

**This page intentionally left blank.**

### **3.0 ALTERNATIVE 6: “JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”<sup>1</sup>**

This alternative’s analysis examines the potential environmental impacts associated with the approval and implementation of the “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” and is intended for inclusion in Section 6.4.6 (Alternative 6 - “January 2012 SDSP” Alternative) of the DEIR.<sup>2</sup>

#### **3.1 Introduction to the “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”**

As indicated by Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR): “A specific plan is a tool for the systematic implementation of the general plan. It effectively establishes a link between implementing policies of the general plan and the individual development proposals in a defined area. A specific plan may be as general as setting forth broad policy concepts, or as detailed as providing direction to every facet of development from the type, location and intensity of uses to the design and capacity of infrastructure; from the resources used to finance public improvements to the design guidelines of a subdivision.”<sup>3</sup> At the State level, except as otherwise specified in Section 65451 of the CGC,<sup>4</sup> a single specific plan format, structure, and/or level of detail does not exist. Within the context of State and local statutory requirements, local agencies are provided broad discretion as to what suffices as a legally adequate EIR.

As specified in Section 22.60.040 (Preparation and Content) of the City’s Development Code, a draft specific plan shall include detailed information in the form of text and diagrams, organized in compliance with an outline furnished by the State and shall include: (1) the proposed land uses (the distribution, location, and extent of land uses proposed within the area covered by the specific plan, including open space areas); (2) infrastructure (the proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of major components of public and private drainage, energy, sewage, solid waste disposal, circulation/transportation, water, and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the specific plan area and needed to support the proposed land uses); (3) the proposed land use and development standards (standards, criteria and guidelines by which development will proceed and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of

---

<sup>1/</sup> As indicated in Section 15088(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines: “The response to comments may take the form of a revision to the draft EIR or may be a separate section in the final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes in the information contained in the text of the draft EIR, the lead agency should either: (1) Revise the text in the body of the EIR, or (2) Include marginal notes showing that the information is revised in the response to comments.” In preparing this analysis, the Lead Agency predominately seeks to augment Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) in the DEIR so as to include a comparable analysis of the July 2011 SDSP so as to allow consideration by the City’s advisory and decision-making bodies. As reflected in the corresponding additional changes, revisions, and modifications referenced in Section 2.0 (Additional Changes, Revisions, and Modifications) herein, minor changes, revisions, and modifications have been made to Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR in order to effectively integrate that information into the CEQA documentation for the March 2010 SDSP.

<sup>2/</sup> Except where otherwise noted, all references to the DEIR herein are intended to be inclusive of both the DEIR and RTC1.

<sup>3/</sup> Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, The Planner’s Guide to Specific Plans, Part 1, The Specific Plan, April 1998.

<sup>4/</sup> Section 65451 of the CGC mandates that a specific plan include a text and a diagram(s) specifying all of the following in detail: (a) the distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space, within the area covered by the plan; (b) the proposed distribution, location, and extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan; (c) standards and criteria by which development will proceed and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable; and (d) a program of implementation measures, including regulations, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out the items (a), (b), and (c) above. A specific plan shall include a statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the local general plan.

natural resources, where applicable); (4) implementation measures (a program of implementation measures, including regulations, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out the proposed land uses, infrastructure and development and conservation standards and criteria); (5) the relationship to the General Plan (a discussion of the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan); and (6) additional information (the specific plan shall contain additional information determined to be necessary by the Department Director based on the characteristics of the area to be covered by the plan, applicable policies of the General Plan, or any other issues determined to be significant).

Where relevant design and development-related information is not now specified in the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has made reasonable assumptions as to the precise manner of the plan’s implementation and has based its environmental review on the information presented in Title 22 (Development Code) of the “City of Diamond Bar Municipal Code,” the Department’s January 2012 SDSP, and/or those assumptions identified herein.<sup>5</sup> Except as otherwise specified in Section 65457 of the CGC and Section 21080.7 of the PRC, should the Lead Agency approve the January 2012 SDSP and should those later development activities deviate from those stated assumptions, the Lead Agency may need to conduct further environmental review of those later development plans in order to ascertain the adequacy of the FEIR to serve as the environmental bases for those activities under CEQA.

For the purpose of inclusion into the FEIR, the January 2012 SDSP (Alternative 6) constitutes an alternative development option for the “Site D” property. So as not to presuppose the outcome of the CEQA process, the FEIR attempts to provide the Lead Agency’s decision-making body with an adequate environmental basis, under CEQA, to support the approval of those entitlements reasonably associated with the adoption and subsequent implementation of the March 2010 SDSP or the January 2012 SDSP.

## **3.2 Alternative 6 Project Description**

### **3.2.1 “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”**

In order to facilitate a comparative analysis, the following “Alternative 6” project description generally replicates the format presented in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Based on the proposed inclusion of an on-site neighborhood park herein and the increased emphasis placed by the Commission and the Council on the development of an entry feature in the vicinity of Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, the DEIR’s format has been expanded to include a general description of those components. Within the parameters outlined in the January 2012 SDSP ([Appendix RTC2-E](#)), it is the purpose of the alternative specific plan to generally define and describe the nature of the authorized on-site land use while, at the same time, giving the subsequent site developer(s) (Applicant<sup>6</sup>) reasonable flexibility as to the manner in which that broad outline is translated into a precise plan of development.

---

<sup>5/</sup> In science and engineering, a “black box” refers to is a device, system, or object which can be viewed solely in terms of its input, output, and transfer characteristics without any knowledge of its internal workings (i.e., its inner workings are opaque or black). Since certain aspects of the January 2012 SDSP may not be known at this time, the Lead Agency has sought to identify certain parameters as a means of describing and analyzing Alternative 6. Those assumptions serve to define the outside parameters of the “black box” which constitutes the alternative land-use plan. Within reasonable limitations, for the purpose of environmental compliance, any future development project that does not exceed those assumptions and limitations may be deemed to have fulfilled its CEQA obligations.

<sup>6/</sup> As defined in the DEIR, the term “Applicant” refers to not only the City and the District, as the specific plan’s proponents, but also to those subsequent holder(s) of real property interests that will serve as the developer(s) and/or master builder(s) for those uses authorized therein and who may seek discretionary actions from the Lead

Proposed is the adoption of an alternative specific plan governing the future development of the “Site D” property, including those lands owned by the WVUSD, the City, and the County. As proposed, that specific plan includes, but is not limited to, the following key components.

## **Residential Component**

A total of up to 200 dwelling units (DUs) would be constructed on the project site under this alternative.<sup>7</sup> Assuming a gross area of 30.36 acre, the resulting residential density is approximately 6.6 dwelling units per gross acre. If the same 20.2 net acre development footprint associated with the March 2010 SDSF is assumed,<sup>8</sup> residential densities increase to approximately 9.9 dwelling units per net acre. Unless otherwise specified, permitted and conditionally permitted uses shall include those allowed under Section 22.08.030 (RLM Zone) of the Development Code.

The January 2012 SDSF specifies that residential units within the project area will consist of “attached and/or detached, owner-occupied single-family product types.” At the allowable density and unit total, it is unlikely that the Applicant can provide single-family detached units on lots conforming to RLM zoning district standards.<sup>9</sup> Recent development activity in the City (e.g., Vesting Tentative Tract 063623) suggests that the historic distinction between “single-family” and “multi-family” housing products is less clearly differentiated. Medium to high density, small lot residential subdivisions, involving detached “single-family” housing types, have been processed as “condominium projects.”<sup>10</sup>

---

Agency and from other responsible agencies for those development activities, infrastructure improvements, and other programs that may be authorized under the provisions of the adopted specific plan.

<sup>7/</sup> Neither the March 2010 SDSF nor the January 2012 SDSF identified the precise nature of the housing product. The DEIR’s analysis of the March 2010 SDSF was, however, predicated on a “multi-family” housing assumption. For consistency and for analytical purposes, except where otherwise noted, that same assumption is retained as part of this analysis. Notwithstanding the housing product type selected, if consistently applied, the reduction in the number of dwelling units would typically be expected to result in a comparable reduction in those environmental impacts which are dwelling unit derived.

<sup>8/</sup> The March 2010 SDSF illustrates three super pads totaling 20.16 acres (rounded to 20.2 acres). The Lead Agency acknowledges that the January 2012 SDSF illustrates a slightly lesser net developable acreage (17.9 acres) than indicated in the DEIR and assumed herein. For the purpose of CEQA compliance, in the absence of a conceptual grading plan, in order to present a worst-case analysis and to provide the Applicant greater flexibility, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, the Lead Agency has retained the 20.2 net acreage assumption since it would likely necessitate a higher level of site disturbance and, therefore, result in potentially greater environmental impacts.

<sup>9/</sup> The maximum allowed density for subdivisions within the RLM zoning district is five dwelling units per gross acre and the minimum lot size is 8,000 square feet.

<sup>10/</sup> As defined in Section 1351(f) of the California Civic Code: “A ‘condominium project’ means a development consisting of condominiums. A condominium consists of an undivided interest in common in a portion of real property coupled with a separate interest in space called a unit, the boundaries of which are described on a recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan in sufficient detail to locate all boundaries thereof. The area within these boundaries may be filled with air, earth, or water, or any combination thereof, and need not be physically attached to land except by easements for access and, if necessary, support. The description of the unit may refer to (1) boundaries described in the recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan, (2) physical boundaries, either in existence, or to be constructed, such as walls, floors, and ceilings of a structure or any portion thereof, (3) an entire structure containing one or more units, or (4) any combination thereof. The portion or portions of the real property held in undivided interest may be all of the real property, except for the separate interests, or may include a particular three-dimensional portion thereof, the boundaries of which are described on a recorded final map, parcel map, or condominium plan. The area within these boundaries may be filled with air, earth, or water, or any combination thereof, and need not be physically attached to land except by easements for access and, if necessary, support. An individual condominium within a condominium project may include, in addition, a separate interest in other portions of the real property.”

Without precluding the development of other product types, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, the Lead Agency has assumed that the subsequent tentative tract map will reflect a higher density, smaller lot subdivision consisting of “site condominiums.” As defined in the Federal Housing Administration, “site condominiums” are “single family totally detached dwellings (no shared garages or any other attached buildings) encumbered by a declaration of condominium covenants or condominium form of ownership.”<sup>11</sup> Nothing herein, however, is intended to preclude the development of any housing product meeting the January 2012 SDSP’s allowable provisions (i.e., attached and/or detached, owner-occupied single-family product types).

During the public hearing process, comments were raised with regards to the provisions of a density bonus should the Applicant propose the development of either affordable or senior housing on the project site.<sup>12</sup> Except as otherwise authorized under the alternative specific plan, for the purpose of environmental compliance, the Lead Agency has not presupposed the granting of a density bonus or other incentives for a qualifying project. Whether emanating from the desires of the Applicant or through the site-specific application of the State’s Density Bonus Law, any future project proposing more than 200 dwelling units on the project site, including secondary residential units (granny flats),<sup>13</sup> would be subject to additional environmental review.

The January 2012 SDSP stipulates that “[t]he new spine road providing access into the project site shall be a public right-of-way in order to provide access to the public park.” The January 2012 does not preclude the establishment of a gated residential community.<sup>14</sup> If gated, internal streets serving the residential lots will not be dedicated to the City as public streets but will be private roadways maintained by the subsequently established homeowners’ association.

## **Commercial Component**

No on-site retail commercial, general commercial, or office professional development is proposed or would be authorized under the authority of the January 2012 SDSP. In addition, no business park, light industrial, manufacturing, warehouse and distribution center, or other similar uses would be authorized or conditionally authorized under the January 2012 SDSP. Subject to the provisions of Section 22.42.070 (Home-Based Businesses) of the Development Code, residents may operate home-based businesses, subject to the limitations specified therein.

---

<sup>11/</sup> Federal Housing Administration, Condominium Project Approval and Processing Guide, June 30, 2011, p. 19.

<sup>12/</sup> California’s density bonus law, as codified in Section 65915 *et seq.* of the CGC (Density Bonus Law), reduces and strictly limits the discretion that local government has over qualifying development projects. Although seniors are themselves a qualified category absent any affordability restrictions, Section 65915(b) requires density bonus benefits for any project which includes at least 10 percent of units set aside for and affordable to households at 80 percent of area median income. The Density Bonus Law prescribes bonuses as a percentage of “otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan” (Section 65915[g][1]). Statute authorizes “up to a maximum combined mandated density increase of 35 percent” (Section 65915[g]). The courts have concluded that local government can authorize density bonuses in excess of the statutory limits.

<sup>13/</sup> As specified in Section 22.42.120 (Second Units) in Title 22 (Development Code) of the City’s Municipal Code, secondary residential units are permitted in the “Rural Residential (RR)” and “Low Density Residential (RL)” districts on lots between 10,000 and 20,000 square feet.

<sup>14/</sup> Neither the “City of Diamond Bar General Plan” nor the “City of Diamond Bar Municipal Code” includes endorsement of or prohibitions against the development of new gated communities. A number of gated residential projects now exist within the City

## Conceptual Neighborhood Park and Trail Component

With regards to the creation of “safer neighborhoods,” the American Planning Association (APA) states that “[n]ew parks and open space should be developed within residential developments so that nature is close to home. It is critical that these spaces are carefully designed to support the activities for which they were intended, that requires that each space have an intended purpose. If the purpose of the space is to promote social interaction, it should be located where frequent, causal encounters by neighborhoods are likely to occur. In addition, shade trees are proven attractions for neighbors to mingle and form social ties. If the intention of the park or open space is to promote restoration, areas that can be left green and pervious will help people relax and will reduce feelings that lead to aggression.”<sup>15</sup>

Under this alternative, a new neighborhood park, consisting of not less than 2.0 usable acres, would be constructed within the specific plan boundaries. Park improvements, including the creation of a connection to the trail system along Brea Canyon Road (i.e., Schabarum Trail), shall be the responsibility of the site’s subsequent developer.<sup>16</sup> Although a minimum 2.0-acre park dedication is assumed herein, nothing in the January 2012 SDSP or in the accompanying CEQA documentation would preclude the dedication of more real property.<sup>17</sup> Vehicular access to the neighborhood park will be provided via a signalized entry at the intersection of Cherrydale Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard or at the intersection of Crooked Creek Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard. Additional pedestrian access to the proposed neighborhood park will be provided from Pasado Drive. The public park shall include opportunities for pedestrian and bike trails with linkages to the sidewalks on Brea Canyon Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard.

With regards to the proposed park, the P&RMP states that “[t]his park would serve as a small neighborhood park and include opportunities for pedestrian and bike trails with linkage to the sidewalk on Brea Canyon Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard.”<sup>18</sup> As further indicated therein, “[t]he future developer will be required to hold neighborhood outreach meetings for the design and location of the public park as part of the tentative tract map entitlement process.”<sup>19</sup> Park features and amenities remain subject to subsequent development plans and community input.

All City parks are open daily. Hours of operation are generally limited to one-half hour before sunrise until one-half hour after sunset. Although low-intensity security lighting will be incorporated into the facility’s design, park amenities are not anticipated to include any pole-mounted, high-intensity sports lighting that would allow for organized sporting activities to extend into evening hours. Because the park is intended to serve as a neighborhood facility, no comfort facilities are assumed.

---

<sup>15/</sup> American Planning Association, City Parks Forum Briefing Paper 04: How Cities Use Parks to Create Safer Neighborhoods, 2003, p. 3.

<sup>16/</sup> Within the City, proposed parkland dedication and the payment of park in-lieu fees, including receipt of “credit” for the corresponding provision of recreational improvements on dedicated land, is governed by the provisions of Section 21.32.040 (Parkland Dedication and Fees) in Title 21 (Subdivisions) in the Municipal Code.

<sup>17/</sup> For example, based on the development of 200 attached single-family dwelling units, it is estimated that parkland dedication requirements would total approximately 3.4 acres. The Applicant may elect to dedicate acreage in a quantity up to or exceeding the specific requirements of Section 21.32.040 (Parkland Dedication and Fees) in Title 21 (Subdivisions) in the Municipal Code in lieu of the payment of park fees.

<sup>18/</sup> City of Diamond Bar (TKE Engineering and Planning), Diamond Bar Parks & Recreation Master Plan 2011, Document 1, July 8, 2011, p. 62.

<sup>19/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

Since most park users are expected to access the proposed facility on foot, with the exception of maintenance vehicles, no off-street parking for the proposed neighborhood park has been assumed. Should the proposed residential development be developed as a gated community, broad-based access to the park will be maintained by linking the park to a public access roadway. Other than as is customary for City parks, access restrictions will not be established with regards to public park use.

## Conceptual Landmark Entry Feature

A landscaped “entry feature”<sup>20</sup> will be established near the corner of Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, predominately in the vicinity of the City Property. The entry feature is intended to establish a visual “landmark” or “gateway” along one of the City’s prominent arterial highways. As specified in the January 2012 SDSP, at minimum, the entry feature shall have a value not less than one-half (0.005) percent of the building permit valuation of the proposed residential development. The Lead Agency further seeks to promote the integration of this design feature into the project’s overall visual character, allowing for a unifying design theme which serves to visually and/or physically link the entry feature with the proposed neighborhood park and the site’s residential development. Precise development plans remain subject to site plan review.<sup>21</sup>

## Conceptual Circulation Plan

Two categories of internal streets are proposed under this alternative’s conceptual circulation plan.<sup>22</sup> “Primary” vehicular access to the project site will align with either Crooked Creek Drive or Cherrydale Drive via a proposed signalized intersection at Diamond Bar Boulevard. Traffic traveling westbound (WB) on Diamond Bar Boulevard will access the “primary” street via a new single-lane left-turn pocket to be constructed within the median along Diamond Bar Boulevard.<sup>23</sup> “Emergency vehicle access” and pedestrian access to and from the project site will be provided via Pasado Drive.

With regards to the site’s frontage along Brea Canyon Road, as specified by the City Engineer, the Applicant shall widen and/or re-stripe the northbound (NB) approach on Brea Canyon Road

---

<sup>20/</sup> In landscape architecture, the term “entry monumentation” is often used as synonymous with “entry feature.” For the purpose of environmental review, the two terms are not intended to be interchangeable. Although both the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP use the term “entry monumentation,” reference to “monumentation” often implies a rigid and monolithic design element (hardscape). With regards to the “Site D” property, for design purposes, the City seeks to allow a greater level of design flexibility so as to promote a greater use of landscape (greenscape) as the dominant or codominant visual component of this proposed design element.

<sup>21/</sup> Although separate and distinct physical elements, such that the provision of the entry feature cannot, in and of itself, be used to satisfy the public park acreage requirements, nothing herein precludes a direct linkage and/or connectivity between the proposed entry feature and the proposed public park.

<sup>22/</sup> Proposed design standards for “primary” streets include two 18-foot wide travel lanes (one inbound and one outbound), a 7-foot wide curb-adjacent parkway, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk located on both sides of the roadway within a minimum 60-foot wide right-of-way. “Emergency vehicle access” street standards include two 13.5-foot wide travel lanes within a minimum 28-foot wide easement.

<sup>23/</sup> Based on the higher traffic volumes associated with the March 2010 SDSP, a duel-lane left-turn pocket configuration within the median at Cherrydale Drive was assumed therein. As indicated in the accompanying traffic analysis ([Appendix RTC2-G](#)), the turning volumes associated with the reduced traffic volumes attributable to the January 2012 SDSP can be adequately accommodated at either Crooked Creek Drive or Cherrydale Drive based on a single lane turning pocket with sufficient queuing length. Final intersection geometrics at the Crooked Creek Drive/Diamond Bar Boulevard or Cherrydale Drive/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection will be determined at the time a detailed development proposal is presented for City review.

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

to provide a second right-turn lane. With regards to the site’s frontage along Diamond Bar Boulevard, as specified by the City Engineer, the Applicant shall widen and/or re-stripe the eastbound (EB) departure on Diamond Bar Boulevard to accommodate a third through lane.<sup>24</sup>

Identified improvements to the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive intersection or the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cherrydale Drive intersection, as well as right-of-way dedication and associated improvements to the site’s frontages along Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, constitute components of the January 2012 SDSP’s conceptual circulation plan and project-specific obligations upon the Applicant. Those dedications and improvements, therefore, have neither been identified as mitigation measures herein nor has the payment of a proportional fair-share contribution toward those costs been assumed in lieu thereof.

Design guidelines for entry gates, applicable whenever an emergency access roadway is restricted by a gate or barrier, are set forth in Article 9 of the California Fire Code (CFC), as locally amended. As specified, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) has established the following requirements for gated entrance design: (1) single-gate design shall provide a minimum clear open width of 26 feet, with the keypad set back to a minimum of 50 feet from the back of right-of-way, and provide a minimum turning radius of 32 feet prior to the gate, with a minimum width of 20 feet clear to be maintained through the radius; and (2) double-gate design shall provide for a minimum clear opening width of 20 feet for both ingress and egress, with the keypad set back a minimum of 50 feet from the back of right of way and provide a minimum turning radius of 32 feet prior to the gate, with a minimum width of 20 feet clear to be maintained through the radius. Entry gates, if provided, shall meet or exceed the LACFD’s emergency access requirements.

## **Conceptual Water and Sewer Systems**

The conceptual water and sewer systems identified and the improvements described in the DEIR for the March 2011 SDSP are assumed to remain applicable to the January 2012 SDSP. Because a lesser intensity of development is proposed under this alternative than associated with the March 2011 SDSP, some of the improvements identified therein may not be required to adequately service the subject property or, if required, could be of lesser size or configuration. Although subject to subsequent design-level review, the Lead Agency could reasonably anticipate that the FEIR would adequately suffice for a similar but less intense development, including similar but less intense infrastructure improvements, since such development would likely produce lesser environmental impacts than a more intense development proposal predicated the need for larger infrastructure requirements.

As described in the DEIR, potable and reclaimed water will provided by the Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD). Wastewater collection and treatment will be provided by the City and by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC or Districts).

## **Conceptual Grading Plan**

Although no conceptual grading plan has been formulated at this time, for the purpose of impact assessment, it is assumed that the entire project site will be grubbed (denuded of existing vegetation), graded, and recontoured to accommodate the residential development, park

---

<sup>24/</sup> These improvement may require some modification to existing traffic signal equipment (i.e., recut/install new vehicle loop detectors, modification to traffic signal controller), as well as the termination of the existing bike lane.

facilities, and circulation system authorized under the January 2012 SDSP.<sup>25</sup> In the absence of a conceptual grading plan, the Lead Agency has assumed that the area and extent of site disturbance, location of cut and fill slopes, location and size of retaining walls, and grading quantities generally remain as described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Based on the March 2010 SDSP, it is estimated that development of the project site would involve approximately 390,000 cubic yards of earth movement in order to create the alternative project's major building pads and internal circulation system. To the extent that on-site vegetation can be retained, inclusive of protected trees, the resulting impacts which are directly and/or indirectly linked to grading activities would be less than depicted herein.

Development activities remain subject to the City's subdivision review (Section 22.08.040, Development Code), plot plan review (Section 22.47.020, Development Code), and development review (Section 22.48.020, Development Code). Through those processes, the City will ensure that development plans are consistent with land-use authority and compatible with other proximal land uses.

## **Conceptual Drainage Plan**

Although no conceptual drainage plan has been formulated for the January 2012 SDSP at this time, for the purpose of impact assessment, it is assumed that the drainage plan will be similar to that associated with the March 2010 SDSP and that, absent the previously proposed commercial component and the impervious surfaces associated with on-site parking, post-project drainage flows will be at levels less than those assumed in the DEIR.

At the time grading plans and/or building permit applications are filed with the Lead Agency, detailed engineering studies, consistent with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work's (LACDPW) "Hydrology/Sedimentation Manual," shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer. In accordance with LACDPW's "Interim Peak Flow Standard," all post-development runoff from a 2-year, 24-hour storm, and 50-year capital storm shall not exceed pre-development peak-flow rate. In addition, as required under the Construction General Permit, the Applicant shall prepare a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) prior to the commencement of grading operations and implement that plan during construction. The City is required to conduct monitoring and reporting to ensure that BMPs are correctly implemented and effective in controlling the discharge of pollutants.

## **Energy Conservation**

With regards to site development, the January 2012 SDSP emphasizes the use of "project sustainability" and "green building design elements." Numerous energy conservation features are outlined in the specific plan which, if adopted, shall constitute design and development obligations imposed on the subsequent site developer. As specified, the specific plan will "exceed current standards of protection for all valuable resources." For example, all new homes

---

<sup>25/</sup> In describing the alternative project's grading assumptions herein, the Lead Agency is neither stating its desire for nor approval of an implementation plan that conforms to those assumptions. Absent a precise development plan and corresponding grading plan, the Lead Agency has sought to formulate a set of assumptions that would allow a reasonable environmental assessment and comparative analysis of this alternative relative to the March 2010 SDSP. These assumptions are presented for the purpose of ascertaining the potential environmental impacts that would be anticipated to occur should those assumptions be realized. In general, it can be assumed that a lesser level of development, including retention of certain stable geologic features and land areas, would result in a lesser environmental impact than assumed herein.

shall be not less than 10 percent more energy efficient than 2008 Energy-Efficiency Standards requirements on a total daily valuation (TDV) basis.<sup>26</sup> In addition, the residential development shall be required to meet a 50 percent solar requirement.

### **3.2.2 Tentative Subdivision Map**

No tentative or vesting tentative subdivision map is being concurrently processed at this time so as to provide the subsequent site developer(s) or master builder(s) reasonable flexibility as to the design and configuration of on-site land uses, the type of housing product, the location and configuration of the new neighborhood park (including the amenities to be provided thereupon), and the development’s circulation and infrastructure systems. Although no tentative subdivision map has been submitted by the WVUSD or formulated by the Lead Agency, it is reasonable to assume that a tentative map or vesting tentative map would logically follow the Lead Agency’s approval or conditional approval of the “January 2012 SDSP” alternative. That tentative map would include a lotting plan (showing the configuration of individual lots), designate the location and configuration of the proposed park, and illustrate the on-site circulation and infrastructure systems (inclusive of any associated dedications) required to support those uses. Except where otherwise authorized, the resulting subdivision shall conform to and comply with the provisions of Title 21 (Subdivisions) in the “City of Diamond Bar Municipal Code” (Municipal Code) and the Subdivision Map Act, as codified in Sections 66410-66499.37 of the CGC.

Although subject to subsequent design-level review, the Lead Agency could reasonably anticipate that the FEIR would provide an adequate environmental basis for the approval of that tentative tract map or vesting tentative tract map assuming that the tentative map serves to reasonably implement the alternative project described herein.

### **3.2.3 Tentative Alternative Project Schedule**

Based on extensive public hearings (as conducted by the Commission and the Council), the Lead Agency’s concerted efforts to fully respond to comments received on the DEIR and RTC1, the extended scoping process (conducted by the WVUSD) initiated subsequent to the preparation of the RTC1 document, and the Department’s subsequent formulation of an alternative specific plan, the tentative project schedule identified in the DEIR cannot be realistically realized for either the March 2010 SDSP or for the January 2012 SDSP. Presented in Table RTC2-1 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Tentative Alternative Project Schedule) is a revised implementation schedule extending the occupancy date for on-site development from June 2012 to June 2015.

