

Appendix III-C
**Minutes of the
City of Diamond Bar
Neighborhood Forum of
Site “D” Specific Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report**
(Heritage Park Community Center,
2900 S. Brea Canyon Road,
Diamond Bar, August 3, 2009)

This page intentionally left blank.

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DIAMOND BAR
NEIGHBORHOOD FORUM OF SITE 'D' SPECIFIC PLAN
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
Heritage Park Community Center
2900 S. Brea Canyon Road, Diamond Bar**

AUGUST 3, 2009

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the neighborhood forum was to provide the public with an additional opportunity to ask questions as well as, comment on the Site 'D' Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) prior to the close of the 45-day public review period on Monday, August 10, 2009.

MEETING AGENDA:

1. Overview of Proposed Site D Specific Plan
2. Overview of the EIR Process
3. Summary of Key issues identified in the Site D Draft EIR
4. Questions and comments from the audience

CDD/Gubman stated the purpose of tonight's meeting and asked for public comments to be addressed to him and no later than the August 10, 2009, deadline for review. He provided an overview of the proposed Site D Specific Plan and talked about the EIR Process that began in February 2008. The decision about whether to approve the Specific Plan will be made by the City Council after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Following an overview of the EIR Process, CDD/Gubman provided a summary of the key issues identified in the Draft EIR.

CDD/Gubman reported that the Specific Plan process began in the summer of 2007 with the adoption of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Walnut Valley Unified School District (majority owner) and the City of Diamond Bar that directed the City to prepare a Specific Plan, a state prescribed land use planning process. One of the parameters established in the MOU was that of the approximately 30 acres, half would be planned for residential development and half for commercial development. The Specific Plan ultimately prescribes the maximum number of dwelling units and the maximum square footage of commercial development that the site can accommodate.

Consultants Mark Rogers, TRG Land prepared the Specific Plan, and Peter Lewandowski, Environmental Impact Sciences (EIS), prepared the DEIR. Mr. Rogers explained that tonight's meeting is not required by the state (i.e., under the California Environmental Quality Act, or "CEQA"). The City felt it was very important that there be one more opportunity to make certain the public was clear about the details of the Specific Plan and its intent in order to get the most accurate feedback as this project moves forward. Mr. Rogers spoke about his involvement with this project. The School District acquired the property in 1970 and he became involved in the late 1980's. He believed that the City was fortunate that the applicant for this project was the School District and the City rather than a developer so that the project would be more compatible with the surrounding community. This Specific Plan merely establishes a threshold from which

when the property moves into a sale mode, the buyer would come back with a discretionary project relative to architecture and a final application for the total number of dwelling units which will be a market-driven process by virtue of the applicant at that time. He showed photos of the property and talked about how the project was formulated and what it would entail.

Peter Lewandowski said his firm prepares environmental documents for public and private projects and his firm was selected by the City to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The project before the City and the City's General Plan is a consideration for the particular land use for this site. The City Council and Planning Commission will be presented with various informational documents, one of which is the EIR. CEQA stipulates that before a public agency can make a land use decision it should consider the environmental implications of that decision. CEQA was adopted for the purpose of providing an informed decision basis. Although the project before the community can be adopted, part of the information that needs to be provided to the City and to the community is the assessments of the environmental implications of taking this action. He talked about the process of preparing the document that was intended to assist the City decide the merits of this particular land use and the impacts of that action to ascertain whether there are conditions of approval or alternative land uses that might reduce those environmental impacts. Further, the document brings forward mitigation measures to reduce those impacts and presents alternatives to this particular land use. Comments received during the public review period are published and addressed in a document called *Response to Comments*. Therefore, tonight we are asking speakers to submit their comments to the City for further reflection and analysis in order to assist in the publication of the Response to Comments document.

