Proposed Action; (3) past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that have or that are expected to have impacts in the same area; (4) the impacts or expected impacts from these other actions; (5) and the overall impact(s) that can be expected if the individual impacts are allowed to accumulate.

## 5.2 Analysis of Cumulative Impacts

### 5.2.1 Air Quality

Construction activities for this Phase II Proposed Project would not have impacts above and beyond those determined in the 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum, where cumulative impacts were determined to be significant in large part to the significant impacts of the overall Prado Basin dike projects. Mitigation measures identified in the 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum, as presented in Chapter 6, would reduce impacts to the extent feasible. Therefore, the cumulative impact findings for the Phase II Proposed Project are the same as those determined in the 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum.

#### Air Pollutants

The Phase II Proposed Project impacts have been determined to be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.1. The cumulative projects would also be assumed to have less than significant air pollutants impacts due to minimal emissions and short project duration. Therefore, the cumulative air pollutants impacts are also considered to be less than significant.

### **Greenhouse Gases**

Impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change are inherently cumulative. As discussed in Section 4.1, the Phase II Proposed Project would have less than significant impact GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly on the environment. Based on the above, impacts would be less than significant

#### **5.2.2 Biological Resources**

Implementation of the Phase II Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to biological resources (See Section 4.2). The Phase II Proposed Action combined with other projects would not contribute to cumulative biological resource impacts within the region. The effects of the Phase II Proposed Project are site specific and localized and would not result in incremental cumulative impacts to biological resources through increased human encroachment (e.g., removal of habitat, degradation of habitat through trampling, increased noise, or decreased water quality). At the conclusion of construction, the Corps would restore or enhance habitat in the project area. Impacts of the Phase II Proposed Action would be reduced to less than significant levels and effects of this Phase II Proposed Project would not be considered cumulatively significant with mitigation.

#### **5.2.3 5.2.3 Water Resources and Hydrology**

The cumulative scenario relevant to the Proposed Action is largely characterized by other flood control projects in and downstream of the Prado Basin. As described in Section 4.3 (Water Resources and Hydrology) of this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum, implementation of the Phase II Proposed Action would include full compliance with applicable laws and regulations, as well as Environmental Commitments identified in the *2001 SEIS/EIR* and the *2018 I Final SEA/EIR Addendum*. As such, potential impacts to water resources and hydrology would be site-specific and not substantial. Water resources and hydrology impacts of the Phase II Proposed Action would not combine with similar impacts of other projects in the cumulative scenario. Furthermore, as described in Section 2.1 of this Phase II SEA/EIR, the Proposed Action would contribute to the national economic development (NED) objective of providing flood protection for the surrounding area. Other flood control projects in the cumulative scenario would also contribute to this NED objective, resulting in an overall benefit.

#### **5.2.4 5.2.4 Earth Resources**

No significant impacts to earth resources and geology would occur from implementation of the Phase II Proposed Action. As potential effects to soils and geology would be site-specific and less than significant, no contribution to cumulative impacts in the region would occur.

#### **5.2.5 5.2.5 Land Use**

Land use impacts tend to be localized, affecting properties in the immediate vicinity of the project. Potential land use impacts from the Phase II Proposed Action would affect existing recreational and light industrial land uses surrounding the project site. Similarly, the area potentially affected by cumulative land use impacts is the local vicinity of the proposed flood control features where construction and operation activities could affect nearby land uses.

As described in Section 4.5 and 4.7 (Land Use and Recreation, respectively), implementation of the Phase II Proposed Action would result in a ponding area replacing a baseball field and a portion of parkland within Butterfield Park. However, the Phase II Proposed Action's

contribution to cumulative land use and recreation impacts would be minimized with implementation of EC-LU-1. Although potential adverse land use impacts from construction and operation are localized, the land use benefits of the project, in terms of flood protection for populated areas, are regional in scope, benefiting developed areas in Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. Therefore, cumulative impacts on land use from the Proposed Action would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.6 5.2.6 Aesthetics**

The activities associated with the Phase II Proposed Project would be short term, localized, and would not significantly impact or conflict with visual resources (see Section 4.6.2). Therefore, the Phase II Proposed Project would not contribute to a degradation or alteration of the scenic viewscape. As such, no cumulative aesthetics impacts would occur.

#### **5.2.7 5.2.7 Recreation**

As described in Section 4.7 (Recreation) of this Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in a ponding area replacing a baseball diamond and a portion of parkland within Butterfield Park, although as this area was planned for flood control purposes under the 2001 SEIS/EIR, this would not be considered a significant impact. The cumulative projects listed in Table 5.1-1 would not result in the elimination or replacement of recreation uses or facilities. The City of Corona Santa Ana River Trail is not included as part of the Proposed Action, although it is anticipated that the trail would be aligned along the top and toe of the Alcoa Dike. The trail is listed in Table 5.1-1, would improve and increase recreational opportunities in the Alcoa Dike Project area. With the implementation of environmental commitments for recreation described in Section 2.4.2 (Proposed Action) and Section 4.7 (Recreation), no contribution to cumulative impacts in the region would occur.

#### **5.2.8 Noise**

With regards to a cumulative increase in temporary noise levels of the Phase II Proposed Action construction in conjunction with construction of cumulative projects identified in Table 5.1-1, Phase II Proposed Action construction would temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Proposed Action area. As discussed in Section 3.0 (Affected Environment), the nearest sensitive receptors are located approximately 600 feet north of the site. Construction activities associated with other projects in close proximity to the Proposed Action (as identified in Table 5.1-1) could potentially occur at the same time as the Phase II Proposed Action and further increase noise levels at these sensitive receptor locations. However, due to the distances and construction timing of projects identified in Table 5.1-1, it is unlikely that construction noise from the proposed Alcoa Dike would combine with construction noise from those projects to increase potential cumulative construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors. In the event this occurred, these impacts would be temporary and of short duration. While mobile construction vehicles bringing construction supplies to cumulative project sites could share travel routes with the Proposed Action, it is assumed these shared routes would be limited to regional access roadways (I-15 and SR-91). Due to the traffic volumes on these roadways, no significant cumulative noise from mobile construction sources would occur to sensitive receptors along shared travel routes.