---

<sup>26/</sup> New Californian homes must be designed to meet building energy-efficiency standards (Title 24). Compliance with Title 24 is determined from the total daily valuation (TDV) of energy use in the built-environment (on a per square foot per year basis). The regulated energy uses include space heating and cooling, domestic hot water heating, and hard-wired lighting. TDV energy use is a parameter that reflects the burden that a building imposes on an electricity supply system. In general, there is a larger electricity demand and, hence, higher stress on the supply system during the day (peak times) than at night (off peak times). To account for this variation, the calculation of TDV assigns different weights for energy used at different times. For example, a building that uses a given amount of electricity during the peak mid-day period will have a higher TDV value than a building using an equivalent amount of electricity during off-peak hours. Title 24 determines compliance by comparing the energy use of a modeled (proposed) home to a minimally Title 24-compliant “standard home” of equal dimensions. Title 24 focuses on building energy efficiency per square foot and places no limits upon the size of the house or the actual energy used per dwelling unit.

Table RTC2-1  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
TENTATIVE ALTERNATIVE PROJECT SCHEDULE<sup>1</sup>**

Activity	Commencement Date	Completion Date
Specific Plan Approval	01 / 2012	02 / 2012
Tentative Tract Map Approval	06 / 2012	10 / 2012
Final Map Approval	11 / 2012	02 / 2013
Site Grading	04 / 2013	10 / 2013
Construction	11 / 2013	11 / 2014
Build-Out and Occupancy	11 / 2014	06 / 2015
Notes: 1. Subject to further change and refinement.		

Source: City of Diamond Bar

### 3.2.4 Conditions of Approval and Performance Standards<sup>1</sup>

With regards to this alternative, the Lead Agency has examined each of the recommended conditions of approval presented in Table ES-3 (Recommended Conditions of Approval) of the DEIR and formulated in response to the March 2010 SDSP to ascertain their continuing relevancy to the January 2012 SDSP. Where relevant, those conditions (either in the manner previously presented or as revised) have been carried forward and constitute recommended conditions of approval and/or performance standards for the January 2012 SDSP.

Presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Conditions of Approval/Performance Standards)<sup>27</sup> are those recommended conditions and performance standards deemed relevant to the January 2012 SDSP. Unless otherwise modified by the Lead Agency’s decision-making body, those recommended conditions constitute and performance standards constitute a component of the alternative project description and, as such, are an integral part of the January 2012 SDSP.

In order to facilitate cross-referencing with the recommended conditions of approval presented in the DEIR, in addition to the use of underlining to indicate an exhibit or a recommended condition of approval, underlining and strikeouts have been used herein to indicate the presence of new, modified, or deleted<sup>28</sup> language. As with the case of the March 2010 SDSP, the Lead Agency seeks to distinguish these recommended “conditions of approval and performance standards” from other recommended “mitigation measures” identified herein. Because these conditions have not been formulated in response to the existence of any significant

<sup>27/</sup> The Lead Agency notes that the sequence in which certain tables are presented in this RTC2 differs from that sequence presented in the DEIR. With regards to the March 2010 SDSP, the DEIR presented the following exhibits in the following order: (1) Table ES-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance); (2) Table ES-2 (Draft Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program); and (3) Table ES-3 (Recommended Conditions of Approval). In comparison, with regards to the January 2012 SDSP, this RTC2 contains the following exhibits in the following sequence: (1) Table RTC2-2 (Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval); (2) RTC2-3 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance); and (3) RTC2-4 (Draft Alternative Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program).

<sup>28/</sup> With regards to the phrase “new, modified, and deleted” herein, except as otherwise noted, the Lead Agency has not substantively changed the environmental analysis of the March 2010 SDSP, as presented in the DEIR. For the purpose of this RTC2 document, the Lead Agency has attempted (through the use of underlining and strikeouts) to illustrate the similarities and nexus between the environmental analysis, mitigation measures, and recommended conditions of approval between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

environmental effects and do not serve to reduce otherwise significant impacts to a less-than-significant level, these actions are not subject to the mitigation reporting and monitoring requirements specified in Section 21081.6 of CEQA.

With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Department’s CEQA-based recommended conditions of approval and performance standards are presented below:

1. Prior to the issuance of any precise grading permit for the project site, the City Engineer shall conduct a consistency analysis with the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance, as codified in Chapter 22.22 (Hillside Management) of the Development Code and no grading permit shall be issued unless reasonable consistency has been determined by the City Engineer (Condition of Approval 1.1).
2. To the extent that it were to result in an exceedance of any adopted regional projections on population and/or housing growth within the City, following the approval of the specific plan and/or any associated amendments to the City’s General Plan, the Lead Agency shall provide notification of that action to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), requesting that any subsequent amendments to SCAG’s “Regional Transportation Plan” (RTP) and other regional planning forecasts reflect a greater level of population and housing growth within the City during the 2010-2015 time period (Condition of Approval 1.2).
3. Prior to the approval of a tentative tract map or grading permit, a subsequent site-specific and design-specific geotechnical and geologic report shall be submitted to and, when acceptable, approved by the City Engineer documenting the project’s geotechnical feasibility and the appropriate geotechnical, geologic, and seismic conditions required to protect the public health and safety. Unless otherwise modified by the City Engineer, any conditions, recommendations, or mitigation measures contained therein shall become conditions of project approval (Condition of Approval 3.1).
4. Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the Applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, that each of the recommendations contained in the project’s preliminary geotechnical investigation and in any supplemental reports as may be prepared by the Applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer or by others have been incorporated into the project’s design, development, and operation and that such recommendations serve to demonstrate compliance with applicable Uniform Building Code (Title 24, Part 2, CCR) standards. The project shall be constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with those recommendations and with such additional geologic, geotechnical, seismic, and soils recommendations as may result from further analyses that may be presented to, imposed, or adopted by the City (Condition of Approval 3.2).
5. Prior to the approval of a tentative tract map or grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when acceptable, the City Engineer shall approval a hydrology study consistent with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work’s (LACDPW) “Hydrology/Sedimentation Manual” and applicable LACDPW policies and procedures. Unless otherwise preempted, in accordance with LACDPW’s “Interim Peak Flow Standard,” all post-development runoff from a 2-year, 24-hour storm, and 50-year capital storm shall not exceed pre-development peak-flow rate (Condition of Approval 4.1).

6. If the County flood control channel right-of-way is to be utilized as part of the project's development plan, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall obtain all requisite permits and approvals from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works – Flood Control District allowing for the overbuilding of the Brea Canyon Storm Drain Channel and shall provide the City Engineer with documentation, acceptable to the City Engineer, demonstrating County approval and authorization, including a complete list of all permit requirements that may be associated therewith (Condition of Approval 4.2).
7. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall prepare and, when acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a standard urban stormwater mitigation plan (SUSMP) conforming to the requirements of Section 8.12.1695 (Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Requirements for New Development and Redevelopment Projects) of the Municipal Code and the County's "Manual for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan" (Condition of Approval 4.3).
8. In order to demonstrate compliance with applicable State and federal resource protection policies designed to protect or compensate for the loss of biological resources, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, were applicable, the Applicant shall provide the Director with documentation of receipt of the following permits: (1) Section 401 (Federal Clean Water Act) water quality certification or waiver of waste discharge requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region; (2) nationwide Section 404 (Federal Clean Water Act) permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers; and (3) Section 1602 (California Fish and Game Code) streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. The Applicant shall comply with all associated permit requirements (Condition of Approval 5.1).
9. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit to the Community Development Director and, when acceptable, the Director shall accept for subsequent processing an arborist-prepared tree survey, specifying: (1) the precise number and type of protected trees that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the project; (2) the number (ratio), type, size, and source of trees that will be planted in compensation thereof; (3) the location of all replacement trees; (4) planting notes and irrigation requirements; (4) performance standards for the survivability of replacement trees; (5) a maintenance agreement stipulating the Applicant's obligations for a minimum 3-year period, including the annual reporting; and (6) the amount and derivation of the security deposit required under the City's tree preservation ordinance (Condition of Approval 5.2).
10. Measures to mitigate impacts to California walnut woodland will be orchestrated in concert with the replanting of trees protected by the City's tree preservation and protection ordinance. To the extent possible, southern California black walnut trees will be planted on manufactured slopes within the development. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a plan shall be submitted to the Community Development Director and, when acceptable, the Director shall approve a plan describing the number, size, and location of walnut and other compensatory trees to be planted and outline success criteria and adaptive management procedures to ensure that the mitigation plan is successful (Condition of Approval 5.3).

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

11. As determined feasible by the Community Development Director, initial vegetation removal activities shall be conducted outside the nesting season (February 15-August 15) to avoid impacts upon nesting birds. If initial vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season, prior to the commencement of any grading or grubbing activities, all suitable habitat shall first be thoroughly surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of nesting birds. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) shall be delineated, flagged, and vegetation removal activities avoided therein until the nesting cycle is complete, as determined by the surveying biologist or a qualified biological monitor (Condition of Approval 5.4).
12. Best Management Practices (BMP) devices shall be designed in consultation with the Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District and shall be of a type which minimizes the potential for vector (public nuisance) problems and maintained throughout the project life so as not to contribute to those problems. Unless accepted by the County and/or by the City, the responsibilities for and the funding of the maintenance of BMPs shall constitute obligations of the homeowners' association (Condition of Approval 5.5).
13. Construction Worker Parking and Equipment Staging Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a construction worker parking and equipment staging plan (PESP) designed to minimize disturbance to the surrounding residences to the greatest extent feasible. Unless otherwise authorized therein, contractors and other construction personnel performing construction activities in proximity to the project site shall be prohibited from parking and/or operating construction equipment, dumpsters, trailers, or other material within a public right-of-way or other public property. The PESP can be combined with or become a part of the construction traffic safety plan and/or any other construction management plan as may be required by the City (Condition of Approval 6.1).
14. Unless previously approved by the City Engineer, no construction access shall be authorized from and no construction traffic shall be permitted along Castle Rock Road and Pasado Drive, except as may be required to construct and maintain any project-related street and other improvements within and adjacent to those rights-of-way (Condition of Approval 6.2).
15. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a construction traffic mitigation plan (CTMP). The CTMP shall identify the travel and haul routes to be used by construction vehicles; the points of ingress and egress for all construction vehicles; temporary street or lane closures, temporary signage, and temporary striping; location of materials and equipment staging areas; maintenance plans to remove spilled debris from roadway surfaces; and the hours during which large construction equipment may be brought on/off the project site. The Applicant shall keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas. Hauling or transport of oversize loads will be allowed between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM only, Monday through Friday, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport will be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends, or federal holidays. The use of local streets shall be limited only to those that provide direct access to the destination.

- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic. If hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, street, curb, and/or gutter along the haul route, the Applicant will be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer (Condition of Approval 6.3).
16. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City shall approve a traffic control plan (TCP). The TCP shall be consistent with the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association’s “Work Area Traffic Control Handbook” (WATCH), the California Department of Transportation’s “Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones,” or such alternative as may be deemed acceptable by the City. The TCP shall describe the Applicant’s plans to safely and efficiently maintain vehicular and non-vehicular access along local roadways throughout the construction period. If any temporary access restrictions or lane closures are proposed by the Applicant, the TCP shall delineate detour routes, the hours, duration and frequency of such restrictions, and the emergency access and safety measures that will be implemented during those closures or restrictions. The TCP can be combined with or become a part of the construction traffic safety plan and/or any other construction management plan as may be required by the City (Condition of Approval 6.4).
  17. As determined by the City Engineer, should project-related construction activities result in the short-term closure of the existing Class II bicycle lanes or Class III bicycle paths along Diamond Bar Boulevard and/or Brea Canyon Road, during the term of that closure, signage shall be posted and other reasonable actions designed to enhance public safety shall be taken within the area of those closures informing both motorists and bicyclists of that action (Condition of Approval 6.5).
  18. Prior to the approval of any subsequent tentative tract map or the initiation of any improvements to Diamond Bar Boulevard that would result in the elimination of the existing Class II bicycle lane within that right-of-way, the City Engineer shall review street improvement plans for Diamond Bar Boulevard and determine the potential for retention, reconfiguration, and/or reclassification of the existing Class II bicycle lane along the property’s frontage, within the existing right-of-way or as a result of the dedication of additional public right-of-way along Diamond Bar Boulevard or within the tract map boundaries and linking with the existing terminus points beyond the boundaries of the project site. Should the City Engineer determine that none of those options are feasible or desirable, a study shall be conducted and, when acceptable, approved by the City Engineer ascertaining whether the near-site elimination of the existing Class II bicycle lane will adversely impact rider safety or traffic flow and what actions can be taken by the City and/or the Applicant to maintain a sufficient level of rider and motorist safety. The findings of that study and the recommendations contained therein shall be submitted to the City Council for their consideration (Condition of Approval 6.6).
  19. In order to reduce freeway-related noise impacts, all residential shall include forced air ventilation designed and installed in accordance with Title 24 of California Building Code standards (Condition of Approval 8.1).
  20. Prior to the commencement of grading activities, the Applicant shall prepare and submit for review by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD) a draft construction

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

- security plan outlining the activities that will be instituted by the Applicant to secure the construction site and the equipment and materials located thereupon from potential criminal incidents. The Applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the LACSD, if any, into a final construction security plan and shall implement that plan during the construction period (Condition of Approval 9.1).
21. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the LACSD shall be provided the opportunity to review and comment upon building plans and the configuration of the residential development and neighborhood park in order to: (1) facilitate opportunities for improved emergency access and response; (2) ensure the consideration of design strategies that facilitate public safety and police surveillance; and (3) offer specific design recommendations to enhance public safety and reduce potential demands upon police protection services (Condition of Approval 9.2).
  22. Prior to the commencement of grading or grubbing activities, the Applicant shall prepare and submit and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) shall review and, when deemed acceptable, approve a fire protection program and workplace standards for fire safety outlining those activities to be undertaken by the Applicant during the construction period. The Applicant shall abide by specific project-level permit conditions identified by the LACFD (Condition of Approval 9.3).
  23. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and the Los Angeles County Fire Department shall review and, when deemed acceptable, approve a fuel modification, landscape, and irrigation plan in compliance with County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4) standards (Condition of Approval 9.4).
  24. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) will review and, when deemed acceptable, approve (1) final water improvement plans including, but not limited to, the location, sizing, design, and fire flow capacity of the proposed water mains and fire hydrants and proposed access improvements to ensure compliance with applicable Fire Code requirements; and (2) building plans. The project’s water system shall be designed in response to final fire flow requirements identified by the LACFD (Condition of Approval 9.5).
  25. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit to the Building Official for review and approval a temporary fencing and signage plan designed to discourage access to any active construction areas by children and other unauthorized parties (Condition of Approval 9.6).
  26. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall present the City with a certificate of compliance or other documentation demonstrating that the Applicant has complied with the Walnut Valley Unified School District’s School Board resolutions governing the payment of school impact fees or has entered into an Assembly Bill 2926 authorized school fee mitigation agreement or is not subject to the school impact fee exaction (Condition of Approval 9.7).
  27. It is the City’s intent that the Applicant deliver to the City a “turn-key” park facility. Prior to the approval of the final subdivision map, unless an alternative milestone event or other manner of fulfillment of the Applicant’s obligations under Section 21.32.040 (Park Land Dedications and Fees) in Chapter 21.32 (Subdivisions) of the Municipal Code is first approved by the City Council, the Applicant shall dedicate or conditionally dedicate

- and improve or commit to improve a minimum of two usage acres of real property to the City for park purposes and, unless Quimby Act obligations are otherwise fulfilled by dedication and/or the provision of Applicant-sponsored park improvements, provide the City with an additional in-lieu park fee payment in the manner and in the amount authorized thereunder or otherwise specified by the City Council (Condition of Approval 9.8).
28. In cooperation with the City, as part of the tentative tract map entitlement process, the Applicant shall conduct or participate in conducting not less than two neighborhood outreach meetings soliciting public comments concerning the location, configuration, design, and range of amenities to be included in the on-site public park (Condition of Approval 9.9).
29. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, a sewer area study, prepared by a licensed civil engineer registered in the State of California, shall be submitted to the City Engineer and to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) for review and, when deemed acceptable, for approval. The sewer area study shall include sewer flow monitoring at specific locations to be determined by the City Engineer and the LACDPW. The sewer flow analysis shall include calculations for the quantities of sewer flow for the pre-development and post-development conditions and determine the impact on all affected City and County-operated sewerage facilities. Should project-related sewer flows be determined to impact the sewer capacity downstream from the development, the Applicant shall be required to mitigate any potential capacity deficiency by a method approved by the City Engineer or the LACDPW, subject to appropriate jurisdictional authorities. As stipulated by the jurisdictional authority, unless an alternative funding agreement can be derived, the Applicant shall be responsible for all costs required to mitigate the potential capacity deficiency, including, but not limited to, upgrading existing sewer mains (Condition of Approval 10.1).
30. The Applicant shall construct a landscaped “entry feature” in the vicinity of the Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road. With regards to its design characteristics, the entry feature shall seek to visually draw from elements of the community and/or its history and serve as a “gateway” informing motorists and other viewers that they have entered the City of Diamond Bar. The minimum standard of performance used to measure compliance with this requirement shall be that the entry feature shall have a value, as determined by the Community Development Director, of not less than one-half (0.005) percent of the building permit valuation of the residential development (Condition of Approval 12.1).
31. Subsequent development plans shall include design details, acceptable to both the City Engineer and to the Community Development Director, for all proposed retaining walls. Retaining wall plans shall include landscape and irrigation details sufficient to ensure that each of those elements are, as appropriate, integrated into wall design and that the interrelationship between those elements are considered from both structural integrity and aesthetic viewpoints (Condition of Approval 12.2).

### **3.3 Environmental Analysis**

As required under Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

comparison. Relative to each of the topical issues examined in the DEIR, presented in the following sections is an environmental analysis of “Alternative 6.”<sup>29</sup>

The “January 2012 SDSP” alternative constitutes a variation or revision to not only the proposed project (March 2010 SDSP) but also to both the “low-density residential” (Alternative 4) and “high-density residential” (Alternative 5) alternatives examined in the DEIR. As such, as with the other development-based alternatives examined in the DEIR, except as otherwise noted herein, most of the environmental analysis presented in the DEIR remains reasonably germane to the environmental analysis of the “January 2012 SDSP” alternative and, as such, that previously presented analysis does not again require repeating herein.<sup>30</sup> For example, except as otherwise noted, the regulatory and environmental settings, thresholds of significance criteria, and the recommended conditions of approval and mitigation measures remain applicable to this alternative and its potential environmental effects.<sup>31</sup> Presented herein is only such additional information and analysis that is, in the Lead Agency’s sole judgment, required to provide a reasonably comparable assessment of the January 2012 SDSP and to allow for informed decisionmaking regarding the March 2010 SDSP. Where the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains reasonably applicable to the alternative project and where no further augmentation is deemed warranted by the Lead Agency, those impacts are not again addressed herein.

With regards to the Lead Agency’s analysis of potential environmental impacts, as a result of the deletion of the proposed general commercial component and the introduction of an on-site public park: (1) minor changes to some of the identified environmental effects (as presented in the DEIR) are required to ensure a comparative analysis of the January 2012 SDSP; and/or (2) some of the previously identified environmental impacts, recommended conditions of approval, and/or mitigation measures are deemed to no longer be relevant to the assessment of the January 2012 SDSP or, if relevant (a) the manner of that relevancy has been altered and/or (b) the specific language of those impacts, conditions, and/or measures have been modified to reflect the January 2012 SDSP. As specified, those changes have predicated the need for additional information and/or analysis with regards to specific environmental impacts.

Retaining, to the extent feasible, the numbering and format presented in the DEIR, with regards to the January 2012 SDSP, presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) is a summary of each of the relevant alternative-specific environmental impacts identified by the City, a listing of those recommended mitigation measures, conditions of approval, and performance standards

---

<sup>29/</sup> Additional analysis of the January 2012 SDSP is presented in Appendix RTC2-G (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Traffic Impact Analysis) and in Appendix RTC2-H (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Air Quality Analysis) herein.

<sup>30/</sup> It is acknowledged that there exist land-use and other variations between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP such that the two development scenarios depicted by those specific plans constitute separate and distinct development alternatives for the “Site D” property. In recognition of those differences, certain analyses presented in the DEIR (e.g., impacts attributable to the proposed on-site commercial use) are not directly applicable to the January 2012 SDSP. It is not the Lead Agency’s intent herein to suggest that the environmental analysis of the March 2010 SDSP (as presented in the DEIR) serves as a direct substitute for the alternative’s analysis of the January 2012 SDSP. As noted, certain aspects of the analysis of the March 2010 SDSP do not bear direct relationship to the analysis of the January 2012 SDSP and should not be considered directly relevant thereto.

<sup>31/</sup> The DEIR was released in June 2009. The Lead Agency acknowledges that the environmental baseline has undergone minor changes between the dissemination of the DEIR and the release of this RTC2 document. Relative to each of the topical issues examined herein, the Lead Agency has considered what, if any, changes have occurred and has sought to ascertain whether any of those changes or changed conditions predicate further revisions to the environmental analysis.

formulated in response to the identified environmental effects, and the City’s preliminary conclusions regarding both the pre- and post-mitigated level of significance of each of those identified effects. As presented in Table RTC2-4 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – Draft Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program), in order to reduce potentially significant environmental effects to a less-than-significant level, as extracted from the DEIR, a number of relevant alternative-specific mitigation measures have been identified. In order to facilitate cross-referencing with the March 2010 SDSP, as presented in the DEIR, underlining and strike-through have been used to indicate the presence of new and deleted text, respectively.

### **3.3.1 Land Use**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the 30.4-acre site.

From a land-use perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its estimated 533-space parking area<sup>32</sup> and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint. Primary vehicular access would be provided via a signalized intersection along Diamond Bar Boulevard, aligning with either Crooked Creek Drive or Cherrydale Drive.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the land-use analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

Presented below are those revised land-use impacts and additional analyses deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential land-use impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Land-Use Impact 1-1.*** ~~New commercial uses and higher density residential~~ and public park uses could introduce land-use compatibility conflicts between the proposed mixed-use project and existing single-family residential uses abutting the project site.

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

---

<sup>32/</sup> Assuming 153,985 square feet of commercial use and a minimum parking ratio of one space for each 300 square feet of “shopping center” area pursuant to Table 3-10 (Parking Requirement by Land Use and Use Type) in Section 22.30.040 (Number of Parking Spaces Required) in Title 22 (Development Code) of the Municipal Code.

Table RTC2-2  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
	<b>Land Use</b>
1-1	<del>Unless effective sound mitigation can be demonstrated once the project is operational or other controls imposed on delivery and related activities, no delivery activities shall occur between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM.</del>
1-2	<del>The Applicant shall include as part of the real estate disclosure documentation, as required by the California Department of Real Estate for purchasers of those residential units to be constructed on the project site, the disclosure that commercial activities are proposed on the adjacent property and that the operational characteristics of those activities may include trucking, delivery, and maintenance operations by diesel fueled and non-diesel fueled vehicles.</del>
1-1	<u>Prior to the issuance of any precise grading permit for the project site, the City Engineer shall conduct a consistency analysis with the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance, as codified in Chapter 22.22 (Hillside Management) of the Development Code and no grading permit shall be issued unless reasonable consistency has been determined by the City Engineer.</u>
1-3 1-2	<u>To the extent that it were to result in an exceedance of any adopted regional projections on population and/or housing growth within the City, following the approval of the specific plan and/or any associated amendments to the City’s General Plan, the Lead Agency shall provide notification of that action to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), requesting that any subsequent amendments to SCAG’s “Regional Transportation Plan” (RTP) and other regional planning forecasts reflect a greater level of population and housing growth within the City during the 2005-2010-2015 time period.</u>
1-4	<del>Total new residential and non-residential development constructed on the project site shall not exceed 202 200 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leaseable square feet, respectively, unless a subsequent traffic study, addressing the traffic-related impacts associated with any such increase, is prepared by or submitted to and deemed acceptable by the City or unless such increase can be determined by the City to not result in any substantial increase in project-related traffic impacts. Should additional traffic impacts be identified, the City, at its sole discretion, may initiate additional environmental review and/or impose additional conditions or other measures in response to those impacts.</del>
	<b>Geotechnical Hazards</b>
3-1	<u>Prior to the approval of a tentative tract map or grading permit, a subsequent site-specific and design-specific geotechnical and geologic report shall be submitted to and, when acceptable, approved by the City Engineer documenting the project’s geotechnical feasibility and the appropriate geotechnical, geologic, and seismic conditions required to protect the public health and safety. Unless otherwise modified by the City Engineer, any conditions, recommendations, or mitigation measures contained therein shall become conditions of project approval.</u>
3-4 3-2	<u>Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the Applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, that each of the recommendations contained in the project’s preliminary geotechnical investigation and in any supplemental reports as may be prepared by the Applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer or by others have been incorporated into the project’s design, development, and operation and that such recommendations serve to demonstrate compliance with applicable Uniform Building Code (Title 24, Part 2, CCR) standards. The project shall be constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with those recommendations and with such additional geologic, geotechnical, seismic, and soils recommendations as may result from further analyses that may be presented to, imposed, or adopted by the City.</u>

Table RTC2-2 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	
4-1	Prior to the approval of a tentative tract map or grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a hydrology study consistent with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Work’s (LACDPW) “Hydrology/Sedimentation Manual” and applicable LACDPW policies and procedures. Unless otherwise preempted, in accordance with LACDPW’s “Interim Peak Flow Standard,” all post-development runoff from a 2-year, 24-hour storm, and 50-year capital storm shall not exceed pre-development peak-flow rate.
4-4 4-2	If the County flood control channel right-of-way is to be utilized as part of the project’s development plan, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall obtain all requisite permits and approvals from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works – Flood Control District allowing for the overbuilding of the Brea Canyon Storm Drain Channel and shall provide the City Engineer with documentation, acceptable to the City Engineer, demonstrating County approval and authorization, including a complete list of all permit requirements that may be associated therewith.
4-2 4-3	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall prepare and, when acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a standard urban stormwater mitigation plan (SUSMP) conforming to the requirements of Section 8.12.1695 (Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Requirements for New Development and Redevelopment Projects) of the Municipal Code and the County’s “Manual for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan.”
<b>Biological Resources</b>	
5-1	In order to demonstrate compliance with applicable State and federal resource protection policies designed to protect or compensate for the loss of biological resources, prior to the approval issuance of a grading permit, were applicable, the Applicant shall provide the Director with documentation of receipt of the following permits: (1) Section 401 (Federal Clean Water Act) water quality certification or waiver of waste discharge requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region; (2) nationwide Section 404 (Federal Clean Water Act) permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers; and (3) Section 1602 (California Fish and Game Code) streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. The Applicant shall comply with all associated permit requirements.
5-2	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit to the Community Development Director and, when acceptable, the Director shall accept for subsequent processing an arborist-prepared tree survey, specifying: (1) the precise number and type of protected trees that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed project; (2) the number (ratio), type, size, and source of trees that will be planted in compensation thereof; (3) the location of all replacement trees; (4) planting notes and irrigation requirements; (4) performance standards for the survivability of replacement trees; (5) a maintenance agreement stipulating the Applicant’s obligations for a minimum 3-year period, including the annual reporting; and (6) the amount and derivation of the security deposit required under the City’s tree preservation ordinance.
5-3	<del>California Walnut Woodland.</del> Measures to mitigate impacts to California walnut woodland will be orchestrated in concert with the replanting of trees protected by the City’s tree preservation and protection ordinance. To the extent possible, southern California black walnut trees will be planted on manufactured slopes within the development. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a plan shall be submitted to the Community Development Director and, when acceptable, the Director shall approve a plan describing the number, size, and location of walnut and other compensatory trees to be planted and outline success criteria and adaptive management procedures to ensure that the mitigation plan is successful.