Public Comments:

Gale Eastman said he was told years ago that a school could not be built on this site and wondered if something had changed so that they can build commercial and residential at this site. Mr. Rogers responded that it was not that they could not build a school, schools are located based on population, and there is not a need to locate a school at this site. When the state surpluses property under the State Education Code, they go through a mandatory process by committee and enlist the help of the public to determine future uses of the site. Site D was declared surplus property in 1988 or 1989. Mr. Eastman said he would like to see Castle Rock rebuilt at Site D, and Heritage Park expanded.

Allen Wilson said that traffic mitigation needed to be addressed and if the school district has no need for this property why don't they donate it for the City to enjoy. If the school district sells this property what will they use the funds for? He felt that if this project was allowed it would open the door for the Aera project. Mr. Rogers said he was not qualified to address the Aera project in relationship to this proposed project because he was not sure they would necessarily relate. This is a much smaller project that has been in the works for 18 years. The funds that are generated by this project for the school district go into their maintenance and operations budget and would not go into the general fund. This is currently under the General Plan designation of "public

facilities” which is not necessarily coincidental to the school site. The district has no need for this surplus property as a school site. He said that in today’s economy it would be in the best interest of the community for it to generate funds where appropriate and this seems, after 18 years, to be an appropriate opportunity. He cannot speak to what specific improvements would be part of the project moving forward as they would be conditioned under the subdivision map approvals for the site. There are a number of capital improvements that come with the project that are street improvements – how it is conditioned is a separate issue. Separately from that, the project pays into a fund for future improvements based on regional impacts that occur as a result of this project. One of the things he mentioned in his discussion was the split between commercial and residential gives the project off-peak uses on 50 percent of the property. The peak hour uses for residential are the work hours that are typically 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Commercial tends to be off-peak to those hours and starts at 10:00 am and go beyond. In some respect the split use has some benefit in terms of the overall impact. CDD/Gubman said that whether or not the Aera project will move forward and what may occur is unknown. There is a section of the traffic study that looked at related projects and did a traffic generation forecast. The Aera project as described to the City by Aera Energy is included in the traffic analysis. The number of units that had been initially stated were used as the basis for the traffic generation forecast. Mr. Lewandowski said that the purpose of CEQA is to look at the environmental implications for a project to ascertain whether there are particular conditions of approval that could be adopted (mitigate measures under CEQA) or whether different land use options could be brought forward if one of those alternate land uses might lessen the impacts of those actions. In the preparation of the environmental impact report, separate traffic studies were done by a very reputable local traffic firm that analyzed both the on and off-site traffic implications of this particular project. Small projects will incrementally contribute to further increase in traffic in the area. However, the traffic study determined, based on the methodology used in traffic engineering to determine what conditions could be brought forward so as to further implement the City’s traffic goals of different levels of service standards. The traffic study that he researched for both onsite and offsite traffic implications brought forward mitigation measures for the physical improvements as well as financial contributions to regional intersections and those mitigation measures are identified in the document. To Mr. Wilson’s fundamental question, the City is being asked to consider a particular land use. CEQA identifies a variety of other land uses that which could be considered for the site. CEQA mandates that one of those alternatives be called a “no project” alternative under which the City as the lead agency takes no action on the project and the site is not developed. The EIR also looked at four other alternatives including public facilities, neighborhood serving commercial, higher density, and lower density residential. One of the things the City Council will be considering is not only the land use that is presented in the Specific Plan but all other possible land use options for this site including those that are in the EIR and others that might be brought forth in the future.

Mary Rodriguez, 33419 Pasado Drive, said there are a lot of problems with this project that were not included in the 400 page report. The report does not mention Copper Canyon and Silver Bullet, etc. The reputable firm that conducted the traffic study may be reputable but they have made a mistake by not including these streets in the study and the public needs assurance there