Each cumulative project identified in Table 5.1-1 would be required to comply with local noise ordinances. However, per discussion in Section 4.0 (Environmental Consequences), as long as construction activities

occur during 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, which are the exempted time periods per County of Riverside Municipal Code and City of Corona Municipal Code, the proposed construction projects would be in compliance with local (city and county) noise ordinances; any changes to that schedule, including occasional overtime work, would require obtaining a variance from local authorities. As a result, the Proposed Action would not result in significant construction or operational noise impact. Therefore, while overall development of the Alcoa Dike area could result in cumulative temporary and permanent increases to existing ambient noise levels, the Proposed Action would have a minimal cumulative contribution to these potential noise impacts. Therefore, noise impacts of the Proposed Action would not combine with impacts of present and reasonably foreseeable projects to result in a significant cumulative impact.

#### **5.2.9 Socioeconomics**

The Phase II Proposed Action would not create socioeconomic impacts to any adjacent communities in the region (see Section 4.9). As such, implementation of the Phase II Proposed Action would not contribute to an incremental socioeconomic effect that would be cumulatively considerable.

#### **5.2.10 Transportation**

Cumulative projects within the area (as identified in Table 5-1) will generate trips to and from the respective project sites using local roadways. The combined contribution of these vehicle trips could result in an increase to existing roadway network levels of service. However, each project identified in Table 5.1-1 would be required to comply with the performance standards identified in the Riverside County General Plan (Refer to Section 3.10-1). While development of cumulative projects identified in Table 5-1 will result in a cumulative addition to traffic volumes on study area roadways, the Proposed Action's contribution to this impact would be minimal during both construction and operation (refer to Section 4.10). Therefore, the contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.11 Safety and Hazards**

As discussed in Section 4.11, the Proposed Action would not result in increased risks to public safety. The construction of the Phase II Proposed Project would be a beneficial impact. Therefore, safety risks associated with the Phase II Proposed Project would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

#### **5.2.12 Cultural Resources**

The Proposed action would result in the destruction of two archaeological sites that have been determined to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D. Both of these resources are important for the data that they contain. Therefore, the issue that must be explored in a cumulative analysis is the cumulative loss of data potential. Both sites have been or will be excavated and the results of these excavations have been or will be compiled and available for public and academic research. While the destruction of these sites have been determined to be a significant impact, the loss of these two sites would not significantly diminish the cumulative scientific and cultural value of such resources in the region.

It is expected that the Proposed Action in conjunction with ongoing and future actions would not contribute significantly to the loss of cultural values or data within the basin especially if the resources are effectively mitigated.

#### **5.2.13 Public Services and Utilities**

The Proposed Action would have no significant impacts on public services and utilities (See Section 4.13), including the Brine Line protection. As such, the proposed project would not contribute to an incremental impact on public services and utilities that would be cumulatively considerable.

Based on the analysis provided by SCE in the TD1287836 Mira Loma-Cleargen-Delgen 66 kV General Order 131-D Evaluation (SCE, 2020) and the description of the proposed power line relocation provided in Chapter 2, the upcoming power line relocation that will be constructed by SCE occur within and adjacent to the Alcoa Phase II footprint would not have any significant unavoidable impacts. SCE's replacement footprint is relatively minor and impacts from construction and operations and maintenance are expected to be less than significant. In addition, SCE's scope, through design, will comply with all federal and state laws and regulations, and local ordinances. This includes compliance with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations relating to transmission pole height. The SCE replacement will be located within Compatibility Zones B1 and C (Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document, 2004) which have height restrictions and requirements for structures within these Compatibility Zones (maximum 35 feet for Zone B1 and maximum 70 feet for Zone C). Moreover, no significant, unavoidable cumulative effects are anticipated from implementation of Alcoa Phase II, SCE power line replacement, and other reasonably foreseeable projects. SCE will obtain approval from the FAA for all pole locations/heights in these Compatibility Zones prior to construction, minimize vegetation disturbance to the extent practicable, and any impacts from the proposed relocation projects would be fully mitigated, therefore, the replacement will result in a less than significant impact (SCE, 2020). As such, the Phase II Proposed Project would not contribute to an incremental impact on public services and utilities that would be cumulatively considerable.

## 6 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

### 6.1 Environmental Commitments

The following environmental commitments have been incorporated into the proposed project for the purpose of minimizing environmental effects. Many of these commitments were included in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and other related documents. Updates and additional information are provided in brackets, and new commitments or measures that were developed subsequent to the 2001 SEIS/EIR are prefaced with “EC- “.

#### 6.1.1 Air Quality

**AQ-1** The project construction contractor shall retard diesel engine injection timing by two degrees before top center on all construction equipment that was manufactured before 1996, and which does not have an existing IC engine warranty with the manufacturer. The contractor shall provide a certification from a third-party certified mechanic prior to start of construction, stating the timing of all diesel-powered construction equipment engines have been retarded two degrees before top center.

**AQ-2** The project construction contractor shall use high-pressure injectors on all diesel engines that were manufactured before 1996, and which do not have existing IC engine warranties with the manufacturer. The contractor shall provide documentation of warranty and manufacture date or a certification from a third-party certified mechanic stating that all diesel construction equipment engines are utilizing high-pressure fuel injectors.

**AQ-3** The project construction contractor shall use Caterpillar pre-chamber diesel engines or equivalent, and perform proper maintenance and operation.

**AQ-4** The project construction contractor shall electrify equipment, where feasible.

**AQ-5** The project construction contractor shall restrict the idling of construction equipment to 10 minutes.

**AQ-6** The project construction contractor shall ensure that equipment will be maintained in proper tune to prevent visible soot from reducing light transmission through the exhaust stack exit by more than 20 percent for more than 3 minutes per hour and use low-sulfur fuel as required by SCAQMD regulation.

**AQ-7** The project construction contractor shall use catalytic converters on all gasoline equipment (except for small [2-cylinder] generator engines). If this measure is not implemented, emissions from gasoline equipment shall be offset by other means (*e.g.*, Emission Reduction Credits).