Table RTC2-2 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
	<b>Biological Resources</b> (Continued)
5-4	As determined feasible by the Community Development Director, initial vegetation removal activities shall be conducted outside the nesting season (February 15-August 15) to avoid impacts upon nesting birds. If initial vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season, prior to the commencement of any grading or grubbing activities, all suitable habitat shall first be thoroughly surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of nesting birds. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) shall be delineated, flagged, and vegetation removal activities avoided therein until the nesting cycle is complete, as determined by the surveying biologist or a qualified biological monitor.
5-5	<del>Best Management Practices (BMP) devices shall be designed in consultation with the Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District and shall be of a type which minimizes the potential for vector (public nuisance) problems and maintained throughout the project life so as not to contribute to those problems. Unless accepted by the County and/or by the City, the responsibilities for and the funding of the maintenance of Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall constitute obligations of the homeowners’ association as to those BMPs associated with the project’s residential component and the property owners’ association as to those BMPs associated with the project’s commercial component. BMPs not directly attributable to a single project component or use shall, by agreement between owners, become the shared obligation of both associations.</del>
	<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>
6-1	<del>Construction Worker Parking and Equipment Staging Plan.</del> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a construction worker parking and equipment staging plan (PESP) designed to minimize disturbance to the surrounding residences to the greatest extent feasible. Unless otherwise authorized therein, contractors and other construction personnel performing construction activities in proximity to the project site shall be prohibited from parking and/or operating construction equipment, dumpsters, trailers, or other material within a public right-of-way or other public property. The PESP can be combined with or become a part of the construction traffic safety plan and/or any other construction management plan as may be required by the City.
6-2	Unless previously approved by the City Engineer, no construction access shall be authorized from and no construction traffic shall be permitted along Castle Rock Road and Pasado Drive, except as may be required to construct and maintain any project-related street and other improvements within and adjacent to those rights-of-way.
6-3	<del>Construction Traffic Safety Plan.</del> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City Engineer shall approve a construction traffic mitigation plan (CTMP). The CTMP shall identify the travel and haul routes to be used by construction vehicles; the points of ingress and egress for all construction vehicles; temporary street or lane closures, temporary signage, and temporary striping; location of materials and equipment staging areas; maintenance plans to remove spilled debris from roadway surfaces; and the hours during which large construction equipment may be brought on/off the project site. The Applicant shall keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer, of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas. Hauling or transport of oversize loads will be allowed between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM only, Monday through Friday, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport will be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends, or federal holidays. The use of local streets shall be limited only to those that provide direct access to the destination. Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic. If hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, street, curb, and/or gutter along the haul route, the Applicant will be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Table RTC2-2 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
	<b>Transportation and Circulation</b> (Continued)
6-4	<del>Traffic Control Plan.</del> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the City shall approve a traffic control plan (TCP). The TCP shall be consistent with the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association’s “Work Area Traffic Control Handbook” (WATCH), the California Department of Transportation’s “Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones,” or such alternative as may be deemed acceptable by the City. The TCP shall describe the Applicant’s plans to safely and efficiently maintain vehicular and non-vehicular access along local roadways throughout the construction period. If any temporary access restrictions or lane closures are proposed by the Applicant, the TCP shall delineate detour routes, the hours, duration and frequency of such restrictions, and the emergency access and safety measures that will be implemented during those closures or restrictions. The TCP can be combined with or become a part of the construction traffic safety plan and/or any other construction management plan as may be required by the City.
6-5	<del>Shared Parking Plan.</del> Prior to the issuance of building permits for any on-site commercial use, the Applicant shall submit and, when deemed acceptable, the Community Development Director and the City Engineer shall approve a shared parking study. The study, conducted using the Urban Land Institute’s “Shared Parking” (Second Edition, 2005) unless otherwise approved by the City, shall present a quantification of on-site commercial parking needs, quantify the number of on-site parking spaces required under existing City regulations, discuss and evaluate opportunities for shared parking between on-site commercial uses, and quantify the number and type of parking spaces that need to be provided to support those commercial uses to be developed on the project site. The number, type, and location of on-site parking shall be determined by the City based, in whole or in part, by the findings of that shared parking study.
6-5	<u>As determined by the City Engineer, should project-related construction activities result in the short-term closure of the existing Class II bicycle lanes or Class III bicycle paths along Diamond Bar Boulevard and/or Brea Canyon Road, during the term of that closure, signage shall be posted and other reasonable actions designed to enhance public safety taken within the area of those closures informing both motorists and bicyclists of that action.</u>
6-6	<u>Prior to the approval of any subsequent tentative tract map or the initiation of any improvements to Diamond Bar Boulevard that would result in the elimination of the existing Class II bicycle lane within that right-of-way, the City Engineer shall review street improvement plans for Diamond Bar Boulevard and determine the potential for retention, reconfiguration, and/or reclassification of the existing Class II bicycle lane along the property’s frontage, within the existing right-of-way or as a result of the dedication of additional public right-of-way along Diamond Bar Boulevard or within the tract map boundaries and linking with the existing terminus points beyond the boundaries of the project site. Should the City Engineer determine that none of those options are feasible or desirable, a study shall be conducted and, when acceptable, approved by the City Engineer ascertaining whether the near-site elimination of the existing Class II bicycle lane will adversely impact rider safety or traffic flow and what actions can be taken by the City and/or the Applicant to maintain a sufficient level of rider and motorist safety. The findings of that study and the recommendations contained therein shall be submitted to the City Council for their consideration.</u>
	<b>Air Quality</b>
7-1	<del>The Applicant shall include as part of the real estate disclosure documentation, as required by the California Department of Real Estate for purchasers of these residential units to be constructed on the project site, the disclosure that commercial activities are proposed on the adjacent property and that the operational characteristics of these activities may include trucking, delivery, and maintenance operations involving diesel-fueled vehicles.</del>

Table RTC2-2 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
	<b>Noise</b>
8-1	In order to reduce freeway-related noise impacts, all residential <del>and commercial</del> units shall include forced air ventilation designed and installed in accordance with Title 24 of California Building Code standards.
	<b>Public Services and Facilities</b>
9-1	Prior to the commencement of grading activities, the Applicant shall prepare and submit for review by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD) a draft construction security plan outlining the activities that will be instituted by the Applicant to secure the construction site and the equipment and materials located thereupon from potential criminal incidents. The Applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the LACSD, if any, into a final construction security plan and shall implement that plan during the construction period.
9-2	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the LACSD shall be provided the opportunity to review and comment upon building plans and the configuration of the <u>residential</u> development <u>and neighborhood park</u> in order to: (1) facilitate opportunities for improved emergency access and response; (2) ensure the consideration of design strategies that facilitate public safety and police surveillance; and (3) offer specific design recommendations to enhance public safety and reduce potential demands upon police protection services.
9-3	Prior to the commencement of grading or grubbing activities, the Applicant shall prepare and submit and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) shall review and, when deemed acceptable, approve a fire protection program and workplace standards for fire safety outlining those activities to be undertaken by the Applicant during the construction period. The Applicant shall abide by specific project-level permit conditions identified by the LACFD.
9-4	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit and the Los Angeles County Fire Department shall review and, when deemed acceptable, approve a fuel modification, landscape, and irrigation plan in compliance with County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4) standards.
9-5	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) will review and, when deemed acceptable, approve (1) final water improvement plans including, but not limited to, the location, sizing, design, and fire flow capacity of the proposed water mains and fire hydrants and proposed access improvements to ensure compliance with applicable Fire Code requirements; and (2) building plans. The project’s water system shall be designed in response to final fire flow requirements identified by the LACFD.
9-6	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall submit to the Building Official for review and approval a temporary fencing and signage plan designed to discourage access to any active construction areas by children and other unauthorized parties.
9-7	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall present the City with a certificate of compliance or other documentation demonstrating that the Applicant has complied with the Walnut Valley Unified School District’s School Board resolutions governing the payment of school impact fees or has entered into an Assembly Bill 2926 authorized school fee mitigation agreement or is not subject to the school impact fee exaction.
9-8	It is the City’s intent that the Applicant deliver to the City a “turn-key” park facility. Prior to the approval of the final subdivision map, unless an alternative milestone event or other manner of fulfillment of the Applicant’s obligations under Section 21.32.040 (Park Land Dedications and Fees) in Chapter 21.32 (Subdivisions) of the Municipal Code is first approved by the City Council, the Applicant shall <u>dedicate or conditionally dedicate and improve or commit to improve a minimum of two usage acres of real property to the City for park purposes and, unless Quimby Act obligations are otherwise fulfilled by dedication and/or the provision of Applicant-sponsored park improvements, provide the City with an additional in-lieu park fee payment in the manner and in the amount authorized thereunder or otherwise specified by the City Council.</u>

Table RTC2-2 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL / PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

No.	Condition of Approval
	<b>Public Services and Facilities</b> (Continued)
9-9	<u>In cooperation with the City, as part of the tentative tract map entitlement process, the Applicant shall conduct or participate in conducting not less than two neighborhood outreach meetings soliciting public comments concerning the location, configuration, design, and range of amenities to be included in the on-site public park.</u>
	<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>
10-1	Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, a sewer area study, prepared by a licensed civil engineer registered in the State of California, shall be submitted to the City Engineer and to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) for review and, when deemed acceptable, for approval. The sewer area study shall include sewer flow monitoring at specific locations to be determined by the City Engineer and the LACDPW. The sewer flow analysis shall include calculations for the quantities of sewer flow for the pre-development and post-development conditions and determine the impact on all affected City and County-operated sewerage facilities. Should project-related sewer flows be determined to impact the sewer capacity downstream from the proposed development, the Applicant shall be required to mitigate any potential capacity deficiency by a method approved by the City Engineer or the LACDPW, subject to appropriate jurisdictional authorities. <u>As stipulated by the jurisdictional authority, unless an alternative funding agreement can be derived, the Applicant shall be responsible for all costs required to mitigate the potential capacity deficiency, including, but not limited to, upgrading existing sewer mains.</u>
	<b>Aesthetics</b>
12-1	<u>The Applicant shall construct a landscaped “entry feature” in the vicinity of the Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road. With regards to its design characteristics, the entry feature shall seek to visually draw from elements of the community and/or its history and serve as a “gateway” informing motorists and other viewers that they have entered the City of Diamond Bar. The minimum standard of performance used to measure compliance with this requirement shall be that the entry feature shall have a value, as determined by the Community Development Director, of not less than one-half (0.005) percent of the building permit valuation of the residential development.</u>
42-4 12-2	<del>The specific plan</del> <u>Subsequent development plans shall include design details, acceptable to both the City Engineer and to the Community Development Director, for all proposed retaining walls. Retaining wall plans shall include landscape and irrigation details sufficient to ensure that each of those elements are, as appropriate, integrated into wall design and that the interrelationship between those elements are considered from both structural integrity and aesthetic viewpoints.</u>

Table RTC2-3  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Land Use</b>				
Land-Use Impact 1-1. <del>New commercial uses and higher density residential and public park uses</del> could introduce land-use compatibility conflicts between the <del>proposed mixed-use project</del> and existing single-family residential uses abutting the project site.	Less-than Significant	<del>Conditions of Approval 1-1 and 1-2</del> None	None	Less-than Significant
Land-Use Impact 1-2. The <del>proposed mixed-use project</del> , including the land uses, densities, and development standards now under consideration, could conflict with the adopted plans and policies of the City.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 1-3 1-2 (As Modified)	None	Less-than Significant
Land-Use Impact 1-3. Project implementation requires a General Plan amendment, <del>adoption of a specific plan</del> , zone change, subdivision of the project site, and other discretionary actions to accommodate the proposed land uses. Each of those actions is subject to specific findings by the City Council and/or by other responsible agencies.	Less-than Significant	<del>Condition of Approval 1-4</del> None	None	Less-than Significant
Land Use Impact 1-4. Cumulative residential development within the City and the population increase associated with the introduction of new dwelling units could exceed the <del>2005-2010-2015</del> population growth forecasts presented in the “Regional Transportation Plan – Destination 2030” (SCAG, 2004) and which serve as a basis for regional transportation planning.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 1-3 1-2 (As Modified)	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Population and Housing</b>				
Population and Housing Impact 2-1. Project construction will increase the local labor force and, through job creation and the possibility of worker relocation, has the potential to induce population growth in the general project area.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Population and Housing Impact 2-2. Project implementation will result in the addition of <del>up to 202</del> 200 dwelling units to the City’s existing housing stock and will increase the City’s population by approximately <del>662</del> 656 individuals, based on the California Department of Finance’s <del>existing</del> (January 2008) Citywide <del>vacancy rates and</del> average household size (3.335 persons/unit) and vacancy rate (1.71 percent).	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Population and Housing</b> (Continued)				
Population and Housing Impact 2-3. Project implementation will result in the construction of 153,985 square feet of commercial use, directly creating about 462 new permanent jobs.	Less than Significant	None	None	Less than Significant
Population and Housing Impact 2-4 2-3. Absent a corresponding and proportional increase in long-term employment opportunities, projects that increase the City’s housing stock would contribute to the perpetuation of the existing Citywide jobs-housing imbalance.	Less than Significant	None	None	Less than Significant
<b>Geotechnical Hazards</b>				
Geotechnical Hazards Impact 3-1. Conversion of the project site from a vacant property to an urban use will expose site occupants to regional seismic hazards and localized geologic and geotechnical conditions. Should development occur in the absence of an understanding of those regional and local conditions, site occupants may be subjected to unacceptable geotechnical hazards.	Less than Significant	<u>Conditions of Approval 1-1, 3-1, and 3-2 (As Modified)</u>	None	Less than Significant
Geotechnical Hazards Impact 3-2. During the life of the project, structures and other improvements constructed on the property will be subject to periodic ground shaking resulting from seismic events along earthquake faults located throughout the region.	Less than Significant	<u>Conditions of Approval 1-1, 3-1, and 3-2 (As Modified)</u>	None	Less than Significant
Geotechnical Hazards Impact 3-3. Los Angeles County is located within a seismically active region. Since earthquakes have historically occurred throughout the region and can be expected to occur in the future, development activities that occur throughout the region, including their occupants and users, will remain subject to seismic forces.	Less than Significant	None	None	Less than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
Hydrology and Water Quality 4-1. Construction activities may increase sediment discharge and/or result in the introduction of hazardous materials, petroleum products, or other waste discharges that could impact the quality of the area’s surface and ground water resources if discharged to those waters.	Less-than Significant	<u>Conditions of Approval 4-1 and 4-3</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality 4-2. Project implementation will result in the introduction of impervious surfaces onto the project site and, as a result of the impedance of opportunities for absorption and infiltration of those waters, has the potential to increase the quantity, velocity, and duration of storm waters discharged from the project site.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<u>Condition of Approval 4-2</u>	Mitigation Measure 4-1	Less-than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality 4-3. Continuing urbanization of the general project area will collectively contribute to surface flows within the Diamond Bar Creek watershed will result in the introduction of additional urban pollutants that could affect the beneficial uses of existing surface and ground water resources.	Less-than Significant	<u>Conditions of Approval 4-1 and 4-3</u>	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Biological Resources</b>				
Biological Resource Impact 5-1. Construction activities and fuel-modification requirements will result in direct impacts from vegetation removal of about 30.4 acres located within the tract map area. Fuel modification requirements imposed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department could directly impact additional vegetation.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Biological Resource Impact 5-2. The project will permanently impact approximately 2,125 linear feet of streambed, including approximately 0.20 acres of United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdictional waters and approximately 4.10 acres of California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Condition of Approval 5-1	Mitigation Measure 5-1	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Biological Resources</b> (Continued)				
Biological Resource Impact 5-3. Proposed grading and grubbing activities will result in the removal of 83 protected ordinance-size trees, including 75 California black walnut, six willow, and two coast live oak trees, which now exist on the project site.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 <u>(As Modified)</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Biological Resource Impact 5-4. Construction activities initiated during the nesting season, typically extending from February 15 to August 15 of each year, could impact nesting birds and raptors in violation of the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 5-4	None	Less-than Significant
Biological Resource Impact 5-5. Project implementation has the potential to impede existing wildlife movement patterns across the project site.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Biological Resource Impact 5-6. If improperly designed and maintained, the proposed on-site flood control facilities and structural and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) could potentially provide a habitat for the propagation of mosquitoes and other vectors.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 5-5 <u>(As Modified)</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Biological Resource Impact 5-7. Implementation of the <del>proposed</del> project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable future projects, will contribute incrementally to the continuing reduction in open space areas in the general project area and contribute to the general decline in species diversity throughout the region.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>				
Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-1. Construction vehicles will transport workers, construction equipment, building materials, and construction debris along local and collector streets and along arterial highways within and adjacent to established residential areas and other sensitive receptors.	Less-than Significant	Conditions of Approval 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b> (Continued)				
Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-2. The project is forecast to generate approximately <del>9,276</del> <u>1,182</u> daily <del>two-way vehicle trips</del> <u>trip ends</u> , including <del>272</del> <u>90</u> trips during the AM and <del>650</del> <u>106</u> trips during the PM peak hours, and would increase traffic congestion on local and regional roadways.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2	Less-than Significant
Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-3. The implementation of the <del>proposed</del> project, in combination with other related projects, will collectively contribute to existing traffic congestion in the general project area and exacerbate the need for localized areawide traffic improvements.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2	Less-than Significant
Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-4. The project has the <u>potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</u>	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	<u>Conditions of Approval 6-5 and 6-6</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
<b>Air Quality</b>				
Air Quality Impact 7-1. Because the project involves a General Plan amendment and zone change, it has the potential to be inconsistent with the applicable air quality management plan.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Air Quality Impact 7-2. Construction of the <del>proposed</del> project has the potential to violate or add to a violation of air quality standards.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	None	<del>Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2</del> <u>None</u>	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
Air Quality Impact 7-3. Operation of the <del>proposed</del> project has the potential to violate or add to a violation of air quality standards.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	None	<del>Mitigation Measures 7-3 thru 7-7</del> <u>None</u>	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
Air Quality Impact 7-4. The <del>proposed</del> project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	<u>Condition of Approval 7-4</u> <u>None</u>	<u>None</u> <u>Mitigation Measure 7-1</u>	Less-than Significant
Air Quality Impact 7-5. The <del>proposed</del> project has the potential to create objectionable odors.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Air Quality</b> (Continued)				
Air Quality Impact 7-6. The <del>proposed</del> project, in combination with other related projects, has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	None	None	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
<del>Air Quality Impact 7-7. The construction and operation of the proposed project will contribute to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. GHG have been linked to climate change.</del>	<u>Less than Significant</u>	None	None	<u>Less than Significant</u>
Air Quality Impact 7-7. The project has the potential to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	None	None	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
Air Quality Impact 7-8. The project has the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	<u>Less-than Significant</u>	None	None	<u>Less-than Significant</u>
<b>Noise</b>				
Noise Impact 8-1. Construction activities could result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measures 8-1 thru 8-6 <u>(As Modified)</u>	Less-than Significant
Noise Impact 8-2. Project implementation may result in an exceedance of noise standards established in the General Plan and/or Municipal Code or applicable standards formulated by other agencies.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Condition of Approval 8-1 <u>(As Modified)</u>	Mitigation Measures 8-7 and 8-8 <u>(As Modified)</u>	Less-than Significant
Noise Impact 8-3. Project implementation may result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Noise Impact 8-3. Short-term construction and long-term operational noise associated with the <del>proposed</del> project, in combination with other related projects, will contribute to both a localized and an areawide increase in ambient noise levels in proximity to those projects and along those roadways utilized by project-related traffic.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Public Services and Facilities</b>				
Public Services Impact 9-1. During construction, heavy equipment, materials, and other items of value will be brought to the project site. As buildings are erected, prior to site occupancy, structures may remain unsecured and susceptible to unauthorized entry. The presence of an unsecured site and items of value could result in theft and vandalism that could increase demands upon law enforcement agencies.	Less-than Significant	Conditions of Approval 9-1 and 9-2 <u>(As Modified)</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-2. Project implementation will result in the introduction of equipment, materials, and manpower into a County-designated fire hazard area prior to the provision of water system improvements designated to respond to on-site and near-site fire hazards.	Less-than Significant	Conditions of Approval 9-3 thru 9-5	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-3. The public school located closest to the project site is Castle Rock Elementary School (2975 Castle Rock Road). Construction activities could constitute an attractive nuisance to children located near or passing by the project site and construction traffic could impose a safety hazard to children and/or become disruptive to school activities and operations.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval <u>6-2, 6-3, 6-4, and 9-6</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-4. With a resident population of approximately <del>662</del> <u>656</u> persons and an existing LACSD staffing ratio of one sworn officer for each 1,082 residents, in order to maintain existing staffing levels, the LACSD would need an additional 0.61 sworn deputies.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 9-2 <u>(As Modified)</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-5. The introduction of <del>202</del> <u>200</u> new residential dwellings and <del>new park acreage 153,985 square feet of new commercial use</del> will increase existing demands on LACFD facilities, equipment, and personnel, predicated an incremental need for facility expansion, the purchase of new and/or replacement equipment, and contributing to the need for addition LACFD personnel.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 9-5	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Public Services and Facilities</b> (Continued)				
Public Services Impact 9-6. <u>Based on the Walnut Valley Unified School District’s 2008 fee justification study, since product type remains at the discretion of the Applicant, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, assuming multi-family dwellings, project implementation will increase enrollment within the Walnut Valley Unified School District by an estimated 89 new students, including approximately 26 new elementary school students (Grades K-6 5), 24 new junior high school students (Grades 7 6-9), and 39 new high school students (Grades 9-12).</u>	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 9-7	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-7. Project implementation will increase the resident population of the City, including the number of school-age children, incremental increasing existing spatial and resource demands placed on the Diamond Bar Public Library.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-8. Project implementation will increase the resident population of the City of Diamond Bar and generate a projected need for <del>2.42</del> <u>2.10</u> acres (approximately <del>92,390</del> <u>91,518</u> square feet) of additional parkland within the City.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 9-8 <u>(As Modified)</u> Condition of Approval 9-9	None	Less-than Significant
Public Services Impact 9-9. The approval of other reasonably foreseeable future development projects within the general project area will increase existing demands on the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and on the Los Angeles County Fire Department, increase the number of school-aged children served by the Walnut Valley Unified School District, and increase the demand for park and recreational facilities within the City.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>				
Utilities and Service Systems 10-1. Wastewater collection facilities do not presently exist on the project site and will not be available until the infrastructure improvements required to accommodate the proposed land uses are constructed.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b> (Continued)				
Utilities and Service Systems 10-2. The project’s residential and <del>commercial park</del> components are projected to generate approximately <del>89,435</del> <u>39,100</u> gallons of wastewater per day ( <del>0.09</del> <u>0.04</u> mgd). Applying a peaking factor of 2.7, the peaked flow rate would be about <del>244,475</del> <u>105,570</u> gallons of wastewater per day ( <del>0.25</del> <u>0.11</u> mgd).	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 10-1 <u>(As Modified)</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems 10-3. Implementation of the <del>proposed</del> project and other related projects would impose cumulative impacts on those sewage collection and disposal facilities located in the general project area.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Cultural Resources</b>				
Cultural Resource Impact 11-1. Ground disturbance activities could result in impacts to on-site cultural resources meeting California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measures 11-1 thru 11-3	Less-than Significant
Cultural Resource Impact 11.2. Ground disturbance activities could result in impacts to on-site paleontological resources, including fossil remains, from the Puente Formation.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measures 11-4 thru 11-8	Less-than Significant
Cultural Resource Impact 11-3. Grading activities conducted on other sites located within the general project area could result in impacts to any historic or prehistoric resources that may be located thereupon. In addition, earth-moving activities conducted on other undisturbed sites containing the Puente Formation could result in the loss of recoverable paleontological resources.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-3 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>Aesthetics</b>				
Construction Aesthetic Impact 12-1. Excluding those areas that will be retained as open space, the project site will take on a distinctively urban physiographic character as existing vegetation is removed, construction equipment introduced onto the site, hillside areas recontoured, new uses are introduced, and other physical modifications occur.	Less-than Significant	<u>Condition of Approval 12-1</u>	None	Less-than Significant
Aesthetic Impact 12-2. The project’s implementation will alter the site’s existing topography and necessitate the construction of numerous retaining walls.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval <del>42-4</del> <u>12-2</u> (As Modified)	None	Less-than Significant
Aesthetic Impact 12-3. The introduction of new residential and <del>commercial public park</del> uses will add new sources of artificial lighting to the project site and could result in light trespass extending beyond the project boundaries.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	None	Mitigation Measure 12-1 (As Modified)	Less-than Significant
Aesthetic Impact 12-4. Much of the San Gabriel Valley is already highly urbanized and the area’s remaining open-space areas take on greater visual significance as a respite to the dominance of urban development.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
<b>Growth Inducement</b>				
Growth-Inducing Impact 13-1. Because the project includes both an amendment to the “City of Diamond Bar General Plan” and the adoption of a specific plan, the project may result in on-site development activities that exceed current development assumptions and necessitate the provision of unplanned services and facilities beyond the project boundaries.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant
Growth-Inducing Impact 13-2. The construction of <del>202</del> <u>200</u> new dwelling units and the introduction of <del>153,985</del> square feet of <del>commercial use</del> will increase the City’s population by an estimated <del>662</del> <u>656</u> individuals, <u>require an estimated 72 construction workers to complete,</u> and <u>directly create an estimated 462 new permanent jobs</u> create an estimated additional 86 indirect and induced job opportunities.	Less-than Significant	None	None	Less-than Significant

Table RTC2-4  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**DRAFT MITIGATION REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

No.	Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification	Mitigation Milestone
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
4-1	Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all drainage facilities and improvements shall be subject to final design and engineering review and approval by the City Engineer and, for those storm drain facilities under County jurisdiction, by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW).	City Engineer	Issuance of Grading Permits
<b>Biological Resources</b>			
5-1	<del>Jurisdictional Features.</del> In order to reduce impacts to United States Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board (ACOE/RWQCB) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional waters, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, receipt of any discretionary permits and approval as may be required from the ACOE, RWQCB, and CDFG and commit to the provision of compensatory jurisdictional resources meeting or exceeding the following minimal standards: (1) the on-site and/or off-site replacement of ACOE/RWQCB jurisdictional waters and wetlands at a 2:1 ratio; (2) the on-site and/or off-site replacement of CDFG jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat at a 2:1 ratio; and (3) the incorporation of design features into the <del>proposed</del> project’s design and development <u>enhancing the site’s biological resources.</u>	Community Development Director	Issuance of Grading Permits
<b>Traffic and Circulation</b>			
6-1	Prior to the recordation of the final tract map <u>or issuance of occupancy permits for any residential development, as determined by the City Engineer,</u> the Applicant shall <u>provide complete,</u> to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, <del>the</del> those street and intersection improvements identified in the traffic impact analysis <u>or any supplement thereto, provide a bond or other acceptable instrument committing to those improvements, and/or provide a “fair-share”</u> contribution toward the cost of the improvements to the following intersections: (1) Brea Canyon Road <del>(W)</del> at Pathfinder Road; (2) Diamond Bar Boulevard at Pathfinder Road; (3) Brea Canyon Road at Cold Spring Lane; (4) Diamond Bar Boulevard at Cold Spring Lane; (5) Pathfinder Road at Brea Canyon Cutoff; (6) SR-57 SB Ramps at Brea Canyon Cutoff <del>Road</del> ; (7) SR-57 NB Ramps at Brea Canyon Cutoff/Diamond Bar Boulevard; (8) Brea Canyon Road at Diamond Bar Boulevard; (9) <u>Crooked Creek or Cherrydale Drive</u> at Diamond Bar Boulevard; (10) Brea Canyon Road at Silver Bullet Drive; (11) Diamond Bar Boulevard at Grand Avenue; and (12) Colima Road at Brea Canyon Cutoff.	City Engineer	Final Tract Map Recordation <u>or Issuance of Occupancy Permits</u>
6-2	The final site plan shall include and accommodate those traffic measures, improvements, and such other pertinent factors and/or facilities as may be identified by the City Engineer to ensure the safe and efficient movement of project-related traffic.		Site Plan Approval