will be mitigation for all of the noise. There is sound wall along the SR57 to protect residents from the noise so what can the neighbors expect from more development but more of the same. Mr. Lewandowski asked Ms. Rodriguez to send her comments to the city. If she perceives that there are inadequacies with the traffic study the City would encourage her to identify those so that the traffic engineer could consider those. Noise is an aspect of living in that part of the City and he was sure her neighbors experienced those concerns. He reiterated that the City would benefit from whatever empirical evidence she has. Mr. Lewandowski said that the traffic engineering firm did a very high-quality analysis. The firm has very skilled engineers who conducted the study and yes, much of the study is in engineering format which may not be as clear to people who do not deal with traffic engineering, therefore, it is important for individuals to bring to them whatever information they have from real life situations and clearly those will be considered in the analysis. There are two types of noise: During construction it is, by its very nature, noisy. The City has limited the hours of construction and additional mitigation may be brought forward. Noise will be primarily related to traffic onsite and entering and exiting the site during construction. During analysis, it is difficult to ascertain the City's level of acceptance of impacts. All projects will have certain impacts and if the criteria allows for no impacts no development could proceed. So one of the environmental analyses is to try and define the City's level of acceptability relative to particular impacts. Noise and traffic all have impacts and it is impossible to measure all of them quantitatively. Ms. Rodriguez felt there was no way to mitigate the noise. She was concerned about workers parking on the street, trucks being parked on the street overnight and dirt and debris flowing into the streets and she wanted to know what would be done to protect the three houses on her street. She said she would have to live with the pounding and the dirt. She wanted to know why the school district was in the business of developing property. Mr. Rogers reiterated that the school district owns the lion's share of the property and the City owns a small anchor piece along Brea Canyon Road. The goal of both the City and the school district is to get an entitlement with the property for what is compatible with the surrounding area in order to put the property up for sale. The property owner has a right to do that and they are not envisioned to be the developer of the property but simply benefit from the transaction. As he stated in his presentation, upon acquisition of this property by a developer another process would commence with regard to the actual siting of structures, densities and product types that would be proposed by the ultimate buyer of the property. Ms. Rodriguez asked what the City would do if the developer wanted to do something different. Mr. Rogers reiterated that the reason the City has gone through this process was to ensure a reasonable and thorough entitlement process that ensures a high quality project with current and contemporary zoning, design guidelines and zoning standards so that when the property is sold to the developer if he chooses not to pursue development of this property under these specific plan guidelines and zoning embodied in this entitlement, he would have to start at square one (CEQA, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, etc.) He believed that it was the responsibility of the school district and City to create an entitlement that is compatible and consistent with the region and has benefits for the City, school district and surrounding community.

Christopher Chung, 21470 Cold Spring Lane, asked if upon approval of this document, would any future development not seek additional CEQA approval. Mr. Rogers reiterated that there is

another process following this process that is the implementation of a plan. This is an A level map which establishes the super pads for a future development. The zoning is in place to guide the placement of structures which the City has done very carefully to provide the least amount of impact to the majority of the community. Mr. Chung said he understood there would be further analysis required. He wondered if this proposal took into consideration the ultimate traffic impacts for what was being proposed. Mr. Lewandowski explained that this was looking at a General Plan Amendment and adoption of a specific plan and recordation for same. CEQA provides a provision whereby later action such as architectural review to the extent that discretionary actions are requested the City would have to ascertain – separately and independent of these actions, whether the CEQA document is adequate to address the proposed project (later action) and the City can determine that the project which is brought forth by a developer can require further environmental review or the City could determine that this document adequately addresses the higher level of detail associated with actual development. CEQA mandates that at the time a later action is proposed such as a B Level Subdivision Map such as a site plan review and such as an architectural review the City has to re-examine CEQA compliance and must separately ascertain whether this document will suffice or whether further analysis is required. Mr. Lewandowski explained the drainage and topical issues that were addressed in the hydrology hydraulics analysis. Mr. Rogers said that what is unique about this study is that City staff and the LA County Flood Control staff commiserate on this document. Mr. Chung said he understood that but was concerned about the analysis of a project. Mr. Rogers said Mr. Chung could submit his comment and Mr. Chung said he was hoping to get a response during the meeting. Mr. Chung asked if the project looked at 20 condo units per acre. Mr. Rogers said that was the threshold under which CEQA analyzed the project and this is being crafted as an entitlement for a 202 residential project and a 154,000 square-foot commercial project. It is under the purview of the Council to condition it as such. Mr. Chung said that construction should begin at 8:00 am. He was also concerned about the construction chasing rodents and insects to his property and wondered if there were plans for this type of mitigation. Mr. Chung felt that a condition of approval should be that further development would require grading to begin at the front of the property toward the flood channel. Mr. Lewandowski encouraged Mr. Chung to submit that recommendation. Mr. Chung asked what would happen to the wildlife that would be displaced by this project. He said he was not against development but that this particular area was somewhat akin to open space.