**AQ-8** The project construction contractor shall cease construction during periods of high ambient ozone concentrations (*i.e.*, Stage 2 smog alerts) near the construction area (SCAQMD,



1993).

**AQ-9** The project construction contractor shall schedule all material deliveries to the construction spread outside of peak traffic hours, and minimize other truck trips during peak traffic hours, or as approved by local jurisdictions.

**AQ-10** The project construction contractor shall use only solar powered traffic signs (no gasoline-powered generators shall be used).

The following measures will be implemented to reduce construction emissions of PM10:

**AQ-11** The project construction contractor shall apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more; soil stockpiled for 2 days or more).

**AQ-12** The project construction contractor shall enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturers' specifications to exposed stock piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content.

**AQ-13** In areas where dewatering is not required, the project construction contractor shall water active grading/excavation sites at least twice daily.

**AQ-14** The project construction contractor shall increase dust control watering when wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour for a sustained period of greater than 10 minutes, as measured by an anemometer. The amount of additional watering would depend upon soil moisture content at the time; but no airborne dust should be visible.

**AQ-15** The project construction contractor shall suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph (40 kph).

**AQ-16** The project construction contractor shall ensure that trucks hauling dirt on public roads to and from the site are covered and maintain a 50 mm (2 in) differential between the maximum height of any hauled material and the top of the haul trailer. Haul truck drivers shall water the load prior to leaving the site to prevent soil loss during transport.

**AQ-17** The project construction contractor shall ensure that graded surfaces used for off-road parking, materials lay-down, or awaiting future construction are stabilized for dust control, as needed.

**AQ-18** The project construction contractor shall sweep streets in the project vicinity once a day if visible soil material is carried to adjacent streets.

**AQ-19** The project construction contractor shall install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

**AQ-20** The project construction contractor shall apply water three times daily or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all unpaved parking, staging areas, or unpaved road surfaces.

**AQ-21** The project construction contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to be reduced to 15 mph (25 kph) or less.

**AQ-22** Prior to the approval of plans and specifications, the USACE shall ensure that plans and specifications specify that all heavy equipment shall be maintained in a proper state of tune as per the manufacturer's specifications.

### 6.1.2 Biological Resources

The 1988 GDM/SEIS included numerous environmental commitments and mitigation measures (Table 4-8 of the 2001 (SEIS/EIR) that have already been implemented to compensate for impacts related to construction (or re-construction) of Prado Dam and associated features, including the Alcoa Dike. Several of these measures are summarized in the table 6-1 below:

**Table 6-1 Original Mitigation Commitment from 1988 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and 2018 Final Alcoa Dike SEA/EIR Addendum**

Resource	Impact	Mitigation
Least Bell's Vireo (LBV) habitat	30 acres of LBV habitat potentially converted to willow woodland without understory due to changes in operation schedule (increased inundation) and operation of haul roads	<p>Restore 133 acres of degraded habitat above the 510-ft elevation line to willow woodland with understory. <b>This measure was superseded by the 1995 Cooperative Agreement between OCWD, USFWS, and USACE wherein \$1 million was contributed to the SAR Conservation Trust Fund.</b></p> <p>Set aside \$450,000 for a monitoring program for the vireo and a management program for its pests.</p>
Willow woodland	Loss of 23 acres of willow woodland without understory (non-vireo habitat) due to construction	
Proposed least Bell's vireo critical habitat	USFWS proposed that increased durations of inundation could potentially destroy all proposed LBV critical habitat below 500-ft elevation.	

Resource	Impact	Mitigation
Shrub land	Loss of 12 acres due to construction of Highway 71 dike	Reseed Borrow Site No.1 (up to 160 ac) with native shrub land species.
Oak woodland	Loss of 5 acres (84 trees) during construction of Highway 71 dike	Plant 336 trees on 5.17 acres south of Prado Regional Park (mitigation ratio of 4:1). This measure is no longer warranted due to Highway redesign which eliminated all impacts to existing oak woodlands.
Grassland	Loss of Canada Goose foraging habitat at Borrow Site No. 2	Excavation of Borrow Site No. 2 will take place in 3 phases. Completed phases will be recontoured and restored with suitable goose forage material, which will be planted during the season geese are present so that young shoots will always be available. Restoration will include recontouring, resspreading salvaged topsoil, fertilization, and seeding with appropriate seedmixes). Additionally, 60 acres will be enhanced for geese through mowing during years the borrow site is active.
Aquatic habitat	Minor impacts from Borrow Site No. 2 haul road adjacent to Chino Creek	None (impact not significant)
All biological resources	Noise impacts from construction	None (impact not significant)

Resource	Impact	Mitigation
Least Bell's Vireo (LBV) habitat  Willow Woodland and Coastal sage Scrub (CSS) habitat for California gnatcatcher foraging	Impacts to Alcoa Dike Phase 1 and 2 Project (s)	<p>Restore 204-acres riparian habitat and 13 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat by removing non-native invasive (primarily arundo) vegetation in these parcels as detailed below.</p> <p>There are two riparian habitat restoration parcels and three CSS habitat restoration parcels (collectively, the Habitat Restoration Areas). Riparian Parcel 1 is located between Auburndale and Lincoln Avenue within Temescal Creek. This 23-acre parcel is estimated to contain 19-acres of non-native, invasive vegetation. Riparian Parcel 2 is located in Prado Basin, downstream of existing, previously establish mitigation parcels. This 285-acre parcel is estimated to contain 65% or 185-acres of non-native invasive vegetation (primarily arundo). Removing this vegetation and continuing to spray and remove new growth of non-natives throughout the contract period would allow native riparian habitat to establish in its place, with both parcels.</p> <p>The CSS Parcels 1-3 total 19.24 acres and are located in close proximity to the Alcoa Dike project borrow site. These 3 parcels are currently dominated by non-native vegetation and will require supplemental planting and irrigation and continued herbicide treatment for conversion to CSS habitat, and to achieve success criteria. Restoration of a minimum of 13 acres to CSS habitat within these areas is required.</p>