Table ES-4 (Continued)  
**“ JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**DRAFT MITIGATION REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

No.	Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification	Mitigation Milestone
	<b>Air Quality</b>		
7-1	All non-residential paints shall contain no more than 0.22 pound/gallon (100 gram/liter) of volatile organic compound (VOC).	Community Development Director	Building Permit Issuance
7-2	The Applicant shall abide by any other air pollution reduction measures as may be approved by the City of Diamond Bar and/or by the South Coast Air Quality Management District.		
7-3	Traffic lane improvements and signalization, as outlined in the traffic study, shall be implemented and will generally improve local traffic flow, thereby reducing emissions created in the project area.	City Engineer	
7-4	To encourage the use of mass transportation, the Applicant shall place bus stop shelters at any bus stops situated or to be situated along any site frontage routes if not already so equipped.		
7-5	To encourage the use of localized commercial facilities and reduce the need for vehicle travel, the Applicant shall include both bike lanes (where feasible) and bike paths between the residential and commercial development areas. Additionally, the Applicant shall provide sidewalks and walking paths to the proposed commercial areas.		
7-6	The Applicant shall specify the installation of energy efficient lighting, air conditioning, water heaters, and appliances for all residential and commercial uses.		
7-7	The Applicant shall specify the installation of energy efficient street lighting.		
7-1	Site watering shall be conducted a minimum of three times daily during site preparation activities within disturbed areas lacking ground coverage.	Building Inspector	Construction Term
	<b>Noise</b>		
8-1	In accordance with the Development Code, construction shall be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM on weekdays and Saturdays. No construction shall occur at any time on Sundays or on federal holidays. These days and hours shall also apply any servicing of equipment and to the delivery of <u>construction</u> materials to or from the site.	Building Inspector	Construction Term
8-2	All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and tuned to minimize noise emissions.		
8-3	All equipment shall be fitted with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than originally equipped.		
8-4	The construction contractor shall place temporary noise barriers along the site perimeter when doing any work within 100 feet of any <u>existing</u> residential units. <u>Where feasible</u> , such barriers shall attempt to block the line of sight between the residents and construction equipment.		
8-5	The construction contractor shall specify the use of electric stationary equipment (e.g., compressors) that can operate off the power grid where feasible. Where infeasible, stationary noise sources (e.g., generators and compressors) shall be located as far from residential receptor locations as is feasible.	City Engineer	Building Permit Issuance

Table ES-4 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**DRAFT MITIGATION REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

No.	Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification	Mitigation Milestone
	<b>Noise</b> (Continued)		
8-6	Construction shall be subject to any and all provisions set forth by the City of Diamond Bar Planning Department.	Planning Manager	Building Permit Issuance
8-7	No residential units shall be located within 830 feet of the SR-57 Freeway’s nearest travel lane unless additional sound attention is provided to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.	Community Development Director	Final Tract Map Recordation
<del>8-8</del>	<del>No commercial units shall be located within 60 feet of the centerline of Diamond Bar Boulevard.</del>		<del>Building Permit Issuance</del>
<del>8-9</del> <u>8-8</u>	No residential units shall be located within 130 feet of the centerline of Diamond Bar Boulevard unless additional sound attention is provided to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.		Final Tract Map Recordation
	<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
11-1	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the Applicant and approved by the City to monitor all vegetation removal and ground disturbance to a depth of three feet within the following portions of the study area: (1) the boundary of SD-Cultural-1; (2) the open valley floor adjacent to SD-Cultural-1; and (3) the riparian areas that were not previously surveyed due to dense vegetation cover. The archaeologist will determine if additional monitoring below the depth of three feet is warranted based on soil and bedrock conditions and presence/absence of archaeological materials. No archaeological monitoring is required for ground disturbing activities outside of these monitor areas.	Community Development Director and City Engineer	Issuance of Grading Permits
11-2	If cultural resources are identified during monitoring of the ground disturbing activities, the archaeologist shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading or excavation activities in the vicinity of those resources in order to make an evaluation of the find and determine appropriate treatment. Treatment will include the goals of preservation where practicable and public interpretation of historic and archaeological resources. All cultural resources recovered will be documented on California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms to be filed with the CHRIS-SCCIC. The archaeologist shall prepare a final report about the monitoring to be filed with the Applicant, the City, and the California Historical Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center at the California State University, Fullerton (CHRIS-SCCIC), as required by the California Office of Historic Preservation. The report shall include documentation and interpretation of resources recovered, if any. Interpretation will include full evaluation of the eligibility of SD-Cultural-1 with respect to the California Register of Historic Places and CEQA. The report shall also include all specialists’ reports as appendices. The City shall designate repositories in the event that significant resources are recovered. If cultural resources are identified during ground disturbing activities that occur outside the designated monitoring area, ground disturbing activities shall be temporarily redirected away from the vicinity of the find until the retained archaeologist is notified by the Applicant. The archaeologist shall coordinate with the Applicant as to the immediate treatment of the find until a proper site visit and evaluation is made by the archaeologist.	Building Inspector	Construction Term

Table ES-4 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN”**  
**DRAFT MITIGATION REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

No.	Mitigation Measure	Compliance Verification	Mitigation Milestone
<b>Cultural Resources</b> (Continued)			
11-3	If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.	Building Inspector	Construction Term
11-4	Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified paleontologist meeting the qualifications established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists shall be retained by the Applicant and approved by the City to develop and implement a paleontological monitoring plan. Development of the monitoring plan shall include a site visit by the paleontologist prior to initiation of project development in order to determine or delineate sensitive areas. The paleontologist may also perform collections of fossils from the surface and near-surface.	Community Development Director	Issuance of Grading Permits
11-5	The paleontologist shall attend a pre-grade meeting in order to become familiar with the proposed depths and patterns of grading of the study area.	City Engineer	
11-6	The paleontologist shall establish a curation agreement with an accredited facility prior to grading permit issuance.		
11-7	A paleontological monitor, supervised by the paleontologist, shall monitor all excavations in the Puente Formation or excavations anticipated to extend into the Puente Formation. If fossils are found during ground-disturbing activities, the paleontological monitor shall be empowered to halt the ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment.	Building Inspector	Construction Term
11-8	The paleontologist shall prepare a final report on the monitoring. If fossils were identified, the report shall contain an appropriate description of the fossils, treatment, and curation. A copy of the report shall be filed with the City and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and shall accompany any curated fossils.	Community Development Director	Grading Sign-Off
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
12-1	<u>All pole-mounted or wall-mounted luminaires installed for the purpose of illuminating <del>homes, commercial public park areas, parking lots, private</del> roadways, and driveways shall conform to appropriate lighting standards and demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, that light trespass will not exceed 0.5 horizontal foot candle, as measured at the project boundaries abutting any existing residential use. These standards shall not be applied to any adjoining public streets or to any entry feature or other City-oriented signage to be constructed on or adjacent to the project site <del>other non-light sensitive land uses.</del></u>	Community Development Director City Engineer	Building Permit Issuance

Source: City of Diamond Bar

As indicated in the “City of Diamond Bar 2008-2014 Housing Element,” as adopted on April 19, 2011 (Resolution No. 2011-11), as indicated in Table RTC2-5 (City of Diamond Bar General Plan Residential Land-Use Categories), “[t]he Diamond Bar General Plan Land Use Element provides for six residential use designations.” Maximum allowable residential densities range from 1.0 to 20.0 dwelling units per gross acre.

Table RTC2-5  
**CITY OF DIAMOND BAR GENERAL PLAN  
 RESIDENTIAL LAND-USE CATEGORIES**

<b>Designation</b>	<b>Maximum Density<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Description</b>
Rural Residential (RR)	1.0	Single-family detached units on large lots, generally in hillside areas.
Low Density Residential (RL)	3.0	Single-family detached homes on large to moderate sized lots.
Low Medium Density Residential (RLM)	5.0	Single-family detached homes on moderate to small-sized lots.
Medium Density Residential (RM)	12.0	Townhomes, condominiums, apartments, mobile homes, and other multi-family residential projects.
Medium High Residential (RMH)	16.0	Townhomes, condominiums, apartments, other multi-family residential projects, and mobile home parks.
High Density Residential (RH)	20.0	High-density condominiums and apartment projects, other high-density residential projects, and mobile home parks.
Notes: 1. Density expressed in dwelling units per gross acre.		

Source: City of Diamond Bar General Plan

As specified in the City’s General Plan, the maximum allowable density within the “Low Medium Density Residential (RLM)” district is 5.0 dwelling units per acre. At about 6.6 units per gross acre (200 units/30.4 acres) and 9.9 units per net acre (200 units/20.2 acres), the resulting residential density associated with the January 2012 SDSP is most closely aligned with the City’s “Medium Density Residential (RM)” which authorizes a maximum density of 12 dwelling units per gross acre. As indicated in the City’s General Plan, that land-use designation authorizes a variety of housing types, including townhomes, condominiums, apartments and other types of both occupant-owned and rental multi-family dwellings.<sup>33</sup>

Specific plans constitute appropriate vehicles to formulate site-specific development standards. The January 2012 SDSP notes that “the Specific Plan area will contain low medium-density residential housing.” Under the City’s General Plan, the “Low Medium Density Residential (RLM)” district promotes the development of “single-family detached homes” at densities of up to 5.0 dwelling units per gross acres. However, the January 2012 SDSP allows for the development of both “attached and/or detached” housing products” at densities of up to 6.6 dwelling units per gross acre. As such, the specific plan allows for an expansion of the range of authorized housing products, with a moderate increase in allowable density, while maintaining the overall intent of the RLM district.

As illustrated in Figure 4.1.1 (City of Diamond Bar General Plan and Zoning Designations) in the DEIR, south of Diamond Bar Boulevard and east of Brea Canyon Road, the abutting property is

<sup>33/</sup> It is noted that the January 2012 stipulates that “[r]esidential units within Site D project area will consist of attached and/or detached, owner-occupied single-family product types.” A rental-type housing product (e.g., apartments) is, therefore, precluded.

designated “Low Density Residential (RL)” in the City’s General Plan. North of Diamond Bar Boulevard, properties abutting that roadway are designated “Low Medium Density Residential (RLM)” in the General Plan. Residential densities authorized under the January 2012 SDSP appear generally compatible with other proximal residentially-designated areas.

As indicated in Table 2-3 (Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for Residential Zoning Districts) in Section 22.0-8.030 (Residential Zoning District Land Uses and Permit Requirements) in Title 22 (Development Code) of the Municipal Code, “parks and playgrounds” are identified as permitted uses in all residential zones throughout the City. As such, the City has, through its local land-use policies, deemed park and park-related uses to be inherently compatible with residential use.

Although forfeiting some of the benefits available through the adoption of a specific plan, based on the proposed land uses and resulting residential density, the City could implement this alternative without the need to process a specific plan. Because the District Property is designated “Public Facility” and the City Property is designated “General Commercial,” a General Plan amendment (GPA) would still be required to a comparable residential land-use designation (e.g., “Medium Density Residential [RM]” or “High Density Residential [RH]”). Similarly, because the District Property is zoned “Low Density Residential (R-1 10,000)” and “Low Medium Residential (R-1 7,500)” and the City Property zoned “Neighborhood Commercial (C-1),” the City might elect to eliminate the commercial zoning designation for the City Property and process a zone change (ZC) to a comparable residential zoning designation (e.g., “Medium Density Residential (RM)” or “Medium/High Density Residential [RMH]”). The appropriate General Plan and zoning designations would be dependent upon the precise net acreage within the specified development footprint and the precise number of dwelling units proposed therein.

With regards to land-use compatibility, although lot sizes and product types may differ, the land-uses and allowable density authorized under the January 2012 SDSP would be generally similar to and the nature and character of the resulting residential and public park uses will closely replicate that found in other adjoining residential areas. Since none of the threshold criteria would be exceeded, no significant land-use impacts would be anticipated and no additional mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval would be required or recommended to reduce potential land-use impacts to a less-than-significant level.

***Land-Use Impact 1-2.*** *The proposed mixed-use project, including the land uses, densities, and development standards now under consideration, could conflict with the adopted plans and policies of the City.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

With regards to the March 2010 SDSP, presented in Table 4.1-2 (Project Consistency with General Plan Policies) in the DEIR is the Lead Agency’s consistency analysis with regards to those General Plan policies deemed to be most applicable to the March 2010 SDSP. With those minor revisions identified in Table RTC2-6 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Consistency with City of Diamond Bar General Plan Policies), the findings of the Lead Agency’s consistency analysis remain reasonably applicable to the January 2012 SDSP. Based on the policies examined, the January 2012 SDSP appears generally consistent with the General Plan.

Table RTC2-6  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
CONSISTENCY WITH  
CITY OF DIAMOND BAR GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

No.	General Plan Policies	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
Strategy 1.1.9 Land Use Element	Encourage the innovative use of land resources and development of a variety of housing and other development types, provide a means to coordinate the public and private provisions of services and facilities, and address the unique needs of certain lands by recognizing Specific Plan (SP) overlay designations: (a) for large scale development areas in which residential, commercial, recreational, public facilities, and other land uses may be permitted; and (b) large acreage property(ies) in excess of ten acres that are proposed to be annexed into the City.	Consistent. The proposed <del>configuration</del> of residential and <del>commercial</del> park development represents a unique <del>mixed-use</del> project and expands the range of housing <u>and recreational</u> options available to City residents.
Strategy 1.2.4 Land Use Element	Maintain residential areas which provide for ownership of single family housing and require that new development be compatible with the prevailing character of the surrounding neighborhood.	Consistent. The project includes “for-sale” residential units of <u>unspecified product type</u> . <del>The entitlement strategy is to have the maximum number of units for a Type 5 residential project approved, such that the upper limits of the entitlement could be realized if that is where the market is at the time of the project sale.</del> The general project is <u>surrounded by area includes</u> a variety of existing residential unit types, including attached and detached residential and for-sale and rental residential.
Strategy 1.2.6 Land Use Element	Broaden the range of, and encourage innovation in, housing types. Require developments within all residential areas to provide amenities such as common usable, active open space and recreational areas, when possible.	Consistent. <del>Private</del> <u>Public</u> recreational facilities will be provided on the site <u>in close proximity to existing and proposed</u> the residential areas. <del>To ensure connectivity is provided, a trail system is provided to both adjoining major streets for public transportation and connectivity to adjoining neighborhoods. Internal to the project, connectivity is provided to give residents direct access to the commercial site.</del>
Strategy 1.6.4 Land Use Element	Encourage clustering within the most developable portions of project sites to preserve open space and/or other natural resources. Such development should be located to coordinate with long-term plans for active parks, passive (open space) parks, and preserve natural open space areas.	Consistent. <del>The project includes the clustering of residential development in the upper portions of the site adjacent to the existing areas and open space. It is the City’s intent that the adjoining on-site slopes and passive open space areas surrounding the property proposed development will be enhanced by planting indigenous materials to blend the project with the existing surrounding vegetation.</del>
Goal 2 Housing Element	Provide opportunities for development of suitable housing to meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents.	Consistent. The development of <del>202</del> <u>200</u> dwelling units is being proposed.

Table RTC2-6 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**CONSISTENCY WITH**  
**CITY OF DIAMOND BAR GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

No.	General Plan Policies	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
Strategy 1.1.2 Resource Manage. Element	Require that dwelling units and structures within hillside areas be sited in such a manner as to utilize ridgelines and landscape plant materials as a backdrop for the structures and the structures themselves to provide maximum concealment of cut slopes.	Consistent. The existing site is a gently sloping plateau tending to the north with the grade flattening out at the intersections of Brea Canyon and Diamond Bar Boulevard. <u>It is the City’s intent that the project will emulate the existing site conditions in so far as the upper levels will be maintained high and the slopes that transcend from south to north will be steepened to a 2:1 ratio to maximize the amount of usable area for the site. The project is envisioned to have large slopes on between the southern edge and the adjoining residents. The <u>Vegetated slopes heights will exceed 50 feet in many places and allow for the a back drop of landscape material to screen the manufactured slopes and act as an aesthetic backdrop.</u></u>
<u>Strategy 1.5.3 Public Services and Facilities</u>	<u>Within new residential developments, encourage organizations of individual neighborhoods and discourage through traffic on local streets while maintaining pedestrian and bicycle continuity and encourage neighborhood parks, improvement programs and social events.</u>	<u>Consistent. A neighborhood park is included as a project component. Although implementation could impact a segment of a Class II bicycle lane along Diamond Bar Boulevard, the project is conditioned to ensure bicycle continuity, both during construction and following commencement of the project’s operations.</u>

Source: City of Diamond Bar

Under the provisions of the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance, codified in Chapter 22.22 (Hillside Management) of the Municipal Code, the maximum number of units that may be allowed on a given parcel is calculated in compliance with specified requirements, such that allowable density diminishes as slope grade increases on hillside properties. As indicated in Table 4.1-1 (Allowable Hillside Management Densities) in the DEIR, in accordance with the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance, a maximum of 524 dwelling units can be constructed within the project area. The 200 dwelling units authorized under the January 2012 SDSP are substantially less than allowable under the provisions of that ordinance.

Presented in Table 4.1-3 (Project Consistency with Hillside Management Objectives) in the DEIR is an assessment of March 2010 SDSP’s consistency with the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance. In the absence of an alternative-specific conceptual grading plan, the Lead Agency has assumed that the preliminary grading plan associated with the March 2010 SDSP generally represents post-project conditions resulting from the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP. Although consistency would be mandated at the time that a tentative tract map was submitted for the City’s review and although the January 2012 SDSP explicitly states that “hillside development” will be conducted in the manner “required by Diamond Bar Development Code Section 22.22 (Hillside Management),” in order to ensure that the resulting grading plan sufficiently conforms to the City’s Hillside Management Ordinance, as indicated in Table RTC2-

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval), a condition of approval (Condition of Approval 1-1) has been formulated requiring reasonable consistency therewith. As so conditioned, with the minor revisions identified in Table RTC2-7 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Consistency with City of Diamond Bar Hillside Management Objectives) herein, the Lead Agency’s previous consistency analysis remains reasonably applicable to the January 2012 SDSP. Based on the policies examined, the January 2012 SDSP, as conditioned, appears generally consistent with the Hillside Management Ordinance.

Presented in Table 4.1-4 (Project Consistency with Southern California Association of Governments Policies – 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan) in the DEIR is an assessment of March 2010 SDSP’s consistency with SCAG’s “Regional Comprehensive Plan”<sup>34</sup> (RCP). With the minor revisions identified in Table RTC2-8 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Consistency with Southern California Association of Governments Policies – 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan) herein, the Lead Agency’s previous analysis remains reasonably applicable to the January 2012 SDSP. Based on the policies examined, the January 2012 SDSP appears generally consistent with the 2008 RCP.

With regards to both local and regional land-use policy consistency, since none of the threshold criteria would be exceeded, no significant land-use impacts would be anticipated and no additional mitigation measures would be required or recommended to reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, because the January 2012 SDSP will necessitate a General Plan amendment, in order to ensure that regional plans continue to reflect local decision making, as indicated in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval), a condition of approval (Condition of Approval 1-3 1-2) has been formulated requiring coordination with SCAG.

***Land-Use Impact 1-3.*** *Project implementation requires a General Plan amendment, ~~adoption of a specific plan~~, zone change, subdivision of the project site, and other discretionary actions to accommodate the proposed land uses. Each of those actions is subject to specific findings by the City Council and/or by other responsible agencies.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

Implementation of the January 2012 SDSP would require a number of discretionary actions both from the City and from other responsible agencies. The information presented in this EIR may be used, in whole or in part, by the City and those agencies to support specific findings, as mandated by State law and by agency requirements and procedures, both as may be required under CEQA and as may be required in support of other discretionary actions.

In the event that the City and/or other responsible agencies are unable to make requisite findings, those discretionary approvals associated with those findings cannot be issued. In the absence of the issuance of requisite permits and approvals, no physical changes to the property would be anticipated and no environmental impacts would, therefore, result therefrom.

Since none of the threshold criteria would be exceeded, no significant land-use impacts would be anticipated and no additional mitigation measures would be required or recommended to reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

---

<sup>34</sup>/ Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan – Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future, October 2, 2008.

Table RTC2-7  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
CONSISTENCY WITH  
CITY OF DIAMOND BAR HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**

No.	Municipal Code Objective	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
3	Facilitate hillside preservation through appropriate development standards and guidelines of hillside areas. The guidelines are intended to provide direction and encourage development which is sensitive to the unique characteristics common to hillside properties, which include, slopes, landform, vegetation and scenic quality. Innovation in design is encouraged as long as the end result is one which respects the hillside and is consistent with the purposes expressed in this section and in the goals and objectives of the General Plan.	Consistent. <u>At the time grading plans are submitted, the City will require that the fundamental shaping of the property is be consistent or made consistent with the existing landforms.</u> <del>In order to achieve a balanced condition, those areas on the northwest side of the property which are relatively low will remain as a flatter pad area to house the neighborhood commercial project. The southeasterly portions which rise above Diamond Bar Boulevard will be maintained as high points and will house residential part of this mixed use development.</del>
3	Facilitate hillside preservation through appropriate development standards and guidelines of hillside areas. The guidelines are intended to provide direction and encourage development which is sensitive to the unique characteristics common to hillside properties, which include, slopes, landform, vegetation and scenic quality. Innovation in design is encouraged as long as the end result is one which respects the hillside and is consistent with the purposes expressed in this section and in the goals and objectives of the General Plan.	Consistent. <u>At the time grading plans are submitted, the City will require that the fundamental shaping of the property is be consistent or made consistent with the existing landforms.</u> <del>In order to achieve a balanced condition, those areas on the northwest side of the property which are relatively low will remain as a flatter pad area to house the neighborhood commercial project. The southeasterly portions which rise above Diamond Bar Boulevard will be maintained as high points and will house residential part of this mixed use development.</del>
4	Ensure that development in the hillside areas shall be concentrated in those areas with the least environmental impact and shall be designed to fit the existing landform.	Consistent. <u>At the time grading plans are submitted, the project is being City will require that the site be graded in a manner consistent with the existing landforms.</u> The site has been disturbed over a period of many years going back prior to the incorporation of the City. The site was part of a working cattle ranch.
5	Preserve, where possible, significant features of the natural topography, including swales, canyons, streams, knolls, ridgelines, and rock outcrops. Development may necessarily affect natural features by, for example, roads crossing ridgelines. Therefore, a major design criterion shall be the minimization of such impacts.	Consistent. <u>At the time grading plans are submitted, the City will require that the site's landform grading that has been proposed for the project is as consistent to the existing site condition as is reasonably possible while still allowing for the site's development.</u>
6	Provide a safe means of ingress and egress for vehicular and pedestrian traffic to and within hillside areas, with minimum disturbance to the undeveloped terrain.	Consistent. Site access has been analyzed by a traffic engineer and fair-share requirements have been set forth. Ingress and egress to the site has been carefully designed and will include a series of turning movements facilitated by increased turn pocket configurations within the median at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Crooked Creek Drive <u>or</u> Cherrydale Drive, as well as deceleration lanes and turn pockets at the site entry.

Table RTC2-7 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
CONSISTENCY WITH  
CITY OF DIAMOND BAR HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**

No.	Municipal Code Objective	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
7	Correlate intensity of development with the steepness of terrain in order to minimize the impact of grading, unnecessary removal of vegetation, land instability, and fire hazards.	Consistent. The existing site conditions have the larger portion of the property gently sloping from south to north, terminating at the drainage at Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road. The existing topography is mimicked by the proposed plan as the low areas are kept low and the high areas kept high, thus providing for the greatest amount of land stability consistent with the underlying landforms and minimization the amount of grading necessary for the property.
8	Provide in hillsides alternative approaches to conventional flat land development practices by achieving land use patterns and intensities that are consistent with the natural characteristics of hill areas (e.g., slopes, landform, vegetation and scenic quality).	Consistent. <del>The project intends to use the more conventional flat pad approach to development.</del> The ability to maintain the natural characteristics of this hill area are incumbent on the overall grading concept maintaining low areas that exist as low area and high areas that exist as high areas. The existing profile of the property will be mimicked and the <del>large</del> slopes bordering Diamond Bar Boulevard and the large slopes on the south end of the property will add to a backdrop to the development. The vegetation will include indigenous plants and, to the extent feasible, meet mitigation requirements for the California black walnut.
9	Encourage the planning, design and development of sites that provide maximum safety with respect to fire hazards, exposure to geological and geotechnical hazards, drainage, erosion and siltation, and materials of construction; provide the best use of natural terrain; and to prohibit development that will create or increase fire, flood, slide, or other safety hazards to public health, welfare, and safety.	Consistent. Planning design of the site <del>has had</del> <u>will have</u> extensive geological and engineering applications applied due to the instability associated with this region. The project design <del>seeks</del> <u>will seek</u> to ensure that existing and future residents are protected from potential geological hazards. On-site drainage <del>has been</del> <u>will be</u> handled in a fashion that provides for the existing provisions of the water quality requirements of the region as well as ensuring flood capacities are adequately handled within this property to outlying systems. In consultation with the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, on-site drainage facility will provide adequate flood protection.