John Martin stated that at the February 2008 scoping meeting plans were listed for Site D and residents were told nothing was cast in stone. He raised the objection that Site D is an entrance to the City and that the berm along Diamond Bar Boulevard should be maintained and the asphalt should not come down to the corner of Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon. The residents were told their concerns would be addressed and tonight the plan is basically the same as originally presented with no consideration to the Diamond Bar residents and specifically to the residents that live next door to the actual project. If he lived next door he would not be happy. The berm has 100 year old trees that front Diamond Bar Boulevard and this project proposes to replace those trees with asphalt parking lot at street level in order to get great visibility. Vehicles will exit the SR 57 and turn the corner and instead of seeing 100 year-old Eucalyptus trees

residents will see an asphalt pavement with retail shops. The answer is to keep the existing berm with the 100 year old trees and make the setback 120 feet instead of 30 feet and leave the creek uncovered. The most frustrating thing is that in the EIR five alternatives are proposed. Certainly one of the alternatives was to do nothing which would not be economically feasible. On page 5 the second to the last paragraph, second sentence reads "based on the lead agency's analysis, the public facilities, low-density residential high-density residential alternatives are each considered to be environmentally superior to the proposed project. What that means is that the lead agency has chosen the worst alternative. Diamond Bar does not need a retail center. On page 15 the report states that new sources of artificial lighting could result in light trespass beyond the project boundaries which is terrible for the residents living next door. Diamond Bar does not want to be "highly urbanized." People came here for "country living." There is a very successful commercial real estate – the H-Mart center but at this time there are eight vacancies. If the City needs to develop a commercial center it should look at the Kmart center. He asked that the Council members that are present consider the high-density housing alternative. The City stated at the beginning that the goal was to have 50 percent housing and 50 percent commercial and in his opinion, the City should build 100 percent housing.

Mary McCormick-Busse, 21455 Ambushers, asked what portion of Site D was designated Public Facilities in the General Plan and Mr. Rogers responded the entirety. She asked for a copy of the 7-11 committee report that was prepared in 1990 and 1991. There was talk of creating a park and of leaving Site D in its natural state and a minimum tolerance was shown for housing. At the end of the report it shows that the committee received testimony and based on public hearing testimony that Site D be used for public use or that it be retained in its natural state. She offered a copy of the report as part of her testimony. Development is not a problem for her but everyone needs to think about the history of the City and what the City is proposing to knock down with this project.

Jeff Layton, 3703 Crooked Creek Drive, said he had real concerns about the commercial part of the project because to create a flat area would create the same scenario as was created behind Target. The Target area is the main entrance to Diamond Bar but the Site D area is the southerly gateway to Diamond Bar and to have to drive into the asphalt area with a 40-50 foot wall behind it would be tremendous upheaval and the aesthetics will be very unpleasing. In addition, the traffic that will be generated will occur at the worst time. Diamond Bar is a one-horse town and Diamond Bar Boulevard is the only main thoroughfare. Engineers or not, counting cars has nothing to do with people who actually live in the area. In addition, the air quality is bad enough now and this project will not help. Proposing a project that will bring as much money to the City as possible on the backs of the people is really unfair.