### 6.1.3 Water Resources and Hydrology

**EC-WR-1 Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.** A Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be developed for the project by the construction contractor and filed with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to construction. The SWPPP shall be stored at the construction site for reference or inspection review. Implementation of the SWPPP would help stabilize graded areas and waterways and reduce erosion and sedimentation. The plan would designate BMPs that would be adhered to during construction activities. Erosion minimizing efforts such as straw wattles, water bars, covers, silt fences, and sensitive area access restrictions (for example, flagging) would be installed before clearing and grading begins. Mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures would be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities. During construction activities, measures would be in place to ensure that contaminants are not discharged

from the construction sites. The SWPPP would define areas where hazardous materials would be stored, where trash would be placed, where rolling equipment would be parked, fueled and serviced, and where construction materials such as reinforcing bars and structural steel members would be stored. Erosion control during grading of the construction sites and during subsequent construction would be in place and monitored as specified by the SWPPP. A silting basin(s) would be established, as necessary, to capture silt and other materials, which might otherwise be carried from the site by rainwater surface runoff.

**EC-WR-2 Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan.** A project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management plan would be developed prior to initiation of construction. The plan would identify types of hazardous materials to be used during construction and the types of wastes that would be generated. All project personnel would be provided with project-specific training to ensure that all hazardous materials and wastes are handled in a safe and environmentally sound manner. This plan shall include an emergency response program to ensure quick and safe cleanup of accidental spills.

**EC-WR-3 Water quality permits.** Prior to engaging in any soil-disturbing activities, the construction contractor shall document compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA) WQC Section 401 and Section 402 NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, and shall also receive any necessary permits for dewatering activities.

#### **6.1.4 Land Use**

**EC-LU-1 Butterfield Park Construction and Maintenance Plan.** Prior to commencement of construction within Butterfield Park, a Butterfield Park Construction and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Corona's Parks and Community Services Department for review and approval. At a minimum, the plan shall include the following: the expected start date and duration of construction; a detailed description of the activities associated with construction; a detailed description of expected maintenance activities that will occur in the future, which shall include the frequency and duration of such activities, and the procedures for notifying the City prior to maintenance activities in order to avoid disruptions to the remaining recreation resources; and any additional information that would help minimize disruptions to the remaining recreation resources.

#### **6.1.5 Noise**

As long as construction activities occur during 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, which are the exempted time periods per County of Riverside Municipal Code and City of Corona Municipal Code, no additional environmental commitments would be required. However, any changes to that schedule, including occasional overtime work, would require obtaining a variance from local authorities per the following additional environmental

commitments, which would be incorporated into contract specifications for the proposed project to reduce potential impacts to noise.

**EC-N-1** Prior to construction, the construction contractor shall obtain Riverside County approval (exemption or variance) per Riverside County Municipal Code Section 847, Section 7.(a).1 – Construction Related Exceptions, for all noise sources not exempt by Riverside County Municipal Code Section 847, Section 2.i. and exceeding Riverside County Municipal Code Section 847, Section 4 – General Sound Level Standards. Additionally, prior to any such activities occurring, the construction contractor shall obtain Riverside County approval (exemption or variance) for all operational and maintenance activities not compliant with Riverside County Municipal Code Section 847.

**EC-N-2** Prior to construction, the construction contractor shall obtain a variance from the City of Corona for all construction activities not compliant with the performance standards identified within the City of Corona Municipal Code Section 17.84.040 (c) – Noise Standards. Additionally, prior to any such activities occurring, the project proponent shall obtain a variance from the City of Corona for all operational and maintenance activities not compliant with City of Corona Municipal Code Section 17.84.040 (c) – Noise Standards.

#### **6.1.6 Cultural Resources**

**CR-1** The Corps shall ensure that ground disturbing activities that have the potential to impact historic properties is monitored by archaeologists meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Any finds shall be documented in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement.

**CR-2** If previously unknown cultural resources are found during construction of any feature of the Santa Ana River Project, construction in the area of the find shall cease until the requirements in 36 CFR 800.13, are met. This would include coordination with the California State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and appropriate Native American groups and/or other interested parties. It may require additional measures such as test and data recovery excavations, archival research, avoidance measures, etc.

## 7 COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

### 7.1 Relevant Federal, State, and Local Statutes, Laws, and Guidelines

The following section provides a brief summary of the laws, regulations, Executive Orders, and other guidelines that are relevant to the proposed project activities and alternatives. Included in this summary is a discussion of the consistency of the proposed project activities with each of the plans, policies, and regulations listed below.

#### 7.1.1 Federal Laws and Regulations

**The National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act.** This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum has been prepared in accordance with both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The local sponsor for the project, Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD), is the CEQA lead and is responsible for compliance with that State law. Pursuant to Section 15164 of CEQA guidelines, an addendum to an approved EIR shall be prepared if “none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred,” “only if minor technical changes or additions are necessary to make the EIR under consideration adequate under CEQA,” and “the changes to the EIR made by the addendum do not raise important new issues about significant effects on the environment.”

Based on the analyses in Chapters 4 and 5, the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. OCFCD has determined the changes to the project design, construction, operation and maintenance of Alcoa Dike embankment under the Proposed Action does not raise important new issues of significant effects on the environment. Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIR is, therefore, not required.

**National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as Amended (NHPA).** The Corps is in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. A programmatic agreement (PA) was executed for the SARMP in 1992 by the Corps, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The PA details the procedures to be followed for each feature of the project. Under the Proposed Action, no additional consultation is required. The two historic properties, CA\_RIV-1039 and CA-RIV-1044, have previously been mitigated in consultation with the SHPO and in accordance with the procedures of the PA.

**Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.** The proposed project is in compliance. The SARMP has been fully coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and other agencies. Two Coordination Act Reports have been prepared for the SARMP (1988 and 1999). These documents are included in the 1988 SEIS and the 2001 SEIS/EIR, and the recommendations continue to be carried forward during implementation of each SARMP feature. In recent years, numerous meetings have occurred between the USFWS, CDFW, other resource agencies, local sponsors and the Corps to discuss the various proposed projects in Prado Basin and the Lower Santa Ana River. Discussions included potential impacts to, mitigation for, and minimization and avoidance measures for nesting birds covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), species covered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)

(such as the least Bell's vireo and Santa Ana sucker), and wildlife movement issues. In addition, consultation with the USFWS under the ESA has been completed as noted below.

**Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as Amended.** Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies, in consultation with, and with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, to insure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for these species. Potential impacts to the federally endangered least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*; vireo) and its designated critical habitat, and the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*; gnatcatcher) and potential impacts to proposed critical habitat for the federally threatened (western distinct population segment of the) yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*; cuckoo) are addressed in an amended biological opinion (FWS-WRIV-08B0408-18F1350) and conference opinion rendered by the USFWS dated August 23, 2018.

The Corps has determined the Proposed Action would not affect the federally endangered southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) or its designated critical habitat or the Santa Ana sucker, (*Catostomus santaanae*). Therefore, consultation is not required. The Proposed Action is in compliance with the Act.

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) makes it unlawful to possess, buy, sell, purchase, barter or "take" any migratory bird listed in Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 10. "Take" is defined as possession or destruction of migratory birds, their nests or eggs. The clearing or mowing of vegetation associated with proposed project construction is only allowed during periods when migratory birds are not nesting (August 16 through February 14). Construction may be done anytime of the year provided that the clearing or mowing of vegetation is done between August 16 and February 14 when migratory birds are not nesting. The current list of species protected by the MBTA includes several hundred species and essentially includes all native birds. Mitigation measures developed in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR have been formulated to reduce impacts on migratory birds and will be implemented as part of the Proposed Action. Therefore the project is in compliance with the MBTA.

**Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, as Amended.** The proposed project is in compliance. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940, as amended, protects bald and golden eagles by prohibiting the taking, possession, and commerce of such birds and nests without a permit and establishes civil penalties for violation of this Act. Take of bald and golden eagles is defined as follows: "disturb means to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, (1) injury to an eagle, (2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or (3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior" (72 FR 31132; 50 CFR 22.3).

On November 10, 2009, the USFWS implemented new rules (74 FR 46835) governing the "take" of golden and bald eagles. The new rules were released under the existing Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act which has been the primary regulation protecting unlisted eagle populations since 1940. All activities that may disturb or incidentally take an eagle or its nest as a result of an otherwise legal activity must be permitted by the USFWS under this Act. The definition of disturb (72 FR 31132) includes interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior to the degree that it causes or is likely to cause decreased productivity or nest abandonment.



The proposed project would not affect birds protected under this Act beyond those effects that were addressed in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and CESA permit (2081-2001-023-06). Golden eagles may occasionally forage within the borrow site and other upland habitats within Prado Basin, as do other raptors. However, no nesting habitat would be affected and no nests are known to occur in the vicinity. Mitigation and compensation measures that were outlined in the 2001 SEIS/EIR and CESA permit would be implemented as required for impacts related to the proposed project. For instance, temporarily impacted areas will be reseeded following construction.

**Clean Air Act, as Amended.** Under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990, the Lead Agency is required to make a determination of whether the Alcoa Dike proposed project “conforms” with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Conformity is defined in Section 176(c) of the CAAA as compliance with the SIP’s purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards. If the total direct and indirect emissions of the criteria pollutant or precursor in a nonattainment or maintenance area caused by a Federal action would equal or exceed the applicability rates at 40 CFR 93.153(b), a conformity determination is not required.

The proposed project is located approximately in the central part of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) of California. Criteria pollutants that are in non-attainment are Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and Suspended Particulate Matter PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The proposed project emissions considered heavy duty construction equipment and commuter vehicles for all phases of construction during the project duration. Daily (Pounds per day) and yearly (Tons per year) emissions for the proposed project were calculated for the air quality analysis determination. Implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and environmental commitments during construction would avoid, reduce, and minimize impacts to air quality, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Emissions generated by the Proposed Action are expected to be temporary, and would be below the applicability rates. Thus, emissions from the Proposed Action would conform to the SIP. The Corps has determined that the proposed project is in compliance with the CAAA.

For the proposed project, the Corps would implement environmental commitments (AQ-1 to AQ-22) to further minimize impacts to air quality.

**Clean Water Act, as Amended.** The proposed project is in compliance with 40 CFR Part 230, regulations promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) and 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The 2001 SEIS/EIR identified that the proposed project and other Prado Basin and Vicinity features would affect jurisdictional waters (Waters of the U.S.). The proposed revised Alcoa Dike footprint (the Proposed Action) does not encroach any further into Waters of the U.S. compared to that analyzed in the 2001 SEIS/EIR, however, does include some additional temporary impacts in the expanded footprint and permanent impacts overall. See Section 4.2, Biological Resources, for an accounting and description of impacts to Waters of the U.S. related to the Proposed Action. Information on the proposed project’s compliance to Section 404, including a 404(b)(1) evaluation, may be found in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR. In addition, a Section 401 water quality certification (SARWQCB WDID # 332019-08) was obtained from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board in April 2019 for the Phase II Alcoa Dike project. The Corps’ contractor will submit a Notice of Intent and obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction

general stormwater permit (Section 402 of the CWA) prior to construction. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, would be developed and implemented by the Corps' contractor prior to and during construction to minimize site erosion.

**Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management.** Under this Executive Order, the Corps must take action to avoid development in the base floodplain (100-year) unless it is the only practicable alternative to reduce hazards and risks associated with floods; to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare; and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial value of the base floodplain. The Proposed Action would avoid development in the flood basin to the extent practicable to reduce hazards and risks. The Proposed Action is in compliance.

**Executive Order 11900. Protection of Wetlands.** The Corps considered the effects of the proposed project on the survival and quality of wetlands. Projects are to "...avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative..." See Section 4.2, Biological Resources, for an accounting and description of impacts to wetlands related to Alcoa Dike Phase II construction. Mitigation measures developed in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR, 2018 SEA/EIR Addendum and subsequently for this project feature have been formulated to reduce impacts on wetlands.

**Executive Order 12898. Environmental Justice.** The proposed project is in compliance. There will be no impacts resulting from the proposed project that would result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority and low income communities.