Source: City of Diamond Bar

Table RTC2-8  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
CONSISTENCY WITH  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS POLICIES  
2008 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

No.	SCAG Goal, Objective, Policy, or Action	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
	Land Use and Housing Action Plan	
LU4	Local government should provide for new housing consistent with State Housing Element law, to accommodate their share of forecast regional growth.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP will allow for the development of <del>up to 202</del> <u>200</u> dwelling units which will facilitate Citywide planning efforts to accommodate the City’s share of the forecasted regional growth forecast.
	Open Space and Habitat – Community Open Space Action Plan	
OSC 8	Local governments should encourage patterns of urban development and land use, which reduce costs on infrastructure and make better use of existing facilities.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP encourages efficient patterns of urban development and land use by clustering housing <del>and concentrating non-residential uses within developable areas while retaining peripheral open space.</del>
OSC 11	Developers should incorporate and local governments should include land use principles, such as green building, that use resources efficiently, eliminate pollution and significantly reduce waste into their projects, zoning codes and other implementation mechanisms.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <del>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy conservation.</del>
	Energy Action Plan	
EN 9	Local governments should include energy analyses in environmental documentation and general plans with the goal of conserving energy through the wise and efficient use of energy. For any identified energy impact, appropriate mitigation measures should be developed and monitored. SCAG recommends the use of Appendix E, Energy Conservation, of the California Environmental Quality Act.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <del>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy conservation.</del>
EN 14	Developers and local governments should explore programs to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips such as telecommuting, ridesharing, alternative work schedules, and parking cash-outs.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <del>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy conservation.</del>
EN 15	Local governments should employ land use planning measures, such as zoning, to improve jobs/housing balance and creating communities where people live closer to work, bike, walk, and take transit as a substitute for personal auto travel.	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <del>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy conservation.</del>
	Air Quality Action Plan	
AQ 8	Local governments should practice and promote sustainable building practices by: [AQ-8.1]	Consistent. The <u>January 2012</u> SDSP incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <del>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy conservation.</del>

Table RTC2-8 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
 CONSISTENCY WITH  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS POLICIES  
 2008 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

No.	SCAG Goal, Objective, Policy, or Action	Assessment of Project Consistency/Inconsistency
	Air Quality Action Plan (Continued)	
AQ 8 (Cont.)	Updating their general plans and/or zoning ordinances to promote the use of green building practices, which include incorporating LEED design standards and utilizing energy efficient, recycled-content and locally harvested or procured materials. [AQ-8.2] Developing incentive programs (e.g., density bonuses) to encourage green building and resources and energy conservation in development practices. [AQ-8.3] Adopting policies that strive for carbon neutrality for their own facilities and operations.	
	Solid Waste Action Plan	
SW 14	Developers and local governments should integrate green building measures into project design and zoning including, but not limited to, those identified in the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, Energy Star Homes, Green Point Rated Homes, and the California Green Builder Program. Construction reduction measures to be explored for new and remodeled buildings include: [1] Reuse and minimization of construction and demolition (C&D) debris and diversion of C&D waste from landfills to recycling facilities. [2] An ordinance that requires the inclusion of a waste management plan that promotes maximum C&D diversion. [3] Source reduction through (1) use of building materials that are more durable and easier to repair and maintain, (2) design to generate less scrap material through dimensional planning,	Consistent. The <u>January 2012SDSP</u> incorporates land use principles, such as green building strategies and <u>mixed-use development, encouraging the efficient use of resources, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and facilitating energy and water conservation and waste reduction.</u>

Source: City of Diamond Bar

**Land Use Impact 1-4.** *Cumulative residential development within the City and the population increase associated with the introduction of new dwelling units could exceed the 2005-2010-2015 population growth forecasts presented in the “Regional Transportation Plan – Destination 2030” (SCAG, 2004) and which serve as a basis for regional transportation planning.*

**Level of Significance before Mitigation.** *Less-than-significant impact.*

On December 20, 2011, SCAG released the draft “2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy” (RTP/SCS). On December 30, 2011, SCAG released the “Draft Program Environmental Impact Report – 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, SCH No. 2011051018” for public review and comment. The formal comment period for those documents concludes on February 14, 2012. Since the

RTP/SCS has not been adopted and its accompanying program EIR has not been certified, information from those documents is not cited herein.

While the project and other related residential projects in the City represent only a small percent of the overall regional growth, anticipated residential development in the City exceeds the population growth estimates formulated by SCAG over the 2010-2015 time period. SCAG’s projections are used as the basis for establishing regional transportation plans. By under-estimating the pace of local development, regional plans may not be as effective in responding to areawide transportation demands. Although not likely to have any long-term implications, should the Lead Agency approve the January 2012 SDSP, the City should inform SCAG that their 2010-2015 population projections for the City should be revised upward to reflect actual development. That recommended inter-agency notification is identified as a condition of approval (Condition of Approval 4-3 1-1) herein. As conditioned, with the proposed elimination of the on-site commercial use and the introduction of a new neighborhood park, it can generally be concluded that the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP will produce lesser land-use impacts than the implementation of the March 2010 SDSP.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative land-use impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new land-use impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified land-use effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR.

### **3.3.2 Population and Housing**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a population and housing perspective, the net change represents a reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial uses, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the population and housing analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 ( “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

Presented below are those revised population and housing impacts and additional analyses deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential population and housing impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Population and Housing Impact 2-1.*** *Project construction will increase the local labor force and, through job creation and the possibility of worker relocation, has the potential to induce population growth in the general project area.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation. Less-than-significant impact.***

As indicated in the URBEMIS2007 user’s guide, construction-worker commute trip generation can be estimated by using the following equations: (1) multi-family residential trips = 0.36 trips/unit x number of units; (2) single-family residential trips = 0.72 trips/unit x number of units; (3) commercial and retail trips = 0.32 trips/1,000 square feet x number of 1,000 square feet; and (4) office and industrial trips = 0.42 trips/1,000 square feet x number of 1,000 square feet.<sup>35</sup> Assuming, for the purpose of this analysis, that each “building construction worker commute trip” equates to a construction worker and that a “multi-family” housing product is developed, with regards to the March 2010 SDSP, an estimated 73 workers would be associated with the project’s 202 units and an estimated 49 workers would be associated with the project’s 153,985 square feet of commercial use. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, assuming a “multi-family” housing type, with regards to the January 2012 SDSP, construction of the 200 housing units would require 72 construction workers. The elimination of the 153,985 square feet of commercial use will reduce the required work force by an estimated 49 construction workers.<sup>36</sup>

It is noted that the CalEEMod emissions model uses different construction and vendor trip rates than presented in the URBEMIS2007 model. As indicated therein, worker trip rates for single-family housing is represented as 0.36 daily trips per dwelling unit while daily worker trip rates for multi-family housing is represented as 0.72 trips per unit. Commercial/retail and office/industrial daily trip rates in the CalEEMod emissions model are the same as those presented in the URBEMIS2007 model.<sup>37</sup> Based on those rates and assuming a “multi-family” housing type, under the assumption that each daily trip equates to a construction worker, an estimated 145 workers would be associated with the residential component of the March 2010 SDSP while an estimated 144 workers would be associated with the January 2012 SDSP.

As demonstrated in the DEIR, the regional workforce is sufficiently sized to supply the construction workers required to implement both the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP. Since none of the threshold criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no conditions or mitigation measures are recommended or required for this alternative.

***Population and Housing Impact 2-2.*** *Project implementation will result in the addition of up to 202 200 dwelling units to the City’s existing housing stock and will increase the City’s population by approximately ~~662~~ 656 individuals, based on the California Department of Finance’s existing (January 2008) Citywide vacancy rates and average household size (3.335 persons/unit) and vacancy rate (1.71 percent).*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation. Less-than-significant impact.***

Under this alternative, a total of 200 dwelling units and an approximately 2-acre public park would be constructed. In comparison, the March 2010 SDSP assumed 202 dwelling units and, although the DEIR did not preclude the on-site dedication of parkland, assumed that park

---

<sup>35/</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District (Jones & Stokes Associates), Software User’s Guide: URBEMIS2007 for Windows, Version 9.2 – Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects, November 2007, p. A-11.

<sup>36/</sup> Based on the URBEMIS2007 model, assuming a “single-family” housing product, the 202 units associated with the March 2010 SDSP would necessitate 73 construction workers and the 200 units associated with the January 2012 SDSP would necessitate 72 construction workers.

<sup>37/</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District (Environ), California Emissions Estimator Model User’s Guide, Version 2011.1, Appendix A (Calculation Details for CalEEMod), February 2011, p. 13.

requirements would be met through the payment of Quimby Act fees. For the purpose of impact analysis, the difference between 200 and 202 units is de minimus.

Based on the California Department of Finance’s January 2008 Citywide average household size (3.335 persons/unit) and vacancy rate (1.71 percent), under this alternative, a total of 656 individuals would be added to the City’s population, as compared to the 662 individuals associated with the March 2010 SDSP. Although slightly less than the population associated with the March 2010 SDSP, for the purpose of impact analysis, the minimal difference is deemed to be de minimus. Since none of the threshold criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no conditions or mitigation measures are recommended or required for this alternative.

***Population and Housing Impact 2-4 2-3.*** *Absent a corresponding and proportional increase in long-term employment opportunities, projects that increase the City’s housing stock would contribute to the perpetuation of the existing Citywide jobs-housing imbalance.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

Under this alternative, although residential and public park uses can produce limited direct employment opportunities associated with both construction and operation, it is assumed that no substantial jobs-producing land uses will be developed on the project site. As a result, approval of the January 2012 SDSP will add to the City’s population but will not measurably add to the number of jobs available within the community. As reported by SCAG, from a jobs-housing balance perspective, the City is currently categorized as “housing rich” and “jobs poor.” Between 2010 and 2030, SCAG projects that the jobs-housing ratio for the City will decrease from 0.86 (0.86 jobs/unit) to 0.82 (0.82 jobs/unit). Since the jobs-housing ratio will remain <1.0 during the 2010-2030 timeframe, the City is not projected to achieve a jobs-housing balance. Implementation of the January 2012 SDSP will further exacerbate this imbalance.

Because few projects include both housing and non-housing components, attainment of a jobs-housing balance cannot be examined from the perspective of an individual development project but must be examined from a broader regional and subregional perspective. As indicated in the 2008 “Regional Comprehensive Plan,” SCAG’s goal is to successfully integrate land and transportation planning and achieve land use and housing sustainability by implementing the “Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy” by: (1) focusing growth in existing and emerging centers and along major transportation corridors; (2) creating significant areas of mixed-use development and walkable, “people-scaled” communities; and (3) targeting growth in housing, employment, and commercial development within walking distance of existing and planned transit stations. SCAG’s desired land-use outcomes include, but are not limited to: (1) significantly increasing the number of general plans consistent with the Compass Blueprint principles by 2012; (2) significantly increasing the number and percentage of new housing units and jobs created within the Compass Blueprint “2% Strategy Opportunity Areas” by 2012 and improving the regional jobs-housing balance; and (3) adding one new housing unit for every three persons in population growth and one new housing unit for every 1.5 full-time equivalent jobs, whichever is greater.<sup>38</sup> The project site is not located within a “2% Strategy Opportunity Area” and is not within close proximity to an existing or planned transit station. As such, from a regional planning perspective, the site does not appear to be a strong candidate for employment-oriented

---

<sup>38</sup>/ *Op. Cit.*, Regional Comprehensive Plan – Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future, pp. 17 and 18.

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

development. During the public hearing process, many speakers expressed opposition to commercial use, citing the existing sufficiency of retail opportunities in the general project area.

Since none of the thresholds criteria would be exceeded, the resulting impact remains less than significant and no additional mitigation is recommended or required. With the reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of the on-site commercial use, and the introduction of a new approximately 2.0-acre neighborhood park, it can generally be concluded that the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP will produce lesser population and housing impacts than the implementation of the March 2010 SDSP.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative population and housing impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new population and housing impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified population and housing effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR.

### **3.3.3 Geotechnical Hazards**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a geotechnical hazards perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park and park amenities generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, in the absence of a conceptual grading plan, alternative-specific geotechnical investigation, and concurrent processing of a tentative tract map, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, it is assumed that the acreage of site disturbance, the quantity of on-site grading operations, the location of cut and fill slopes, and the location and size of retaining walls would be similar to that associated with the March 2010 SDSP. Similarly, the Lead Agency has assumed that the DEIR’s assessment of geotechnical feasibility would remain generally applicable to a lesser-scale development. It is, however, reasonable to assume that the required grading will be less than represented in the DEIR since the commercial use included in the March 2010 SDSP has been eliminated. Under the March 2010 SDSP, the southwesterly portion of the project site was extensively graded to lower the elevation of the commercial pad in order to enhance the visibility of the previously proposed commercial use from abutting streets. Although the January 2012 SDSP continues to illustrate a number of “super pads” upon which development would occur, the need for or perceived benefit in enhanced street-scale visibility no longer exists.

As a result of the elimination of on-site commercial uses and the reduction of number of on-site dwelling units, fewer site users would be expected to utilize the subject property and the extend and valuation of physical improvements to the site would be expected to be less than associated with the March 2010 SDSP. As a result, the January 2012 SDSP would produce an incrementally lower level of risk than the March 2010 SDSP.

Although site-specific and use-specific geotechnical investigations are typically submitted concurrently with a tentative tract map, in order to best protect public health and safety, as indicated in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval), a new condition of approval (Condition of Approval 3-1) has been formulated requiring the Applicant’s submittal and the City Engineer’s acceptance of a subsequent geotechnical and geologic report.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, with regards to this alternative, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the geotechnical hazards analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Except as otherwise noted, the analysis presented in the DEIR is assumed to remain relevant to the January 2012 SDSP.

Presented below is the revised geotechnical hazards impact and additional analysis which is deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential land-use impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Geotechnical Hazards Impact 3-1.*** *Conversion of the project site from a vacant property to an urban use will expose site occupants to regional seismic hazards and localized geologic and geotechnical conditions. Should development occur in the absence of an understanding of those regional and local conditions, site occupants may be subjected to unacceptable geotechnical hazards.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

For the purpose of this alternative’s analysis, the Lead Agency has assumed that the geotechnical conditions on the project site have not substantively changed since release of the DEIR and that the level of site disturbance is generally similar to that described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Since the level of site disturbance for the January 2012 SDSP is not assumed to be any greater than previously examined, the environmental analysis, as well as the presence or absence of significant unavoidable adverse effects, as presented in the DEIR, remains applicable to the environmental assessment of this alternative project. As a result, no further augmentation of geotechnical hazards is presented herein. Since none of the thresholds criteria would be exceeded, the resulting impact remains less than significant and no additional mitigation is recommended or required.

Under the analysis of land-use impacts, a number of new recommended conditions of approval have been formulated (Conditions of Approval 1-1 and 3-1) to ensure review of the subsequent grading plan by the City Engineer. In addition, the previously recommended condition of approval has been modified and renumbered (Condition of Approval 3-2) to ensure that the specific plan’s design, construction, and operation complies with all applicable provisions of the Uniform Building Code’s (Title 24, Part 2, CCR) seismic standards. As conditioned, with the proposed elimination of the on-site commercial use and the introduction of a new neighborhood park, it can generally be concluded that the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP will

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

produce lesser geotechnical hazard impacts than associated with the implementation of the March 2010 SDSP.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative geotechnical hazard impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new geotechnical hazard impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified geotechnical hazard effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR.

### **3.3.4 Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a hydrology and water quality perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

Under this alternative, in order to enhance site usage, the City has retained the option of covering the existing Brea Canyon Channel and/or replacing the existing drainage facility with a reinforced concrete box, generally in the manner described in the DEIR. This option is retained, not as a binding obligation upon the Applicant, but to allow greater design flexibility should coverage be proposed as part of a precise plan of development.

Since no tentative tract map is being concurrently processed for this alternative, no alternative-specific hydrologic investigation has been performed and no conceptual drainage plan has been submitted. Although the amount of impervious surfaces on the project site would be expected to be less than projected for the March 2010 SDSP as a result of the elimination of on-site commercial uses, in the absence of a conceptual drainage plan and precise plan of development, the Lead Agency has assumed that post-project drainage flows, quantities, and qualities remain as generally described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Similarly, the Lead Agency has assumed that the DEIR's assessment of hydrology and water quality would remain generally applicable to a lesser-scale development. The level of hydrology and water quality impacts is, therefore, assumed to be no greater than the level assumed in the DEIR.

Although a hydrologic study is typically submitted concurrently with the processing of a tentative tract map and is reasonably anticipated once a formal development plan is submitted for the City's review, in order to best protect public health and safety, as indicated in [Table RTC2-2](#) (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval), a new condition of approval ([Condition of Approval 4-1](#)) has been formulated requiring the Applicant's submittal and the City Engineer's approval of a subsequent hydrologic study in conformity with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LADWP) “Hydrology/Sedimentation Manual”<sup>39</sup> and applicable County policies and procedures. With regards to compliance with standard urban storm water mitigation plan (SUSMP) requirements,

---

<sup>39/</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Hydrology/Sedimentation Manual, Hydraulic/ Water Conservation Division, June 1993.

Condition of Approval 4-3 has been revised to require conformity both with the Municipal Code and the County’s “Manual for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan.”<sup>40</sup>

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the hydrology and water quality analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance). As conditioned, with the proposed elimination of the on-site commercial use and the introduction of a new neighborhood park, it can generally be concluded that the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP will produce lesser hydrology and water quality impacts than the implementation of the March 2010 SDSP.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new hydrology or water quality impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified hydrology and water quality effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR.

### **3.3.5 Biological Resources**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a transportation and circulation perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represent a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

For the purpose of this alternative’s analysis, in the absence of a conceptual grading plan and precise plan of development, the Lead Agency has assumed that the level of site disturbance is similar to that described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Based on that site disturbance, the Lead Agency has assumed that the DEIR’s biological resources assessment would remain generally applicable to a lesser-scale development and that the level of biological resource impacts is, therefore, assumed to be no greater than the level assumed in the DEIR.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40/</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Development Planning for Storm Water Management: A Manual for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan, September 2002.

<sup>41/</sup> To the extent that the assumptions presented herein exceed the actual impacts of any resulting development, once a grading plan and precise plan of development have been submitted to the Lead Agency for review, the Applicant can request and/or submit documentation in support of a lesser level of mitigation based on those actual impacts. Once a formal development plan has been submitted, the Lead Agency will independently

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the biological resources analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSPP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) and any associated changes to the mitigation measures, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-4 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Draft Alternative Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program).

Since the level of site disturbance for the January 2012 SDSPP is not assumed to be any greater than examined therein, except where modified, the environmental analysis, mitigation measures, and recommended conditions of approval, as well as the presence or absence of significant unavoidable adverse effects, as presented in the DEIR, remains applicable to the environmental assessment of this alternative project.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSPP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative biological resource impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSPP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new biological resource impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified biological resource effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. As a result, no further augmentation of the biological resources assessment is presented herein.

### **3.3.6 Transportation and Circulation**

Additional information concerning the potential traffic-related impacts resulting from the approval and implementation of the January 2012 SDSPP is presented in “WVUSD Site D, All Residential Alternative, City of Diamond Bar” (Sasaki Transportation Services, January 11, 2012), included in Appendix RTC2-G (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” - Traffic Impact Analysis) herein. That analysis, in combination with the Lead Agency’s independent analysis, is summarized below.

Under the March 2010 SDSPP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSPP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a transportation and circulation perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSPP and the January 2012 SDSPP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

---

review both the then proposed project and the certified EIR, if so certified, to ascertain what, if any, changes to that document and to the adopted mitigation measures may be required to reflect the actual level of development.

---

---

For the purpose of estimating the number of vehicle trips associated with proposed residential uses, the March 2010 SDSP assumed a “residential condominiums/townhouse” (Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE] Code 230) housing product. As described by ITE: “Residential condominiums/townhouses are defined as ownership units that have at least one other owned unit within the same building structure.”<sup>42</sup> For consistency and for analytical purposes, so as to allow a comparative analysis between the two alternatives, the product type assumptions associated with the March 2010 SDSP have been retained for the January 2012 SDSP.

As indicated in the DEIR, if implemented, the March 2010 SDSP would result in a total of approximately 9,276 daily vehicle trips, including 272 morning (AM) peak-hour and 650 evening (PM) peak-hour trips. In comparison, the January 2012 SDSP will generate an estimated total 1,182 daily trip ends,<sup>43</sup> including 90 AM peak-hour and 106 PM peak-hour trip ends. When the two alternatives are compared, the January 2012 SDSP will produce about 8,094 fewer daily trip ends, 182 fewer AM peak-hour trip ends, and 544 fewer PM peak-hour trip ends.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the transportation and circulation analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) and any associated changes to the mitigation measures, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-4 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Draft Alternative Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program).

Presented below are the revised transportation and circulation impacts and the additional analyses which are deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-2.*** *The project is forecast to generate approximately 9,276 1,182 daily two-way vehicle trips trip ends, including 272 90 trips during the AM and 650 106 trips during the PM peak hours, and would increase traffic congestion on local and regional roadways.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.*

## **Existing Conditions**

As indicated in the traffic analysis (Appendix RTC2-G), under “existing conditions,” 17 of the 20 study area intersections currently operate at an “acceptable” levels of service (LOS) during both the AM and PM peak hours, while three of the study locations have “over capacity” operations during at least one peak hour period. Under “existing conditions,” the following intersections

---

<sup>42/</sup> Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, Eight Edition, 2008.

<sup>43/</sup> A “trip end” is defined as a single or one-direction vehicle movement, into or out of the site.

operate at an “unacceptable” LOS during one or both peak-hour period: (1) State Route 57 (SR-57) Southbound (SB) Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff (AM and PM); (2) Pathfinder Road/Brea Canyon Cutoff (PM); and (3) Brea Canyon Road/Silver Bullet Drive (AM and PM).

**Alternative Project Conditions**

As indicated in the Table RTC2-9 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Trip Generation), the 200 residential units associated with the January 2012 SDSP would generate a total of about 1,172 daily trip ends (TEs), of which 88 (14 In, 74 Out) would occurring during the AM peak hour and 104 (70 In, 34 Out) would occur during the PM peak hour. Similarly, County park generation rates were utilized in order to present a worst-case traffic analysis. As indicated by the ITE, a two-acre County park would generate about 10 daily TEs, including two AM peak-hour trip ends and two PM peak-hour trip ends. Trip distribution patterns were developed based on the assumptions used for the residential portion of the March 2010 SDSP, as presented in the traffic impact assessment (TIA) included in the DEIR. Trip assignment totals resulting from the trip generation and distribution percentages are illustrated in the accompanying traffic study.

Table RTC2-9  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**TRIP GENERATION**

Land Use	Units	Daily	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
			In	Out	In	Out
Trip Generation Rates						
Residential	-	-	-	-	-	-
Condominium/Townhouse (ITE Code 230) <sup>1</sup>	TE per DU	5.86	0.07	0.37	0.35	0.17
Park	-	-	-	-	-	-
City (ITE Code 411)	TE per acre	1.59	-	-	-	-
County (ITE Code 412)		2.28	0.008	0.002	0.02	0.04
Projected Trip Generation (Trip Ends)						
Residential	200 DUs	1,172	14	74	70	34
Park	-	-	-	-	-	-
City	2 acre	3	Nom	Nom	Nom	Nom
County		10	1	1	1	1
	Total	1,182	15	75	71	35
Notes:						
1. Assuming “site condominiums,” defined by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) as “single family totally detached dwellings (no shared garages or any other attached buildings) encumbered by a declaration of condominium covenants or condominium form of ownership.”						

Source: Sasaki Transportation Services

The January 2012 SDSP’s projected trips were then added to the “existing conditions” so that the intersection analyses could be recalculated for “with alternative project” conditions.<sup>44</sup> The

<sup>44/</sup> The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology of intersection analysis was utilized to evaluate the signalized intersections, and is the accepted procedure in the City’s “Guidelines for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Analysis Report” (July 2005). The ICU methodology requires comparison of traffic volumes to intersection lane capacities for the critical intersection movements. This volume-to-capacity comparison combined with consideration of “lost time” due to signal phasing and other factors, results in an ICU value. The ICU values are then related to Levels of Service (LOS), which are descriptions of intersection operations and range from “A” (best) to “F”

traffic study illustrates the “existing + project” traffic volumes at each of the 20 study area intersections used in the intersection analyses. Based on AM and PM peak-hour volumes, intersection analyses were completed for “existing + project conditions.” As shown in Table RTC2-10 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Intersection Analyses Summary – Significant Impact Evaluation), with regards to the January 2012 SDSP, 16 of the 17 study area intersections are operating at “acceptable” levels and three “over capacity” study area intersections maintain their same pre-project LOS conditions. Only the proposed access intersection of Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive changes from “acceptable” to “over capacity” operations.

The NB approach at the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive intersection is impacted to LOS “F” with the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP. Since the January 2012 SDSP would cause the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive intersection to change from “acceptable” to “unacceptable” operations, alternative-specific improvements to that intersection are required.<sup>45</sup> Recommended improvements, which would fully mitigate this alternative’s impacts at the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive intersection, include the installation of a traffic signal and associated roadway improvements and the widening and restriping of the EB approach and departure to accommodate a third through lane and a separate right-turn lane, as well as modification of any needed signing and associated measures. Based on previous construction assumptions,<sup>46</sup> the total estimated cost of those improvements is about \$454,875.<sup>47</sup>

Unless an alternative funding agreement or improvement plan was first negotiated with the City, those costs would be borne exclusively by the Applicant prior to the recordation of the final tract map or issuance of any occupancy permits, as determined by the City Engineer, for the resulting residential development (Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2).

Additionally, one added intersection (SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff) continues to have “over capacity” operations and is also found to be “significantly” impacted by the alternative project. The intersection is already “over capacity” and the alternative project only represents a portion of the intersection’s improvement needs. Mitigation (in the form of payment of a fair-share contribution<sup>48</sup>) is, therefore, required at this study intersection.<sup>49</sup> For that intersection, the anticipated improvements include the installation of a traffic signal and associated signing and striping modifications, as necessary. As described in the DEIR, the total estimated cost for those improvements is approximately \$228,125.

---

(worst). It is generally recognized that LOS “D” or better represents “acceptable” intersection operations, while LOS “E” and LOS “F” are considered “over capacity.”

<sup>45/</sup> Specified improvements to either the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive or the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cherrydale Drive intersections constitute a component of the January 2012 SDSP and an obligation upon the Applicant and are, therefore, neither identified as a mitigation measure nor a condition of approval herein.

<sup>46/</sup> The intersections of Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cherrydale Drive are in close proximity and either location could serve as the primary access to the project site. Improvement cost estimates are, therefore, generally assumed to be comparable at those two locations.

<sup>47/</sup> The improvement costs presented herein are intended as current estimates and are subject to change and refinement by the City Engineer following receipt of a formal development application and subsequent design-level engineering studies specifying the precise nature of the outlined improvements.

<sup>48/</sup> The TIA details the improvement measures assumed at various over capacity study locations. For this CEQA-impacted intersection (SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff,) the anticipated improvements include the installation of a traffic signal, as well as associated signing and striping modifications, as necessary. The Applicant would be responsible for the payment of a fair-share contribution toward those improvements.

<sup>49/</sup> The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has jurisdiction over this intersection; therefore, the City does not have direct control/ability to implement the identified improvement measures.

## **Year 2030 Conditions**

Year 2030 conditions include consideration of ambient traffic growth<sup>50</sup> and cumulative future projects within the project vicinity. Graphics presented in the traffic study illustrate the peak-hour traffic volumes at the 20 study area intersections for Year 2030 conditions, including ambient growth and cumulative projects (absent the alternative project).

Ambient growth was applied to all of the intersection movements at each of the study area intersections. As presented in the TIA, the list of cumulative projects included a collection of potential developments that have been provided through a number of sources. Trip generation analyses were performed so the impacts of the cumulative projects on the study area intersections could be evaluated. The trip generation totals were distributed and assigned to the surrounding street study locations. The sum of the cumulative projects volumes was combined with the ambient growth so the study area intersections could be analyzed. The peak-hour intersection volume totals are presented in the traffic study.

Year 2030, “without project” volumes are documented in the accompanying traffic study. These Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Highway Capacity Manual<sup>51</sup> (HCM) analyses were calculated for these “without project” conditions so that “baseline” conditions could be identified. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table RTC2-11 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Intersection Analyses Summary – Year 2030 Evaluation). As indicated, eleven of the study area intersections would operate at “acceptable” service levels.