Gregory Shockley, 3711 Crooked Creek Drive, said it was quite discouraging when the person who is in charge of the environmental assessment firm says that the EIR is problematic. If you cannot believe in what you are doing move on or come up with another suggestion. He asked for CDD/Gubman to comment on what Mrs. Busse had to say. He has lived in Diamond Bar for 45 years and has enjoyed driving home to Diamond Bar. In his opinion, it would be very short-term thinking for the school district to sell property. If it were his piece of property he would probably

look at a project with a smaller footprint. The school district will get the money and the City will get a little money and a little tax money and the money will get frittered away. The City cannot mitigate air quality, traffic and noise and he is quite disappointed that the City Council would entertain the idea of spending money they spent to do this study because he thought it was short-term thinking.

Natalia Porche moved to Diamond Bar for country living. She stated that she had four comments. First, she is asthmatic, and suffers when the wind blows. The site needs to be watered whenever there is earth movement, and needs an on-site monitor. Secondly, she lives near the H-Mart project and had to spend about \$1,200 to fix her front yard because of sewer problems after the H-Mart center remodel was completed. Third, she felt this would affect the Aera project. Fourth, she likes to bicycle and would like to have clean air. She suggested that the project utilize AB 2766 funds to accommodate bicycle transportation.

Eric Everhart asked when the General Plan was last updated and why would it need to be changed? He felt it would be prudent to discuss this plan with a developer and it would be helpful to know if a developer felt it was feasible. He stated that there is not enough park space in the City, that the site would be a great location for a park named after Bob Zirbes, and that he believed the residents would support a bond measure to purchase the property for a park. Even if the school district makes money from the sale of this property it will probably be gone within five years and then the opportunity to maintain the natural space is gone and this is a huge matter to the City's constituents. He stated that he has not heard any specifics about traffic mitigation, and specifically mentioned that there would be a problem with ingress/egress at Brea Canyon Road. The City should properly consider how to best develop this land. Mr. Rogers explained that the operations budget goes into the rehabilitation of aging facilities, rehabilitation of buildings, upgrading of equipment, etc., within the Walnut Valley School District. At the time this property was bid the bid price that was awarded was \$21 million. He said he would not begin to question the value of the property today except to say that values in this region have held fairly well. The Brookfield project (above Target) sold at an incredible pace in spite of the economic downturn all the way through last year. He is not a land appraiser and will not speculate on the value. Mr. Everhart said the City should get an appraisal on the land and he would like for the City to consider the purchase of this property.

CDD/Gubman encouraged speakers to submit their comments in writing. The City appreciates the comments it is receiving at this meeting and will do its best to transcribe those comments. However, supplementing oral comments with written comments may sound redundant but he said he could not stress enough how much the City would appreciate the written comments.

Mr. Rogers responded to a speaker that no developer has been involved in this process. After the departure of the Lewis Companies (who previously had a development interest on Site D), the School District has not since engaged a developer.

David Busse said he would be a neighbor to this project. He wrote a three page letter outlining some of his concerns about the project. He found it odd that Mr. Lewandowski's history of this land failed to mention anything about the discussions prior to 2007. In 1991, there was a general uprising of citizens in front of the 7-11 Committee talking about the obscenity of doing anything with this land other than giving the kids of Diamond Bar more places to play soccer. This alternative was not included in the EIR and it is a glaring omission. He told Mr. Rogers he would have to come up with a better pitch about what his employer intends to do with the money from the sale of this property, and in his 35-years of working with school districts he has never heard any school board say anything other than that they need more money. He was also convinced that the project would be an eyesore. He asked the City Council to tell the school district that the property should be developed for commercial, residential and park purposes. Castle Rock looks like a trailer park and perhaps the school district should consider rebuilding it. Every day in Diamond Bar residents see the work of traffic engineers and the \$60 million that was spent on the SR57/60 Interchange that turned out to be a horrible job. The City Council should put a stop to this kind of thing because traffic is the biggest concern for residents.

Mark Hopper, 3255 S. Diamond Bar Boulevard, agreed that there needed to be a compromise. Page 5 calls for low-density three houses per acre and the EIR calls for 20 houses/units per acre. At least one acre should be set aside for a park as a compromise. Walnut created a buffer at the Staples shopping center (at the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Grand Avenue) by surrounding it with residential homes and putting the commercial development on the main boulevard so that people who had lived in the area for many years did not suffer a huge impact of the commercial development. And the new folks purchasing homes knew what they were buying into. The residents in the area need to be considered to lessen the impact of this project to them.