## 7.2 State Regulations

The State Regulations discussed below apply to the sponsor.

### 7.2.1 Air Quality

**California Air Resources Board.** CARB has issued a number of CAAQS. These standards include pollutants not covered under the NAAQS and also require more stringent standards than those under the NAAQS. There is no change in compliance from the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR.

**Greenhouse Gases.** In 2006, in response to concerns related to global warming and climate change, the California State Legislature adopted *Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32)*, the "California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006." AB 32 focuses on reducing GHGs in California and requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to State-wide levels in 1990 by 2020 (Hendrix, Wilson, et. al., 2007). The Proposed Action would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

### 7.2.2 Biological Resources

**California Endangered Species Act (CESA).** The Proposed Action is or will be in compliance. Effects of the Proposed Action on state-listed species would be addressed in consultations by OCFCD with CDFW, if necessary. The CESA permit (2081-2001-023-06) previously issued for the SARMP would not be amended as per the conditions set forth in the Biological Opinion (FWS-WRIV-08B0408-18F1350) by USFWS in August 2018 to address proposed changes to

the Alcoa Dike feature. However, previous coordination with CDFW on Reach 9 features indicated that neither CESA nor a Streambed Alteration Agreement would be required, considering that construction will be overseen by the federal government, and routine OMMR&R conducted by the non-federal sponsors would not result in additional effects to state-listed species. The same situation exists for the Alcoa Dike Phase II project.

**California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1600**

The Proposed Action is, or will be, in compliance. A 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA No. 6-2001-263) was issued for the SARMP in 2002. This SAA had expired, and a new SAA (1600-2009-0031-R6) was signed by OCFCD in October 2009. OCFCD is responsible for coordinating with CDFW if necessary, for any additional updates. However, previous coordination with CDFW on Reach 9 features indicated that neither CESA nor a SAA would be required, considering that construction will be overseen by the federal government, and routine OMMR&R conducted by the non-federal sponsors would not result in additional effects to listed species. The same situation exists for the Alcoa Dike Phase II project. Nevertheless, minimization and avoidance measures included in the 2009 amended SAA would be followed during construction of the Alcoa Dike Phase II project.

**Native Plant Protection Act.** The proposed project is in compliance. California's Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) requires all State agencies to utilize their authority to carry out programs to conserve endangered and rare native plants. Provisions of NPPA prohibit the taking of listed plants from the wild and require notification to the CDFW at least 10 days in advance of any change in land use. This allows CDFW to salvage listed plant species that would otherwise be destroyed. The Corps is required to conduct botanical inventories and consult with CDFW during and planning to comply with the provisions of this act and sections of CEQA that apply to rare or endangered plants. Impacts to native plants listed as threatened or endangered would not differ from those addressed in the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR and CESA permit (2081-2001-023-06). Mitigation and compensation measures that were outlined in those documents will be implemented as required for impacts related to the Alcoa Dike Phase II project.

### **7.3 Local Regulations**

The Local Regulations discussed below apply to the sponsor only.

#### **7.3.1 Air Quality**

The proposed project is within SCAQMD jurisdiction. The SCAQMD is responsible for planning, implementing, and enforcing federal and State ambient standards within this portion of the South Coast Air Basin. The regulations of this agency are primarily focused on stationary sources; therefore, most of the local agency regulations are not relevant to the proposed project.

The SCAQMD has visible emissions, nuisance, and fugitive dust emissions regulations with which the Project's construction will need to comply. The specific regulations are as follows:

- SCAQMD Rule 401 – Visible Emissions
- SCAQMD Rule 402 – Nuisance
- SCQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust

These rules limit the visible dust emissions from the project construction sites, prohibit emissions that can cause a public nuisance and require the prevention and reduction of fugitive

dust emissions to the extent possible. There is no change in compliance from the 2001 Final SEIS/EIR.

### 7.3.2 Biological Resources

**Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).** The MSHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) focusing on conservation of species and their associated habitats in Western Riverside County. This HCP is one of several large, multi-jurisdictional habitat-planning efforts in Southern California with the overall goal of maintaining biological and ecological diversity within a rapidly urbanizing region. The MSHCP is intended to allow Riverside County and its cities to better control local land-use decisions and maintain a strong economic climate in the region while addressing the requirements of the state and federal ESAs.

The Biological Resources section of this SEA and EIR Addendum document the proposed project's mitigation, which is consistent with MSHCP requirements for a "Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation."

**Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan.** The proposed project is in compliance. This plan directs policy towards the conservation of native vegetation in Riverside County. These policies are based on maintaining the ecological diversity in Riverside County through the management of native vegetation. Policies that are intended to protect superior examples of native vegetation resources in conjunction with permitted uses include: (1) update the vegetation map for western Riverside County in consultation with the CDFW, the Natural Diversity Data Base, the United States Forest Service, and other knowledgeable agencies and the County shall also provide these agencies with data as needed; (2) expand vegetation mapping to include the eastern portion of the County of Riverside; (3) maintain and conserve superior examples of native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, and other features for ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes; (4) conserve the oak tree resources in the County; and (5) encourage research and education on the effects of smog and other forms of pollution on human health and on natural vegetation.

**City of Corona General Plan.** The proposed project is in compliance. The Proposed Project falls within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Corona. Pursuant to California state law (Government Code § 65301), the City of Corona has adopted a General Plan to guide long-term development within its boundaries and sphere of influence.

The following are selected goals and policies from the City of Corona General Plan that are specific to biological and sensitive biological resources occurring and/or potentially occurring in the Project area.

*Goal:* Protect, enhance, and sustain significant plant and wildlife species and habitat, which exist in Corona and its Planning Area for the long term benefit of the natural environment, and Corona visitors and residents.

*Policies:*

- Implement programs that rehabilitate and enhance the biological value, diversity, and integrity of the City's natural resources through such means as vegetation restoration, control of alien plants and animal species, landscape buffering, and natural watercourse channel restoration.