For Year 2030 “without project” conditions, the following nine intersections are projected to be “over capacity” for Year 2030 conditions during the AM or PM peak hour or both: (1) Brea Canyon Road/Pathfinder Road; (2) Diamond Bar Boulevard//Pathfinder Road; (3) Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cold Springs Lane; (4) Pathfinder Road/Brea Canyon Cutoff; (5) SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff; (6) Brea Canyon Road/Diamond Bar Boulevard; (7) Brea Canyon Road/Silver Bullet Drive; (8) Diamond Bar Boulevard/Grand Avenue; and (9) Colima Road/Fairway Drive/Brea Canyon Cutoff.

The alternative project’s trips were added to the Year 2030 “without project” conditions and the appropriate analytical methodologies applied to the “Year 2030 + project” volumes so that the intersection analyses could be recalculated. As shown in Table RTC2-11 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Intersection Analyses Summary – Year 2030 Evaluation), of the eleven intersections with “acceptable” operations for Year 2030 “without project” conditions, only the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek Drive intersection is impacted to “unacceptable” operations with the addition of the January 2012 SDSP. With the implementation of the proposed improvements, this intersection will have “acceptable” operations. The other nine intersections that were found to be “over capacity” for “without project” conditions would, remain “over capacity,” although the identified improvements to the SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff intersection would provide “acceptable” operations at that location.

---

<sup>50</sup>/ Ambient growth can include both general traffic growth and potential projects not specifically included within the cumulative project list.

<sup>51</sup>/ The non-signalized intersections were analyzed using the 2000 “Highway Capacity Manual” (HCM) methodology which is similar to the ICU procedure but based on vehicle delays. The projected intersection delay is associated with the LOS descriptions to determine the operations of a particular location. Even though the basis is different (associated with vehicle delay time), the end results are essentially the same, whereby LOS “A” is considered the best and LOS “F” is considered to be over capacity. For this methodology, it is also generally recognized that LOS “A” through “D” indicates the existence of “acceptable” operations and LOS “E” and “F” indicates the existence of an “over capacity” situation.

Table RTC2-10  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**INTERSECTION ANALYSES SUMMARY - SIGNIFICANT IMPACT EVALUATION**

Intersection	ICU-Delay/LOS				ICU-Delay Increase		Significant Impact	
	Existing		Existing + Project		AM	PM	AM	PM
	AM	PM	AM	PM				
Brea Canyon Road/ Pathfinder Road	0.751/C	0.774/C	0.751/C	0.775/C	0.000	0.001	No	No
SR-57 SB Ramps/ Pathfinder Road	0.689/B	0.568/A	0.690/B	0.570/A	0.001	0.002	No	No
SR-57 NB Ramps/ Pathfinder Road	0.719/C	0.664/B	0.719/C	0.665/B	0.000	0.001	No	No
Fern Hollow Drive – Brea Canyon Road/Pathfinder Road	0.760/C	0.648/B	0.762/C	0.648/B	0.002	0.000	No	No
Diamond Boulevard/ Pathfinder Road	0.786/C	0.792/C	0.787/C	0.795/C	0.001	0.003	No	No
Diamond Bar Boulevard/ Shadow Canyon Drive	0.565/A	0.603/B	0.566/A	0.605/B	0.001	0.002	No	No
Brea Canyon Road/ Fountain Springs Road	16.0/C	13.3/B	16.1/C	13.6/B	0.100	0.300	No	No
Diamond Bar Boulevard/ Fountain Springs Road	0.579/A	0.584/A	0.580/A	0.586/A	0.001	0.002	No	No
Diamond Bar Boulevard/ Sugar Pine Place	0.496/A	0.590/A	0.497/A	0.592/B	0.001	0.002	No	No
Brea Canyon Road/ Cold Springs Lane	15.9/C	12.5/B	16.1/C	12.6/B	0.200	0.100	No	No
Diamond Bar Boulevard/ Cold Springs Lane	0.567/B	0.674/B	0.568/A	0.676/B	0.001	0.002	No	No
Pathfinder Road/ Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.789/C	0.904/E	0.791/C	0.905/E	0.002	0.001	No	No
Fallow Field Drive – Diamond Bar Road/Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.515/A	0.462/A	0.516/A	0.464/A	0.001	0.002	No	No
SR-57 SB Ramps/ Brea Canyon Cutoff	48.1/F	100.2/F	203.5/F	179.4/F	155.40	79.20	Yes	Yes
Improvements	0.665/B	0.586/A	0.677/B	0.612/B	0.012	0.026		
SR-57 NB Ramps/ Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.543/A	0.686/B	0.552/A	0.703/C	0.009	0.017	No	No
Brea Canyon Road/ Diamond Bar Boulevard	0.814/D	0.813/D	0.820/D	0.834/D	0.006	0.021	No	No
Crooked Creek Drive/ Diamond Bar Boulevard	15.4/C	9.7/A	17.6/C	59.2/F	2.20	49.50	No	Yes
Improvements	0.544/A	0.610/B	0.582/A	0.629/B	0.038	0.019		
Brea Canyon Road/ Silver Bullet Drive	1.052/F	1.021/F	1.055/F	1.023/F	0.000	0.002	No	No
Improvements	-	-	0.605/B	0.569/A	-	-		
Diamond Bar Boulevard/ Grand Avenue (CMP Intersection)	0.748/C	0.862/D	0.750/C	0.864/D	0.002	0.002	No	No
Colima Road/Fairway Drive/ Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.843/D	0.854/D	0.843/D	0.856/D	0.000	0.002	No	No

Source: Sasaki Transportation Services

Table RTC2-11  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
INTERSECTION ANALYSES SUMMARY – YEAR 2030 EVALUATIONS**

Intersection	Year 2030 Without Project		Year 2030 With Project		Year 2030 With Project Improvements		ICU – Delay Increase		ICU – Delay Benefits of Improvements	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Brea Canyon Road/Pathfinder Road	0.981/E	0.999/E	0.981/E	1.001/F	0.775/C	0.778/C	0.000	0.002	0.206	0.223
SR-57 SB Ramps/Pathfinder Road	0.877/D	0.746/C	0.878/D	0.747/C	-	-	-	-	-	-
SR-57 NB Ramps/Pathfinder Road	0.852/D	0.875/D	0.852/D	0.876/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fern Hollow Drive – Brea Canyon Road/ Pathfinder Road	0.866/D	0.827/D	0.868/D	0.828/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Pathfinder Road	1.052/F	1.193/F	1.053/F	1.195/F	0.787/C	0.874/C	0.001	0.002	0.266	0.321
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Shadow Canyon Drive	0.747/C	0.860/D	0.748/C	0.863/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brea Canyon Road/Fountain Springs Road	33.5/D	24.0/C	34.0/D	25.3/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Fountain Springs Road	0.761/C	0.835/D	0.762/C	0.837/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Sugar Pine Place	0.647/B	0.862/D	0.648/B	0.864/D	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brea Canyon Road/Cold Springs Lane	32.7/D	19.3/C	33.1/D	19.5/C	27.6/D	19.3/C	0.4	0.2	5.5	0.2
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cold Springs Lane	0.738/C	0.931/E	0.739/C	0.933/E	0.557/A	0.692/B	0.001	0.002	0.182	0.241
Pathfinder Road/Brea Canyon Cutoff	1.033/F	1.217/F	1.036/F	1.218/F	0.696/B	0.871/D	0.003	0.001	0.34	0.347
Fallow Field Dr. – Diamond Bar Road/ Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.651/B	0.608/B	0.651/B	0.610/B	-	-	-	-	-	-
SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff Improvements	-/F 0.789/C	1725/F 0.748/C	1457/F 0.805/D	2271/F 0.774/C	- 0.805/D	- 0.774/C	- 0.016	- 0.026	(LOS Imp) 0.25	(LOS Imp) 0.35
SR-57 NB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.674/B	0.823/D	0.684/B	0.827/D	0.589/A	0.743/C	0.01	0.004	0.095	0.084
Brea Canyon Road/Diamond Bar Boulevard	1.100/F	1.199/F	1.105/F	1.220/F	0.756/C	0.842/D	0.005	0.021	0.349	0.378
Crooked Creek Drive/Diamond Bar Boulevard	21.1/C	12.3/B	31.8/C	323.0/F	0.725/C	0.613/B	-	-	-	-
Brea Canyon Road/Silver Bullet Drive	1.373/F	1.463/F	1.375/F	1.466/F	0.773/C	0.791/C	0.002	0.003	0.602	0.675
Diamond Bar Boulevard/Grand Avenue (CMP Intersection)	1.164/F	1.359/F	1.166/F	1.361/F	0.881/D	0.957/E	0.002	0.002	0.285	0.404
Colima Road/Fairway Drive/Brea Canyon Cutoff	1.039/F	1.074/F	1.042/F	1.076/F	0.731/C	0.796/C	0.003	0.002	0.311	0.28

Source: Sasaki Transportation Services

As shown in Table RTC2-11 ( “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Intersection Analyses Summary – Year 2030 Evaluation), with the exception of the Brea Canyon Road/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection, the alternative project’s impacts at those “over capacity” locations would not be significant. The recommended improvements for the Brea Canyon/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection are based on those intersection improvements identified in the TIA.<sup>52</sup> Specified improvements to the Brea Canyon Road/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection, including dedication of additional right-of-way along the property’s frontages,<sup>53</sup> constitute a component of the January 2012 SDSP and an obligation upon the Applicant and are neither identified as a mitigation measure nor as a condition of approval herein. In addition, unless an alternative funding agreement or improvement plan was first negotiated with the City, the Applicant shall be responsible for the payment of a fair-share obligation for additional intersection improvements (Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2). Both the alternative project-related actions and the payment of the Applicant’s fair-share contribution would effectively mitigate the significant impacts at this location.

The amount of fair-share responsibility is proportional to the impacts created by the January 2012 SDSP. In addition to the Diamond Bar Boulevard/Crooked Creek and Brea Canyon Road/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersections, there are nine other intersections where fair-share contributions will be required to satisfy the City’s “Guidelines for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Analysis Report”<sup>54</sup> requirements. These locations, which are impacted by the January 2012 SDSP but not to a CEQA-based significance level, include: (1) Brea Canyon Road/Pathfinder Road; (2) Diamond Bar Boulevard//Pathfinder Road; (3) Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cold Springs Lane; (4) Cold Springs Lane/Diamond Bar Boulevard; (5) Pathfinder Road/Brea Canyon Cutoff; (6) SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Road; (7) SR-57 NB Ramps/Brea Canyon Road; (8) Brea Canyon Road/Silver Bullet Drive; (9) Diamond Bar Boulevard/Grand Avenue; and (10) Colima Road/Fairway Drive/Brea Canyon Cutoff.

Table RTC2-12 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Fair-Share Calculations – Year 2030) presents a summary of the Applicant’s estimated fair-share calculations. As indicated therein, the January 2012 SDSP’s impacts at the study area intersections are listed under the “project ICU increase” and the “ICU benefit” results from the improvements identified in the TIA. The “project percentage” identifies the alternative project’s monetary responsibility toward the total estimated intersection improvement costs. The alternative project’s fair-share contribution is derived by multiplying the alternative “project percentage” and the “total improvement cost.”

**Transportation and Circulation Impact 6-4. The project has the potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.**

**Level of Significance before Mitigation. Less-than-significant impact.**

---

<sup>52/</sup> As identified in the TIA, those improvements assumed for the Brea Canyon/Diamond Bar Boulevard intersection include: (1) Northbound (NB) on Brea Canyon - widen and/or re-stripe approach on Brea Canyon Road to provide a second right-turn lane; (2) Eastbound (EB) on Diamond Bar Boulevard - widen and/or re-stripe approach and departure to a third through lane; (3) Westbound (WB) on Diamond Bar Boulevard - re-stripe approach to provide a second left-turn lane; and (4) Modify the traffic signal and any signing/stripping, as required. Identified street improvements may require termination of the existing bicycle lane along a segment of Diamond Bar Boulevard.

<sup>53/</sup> The precise nature of the proposed right-of-way dedication requirements and improvements and the Applicant’s obligations associated therewith remain subject to the City’s receipt and the City Engineer’s acceptance of a design-level engineering study specifying right-of-way and/or restriping requirements.

<sup>54/</sup> City of Diamond Bar, Guidelines for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Analysis Report, July 2005.

Table RTC2-12  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**FAIR-SHARE CALCULATIONS – YEAR 2030**

Intersection	Total Project ICU Increase	Total ICU Benefits of Improve.	Project Percentage (%)	Total Improve. Cost <sup>1</sup> (\$)	Project Fair-Share Contribution <sup>1</sup> (\$)
Brea Canyon Rd./Pathfinder Rd.	0.002	0.429	0.50	280,750	1,405
Diamond Bar Blvd./Pathfinder Rd.	0.003	0.587	0.60	591,135	3,545
Brea Canyon Rd./Cold Springs Ln.	0.6	5.7	10.53	9,375	985
Cold Springs Ln./Diamond Bar Blvd.	0.003	0.423	0.71	18,750	135
Pathfinder Rd./Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.004	0.687	0.58	729,688	4,230
SR-57 SB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.042	0.6	7.00	228,125	15,970
SR-57 NB Ramps/Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.014	0.179	7.83	355,000	27,795
Brea Canyon Rd./Diamond Bar Blvd.	0.026	0.727	3.58	684,125	24,490
Crooked Creek/Diamond Bar Blvd.	NA	NA	NA	454,875 <sup>2</sup>	Project
Brea Canyon Rd./Silver Bullet Dr.	0.005	1.277	0.40	37,500	150
Diamond Bar Blvd./Grand Ave.	0.004	0.689	0.58	2,216,500	12,855
Colima Rd./Brea Canyon Cutoff	0.005	0.591	0.85	1,299,375	11,045
Total					\$102,605

Notes:

- Those improvement costs and the Applicant’s associated fair-share contribution toward those costs, as presented herein, are intended as current estimates and are subject to change and refinement by the City Engineer following receipt of a formal development application and subsequent design-level engineering studies specifying the precise nature and cost of the outlined improvements.
- The cost estimate presented herein is based on the development of a signalized intersection, including a dual left-turn lane configuration at Diamond Bar Boulevard/Cherrydale Drive. The traffic analysis, however, demonstrates that traffic to the project site can be adequately accommodated through the construction of a single-lane left-turn pocket at either Crooked Creek Drive or Cherrydale Drive. Since the cost estimates derived from the TIA presented in the DEIR have not been modified to reflect that change, the total improvement costs presented herein could potentially overestimate the actual costs for the needed improvements. Intersection geometrics and associated improvement costs will be determined at the time a detailed development proposal is presented for City review.

Source: Sasaki Transportation Services

Many users of the neighborhood park may access that facility either on foot or by means of a bicycle. Sidewalks provide pedestrians a relative level of safety by offering both a dedicated travel route (segregation) and grade separation between motorized and non-motorized travel. Except were otherwise provided, bicyclists must share roadways with automobiles, thus creating the potential for conflicts<sup>55</sup> between those user groups.

With regards to travel routes, bicycle facilities can be generally described as comprising three classifications: (1) Class I - bicycle paths (also called shared-use paths or multi-use paths) consist of a paved right-of-way for exclusive use by bicyclists, pedestrians, and other non-

<sup>55/</sup> As defined in the “Environmental Health Journal”: “A conflict is normally defined as an interaction between a bicyclist and another road user such that at least one of the parties has to change speed or direction to avoid a collision. Types of conflicts examined in bicycle safety studies include avoidance maneuvers at intersections, bicycle-motor vehicle interactions during passing events on roads, lanes, or paths, and ‘wrong side passing events’ on multi-use path (Reynolds, Conor, et al., The Impact of Transportation Infrastructure on Bicycling Injuries and Crashes: A Review of the Literature, Environmental Health Journal, October 21, 2009, 8:47).

motorized modes of travel which are physically separated from vehicular traffic; (2) Class II - bicycle lanes are defined by pavement striping and signage used to allocate a portion of a roadway exclusively for bicycle travel; and (3) Class III - bicycle routes provide shared use with motor vehicle traffic within the same travel lane.

The Circulation Element of the City General Plan identifies a Class II bicycle route along Diamond Bar Boulevard and a Class III bicycle path along Brea Canyon Road. As indicated in the General Plan, a designated Class II bicycle lane exists along Diamond Bar Boulevard and a designated Class III bicycle route exists along Brea Canyon Road.<sup>56</sup> Along all or a portion of the site's Diamond Bar Boulevard frontage, identified street improvements may require termination of the existing Class II bicycle lane. To the extent that the loss of that segment was to require that motorists and bicyclist share a single Class III travel route, elimination may increase safety hazards for both motorists and bicyclists. Additionally, by eliminating a segment of a Class II bicycle lane and created a shared roadway, as a result of different travel speeds of the two forms of transportation, traffic flow along that segment could be potentially impeded.

Bicycling has the potential to improve fitness, diminish obesity, and reduce air pollution and GHG emissions associated with vehicular travel; however, bicyclists incur a higher risk of injuries requiring hospitalization than motor vehicle occupants.<sup>57</sup> As reported by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), the National Safety Council reports that bicycle/motor vehicle accidents have resulted in about 1,000 fatalities and about 40,000 disabling injuries a year. These statistics, however, may underestimate the extent of fatalities and injuries since a substantial number of bicycle/motor vehicle accidents may not be reported to law enforcement agencies.<sup>58</sup>

Based on the high number of variables, clear and consistent information is lacking with regards to rider safety and the risk-based distinction between Class II bicycle lanes and Class III bicycle routes. A recent analysis has reported that “[o]n-road marked bike lanes were found to have a positive effect in five studies, consistently reducing injury rate, collision frequency or crash rates by about 50% compared to unmodified roadways. Three of these studies found a similar effect for bike routes. One study found that there was an increase in crash rates in the year following installation of marked bike lanes on a major road, especially for a section counter to on-road traffic flow, but this effect was not sustained over the long term.”<sup>59</sup>

In accordance with the City's “Recreation Trails and Bicycle Route Master Plan” (City Bicycle Master Plan), designated goals, applicable to both recreational trails and bicycle routes, include, but are not limited to: (1) Establish loop trail systems wherever feasible throughout the City; (2) The recreational trails and bicycle route system should, to the maximum extent feasible: [a] Link existing and future parks, [b] Link existing and future schools, [c] Link community service elements, and [d] Allow interface with each other; (3) The City's routes should link to adjacent

---

<sup>56/</sup> With regards to existing bikeways, the following categorization exists along Brea Canyon Road: (1) south City limit to Cooper Canyon – not a designated bicycle route; (2) Copper Canyon to Cool Springs Lane – Class II; (3) Cool Springs Lane to Fountain Springs Road – Class I; and (4) Fountain Springs Road to Pathfinder Road – Class III. Also, Brea Canyon Cutoff, west City limit to Brea Canyon Road is not a designated bike route (Source: Greg Gubman, letter to County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Re: Notice of Preparation – County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, May 3, 2011).

<sup>57/</sup> Reynolds, Conor, et al., The Impact of Transportation Infrastructure on Bicycling Injuries and Crashes: A Review of the Literature, *Environmental Health Journal*, October 21, 2009, 8:46.

<sup>58/</sup> United States Department of Transportation, A Study of Bicycle/Motor-Vehicle Accidents: Identification of Problem Types and Countermeasure Approaches, Volume I, Final Report, September 1977, p. 26.

<sup>59/</sup> *Op. Cit.*, The Impact of Transportation Infrastructure on Bicycling Injuries and Crashes: A Review of the Literature, *Environmental Health Journal*, 8:47.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

systems to provide access to regional facilities; (4) The City’s routes should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible, insuring appropriate dedication and improvement of rights-of-way, both in conjunction with the review and approval of adjacent developments and in the adoption of the City of Diamond Bar’s Capital Improvement Program.” Goals applicable primarily to bicycle routes include: (1) Maximize commuter and recreational opportunities; (2) Develop a balanced system providing alternative means of transportation where motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists can co-exist; (3) Provide linkages between residential areas and major activity centers (employment, recreation, shopping, education, and public transit routes); (4) Insure appropriate signage of all Class I, II, and III bike routes; and (5) Upgrade proposed routes to the highest classification possible consistent with traffic safety guidelines.<sup>60</sup>

The City Bicycle Master Plan contains design standards, addressing space requirements, use characteristics, minimum widths, clearances, gradients, roadway curvature, design speed, parking, signage, striping requirements, surface, maintenance, and drainage, have “safety as their goal.”<sup>61</sup> With regards to Class II bicycle lanes, the minimum bike lane width is four feet (with the one-foot gutter) or five feet (with a two-foot gutter). A typical motor vehicle lane next to a bicycle lane is 12 feet but, under favorable conditions, an 11-foot lane may be feasible.<sup>62</sup> With regards to Class III bicycle routes, the City Bicycle Master Plan notes that, whenever feasible, bike routes should be placed on streets in which the curb lane extends the minimum width provided for motor vehicles. Bicycle routes should be signed only if some of the following apply: (1) designated routes will provide for through and direct travel in “bicycle-demand” corridors; (2) the routes will connect discontinuous segments of bicycle lanes; (3) effort is made to adjust traffic control devices to give greater priority to bicyclists; (4) street parking has been removed or restricted in areas of critical width; (5) street imperfections or irregularities have been corrected; and (6) maintenance of the route will be at a higher standard than that of other comparable streets.<sup>63</sup>

The “County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan” (County Bicycle Master Plan) includes a number of goals, policies, and implementation actions. Designated goals include, but are not limited to: (1) Bikeway System: Expanded, improved, and interconnected system of County bikeways and bikeway support facilities (Goal 1); (2) Safety: Increased safety of roadways for all users (Goal 2); (3) Encouragement Programs: Encourage County residents to walk or ride a bike for transportation and recreation (Goal 4); and (4) Community Support: Community supported bicycle network (Goal 5).<sup>64</sup>

As indicated in the County’s “County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report” (County Bicycle Master Plan PEIR): “All surfaced roadways in the County may be used by the bicycling public even through they are not all identified as bikeways (with the exception of some limited access facilities, such as freeways). The State Vehicle Code allows roadways to be used by bicyclists. However, the lack of public awareness and the safety concerns associated with road sharing create a need for bikeways with a grade separation, lane delineation, or designated trail/path construction for bicycle users throughout the County.”<sup>65</sup> Additionally, the County Bicycle Master Plan PEIR notes that “[a]ll bikeways to

---

<sup>60</sup> City of Diamond Bar, City of Diamond Bar Recreation Trail and Bicycle Route Master Plan, Final Draft, 2001, pp. 4-5.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>64</sup> County of Los Angeles Public Works (Alta Planning + Design), County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, Final Plan – December 2011, p. xxi.

<sup>65</sup> County of Los Angeles (ICF International), Final Program Environmental Impact Report - County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, January 2012, p. 3.6-86.

be constructed as part of the [County Bicycle Master] Plan implementation would be required at a minimum to meet the design guidelines outlined in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual (California Department of Transportation, 2009) and the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California Department of Transportation, 2010). One of the key principles for these bicycle guidelines is that the bicycling environment should be safe. On- and off-road bikeways should be designed and built to be free of hazards and to minimize conflicts with external factors such as noise, vehicular traffic, and protruding architectural elements.”<sup>66</sup>

As indicated in the traffic analysis, subject to the findings of a project-level engineering analysis, identified street improvements may require either the short-term closure or termination of the existing bicycle lane along a segment of Diamond Bar Boulevard (adjacent to the site’s frontage). Because the City Bicycle Master Plan acknowledges that Class III bicycle routes can be used to “connect discontinuous segments” of Class II bicycle lanes, the short-term and/or long-term conversion of the exiting Class II bicycle lane to a Class III travel route would not appear to conflict with adopted public policy. Similarly, accident statistics do not demonstrate that such action would substantively increase public safety hazards to bicyclists and/or other motorists.

Based on the goals of the City Bicycle Master Plan and the County Bicycle Master Plan, the replacement of a short segment of a Class II bicycle lane with a Class III bicycle route should be viewed as an adverse impact but does not elevate to a level of significance under CEQA. In order to address both public safety and the potential for traffic impedance, the City has formulated a number of conditions of approval (Conditions of Approval 6-5 and 6-6) requiring consideration of Class II bicycle lane and Class III bicycle route retention both during review of the tentative tract map and during any construction activities that may result in the introduction of any short-term impediments to those lanes and/or routes.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative transportation and circulation impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new transportation and circulation impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified traffic-related effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the transportation and circulation analysis is presented herein.

### **3.3.7 Air Quality**

In addition to that information and analysis provided in the DEIR, presented in Section 4.0 (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” - Greenhouse Gas Emissions) and in Appendix RTC2-I (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – CalEEMod Emissions Model)<sup>67</sup> herein is supplemental material addressing potential GHG emissions associated with the March 2010 SDSP.

---

<sup>66/</sup> *Op. Cit.*, Final Program Environmental Impact Report - County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, p. 3.6-94.

<sup>67/</sup> In early 2011, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) released a new emissions model, identified as the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), replacing the URBEMIS2007 model used in the derivation of potential air quality impacts in the DEIR. This new model includes the emissions to be used in the GHG analysis that was not included in the URBEMIS model. In addition to estimating GHG emissions, the new model uses different assumptions for construction. In 2011, the SCAQMD also released new guidance for projecting localized impacts based on the CalEEMod emissions model. With the exception of the GHG emissions, because the DEIR’s analysis of the March 2010 SDSP and the RTC2’s analysis of the January 2012 SDSP are based on different SCAQMD emission models, the results of those analyses are not directly comparable. The relative scale of each alternative’s potential air quality impacts is, however, reasonably represented by the outputs of those two models.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

Information concerning the potential air quality impacts resulting from the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP, including both criteria and GHG emissions, is presented under this topical heading and in Appendix RTC2-H (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – CalEEMod Emissions Model) herein.

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From an air quality perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, except as otherwise noted herein, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the air quality analysis as may be required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) and any associated changes to the mitigation measures, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-4 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Draft Alternative Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program).

This impact analysis contained in this section was prepared in accordance with the methodologies provided by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), as included in the SCAQMD’s “CEQA Air Quality Handbook” (Handbook) and updates included on the SCAQMD Internet web site. The analysis makes use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) emissions model (Version 2011.1.1) for determination of daily and yearly construction and operational emissions and guidance included in the SCAQMD’s “Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.” Mobile-source emissions associated with the occupation of the site are based on the traffic-projections provided in “WVUSD Site D, All Residential Alternative, City of Diamond Bar” (Sasaki Engineers, January 11, 2012). In accordance with the January 2012 traffic study, the project would add 1,182 average daily trips.

As suggested by the SCAQMD, the significance of project-related GHG emissions is determined through a tiered analysis process. Under CEQA, if a project is not categorically or otherwise exempt, and if it cannot be shown that the GHG emissions from the project are within GHG budgets in approved regional plans, then project proponents are required to show that the project’s GHG emissions are below or mitigated to less than the following significance screening level: (1) 10,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) per year for industrial projects; or (2) 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year for commercial or residential projects.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68/</sup> As indicated in the “Minutes of the GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholders Working Group #5” (SCAQMD, September 28, 2010), “on December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted a numerical GHG significance threshold of 10,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year [metric tons CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent] for industrial projects where the

In selecting the identified threshold of significance criteria for GHG emissions for the project, the Lead Agency is neither making a determination that the selected criteria will be universally applied to all projects located within the City’s jurisdiction in which it serves as “lead agency” under CEQA nor that an alternative criteria may not be selected in the future based on information then available to the Lead Agency. With regards to GHG emissions, for the purpose of this EIR and these specified entitlements, a threshold of significance criteria of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> has been utilized.