Nancy Koziara-Clark was very concerned about the failure of businesses in Diamond Bar because residents go elsewhere to shop. Diamond Bar continues to struggle with commercial business and she does not understand how another commercial center could be considered. Diamond Bar needs a library and a center for teens. The City needs more recreational facilities. If this project gets built she does not see it succeeding.

Cindy Moeder said she and her family moved to Diamond Bar for country living. Three of her four kids play soccer and because Diamond Bar does not have facilities, her kids went to Brea to play soccer and went to Brea for the library and she agrees with the previous speaker who said Diamond Bar did not need another commercial center. She believes the City Council should be ashamed for considering this type of project because if they lived in the immediate area they would not want this project built. She asked Mr. Rogers if any of the proposed project concepts had changed from what was brought before the residents in 2008. Mr. Rogers said the site plan configuration is generally the same. A lot of the standards that were crafted for this entitlement are in response to that meeting. Ms. Moeder replied that nothing the residents said influenced the City. Mr. Rogers said that as a result of the input from residents an 85 foot setback was instituted along the residential portion of the property. Mr. Rogers said that everything is on the table but what the project envisioned was planted slope on the back side of the properties and a

wall at top of slope. Ms. Moeder asked why the consultant said the residents need a drug store in the area. Mr. Rogers stated that when they conducted market studies earlier in the project there was an interest in having a retail center in this location to service this area. Ms. Moeder said that now that the consultant knows the area does not need a retail center why is the City pursuing a commercial project in this area.

Greg Ogonowski thanked his neighbors for showing up for tonight's meeting. His concerns are the same as those voiced by the other speakers. He needs to see a traffic analysis because traffic is a big problem. Even when the SR57 is not backed up Diamond Bar Boulevard is an alternative route. Once again, the commercial market option needs to be studied because residents will not be faithful. He has lived in Diamond Bar since prior to incorporation and wondered how many residents had bobcats in their backyard and all of the raccoons need a home too.

Greg Margolese, 22735 Dry Creek Road, said that before there was Calvary Chapel and Target he could see deer in the area and that is why he moved here. Half of the Diamond Bar kids are in Walnut Valley School District schools that need to be rehabilitated and he understood that. He wondered why the project planned to kill all of the trees because an entire line of trees could be saved. Mr. Rogers said that to grade the site consistent with this plan the trees have to be removed. Mr. Margolese said, why not change the plan. Mr. Rogers explained that this plan is responding to what is considered to be the highest and best use of the land. In its current configuration of grading for balance and adequate access this is the configuration that the plan arrived at.

Su Fann, 21484 Cold Spring said that if more homes and business are built more people will move to Diamond Bar and there will be more traffic and congestion. The City needs more trees and fresh air instead of more buildings. The City does not need more smog than it has now.

Lee Paulson 21919 Santaguin Drive echoed other speaker's concerns. When one talks about the best use of land and that the commercial area has to be kept at street level it presupposes that there is going to be a development in the City like every other city around Diamond Bar and that battle has been lost. San Dimas, Industry and Chino Hills beat Diamond Bar to it because the major chains have chosen to circle Diamond Bar. He reminded the developer that Azusa built a center on the side of a hill with one entry and signage for all stores. That center appears to be doing fine. He suggested that instead of trying to be like every other city that has built to the lowest common denominator, perhaps if the City re-thought the matter and put in a quality of life center with retail and something that set it aside it might attract the kinds of specialty stores and shops that could thrive in this area and raise property values.

Judy Leung, 21175 Running Branch Road, moved to the City three years ago and thought the area was a gem that would not be bothered. There are many Chinese people who are shy to come here to speak their thoughts because they are not sure how to communicate. People she knows are strongly opposed to this proposal. She strongly agrees with what people have said

about traffic congestion, air quality, etc. She understands about the economy but even her 10-year old son does not understand why the City would consider a project like this.