- Preserve the species and habitats listed in Tables 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 of the *Technical Background Report (Alcoa Dike Phase I 2018 Final SEA/EIR Addendum)* and those that may be considered by the City of Corona in the future.
- Acquire and maintain the most current technical information available regarding the status, location, and condition of significant and sensitive biological species and habitats as well as assessments of potential for impacts on those resources and how such resources should be appropriately protected, conditions sustained, and impacts mitigated from nearby development.
- Participate and enroll in the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) to conserve biological diversity through protection of natural communities.
- Preserve the wildlife habitat of significant natural open space areas including expanding habitat ranges, movement corridors, and nesting sites by setting aside lands between open space areas to serve as biological linkages. This network of biological habitat linkages may include the use of riparian corridors, open space dedications, development of parks and/or natural resources, or greenbelts. Any proposed recreational use of those areas such as trails shall be designed to strictly avoid damaging sensitive habitat area.
- Identify and aggressively pursue obtaining available State and Federal funding for the long-term maintenance and protection of significant and sensitive biological resources areas.

*Goal:* Ensure that biological resources are not impacted during or as a result of construction and development activity.

*Policies:*

- Require that construction activities be conducted in a manner to minimize adverse impacts on natural resources through the use of Best Management Practices, as established and updated by the City of Corona.
- Where applications for development are being proposed in undeveloped areas of the City and the SOI areas, or in areas that an Initial Study has determined there is potential for significant adverse impacts to biological resources, and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) shall be undertaken by the proponent. As part of these studies, the proponent shall also submit a Biological Resources Technical Report with the following qualifications:
  - The report must be prepared by a qualified professional who addresses the Proposed Project's impact on federally and State-listed and candidate plants and animals; California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Special Animals; natural communities of high inventory priority with the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB); and any other special interest species or communities identified in the General Plan Technical Background Report, or those hereafter named by federal or State trustee agencies.
  - If appropriate habitat for any listed species occurs on the site, a qualified biologist shall conduct focused surveys according to USFWS and/or CDFW protocol.
  - A qualified botanist shall conduct a focused rare plant survey during the appropriate time of year following USFWS and/or CDFW protocol.

- If any listed species would potentially be impacted by the Proposed Project, consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW would be required to identify mitigation measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts. These mitigation measures would be included in the report.
- The report shall also define a program for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the specified mitigation measures.

*Goal:* Protect natural and biological resources within riparian corridors and wetlands.

*Policies:*

- Review proposed developments in riparian and wetland habitats to evaluate their conformance with the following policies and standards:
  - Full consideration of the nature of existing biological resources present and all reasonable measures that shall be taken to avoid significant impacts, including retention of sufficient natural open space and undeveloped buffer zones.
  - Development shall be designed and sited to preserve watercourses, riparian habitat, vernal pools, and wetlands in their natural condition, unless these actions result in an infeasible and.
  - Where riparian corridors are retained, they shall be protected by an adequate buffer with a minimum 100-foot protection zone from the edge of the tree, shrub, or herb canopy.
  - Development shall incorporate habitat linkages (wildlife corridors) to adjacent open spaces, where appropriate.
  - Development shall incorporate fences, walls, vegetative cover, or other measures to adequately buffer habitat areas, linkages, or corridors from the built environment.
  - Roads and utilities shall be located and designed such that conflicts with biological resources, habitat areas, linkages, or corridors are avoided.
  - Development shall utilize appropriate open space or conservation easements in order to protect sensitive species or their habitats.
  - Development shall mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts to waters of the United States, wetlands, and riparian habitat by replacement on an in-kind basis (i.e., riparian habitat is to be replaced by riparian habitat of the same type). Replacement shall be based on a ratio determined by the California State Fish and Wildlife Department and/or the Army Corps of Engineers in order to account for the potentially diminished habitat value of replacement habitat. Such replacement shall occur on the original development site, whenever possible. Alternatively, replacement can be effected, subject to State and Federal regulatory approval, by creation or restoration of replacement habitats elsewhere, preferably within Corona's Planning Area. Replacement habitats are to be protected in perpetuity through acquisition, an appropriate conservation easement, or dedication.
- Prohibit development and grading that alters the biological integrity of riparian corridors, unless no feasible alternative exists or the damaged habitat is replaced with habitat of equivalent value. Development that is permitted with riparian corridors shall be based on field evidence and interpretation of physical and biological data that shall include the following:

- The nature and extent of the vegetation, or in the case of disturbed sites, the potential vegetation
- Topography
- Hydrology
- Restrict development within riparian corridors to the following uses:
  - Education and research, excluding buildings and other structures
  - Passive (non-motorized recreation)
  - Trails and scenic overlooks on public land(s) if located outside of undeveloped buffer zones
  - Fish, aquatic, and wildlife management activities
  - Necessary water supply and
  - Resource consumptive uses as provided for in the Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Administrative Code
  - Flood control projects where no other methods are available to protect the public safety
  - Bridges when supports are not in significant conflict with riparian resources
  - Underground utilities

*Goal:* Protect forest and vegetation resources in the City of Corona and the Planning Area.

*Policies:*

- Cooperate with federal and State agencies to achieve the sustainable conservation of forest lands as a means of providing open space and protecting natural resources and MSHCP habitat lands.
- Maintain and conserve superior examples of native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, and other features for ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes.

### **7.3.3 Noise**

As long as construction activities occur during 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, which are the exempted time periods per County of Riverside Municipal Code and City of Corona Municipal Code, the proposed construction would be in compliance with local (city and county) noise ordinances; any changes to that schedule, including occasional overtime work, would require obtaining a variance from local authorities.

The proposed project was coordinated formally and informally with numerous agencies, organizations, and individuals, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), State Office of Historic Preservation, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and local cities and counties. This 2020 Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum will be distributed to public agencies and interested parties for review. Comments received and responses to comments will be included in the Final Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum.

## **8 AGENCY COORDINATION**

The proposed project was coordinated formally and informally with numerous agencies, organizations, and individuals, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), State Office of Historic Preservation, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and local cities and counties. This 2020 Phase II Draft SEA/EIR Addendum will be distributed to public agencies and interested parties for review as identified in Distribution Mailing List (Appendix C). Comments received and responses to comments will be included in the Final Phase II SEA/EIR Addendum (Appendix D).