This project includes the construction and operation of 200 dwelling units and a neighborhood park consisting of not less than two useable acres on an approximately 20.2-acre portion of the project site. For the purposes of this analysis, absent a more detailed conceptual grading plan and tentative tract map, the default acreage (12.5 acres) projected by the CalEEMod model (CalEEMod 2011.1.1) for 200 townhomes was retained for analytical purposes. The CalEEMod model does not project the asphalt use associated with various land uses. Instead, the model allows the user to assign a portion of the site as a “parking lot” and calculates the emissions associated with the construction of that area. The model’s technical manual suggests that each parking space occupies 400 square feet (including ingress and egress).<sup>69</sup> If each of the 200 dwelling units included parking for two vehicles (for residents and their guests), parking (including ingress and egress) would occupy a total of approximately 3.8 acres. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that a total of 4.0 on-site acres are paved for parking and roadway purposes. The remaining acreage, totaling approximately 13.2 acres, is assigned to the park and open space and is assumed to be included in the overall site preparation and grading effort.

To best calculate construction emissions and stationary source emissions associated with site occupancy, it is necessary to delineate the work effort used in the analysis. Projected air emissions are calculated using the CalEEMod (CalEEMod 2011.1.1), as released in February 2011. The CalEEMod model uses EMFAC2007 emissions factors for vehicle traffic. For the purposes of this analysis, construction is estimated to begin in April 2013 and follow the default construction schedule, phased in accordance with the CalEEMod model timeframe. Equipment use and timing for the construction effort are based on model default values.

Presented below are the revised air quality impacts and additional analyses deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential air quality impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Air Quality Impact 7-1.*** *Because the project involves a General Plan amendment and zone change, it has the potential to be inconsistent with the applicable air quality management plan.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

---

SCAQMD is the lead agency. [SCAQMD] Staff is now proposing to extend the industrial GHG significance threshold for use by all lead agencies. Similarly, with regards to numerical residential/commercial GHG significance thresholds, at the 11/19/2009 stakeholder working group meeting staff presented two options that lead agencies could choose; option #1 – separate numerical thresholds for residential projects (3,500 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year), commercial projects (1,400 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year), and mixed use projects (3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year) and option #2 – a single numerical threshold for all non-industrial projects of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. If a lead agency chooses one option, it must consistently use that same option for all projects where it is lead agency. The current staff proposal is to recommend the use of option #2, but allow lead agencies to choose option #1 if they prefer that approach.”

<sup>69/</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District, *et al.*, CalEEMod™ Technical Paper – Methodology Reasoning and Policy Development of the California Emission Estimator Model, July 2011, Appendix A, p. 17.

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

Ignoring the potential commercial development opportunities associated with the existing City General Plan (“General Commercial [GC]”) and zoning (“Neighborhood Commercial [C-1]”) designations of the City Property, based on the City General Plan’s existing “Public Facilities” designation of the District Property and the assumptions presented in the DEIR’s alternatives analysis (Table 6-2), development under the existing City General Plan would likely generate an estimated 2,478 daily vehicle trips during a typical weekday, including 336 AM peak-hour trips. In comparison, the January 2012 SDSP is projected to generate approximately 1,182 daily two-way vehicle trips, including 88 trips during the weekday AM and 108 trips during the PM peak hours. The alternative project, therefore, represents only about 47.7 percent of the trips that could be generated under build-out in accordance with the existing City General Plan. Because vehicles are the primary source of emissions associated with site occupancy and because the January 2012 SDSP results in a substantially lesser number of trip ends than might otherwise be generated under the policies of the City General Plan, the alternative project is consistent with the emissions projections that would be expected under the existing City General Plan.

With regards to criteria emissions, neither the construction (Table RTC2-13) nor the operation (Table RTC2-14) of the January 2012 SDSP is projected to exceed the daily threshold values suggested by the SCAQMD. Similarly, with the prescribed mitigation for dust during site preparation (Mitigation Measure 7-1), neither the construction (Table RTC2-15) nor the operation (Table RTC2-16) of the January 2012 SDSP is projected to exceed the annual threshold value for GHG suggested by the SCAQMD. The project would, therefore, not result in significant localized air quality impacts. As such, the project is consistent with the goals of the 2007 AQMP and, in that respect, does not present a significant air quality impact.

***Air Quality Impact 7-2.*** *Construction of the proposed project has the potential to violate or add to a violation of air quality standards.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

As noted, the project involves the construction of 200 dwelling units. As a default value inherent in the emissions model, the CalEEMod allocates these structures over an area of approximately 12.5 acres. For the calculation of asphalt emissions, parking and roadway areas are based the CalEEMod value of 400 square feet per parking space. Assume two parking spaces per unit (including ingress and egress), a total of approximately 3.7 acres of pavement is estimated. In the absence of a detailed street plan, for the purpose of this analysis, this area was increased to 4.0 acres. The remainder of the developable site was allocated to the new neighborhood park and other on-site open space areas.

SCAQMD’s Rule 403 governs fugitive dust emissions from construction projects. This rule sets forth a list of control measures that must be undertaken for all construction projects to ensure that no dust emissions from the project are visible beyond the property boundaries. Adherence to Rule 403 is mandatory and as such, does not denote mitigation under CEQA. The following analysis assumes the use of the minimal measures specified in Rule 403 that overlap between the rule and the URBEMIS model. These include: (1) soil stabilizers shall be applied to all disturbed, inactive areas; (2) ground cover shall be quickly applied in all disturbed areas; (3) the active construction site shall be watered twice daily; (4) stockpiles shall be covered with tarps; and (5) unpaved haul roads shall be watered twice daily. The model assigns a control efficiency of 55 percent for twice daily watering and a similar efficiency was assumed for other controlled dust-producing, heavy equipment activities. In actuality, Rule 403 specifies several measures that the CalEEMod model does not consider so the modeled PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions associated with fugitive dust are considered conservative.

Table RTC2-13  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**COMPARISON OF PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS**  
**AND DAILY CRITERIA VALUES**  
(pounds/day)

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub> Dust	PM <sub>10</sub> Exhaust	PM <sub>10</sub> Total	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Dust	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Exhaust	PM <sub>2.5</sub> Total
Site Preparation (20 Days)										
Fugitive Dust <sup>a</sup>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.66	0.00	3.66	2.01	0.00	2.01
Off Road Diesel <sup>1</sup>	9.90	79.99	45.35	0.07	0.00	3.93	3.93	0.00	3.93	3.93
Worker Trips <sup>b</sup>	0.13	0.14	1.33	0.00	0.28	0.01	0.29	0.01	0.01	0.02
Totals	10.03	80.13	46.68	0.07	3.94	3.94	7.88	2.02	3.94	5.96
Grading (45 Days)										
Fugitive Dust <sup>c</sup>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.76	0.00	1.76	0.67	0.00	0.67
Off Road Diesel <sup>2</sup>	11.85	97.47	52.85	0.10	0.00	4.59	4.59	0.00	4.59	4.59
Worker Trips <sup>d</sup>	0.15	0.15	1.48	0.00	0.31	0.01	0.32	0.01	0.01	0.02
Totals	12.00	97.62	54.33	0.10	2.07	4.60	6.67	0.68	4.60	5.28
Building Construction (440 Days)										
Off Road Diesel <sup>3</sup>	5.17	34.66	23.45	0.04	0.00	2.28	2.28	0.00	2.28	2.28
Vendor Trips <sup>e</sup>	0.36	3.73	2.59	0.01	0.20	0.13	0.33	0.02	0.13	0.15
Worker Trips <sup>f</sup>	1.05	1.11	11.21	0.02	2.21	0.08	2.29	0.08	0.08	0.16
Totals	6.58	39.50	37.25	0.07	2.41	2.49	4.90	0.10	2.49	2.59
Asphalt Paving (35 Days)										
Off-Gas <sup>4, g</sup>	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Off Road Diesel <sup>4, h</sup>	4.89	30.10	20.54	0.03	0.00	2.54	2.54	0.00	2.54	2.54
Worker Trips <sup>i</sup>	0.09	0.10	0.93	0.00	0.23	0.01	0.24	0.01	0.01	0.02
Totals	5.28	30.20	21.47	0.03	0.23	2.55	2.78	0.01	2.55	2.56
Architectural Coating (35 Days)										
Off-Gas <sup>5, j</sup>	44.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Off Road Diesel <sup>6, k</sup>	0.41	2.57	1.90	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.22	0.00	0.22	0.22
Worker Trips <sup>l</sup>	0.18	0.19	1.81	0.00	0.45	0.02	0.46	0.02	0.02	0.03
Totals	45.25	2.76	3.71	0.00	0.45	0.24	0.68	0.02	0.24	0.25
Daily Threshold	75	100	550	150	→	→	150	→	→	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	→	→	No	→	→	No
Notes: Appendix RTC2-H, Site D Alternative, Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer (Criteria Emissions): 1. 3.3 (Site Preparation – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 5 of 25. 2. 3.4 (Grading – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 7 of 25. 3. 3.5 (Building – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 9 of 25. 4. 3.6 (Paving – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 15 of 25. 5. 3.7 (Architectural Coating – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Architectural Coating), p. 17 of 25. 6. 3.7 (Architectural Coating – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 17 of 25.										

Table RTC2-13 (Continued)  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
COMPARISON OF PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS  
AND DAILY CRITERIA VALUES**

- Notes (Continued):  
Appendix RTC2-H, Site D Alternative, Los Angeles-South Coast County, Winter (Criteria Emissions):
- a. 3.3 (Site Preparation – 2013) (Mitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 6 of 25.
  - b. 3.3 (Site Preparation – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 6 of 25.
  - c. 3.4 (Grading – 2013) (Mitigated Construction On-Site) (Fugitive Dust), p. 8 of 25.
  - d. 3.3 (Grading – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 8 of 25.
  - e. 3.5 (Building Construction – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Vendor), p. 10 of 25.
  - f. 3.5 (Building Construction – 2013) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 10 of 25.
  - g. 3.6 (Paving – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Paving), p. 15 of 25.
  - h. 3.6 (Paving – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Off-Road), p. 16 of 25.
  - i. 3.6 (Paving – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 16 of 25.
  - j. 3.6 (Architectural Coating – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Architectural Coating), p. 17 of 25.
  - k. 3.6 (Architectural Coating – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction On-Site) (Off-Road), p. 17 of 25.
  - l. 3.6 (Architectural Coating – 2015) (Unmitigated Construction Off-Site) (Worker), p. 18 of 25.

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

Table RTC2-14  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE  
DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS<sup>1</sup>**  
(pounds/day)

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Mobile Sources	8.62	21.61	80.64	0.15	16.93	1.50
Natural Gas	0.14	1.21	0.51	0.01	0.10	0.10
Fireplaces	5.28	0.20	17.03	0.00	0.33	0.33
Landscape Maintenance	0.54	0.20	17.01	0.00	0.09	0.09
Structural Maintenance	0.43	---	---	---	---	---
Consumer Products	3.96	---	---	---	---	---
Operational Total	18.97	23.22	115.19	0.16	17.45	2.02
Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

- Notes:  
Appendix RTC2-H, Site D Alternative, Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer and Winter (Criteria Emissions):
1. 2.2 (Overall Operational (Unmitigated Operational) (Mobile), p. 4 of 25.
  2. 5.3 (Energy by Land Use) (Mitigated) (Natural Gas) (Condo/Townhouses), p. 22 of 25.
  3. 6.1 (Mitigation Measures Area) (Unmitigated), p. 23 of 25.
  4. 6.2 (Area by Subcategory) (Unmitigated) (Landscaping), p. 23.
  5. 6.2 (Area by Subcategory) (Unmitigated) (Architectural Coating), p. 23.
  6. 6.2 (Area by Subcategory) (Unmitigated) (Consumer Products), p. 23.

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

Table RTC2-13 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Comparison of Projected Construction Emissions and Daily Criteria Values) includes the daily emissions projected for site construction. The CalEEMod emissions model projects both summer and winter emissions. Because these differ for mobile sources, the higher of the two values were included in the summary table. As indicated therein, all values are below their respective thresholds and the

projected air quality impact of the construction of the January 2012 SDSP with regards to criteria emissions is less than significant.

Table RTC2-15  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION BY YEAR**  
(metric tons/year)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> e
2013	682.65	0.07	0.00	684.02
2014	751.32	0.06	0.00	752.67
2015	193.56	0.02	0.00	193.93
Construction Total (Multiple Year)	---	---	---	1,530.62
Threshold	---	---	---	3,000.00
Exceeds Threshold?	---	---	---	No
Notes: 1. Appendix RTC2-H, Site D Alternative, Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual (GHG Emissions), 2.1 (Overall Construction) (Unmitigated Construction), p. 3 of 28.				

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

As indicated in the DEIR (Table 4.7-5), with regards to ROG emissions, construction of the March 2010 SDSP would result in an exceedance of SCAQMD’s recommended threshold criteria. For criteria emissions, ROG, therefore, constitutes the controlling emission with regards to short-term air quality impacts. Because the air quality analysis of the March 2010 SDSP was not repeated using the CalEEMod emissions model and because those two models could potentially yield different analytical results, a comparison between the two methodologies is needed. A comparative analysis of the two models is presented in the SCAQMD’s “Technical Paper – Methodology Reasoning and Policy Development of the California Emission Estimator Model.” As indicated therein, under the discussion of “differences in methodology between CalEEMod and URBEMIS for construction emission,” the SCAQMD states that the CalEEMod emissions model yields an “increase in ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub>” emissions” and a “decrease in construction PM” for the construction profile.<sup>70</sup> As a result, for the purpose of comparative analysis, because the CalEEMod emissions model over-estimate ROG emissions while the URBEMIS model may under-estimate those emissions, the continued application of separate methodologies allows for a more conservative estimate of the January 2012 SDSP relative to the March 2010 SDSP for the critical criteria emissions.

***Air Quality Impact 7-3.*** Operation of the ~~proposed~~ project has the potential to violate or add to a violation of air quality standards.

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** Less-than-significant impact.

Since stationary sources add only minimally, the major source of long-term air quality impacts for criteria pollutants is that associated with the emissions produced from project-generated vehicle trips. With regards to mobile source emissions, at completion and based on the findings of the traffic analysis, the January 2012 SDSP is estimated to produce about 1,182 ADT.

<sup>70</sup>. South Coast Air Quality Management District, Technical Paper – Methodology Reasoning and Policy Development of the California Emission Estimator Model, July 2011, Table 1, p. 5.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

Emissions associated with project-related trips are based on the CalEEMod emissions model and assume occupancy in 2015. Since emissions per vehicle are reduced each year due to tightening emissions restrictions and the replacement of older vehicles, the use of 2015 emission factors presents a worst-case analysis with regards to operational air quality impacts.

Both summer and winter scenarios were modeled and the higher of the two values included in Table RTC2-14 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Daily Operational Emissions). With regards to stationary source emissions, in addition to vehicle trips, the residents would produce emissions from on-site sources, including the combustion of natural gas for fireplaces and space and water heating. Landscaping would be maintained, thus requiring the use of gardening equipment and its attendant emissions. Additionally, the structures would be maintained and this requires repainting over time, thus resulting in the release of additional VOC emissions. Since the use of consumer aerosol products is associated with the project, the resultant emissions are included in Table RTC2-14 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Daily Operational Emissions). As indicated therein, all emissions are within their respective threshold values and the impact is less than significant.

As indicated in the DEIR (Table 4.7-6), with regards to ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO, operation of the March 2010 SDSP would result in an exceedance of SCAQMD’s recommended threshold criteria. For criteria emissions, ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO, therefore, constitutes the controlling emission with regards to long-term air quality impacts. Because the air quality analysis of the March 2010 SDSP was not repeated using the CalEEMod emissions model and because those two models could potentially yield different analytical results, a comparison between the two methodologies is needed. A comparative analysis of the two models is presented in the SCAQMD’s “Technical Paper – Methodology Reasoning and Policy Development of the California Emission Estimator Model.” As indicated therein, under the discussion of “differences in methodology between CalEEMod and URBEMIS for the operational emission sector,” the SCAQMD states that, based on the CalEEMod emissions model, “exhaust emissions increase or decrease depending upon land use,” “VOC emissions tend to be lower,” and “exhaust emissions tend [to] be lower.”<sup>71</sup> As a result, for the purpose of comparative analysis, because the CalEEMod emissions model over-estimate ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO emissions while the URBEMIS model may under-estimate those emissions, the continued application of separate methodologies allows for a more conservative estimate of the January 2012 SDSP relative to the March 2010 SDSP for the critical criteria emissions.

***Air Quality Impact 7-4.*** *The project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Significant.*

### Construction

The SCAQMD has developed screening tables for the construction of projects up to five acres in size. These tables are included in the SCAQMD’s “Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology” (June 2003). The emissions values included in the screening tables are based on the emissions produced at the site and do not include mobile source emissions (i.e., trucks and worker vehicles) spread over a much larger area. The January 2012 SDSP encompasses an area of about 30.4 acres and is larger than the examples included within the “Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.” However, because emissions are spread over a larger

---

<sup>71</sup>. *Ibid.*, Table 4, p. 10.

area, there is more area for emissions to dissipate before making their way off the project site. If it can be shown that the daily emissions do not exceed those for a 5-acre site, then off-site concentrations for a 30.4-acre site would themselves be less than significant.

Screening level allowable emissions are then calculated from the “mass-rate look-up tables” included in the “Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology” (Appendix C). The CalEEMod emissions model bases the area of disturbance on equipment use. Dozers, graders, and tractors are estimated to disturb an area of 0.5 acre while scrapers are estimated to disturb 1.0 acre over an 8-hour work day. The highest level of on-site CO and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are produced during site grading and the emissions model assumes that the effort requires two excavators (0.5 acre each), one grader (0.5 acre), one dozer (0.5 acre), two scrapers (1 acre each), and two tractors (0.5 acre each) to this task, totaling 5.0 acres per day. PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> peak during site preparation and the emissions model assigns three dozers (0.5 acre each) and four tractors (0.5 acre each) to this task totaling 3.5 acres per day. Based on the SCAQMD’s “Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds,” the area of disturbance for grading is to be based on 5.0 acres while that for site preparation is to be based on 3.5 acres. In accordance with the “Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology,” the allowable level for sites that are between 2.0 and 5.0 acres may be extrapolated from those acreages. In this case, 3.5 acres is half-way between 2.0 and 5.0 acres and the allowable levels would also be half-way between the presented levels for projects of those sizes.

For projects of 5.0 acres in size located in SRA 10 (Pomona/Walnut Valley) with sensitive receptors located at distances of 25 meters, the most proximate distance to be used in localized analyses, on-site emissions would not create significant localized emissions impacts if CO and NO<sub>x</sub> levels do not exceed 1,566.0 and 488.0 pounds per day, respectively. PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels would not create a localized impact if daily levels do not exceed 9.0 and 5.5 pounds per day, respectively, for a 3.5-acre site. Peak day, on-site CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels are projected at 52.85, 97.47, 7.59, and 5.94 pounds per day, respectively. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are projected to exceed the 5.5 pounds per day threshold value, resulting in a potentially significant impact. In response, the Lead Agency has formulated a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 7-1) specifying that site watering shall be increased from twice to three times daily.

The CalEEMod model indicates that twice daily site watering results in a control efficiency of 55 percent. Three times daily watering during site preparation would increase this efficiency to no less than 61 percent, as projected by the emissions model. The PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions associated with fugitive dust would, therefore, be reduced from 2.01 to 1.51 pounds per day. When combined with the exhaust emissions, PM<sub>2.5</sub> then totals 5.44 pounds per day. This value is under the 5.5 pound per day threshold and the impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

## **Operations**

Long-term effects of the January 2012 SDSP could also be significant if they exceed the CAAQS. As noted for construction, these criteria only apply to CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. CO and NO<sub>2</sub> would be significant if the project were to raise existing levels above those values included in the CAAQS. Because the Basin is a “non-attainment” area for particulate matter, the operational thresholds for both PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are set at a measurable increase of 2.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

Unlike construction equipment that generates exhaust and dust in a set area, the primary source of operational emissions is the addition of vehicles on the roadway system. These emissions are then spread over a vast area and do not result in localized concentrations in

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

proximity to the site. As such, localized modeling for a project’s operations is not typically prepared for residential, limited commercial, or light industrial uses that do not include a truck terminal. No localized operational impacts would, therefore, be projected.

At the broader scale, CO is the criteria pollutant that is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and, in the past, was typically used to demonstrate the potential for localized operational impacts. However, the SCAB has now been designated an “attainment” area of both State and federal CO standards and no “hot spots” have been reported in the Pomona/Walnut Valley Source Receptor Area (SRA 10) in more than five years. CO is no longer a localized pollutant of concern near roadways and, as such, this analysis is no longer required.

CO “hot spot” modeling conducted for the March 2010 SDSP, which included both commercial and residential components, which generated more peak-hour traffic than the January 2012 SDSP and which was modeled using higher emitting (older) vehicles, did not result in any significant localized CO impacts. No significant localized CO impacts would, therefore, be expected to result from the implementation of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Air Quality Impact 7-6.*** *The project, in combination with other related projects, has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, projects that do not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values do not add significantly to a cumulative air quality impact. With regards to criteria emissions, the air quality analysis demonstrates that construction impacts (without mitigation) and operational impacts (with mitigation) will not exceed the specified threshold standards and will not result in the generation of either significant short-term or long-term air quality impact. Because the project will not contribute significantly to regional air emissions, cumulative air quality impacts are less than significant.

***Air Quality Impact 7-7.*** *The project has the potential to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

### **Construction**

In accordance with the provisions of the January 2012 SDSP, the use of renewable and recyclable materials will be mandated for the construction of all structures on the project. Additionally the project shall divert any construction or demolition wastes away from landfills in accordance with the standards set by the City. Moreover, where possible, porous or pervious pavement should be used for walks and driveway surfaces and parking areas and pavement materials should be a light color to reflect heat and reduce the heat island effect.

Construction activities would consume fuel and result in the generation of GHG emissions. Construction CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions are as projected using the CalEEMod emissions model and, as a reasonable worst-case scenario, are included in [Table RTC2-15](#) (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emission by Year). The CalEEMod emissions model indicates that construction could generate approximately 684.02 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2013, 752.67 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2014, and 193.95 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2015. All of these values are well under

the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year and the impact on construction of the January 2012 SDSP on GHG emissions is less than significant.

## Operations

The January 2012 SDSP includes a number of GHG-related requirements that constitute specific plan-imposed design features of the project. The environment and project sustainability requirements outlined therein are key components of the January 2012 SDSP. The City has formulated policies addressing sustainable development which specify development goals and other actions which will be updated from time to time. As indicated in the January 2012 SDSP, a fundamental strategy for this project is to create a “green” and sustainable community.

While there is no formal definition of “green” site design, the term implies a site structure that is friendlier to its occupants and the environment and is more resource efficient. In general, “green” building design entails the implementation of the following related community goals: energy efficiency, healthy indoor air quality, waste reduction, water efficiency, and reduced environmental impacts. To this end, the City will require that the project be reviewed by a third-party consultant to determine if the proposed development meets the certification requirements of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)<sup>72</sup> or an equivalent program be attained by the project.

As outlined below, specific design features have been included in the January 2012 SDSP. Where appropriate, the following design features were included in the CalEEMod emissions modeling analysis and were used to replace the model’s default values.

- **Water Use:** (1) The use of drought-resistant plant materials, reclaimed water for all public landscape irrigation purposes, water-saving systems, and the use of stormwater filtering systems, where feasible and appropriate; (2) Landscaping water usage will be reduced by using drought tolerant, California-friendly plant material and irrigation systems that measure the local weather condition and respond to current conditions; (3) The use of turf will be discouraged and, if used, will only be allowed in community recreation areas; (4) Rainwater can be diverted with a roof collection system and used to irrigate drought-tolerant gardens<sup>73</sup>; and (5) All development will comply with water-saving features such as utilizing low-flow showerheads, faucets, and water closets.<sup>74</sup>
- **Energy:** (1) Reduction of energy usage can be accomplished by using passive solar techniques and low-energy lighting; to reduce energy costs, passive solar techniques shall be utilized, such as incorporating roof overhangs, awnings, trellises, and shade trees to selectively control heat gain, installation of windows to catch breezes and provide cross ventilation; (2) The residential structures will be required to obtain LEED or equivalent certification; (3) All structures will be oriented to take advantage of solar

---

<sup>72/</sup> Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) consists of a suite of rating systems for the design, construction, and operation of high performance “green” buildings, homes, and neighborhoods. Developed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC), LEED is intended to provide building owners and operators a concise framework for identifying and implementing practical and measurable “green” building design, construction, operations, and maintenance solutions.

<sup>73/</sup> The 100 percent the use of reclaimed and grey water for exterior watering within public areas was used in the modeling effort. Although the CalEEMod emissions model allows for a reduction, because the actual areas of turf are undetermined at this time, no reduction was taken for “turf reduction.” Additionally, the model default value of 6.1 percent reduction in water use was assumed for irrigation controls.

<sup>74/</sup> Low-flow bathroom and kitchen faucets, toilets, and showers were assumed using the model default control efficiencies of 32, 18, 20, and 20 percent, respectively.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

- orientation<sup>75</sup>; (4) The residential project will be required to meet a 50 percent solar requirement<sup>76</sup>; and (5) As appropriate, appliances shall be “Energy Star” qualified appliances.<sup>77</sup>
- Outdoor Lighting: (1) As much as possible, outdoor lighting shall be designed to prevent glare, light trespass, and sky glow; permanently installed lighting shall not blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness; (2) Be energy-efficient and shielded so that all glare is confined within the boundaries of the site; (3) Use timers, where acceptable, to turn outdoor lights off during hours when they are not needed; (4) Be appropriate in height, intensity, and scale to the uses they are serving; (5) Use no more intensity than absolutely necessary; and (6) Where appropriate, use light emitting diode fixtures.<sup>78</sup>

During the project’s operational life, the majority of GHG emissions, specifically CO<sub>2</sub>, are due to vehicle travel and energy consumption. It is projected that all emission sources, including mobile, area source, energy, waste, and water conveyance, generate approximately 3,185.21 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis.<sup>79</sup> The resulting operational impact (unmitigated), exceeds the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year and the impact is considered potentially significant. As shown in Table RTC2-16 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Yearly Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions), once the project’s proposed energy and water conservation measures are included and the CalEEMod emissions model rerun, for all sources (i.e., mobile, area source, energy, waste, and water conveyance), estimated operational GHG emissions are reduced to approximately 2,959.59 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year. This value is under the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e and the impact of GHG emissions attributable to the January 2012 SDSP is less than significant.

With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, estimated construction (unmitigated) and operational (mitigated) GHG emissions are projected to be less than significant. In this context, “mitigated” refers to those measures already included in the alternative project description. As such, no additional mitigation measures are required or recommended.