Frank Abt, 3414 Castle Rock Road, asked what was being considered for the open portion of the project and Mr. Rogers said it would likely be considered to be a water quality feature. Mr. Rogers explained that the first step of the process is to guard the entitlement and environmental clearance. At that point in time it will be bid publicly to achieve the highest price for the school district and community. Once the property is purchased by a development entity it will go through another process for purposes of refining the plan to what is called B level maps, citing the structures, going through architectural approvals in a discretionary process once again. There is still another step for this property to realize its full development potential. This plan creates a threshold or envelope in which the property can be sold and then further refined for purposes of development. Mr. Abt asked why Diamond Bar was responsible for making it saleable. Mr. Rogers explained that the City is the lead agency and responsible for purposes of CEQA and the entitlement. The City is not responsible for the sale of the property. That will be handled in a publicly bid process under the state guidelines.

Mr. Rogers responded to a speaker that there is a total of about 10-acres for commercial which is the reddish brown color on the drawing and the green area (yellow) is roughly 10-acres as well.

Mr. Gubman thanked everyone and reminded participants that they need to turn in their comments to him by August 10. After the public review closes, staff will collect all comments received and develop the Response to Comments per the CEQA process and if necessary, revise the analysis. In concert with the CEQA process is the entitlement process. Tonight's meeting is not meant to advocate approval or support for this project. The City has created a land use plan for the site at the A-level and analyzed that plan with the EIR. The environmental finding will be one decision that the City Council has to make—that is, whether the environmental review has been thorough and adequate. Upon making that finding the City Council needs to determine whether this project should or should not be approved. There will be future noticed public hearings in the matter.

Mr. Rogers responded to Mr. Garrett that the wall at the top of slope is envisioned to be six foot tall.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business the Public Forum was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Gubman
Community Development Director

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix III-D
**Site “D” Public Hearing Report and
Resolution of the Diamond Bar
Improvement Association**

This page intentionally left blank.

WALNUT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SITE "D" PUBLIC HEARING REPORT
(MARCH 4, 1991 AND MARCH 11, 1991)

PREPARED BY:

PROPERTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(7-11 COMMITTEE)

PRESENTED TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON
June 26, 1991

The Board of Trustees appointed this committee to review the projected school enrollment and other data as provided by the District to determine the amount of surplus space and real property.

Since it was established, by the committee, that Site "D" is surplus property, based on enrollment figures and projections, a decision was made to hold public hearings in order to find out what the tolerance level of the community would be in the development of this property.

Notices of these Site "D" Public Hearings were published in the Diamond Bar/Walnut Highlander, the San Gabriel Valley Tribune; the Castle Rock Elementary School newsletter, and the Walnut Valley Unified "Board Briefs." Notices were also posted at the Diamond Bar City Hall, the Diamond Bar Library, the Walnut City Hall, and the Walnut Library, as well as on the bulletin boards in the District Office. Copies of these posted notices were also sent to the people on the Site "D" mailing list and to all of the school principals. It was decided to have these meetings on the Monday evenings of March 4 and March 11, 1991, at 7:00 p.m., at Castle Rock Elementary School.

It was found, based on the statements of 40 community members, that the community preference was for having a park developed. There were also indications that leaving Site "D" in its natural state would be tolerated. Extremely minimal tolerance was shown for housing. This information is supported by the letters received after the hearings as well as the minutes from each of the hearings.

Ref: B-9
June 26, 1991
Page 2 of 3

WALNUT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

REFERENCE INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM: General Business B-9

TITLE: Property Advisory Committee's (7-11 Committee)
Report

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This committee was appointed by the Board of Trustees to conduct public hearings regarding Site "D". They met several times prior to the public hearings that were held on March 4, 1991 and March 11, 1991. Subsequently, the committee met on March 26, and April 2, to write the report.