## 9 LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

Name	Role
Hayley Lovan	Reviewer, Chief, Ecosystem Planning Section
Naeem Siddiqui	Biologist, Ecosystem Planning Section
Danielle Storey	Archaeologist, Ecosystem Planning Section
Jenni Snibbe	Environmental Coordinator, Regional Planning Section

## **10 CONCLUSION**

The changes to project features of the proposed Alcoa Dike project would not have any significant impact on the environmental quality of the area beyond those addressed in previous Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) related to the overall Prado Basin and Vicinity construction. Therefore, another EIS is not required for these features.

## 11 REFERENCES

- Aspen Environmental. 2018. Preliminary Coastal California Gnatcatcher Survey data 2018.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2017. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). Full condensed report for San Fernando, Oat Mountain, and Van Nuys Quadrangles. Generated March 2017.
- California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). 2017. Version 2016.3.2
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 1997. *A Manual of California Vegetation* (online edition). California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, CA. Accessed in December 2009. Available at <http://davisherb.ucdavis.edu/cnpsActiveServer/index.html>.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss. January. 100 pp.
- Foster, John M., Judith A. Rasson, R. Paul Hampson, Daniel G. Landis, and Mark D. Selverston. 1996. Archaeological Assessment of 11 Historical Sites in the Prado Basin. Statistical Research, Tucson.
- Foster, John M., Gwendolyn R. Romani, A. George Toren, R. Paul Hampson, and Vicki L. Solheid. 1995. The Mexican Potters of Prado. Technical Series 57. Statistical Research, Tucson.
- Greenwood, Roberta S., John M. Foster, Anne Q. Duffield, and John F. Elliot. 1987. Historical and Archaeological Evaluation: Rincon Townsite and Environs. Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, California.
- Greenwood, Roberta S. and John M. Foster. 1987. The Rincon Townsite: Cultural Resource Investigation. Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, California.
- Langenwater, Paul E. II, and James Brock. 1985. Phase II Archaeological Studies of Prado Basin and the Lower Santa Ana River. ECOS Management Criteria, Cypress CA.
- Pike, J., D. Pellegrini, S. Reynolds, and L. R. Hays. 1999. The Status and Management of the Least Bell's Vireo and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher within Prado Basin, California 1986-1999. Prepared for Orange County Water District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game.
- Pike, J., D. Pellegrini, L. Hays, and R. Zembul. 2003. Least Bell's Vireos and Southwestern Willow Flycatchers in Prado Basin of the Santa Ana River Watershed. Unpublished

- report prepared for the Orange County Water District and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Santa Ana Watershed Association (SAWA). 2017. Least Bell's Vireo Survey data 2016 - 2017.
- Santa Ana Watershed Association (SAWA). 2019. Least Bell's Vireo Survey data 2018 - 2019.
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2019. Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Order for The Santa Ana River Mainstem Project, Alcoa Dike (SARWQCB WDID # 332019-08). April 11, 2019.
- Sterner, Mathew. 2004. Ranching, Rails, and Clay: The Development and Demise of the Town of Rincon/Prado. Archaeological Data Recovery at CA-RIV-1039H and CA-RIV-1044H, Riverside County, California. Technical Series 83. Statistical Research, Tucson.
- Southern California Edison. 2020. TD1287836 Mira Loma-Cleargen-Delgen 66 kV General Order 131-D Evaluation. Evaluation prepared by Environmental Intelligence for Southern California Edison.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2017. Daily (lb/day) Emissions Threshold.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). 2001. Prado Basin and vicinity, including Reach 9 and stabilization of the bluff toe at Norco Bluffs supplemental final environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (State Clearinghouse No. 97071087) Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties, California. Planning Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Los Angeles, California. November 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_.2010. Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report Addendum for the Auxiliary Dike Project.
- \_\_\_\_\_.2013. California Institution for Women Dike Project. Final supplemental environmental assessment and addendum to environmental impact report No. 583 (in progress). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Los Angeles, California.
- \_\_\_\_\_.2017. SEA/EIR Addendum, Santa Ana River Mainstem, Prado Dam Basin, Auxillary Embankment and Floodwall Phase 2, Santa Ana River Flood Control Project, Riverside County, California. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Los Angeles, California.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018. SEA/EIR Addendum, Santa Ana River Mainstem, Alcoa Dike, Santa Ana River Flood Control Project, Riverside County, California. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Los Angeles, California.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1990. The 1990 Amendment to CAA Section 176 (

General Conformity Rule (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 51.850-51.860 and 93.150-93.160).

\_\_\_\_\_. 2001. Prado Basin and Vicinity, Including Reach 9 and Stabilization of the Bluff Toe at Norco Bluffs, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, and Appendices. November.

\_\_\_\_\_. **2017. OCWD. DRAFT EIR/EA FIVE YEAR (2017-2022) DEVIATION TO THE PRADO DAM WATER CONTROL PLAN AND SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Addendum to Environmental Impact Report (EIR) 583. California Institution for Women.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1994. Designation of Critical Habitat for the Least Bell's Vireo, Final Rule.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Review of Plant and Animal Taxa that are Candidates for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species; Proposed Rule*. 50 CFR Part 17. Vol. 61(40): pp. 7596–7613. February 28.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, Proposed Rule to Designate Critical Habitat for the Santa Ana Sucker.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Initiation of 5-year Reviews of 34 Species in California and Nevada, and Availability of 96 Completed 5-Year Reviews in California and Nevada.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Revised Critical Habitat for the Santa Ana Sucker, Final Rule. August 3, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Reinitiation of Formal Section 7 Consultation on the Biological Opinion on the Prado Mainstem and Santa Ana River Reach 9 Flood Control Projects and Norco Bluffs Stabilization Project, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, California (FWS-SB-909.6). March 28, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2013. List of Species of Special Concern.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2013. Designation of Critical Habitat for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher. March 1, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018. Formal Section 7 Consultation, Biological Opinion on the Santa Ana River Mainstem Flood Control Project at the Alcoa Dike, Corona Riverside California (FWS-WRIV-08B0408-18F1350). August 23, 2018.

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. 2007. Riverside County, CA.FA