RATIONALE FOR REQUEST

Education Code requires that prior to the disposal of school property, a committee must be formed, public hearings must be held and a report must be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION

The Administration recommends that the Board of Trustees accept the report from the Property Advisory Committee (7-11 Committee).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATION

There are no financial implications to the District for accepting this report.

* The following statistics are representative of the opinions expressed at the public hearings and of the testimonies received in the mail.

<u>Park - Active</u>	62.5%	}	85%
<u>Park - Combination Recreation/Wilderness</u>	5.0%		
<u>Wilderness -</u>	17.5%		
No Preference* -	12.5%	}	2.5%
<u>Housing -</u>	2.5%		

Based on the public hearings the committee recommends that Site "D" be used for a public use or retained in its natural state.

* Expressed concern about proposed housing development, but made no stated preference.

E.N.T. SPECIALISTS

Ear, Nose & Throat
 Dr. Lonnie Smith & Dr. Terry Scott
 Diplomate American Board of Otolaryngology

Adult & Pediatric E.N.T.

We are here to serve all of your E.N.T.
 Medical needs including:

- Hearing Tests & Screening
- Allergies*
- Dizziness (Vertigo)
- Middle Ear Surgery
- Sinus Disorders
- Facial Plastic Surgery
- Speech & Swallowing Disorders
- In-Office Minor Surgery
- Certified Audiologist on Staff
- Hearing Screening & Hearing Aids

*Office Hours By Appointment
 Weekend & Evening Appointments Available
 We Accept All Insurance • Mastercard • Visa*



750 North Diamond Bar Blvd., Suite 111
 (Diamond Bar Professional Center)
 (714) 860-7712

RESOLUTION OF DBIA

Whereas, A 28 acre parcel of land, located in south Diamond Bar at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, and owned by the Walnut School District, is presently proposed for development; and

Whereas, public discussion has focused upon several alternative development options; e.g. a residential subdivision, community parks, undeveloped pristine status; and

Whereas, Citizens of Diamond Bar would benefit from development of the parcel into a major recreational center, featuring ball fields for Little League Softball and soccer; multi-purpose courts for volleyball, basketball, tennis and racquetball; children's play area; paths; passive recreation area; as well as a Community Center Building; would mutually enhance the social and recreational amenities of the Diamond Bar area; and

Therefore Be It Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Diamond Bar Improvement Association unanimously expresses its strong support for the concept and proposal above; that the 28 acre parcel above described be purchased and developed by the City of Diamond Bar as a total community wide recreational facility. Additionally; should this park be established, then let the perimeter be retained and designated as a wilderness area (Diamond Bar's original heritage) with trails for hiking and botanical studies for our local schools and students. And be it further resolved that this resolution unanimously adopted by the Diamond Bar Improvement Association Board of Directors be transmitted to appropriate City authorities. □

COTTONTAIL CLASSIC A HIT

The 3rd Annual Cottontail Classic was held on Saturday and Sunday, March 16th and 17th. Eight Diamond Bar teams competed with (5) of the teams making it into the finals. These teams included Girls Division 2, Boys Division 2, Boys Division 3, Girls Division 4 (Devesation) and Boys Division 4.

There were 88 teams participating from throughout the Southern California area. The tournament was a smashing success due to the participation of Spring Team parents, coaches, referees, and the following local merchants:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Roma Sports | Dr. Wong, DDS |
| McDonald's | Schmidt Cannon |
| Soccer Junction | Albertson's |
| Alta Sports | Del Taco |
| New York Seltzer | TriWest Associates |
| Pepsi Cola | KIIS FM |
| Denny's | Domino's Pizza |
| Wendy's | Hudson's Grill |
| Burger King | Miller Meats |
| Webster's Waste Mgt. | Butler Paper |
| Soccer Mania | KMart |
| Carl's Jr. | Whole Enchilada |
| Thrifty's | |

Our thanks for supporting the Diamond Bar A.Y.S.O. Program. Teams from Diamond Bar will now be competing in the local team play and tournaments throughout California.



Environmental Impact Sciences

26051 Via Concha

Mission Viejo, California 92691-5614

(949) 837-1195