***Air Quality Impact 7-8.*** *The project has the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

An impact can also be potentially significant if the project does not comply with the applicable plans necessary for the reduction of greenhouse gases. Projects that generate de minimus quantities of emissions (i.e., less than 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year) and do not result in a significant impact or can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level would be deemed to be in compliance of State policies with respect to GHG. Even so, the project is subject to the requirements of AB 32 and any applicable requirement as may be set forth therein. Like adherence to SCAQMD requirements (e.g., Rule 403 for dust control), adherence to AB 32 and any measures outlined therein are mandated and, as such, do not constitute mitigation under CEQA.

---

<sup>75/</sup> Buildings were assumed to exceed existing Title 24 standards by 10 percent.

<sup>76/</sup> Fifty percent of the electricity is assumed to be generated on the project site.

<sup>77/</sup> Energy-efficient clothes and dishwasher, fans, and refrigerators are assumed using model default control efficiencies of 30, 15, 50, and 15 percent, respectively.

<sup>78/</sup> For these measures, a 10 percent lighting energy reduction was used in the CalEEMod emissions model.

<sup>79/</sup> Appendix RTC2-H (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – CalEEMod Emissions Model), 2.2 (Overall Operational – Unmitigated Operational), p. 4 of 28.

Table RTC2-16  
**“JANUARY 2012 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” ALTERNATIVE**  
**YEARLY OPERATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**  
(metric tons/year)

Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> e
Mobile Sources	2,004.61	0.08	0.00	2,006.23 <sup>1</sup>
Electricity	431.50	0.01	0.00	432.90 <sup>2</sup>
Natural Gas	255.26	0.00	0.00	256.81 <sup>2</sup>
Landscape Maintenance	4.97	0.01	0.00	5.08 <sup>3</sup>
Fireplaces	129.67	0.00	0.00	130.46 <sup>3</sup>
Water Use	76.37	0.32	0.01	85.75 <sup>4</sup>
Waste Disposal	18.91	1.12	0.00	42.37 <sup>5</sup>
Operational Total (Single Year)	2,921.29	1.54	0.01	2,959.59
Threshold	---	---	---	3,000.00
Exceeds Threshold?				No
Notes: Appendix RTC2-H, Site D Alternative – Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual: 1. 4.1 (Mitigation Measures Mobile – Mitigated/Unmitigated), p. 20 of 28. 2. 5.1 (Mitigation Measures Energy – Mitigated), p. 21 of 28. 3. 6.2 (Area by Subcategory – Mitigated), p. 25 of 28. 4. 7.2 (Water by Land Use – Mitigated), p. 26 of 28. 5. 8.2 (Waste by Land Use – Mitigated), p. 28 of 28.				

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

The worst-case construction year is estimated to generate about 752.67 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. This value is below the 3,000-MTCO<sub>2</sub>e threshold and the cumulative impact to climate change is less than significant. As such, construction of the January 2012 SDSP would not conflict with existing plans and policies.

Operationally, the project would be LEED-certified and follow “green” techniques as required by the City and outlined in the January 2012 SDSP. Using these techniques, based on the CalEEMod emissions model, the project represents an increase of 2,959.60 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis and is less than the 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e annual threshold suggested by the SCAQMD. As such, the operational impact of the January 2012 to climate change is less than significant.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative air quality impacts, including both criteria and GHG emissions. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new air quality impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified air quality effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the air quality analysis is presented herein.

### 3.3.8 Noise

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a noise perspective, the physical change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the noise analysis required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

The elimination of commercial uses and their associated operations would reduce both on-site and off-site post-project noise sources attributable to the March 2010 SDSP. In lieu of the commercial use, an approximately 2.0-acre neighborhood park would be constructed and operated on the “Site D” property. The level of park usage would be expected to be substantially less than otherwise associated with a large-scale commercial development. In addition, with two fewer dwelling units and the elimination of 153,985 square feet of commercial development, construction noise impacts may extend over a shorter timeframe.

With the elimination of the project’s commercial component and the reduction in the number of authorized residential units, as described in Section 3.3.6 (Transportation and Circulation) herein, average daily and both AM and PM peak-hour traffic volumes are anticipated to be substantially less than previously calculated for the March 2010 SDSP. Except as otherwise noted, in lieu of remodeling mobile-source noise levels along roadways proximal to the project site in response to the lower average daily and peak-hour projections, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, the Lead Agency has elected to retain the worst-case assumptions and analysis presented in the DEIR, including those mitigation measures and recommended conditions of approval identified therein. Although this will overestimate anticipated post-project noise levels, it will ensure that alternative-related noise impacts are reduced to the maximum extent feasible.

Since the traffic volumes associated with the January 2012 SDSP are not assumed to be any greater than examined in the DEIR, except where modified, the environmental analysis, mitigation measures, and recommended conditions of approval, as well as the presence or absence of significant unavoidable adverse effects, as presented in the DEIR, remains applicable to the environmental assessment of this alternative project.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative noise impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new noise impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified noise-related effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. As a result, no further augmentation of the acoustical analysis is presented herein.

### 3.3.9 Public Services and Facilities

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a public services and facilities perspective, the change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial uses, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park and park amenities generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the public services and facilities analysis as may be required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

Presented below are the revised public serves and facility impacts and additional analyses deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential public serve and facilities impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Public Services Impact 9-4.*** *With a resident population of approximately ~~662~~ 656 persons and an existing LACSD staffing ratio of one sworn officer for each 1,082 residents, in order to maintain existing staffing levels, the LACSD would need an additional 0.61 sworn deputies.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

Based on the California Department of Finance’s existing (January 2008) Citywide vacancy rates and average household size (3.335 persons/unit) and vacancy rate (1.71 percent), under this alternative, a total of 656 individuals would be added to the City’s population, as compared to the 662 individuals associated with the March 2010 SDSP. Although slightly less than the population associated with the March 2010 SDSP, with regards to LACSD staffing levels, for the purpose of impact analysis, the minimal difference is deemed to be de minimus.

Although no significant operational impacts have been identified, a modified condition of approval (Condition of Approval 9-2) has been formulated to provide the LACSD the opportunity to review individual design elements for both the residential development and the neighborhood park in order to reduce potential demand upon police services. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

***Public Services Impact 9-5.*** *The introduction of 202 ~~200~~ new residential dwellings and new park acreage ~~153,985 square feet of new commercial use~~ will increase existing demands on LACFD facilities, equipment, and personnel, predicating an incremental need for facility*

*expansion, the purchase of new and/or replacement equipment, and contributing to the need for addition LACFD personnel.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation. Less-than-significant impact.***

With regards to LACFD facilities, equipment, and personnel, for the purpose of impact analysis, the difference between 200 and 202 units is de minimus. Similarly, because of the park's relatively small size, no organized sporting events are anticipated at the proposed neighborhood park. As a result, the park is not anticipated to impose any substantial demand on the LACFD.

The elimination of the previously proposed commercial use will reduce the type and valuation of on-site improvements, the number of vehicles that would access the property during both a daily and peak-hour period, and the number of individuals located on the property at any one time. In addition, the elimination of that commercial use would likely reduce fire flow requirements from 5,000 gallons per minute (gpm) to 1,250 gpm. As a result, alternative-related impacts upon the LSCFD would be expected to be less than associated with the March 2010 SDSP.

Although no significant impacts have been identified, a recommended condition of approval (Condition of Approval 9-5) has been formulated to provide the LACFD the opportunity to review individual design elements in order to reduce the potential demand upon fire services. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

***Public Services Impact 9-6. Based on the Walnut Valley Unified School District's 2008 fee justification study, since product type remains at the discretion of the Applicant, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, assuming multi-family dwellings, project implementation will increase enrollment within the Walnut Valley Unified School District by an estimated 89 new students, including approximately 26 new elementary school students (Grades K-6 5), 34 new junior high school students (Grades 7 6-9), and 39 new high school students (Grades 9-12).***

***Level of Significance before Mitigation. Less-than-significant impact.***

As presented in the WVUSD's 2008 "Justification Report for the Walnut Valley Unified School District," the student generation rate for single-family dwelling units (0.682 new students/single-family unit) is higher than the corresponding student generation rate for multi-family units (0.443 new students/multi-family unit).<sup>80</sup> When comparing single-family and multi-family housing types, similar increases can be identified for Grades K-5 (0.225 students/single-family unit and 0.128 students/multi-family unit), Grades 6-9 (0.170 students/single-family unit and 0.121 students/multi-family unit), and Grades 9-12 (0.288 students/single-family unit and 0.193 multi-family unit).

Neither the March 2010 SDSP nor the January 2012 SDSP identified the precise nature of the housing product. The DEIR's analysis of the March 2010 SDSP was, however, predicated on a "multi-family" housing assumption. For consistency and for analytical purposes, that same assumption is retained as part of this analysis.

---

<sup>80</sup>/ Calwell Flores Winters, Inc., Justification Report for the Walnut Valley Unified School District - This Study Established the Justification of Developer Fees Pursuant to Applicable Law as of February 2008, February 2008.

Based on the District’s 2008 fee justification study, assuming the categorization of the 200 units as “multi-family” for the purpose of fee calculation, the alternative project’s implementation would increase enrollment within the Walnut Valley Unified School District by an estimated 89 new students, including approximately 26 new elementary school students (Grades K-5), 24 new junior high school students (Grades 6-9), and 39 new high school students (Grades 9-12).<sup>81</sup> Based on rounding, the estimates for the January 2012 SDSP are the same as those identified for the March 2010 SDSP.

As reported in the DEIR, notwithstanding statements to the contrary in the District’s 2008 fee justification study, the WVUSD appears to have a relatively steady-state or decreasing student enrollment,<sup>82</sup> resulting in both the identification of “Site D” as surplus property and public discussions concerning the possible shuttering of other District schools. Within the timeframe assumed herein, sufficient school capacity (inclusive of planned capacity) would appear to exist to accommodate site-specific growth. It is, however, noted that, with regards to the “Diamond Bar area” and projected through Fiscal Year 2017, the anticipated additional school population predicated by the development of “Site D” does not appear to have been factored into the District’s estimation of “projected regular student generation from new development” and/or “total projected students from new development based on dwelling unit occupancy,” both in total and by grade level.<sup>83</sup>

Because the District has declared the “Site D” property to be surplus and because District has requested that the Lead Agency consider a residential use for the subject property, it can be reasonably assumed that the District has sufficient existing and planned school capacity to accommodate this projected increase in student enrollment.

State law prescribes that the payment of applicable school impact fees or execution of an AB 2926 mitigation agreement constitutes effective mitigation for impacts on local school facilities. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

***Public Services Impact 9-7.*** *Project implementation will increase the resident population of the City, including the number of school-age children, incremental increasing existing spatial and resource demands placed on the Diamond Bar Public Library.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

With regards to LACFD facilities, equipment, and personnel, for the purpose of impact analysis, the difference between 200 and 202 units is de minimus. The January 2012 SDSP would add about 656 new residents to the City (as compared to 662 new residents under the March 2010 SDSP). That population increase would create additional demand for library service. Based on

---

<sup>81/</sup> In comparison, based on the District’s 2008 fee justification study, if single-family student generation rates were to be applied, the proposed 200-unit development would increase enrollment by an estimated 136 new students, including 45 new elementary school students (Grades K-5), 34 new middle school students (Grades 6-9), and 58 new high school students (Grades 9-12).

<sup>82/</sup> When comparing the District’s 2006 and 2008 fee justification studies, it appears that the WVUSD is experiencing a decreasing enrollment. For example, in March 2006, the District determined that each new single-family dwelling unit constructed within its boundaries would generate 0.765 new students. However, in the District’s February 2008 fee justification study, each new single-family unit within the school district was calculated to generate only 0.682 new students.

<sup>83/</sup> *Op. Cit.*, Justification Report for the Walnut Valley Unified School District - This Study Established the Justification for the Imposition of Developer Fees Pursuant to Applicable Law as of February 2008, Tables 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

the County Library’s service level guidelines, the Diamond Bar Library would require an additional 328 gross square feet (as compared to 331 gross square feet) of additional facility space and an additional 1,804 new items (as compared to 1,820 new items under the March 2010 SDSP).

In 2011, the County entered into a 40-year lease agreement with the City for a new library facility to be located at 21810 Copley Drive, comprising the ground-floor of an approximately 55,000 square foot office building acquired by the City in 2010 to serve as a new City Hall. The new library facility will have approximately 18,000 square feet and about 200 parking spaces. The existing approximately 9,935-square foot Diamond Bar Library will relocate from its existing location, containing only about 35 parking spaces, at 1061 S. Grand Avenue and is projected to be in operation at its new site in 2012. The new library facility is projected to accommodate existing and reasonably foreseeable future library serve demands within the City.

Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

**Public Services Impact 9-8.** *Project implementation will increase the resident population of the City of Diamond Bar and generate a projected need for ~~2-12~~ 2.10 acres (approximately ~~92,390~~ 91,518 square feet) of additional parkland within the City.*

**Level of Significance before Mitigation.** *Less-than-significant impact.*

On July 19, 2011, the City Council adopted the 2011 P&RMP, identifying the “School District Site D” as a future “site acquisition opportunity.” The following “site analysis” was presented therein: “The parcel is located on the southeast corner of Brea Canyon Road and Diamond Bar Boulevard and is about 30.36 acres in size. Acquisition of the site would serve to add additional parkland acreage to meet the City’s desired 3 acres per thousand [residents] parkland standard and would serve as a neighborhood park for the surrounding community. The future developer of the site shall improve and dedicate a minimum two acre public park. The future developer will be required to hold neighborhood outreach meetings for the design and location of the public park as part of the tentative tract map entitlement process.” As indicated in the 2011 P&RMP, specific “site opportunities” include both a “[m]inimum two acre usable public park and “[p]edestrian and bike trail along Brea Canyon Road.”<sup>84</sup> It is noted that the 2011 P&RMP “does not legally bind the City to act on any of the projects discussed in the document and does not provide funding for those projects.”<sup>85</sup>

Under this alternative, a total of 200 dwelling units and an approximately 2-acre public park would be constructed. In comparison, the March 2010 SDSP assumed 202 dwelling units, 153,985 square feet of commercial use, and, although the DEIR did not preclude the on-site dedication of parkland, assumed that park requirements would be met through the payment of Quimby Act fees (Article 3, Chapter 4, Subdivision Map Act). Quimby Act fees are typically assessed by local jurisdictions for the purpose of park acquisition and development. In the City, separate parkland requirements are imposed for attached “multi-family (5 or more dwelling units),” “attached single-family” dwellings, and “detached single-family” dwellings.

Development-specific park demands can be calculated in accordance with the formula provided in Section 21.32.040 (Park Land Dedications and Fees) in Title 21 (Subdivisions) of the

---

<sup>84</sup>/ *Op. Cit.*, Diamond Bar Parks & Recreation Master Plan, pp. 62-63.

<sup>85</sup>/ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Municipal Code, as follows:  $X = 0.005(U)P$ , where “X” is the amount of parkland required in acres, “U” is the total number of approved dwelling units, and “P” is the unit-type multiplier. The Municipal Code assumes a multiplier of: (1) 2.1 for multi-family (5 or more dwelling units); (2) 2.9 for attached single-family (townhouse) dwellings, duplexes, and multifamily dwellings containing four or fewer dwelling units; and (3) 3.4 for detached single-family dwellings.

Neither the March 2010 SDSP nor the January 2012 SDSP identified the precise nature of the housing product. The DEIR’s analysis of the March 2010 SDSP was, however, predicated on a “multi-family” housing assumption. For consistency and for analytical purposes, that same assumption is retained as part of this analysis.

As specified under Section 21.32.040 (Park Land Dedications and Fees) of the Municipal Code, assuming the classification of on-site housing as “multi-family (5 or more dwelling units),” implementation of the March 2010 SDSP would generate a need for approximately 2.12 acres (approximately 92,390 square feet) of additional parkland within the City. In comparison, assuming that the resulting housing is classified as “multi-family (5 or more dwelling units),” the January 2012 SDSP would generate a need for 2.10 acres (approximately 91,518 square feet) of additional parkland.

As authorized under Section 21.32.040(d) of the Municipal Code: “If the entire parkland obligation for a proposed residential subdivision is not satisfied by dedication in compliance with subsection (c) above, the subdivider shall pay a fee to the city in lieu of dedication, as a condition of tentative map approval. The fee shall equal the parkland obligation derived from the formula in subsection (c), less the amount of parkland, if any, offered for dedication by the subdivider, times the average per-acre fair market value for the appropriate park planning area.”

A condition of approval (Condition of Approval 9-8) has been formulated to ensure the dedication of a minimum of two acres of usage real property within the project boundaries and the payment of in-lieu fees and/or the provision of Applicant-sponsored park improvements for any additional Quimby Act requirements that might exist in excess of that dedication. In addition, a second condition of approval (Condition of Approval 9-9) specifies the Applicant’s obligation to seek community input with regards to the nature of proposed park improvements.

Urban parks are often difficult to police. Local governments typically lack the resources to assign full-time security personnel to each of their public facilities. Compared with streets and buildings, particularly when abutting other open space areas, their boundaries may be complex and ill-defined. Parks may also be difficult to patrol and are hard to lock up and secure. Natural and introduced vegetation can inhibit surveillance and impede line-of-sight visibility from other on-site and off-site areas. Introduced lighting is often opposed because it can increase night-time usage and introduce noise-generating activities affecting off-site receptors. In those parks providing both active and passive areas and amenities, each user’s purpose and intent may not be readily discernible. Types of criminal or antisocial behavior that may occur in public parks include, but are not limited to, disorderly conduct, underage drinking, drug dealing, graffiti and vandalism, illicit sexual activity, panhandling, and disturbances by people with mental illness.<sup>86</sup>

Incidents of and trends regarding criminality are difficult to ascertain since both the City and the County lack crime statistics regarding public safety in public parks. With regards to compatible land uses, since there exists no accepted methodology to equate land-use decisions to the

---

<sup>86</sup>/ Hilborn, Jim, Dealing with Crime and Disorder in Urban Parks, Response Guide No. 9, United States Department of Justice, Center for Problem-Oriented Policies, May 2009.

incidence and type of criminal activities or nuisance, any assumptions that the proposed park will induce, attract, or generate misconduct would be speculative and beyond the scope of CEQA review. Like any new development, some level of police surveillance can be anticipated with regards to both the residential and parks areas. The project will, therefore, incrementally contribute to the areawide demand for police services.

As reported by the American Planning Association (APA): “For those concerned that green spaces may foster crime and illegal activity, evidence now exists that the opposite may be true. When adjacent to residential areas, green spaces have been shown to create neighborhoods with fewer violent and property crimes and where neighbors tend to support and protect one another. These are the findings of scientists at the Human Environment Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who studied green space alongside public housing in Chicago. Other researchers who are conducting similar studies across the country are finding similar results.”<sup>87</sup> The APA further notes: “Some community leaders are inhibited from proposing new parks or supporting existing ones out of concern that parks can be settings for crime and illegal activity. However, when properly planned, parks and greenways adjacent to residential areas help to shield against crime.”<sup>88</sup>

In response to potential public health and safety considerations, the City has identified an additional recommended condition of approval (Condition of Approval 9-2) designed to actively involve the LACSD in the design of on-site park facilities.

Although no significant impacts have been identified, a number of recommended conditions of approval have been formulated to: (1) ensure the dedication and improvement of a minimum of two acres of usable real property within the project boundaries and the payment of in-lieu fees for any additional Quimby Act requirements in excess of that dedication and improvement (Condition of Approval 9-8); (2) provide opportunities for neighborhood participation concerning the location, configuration, design, and range of amenities to be included in the park (Condition of Approval 9-9); and (3) address potential public health and safety issues associated with park use and operation (Condition of Approval 9-2). Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative public services and facilities impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new public services and facilities impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified public services and facilities effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the public services and facilities analysis is presented herein.

### **3.3.10 Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the

---

<sup>87/</sup> *Op. Cit.*, City Parks Forum Briefing Paper 04: How Cities Use Parks to Create Safer Neighborhoods, 2003, p. 1.

<sup>88/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

approximately 30.4-acre site. From a utilities and service systems perspective, the change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial uses, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park and park amenities generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the utilities and service systems analysis as may be required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

Presented below is the revised utility and service system impact and the additional analysis which is deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential utilities and service system impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Utilities and Service Systems Impact 10-2.*** *The project’s residential and commercial public park components are projected to generate approximately ~~89,435~~ 39,100 gallons of wastewater per day (0.09 0.04 mgd). Applying a peaking factor of 2.7, the peaked flow rate would be about 244,475 ~~105,570~~ gallons of wastewater per day (0.25 0.11 mgd).*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

Neither the March 2010 SDSP nor the January 2012 SDSP identified the precise nature of the housing product. The DEIR’s analysis of the March 2010 SDSP was, however, predicated on a “multi-family” housing assumption. For consistency and analytical purposes, that same assumption has been retained. Of the two “multi-family” product types identified by the CSDLAC, the “condominium” category is best representative of the project.

As illustrated, in part, in Table RTC2-17 (Wastewater Loading for Different Classes of Land Use), the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC) has formulated average wastewater generation rates for a variety of land uses. The CSDLAC projects that, for “condominiums,” each unit (parcel) will generate approximately 195 gallons of wastewater per day (gpd).<sup>89</sup> With regards to public park use, wastewater rates are approximately 100 gpd per each 1,000 square feet of any structures that would generate sewer flows. Although no comfort facilities are presently proposed, for the purpose of CEQA compliance, public park use is assumed to generate 100 gallons of wastewater per day.

Based on those generation rates, the project’s 200 units (39,000 gpd) and park (100 GPD) would generate approximately 39,100 gpd of wastewater or 0.04 million gallons per day (mgd).

---

<sup>89</sup>/ The CSDLAC projects that for “single-family residential unit,” each dwelling will generate approximately 260 gallons of wastewater per day (gpd). Based on that generation rates, the project’s 200 dwelling units would generate approximately 52,000 gpd of wastewater or 0.05 million gallons per day (mgd). Applying a peaking factor of 2.7, the peak flow rate would be about 140,400 (0.14 mgd).

Peak daily flow rates are higher than daily rates and serve as the basis for facility planning. Applying a peaking factor of 2.7, the peak flow rate would be about 105,570 (0.11 mgd).

During processing of a tentative tract map, the County stipulates that a “sewer area study” must be performed to determine depth, capacity, and other critical design data. A standard condition (Condition of Approval 10-1) has been formulated requiring the Applicant’s submittal and the City Engineer’s approval of the sewer area study prior to the issuance of building permits. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

Table RTC2-17  
**WASTEWATER LOADING FOR DIFFERENT CLASSES OF LAND USE**

Description	Unit of Measurement	Flow (gallons per day)
Residential	-	-
Single-Family Residential	Parcel	260
Condominium	Parcel	195
Five Units or More	No. of DUs	156
Golf Course, Camp, and Park	1,000 ft <sup>2</sup>	100

Source: County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative utilities and service systems impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new utilities and service systems impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified utility and service systems effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the utilities and service systems analysis is presented herein.

### **3.3.11 Cultural Resources**

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, with regards to this alternative, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria and needed to inform governmental decisionmakers and other stakeholders about the potentially significant environmental effects of this alternative project.

For the purpose of this alternative’s analysis, the Lead Agency has assumed that the physical conditions on the project site have not substantively changed since release of the DEIR and that the level of site disturbance is generally similar to that described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Since the level of site disturbance for the January 2012 SDSP is not assumed to be any greater than previously examined, the environmental analysis, as well as the presence or absence of significant unavoidable adverse effects, as presented in the DEIR, remains applicable to the environmental assessment of this alternative project. As a result, no further augmentation of cultural resources is presented herein. Since none of the thresholds criteria would be exceeded, the resulting impact remains less than significant and no additional mitigation is recommended or required.

### **3.3.12 Aesthetics**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From an aesthetics perspective, the change between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial uses, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park and park amenities generally within the same development footprint.

It is noted that the March 2010 SDSP included a discussion of the proposed “entry monumentation.” With the exception of the inclusion of a Department-recommended “minimum standard of performance” (i.e., valuation of not less than one-half [0.005] percent of the building permit value), the January 2012 SDSP includes the same general discussion as presented in the March 2010 SDSP. As a result, although the proposed “entry monumentation” was widely discussed during the Council’s public hearings, because that feature was included in the March 2010 SDSP and addressed in the DEIR, with the exception of the incorporation of a recommended condition of approval establishing that performance standard (Condition of Approval 12-1), it does not constitute a physical change highlighted herein.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, except as otherwise noted herein, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the aesthetics analysis as may be required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the recommended conditions of project approval are presented in Table RTC2-2 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Recommended Conditions of Alternative Project Approval). Any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) and any associated changes to the mitigation measures, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-4 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative - Draft Alternative Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program).

Presented below are the revised aesthetic impacts and the additional analyses which are deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential aesthetic impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Aesthetic Impact 12-1.*** *Excluding those areas that will be retained as open space, the project site will take on a distinctively urban physiographic character as existing vegetation is removed, construction equipment introduced onto the site, hillside areas recontoured, new uses are introduced, and other physical modifications occur.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

In the absence of a conceptual grading plan, for the purpose of environmental review, the Lead Agency has assumed that the physical area of site disturbance, the location of cut and fill slopes, the location and size of retaining walls, and grading quantities generally remain as

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

described in the DEIR for the March 2010 SDSP. Under those assumptions, the proposed development will consist of three mass-graded “super pads,” connected by an internal roadway system. Development activities conducted on the project site, however, remain subject to the City’s subdivision review (Section 22.08.040, Municipal Code), plot plan review (Section 22.47.020, Municipal Code), and development review (Section 22.48.020, Municipal Code). Through those existing processes, the City will ensure that development plans are consistent with land-use authority and compatible with other proximal land uses.

A number of design elements may serve to “soften” the potential visual change proposed by the project’s development. Proposed as part of the January 2012 SDSP are a landscaped “entry feature” (Condition of Approval 12-1) and a neighborhood park (Conditions of Approval 9-8 and 9-9). In addition, as directed by the City Council at their meeting of December 7, 2010, the alternative project shall include a greenbelt area separating the proposed development from the existing development with a berm. Those elements will incorporate extensive landscaping (including perimeter landscaping) and contribute to the appearance to the resulting development. Similarly, the accessibility and usability of the public park will serve to expand the public use of the project site.

Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

***Aesthetic Impact 12-3.*** *The introduction of new residential and ~~commercial~~ public park uses will add new sources of artificial lighting to the project site and could result in light trespass extending beyond the project boundaries.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.*

The elimination of the proposed commercial uses will reduce the number and change the type and intensity of lighting that would otherwise be created on the project site. Large expanses of off-street parking will not require illumination and on-site signage associated with commercial development will be eliminated. Introduce artificial light sources associated with the proposed residential development (e.g., security, accent, and street lighting) will generally conform to existing near-site light sources attributable to existing proximal residential development. These light sources are generally not of sufficient intensity to adversely impact off-site areas.

Increased site utilization will result in the introduction of vehicle headlights along on-site vehicular travel routes. On-site street gradients and configuration have not been determined. It, however, can be assumed that certain off-site receptors (e.g., adjacent residential areas) may experience an increase in light intrusion attributable to the headlights of automobiles (including trucks) entering the site from Diamond Bar Boulevard. Automobile headlights are common light sources, presently exist within the general project area, and can be effectively reduced through building placement and introduced landscaping. As such, with regards to the potential intrusion of vehicle headlights, no mitigation or other conditions of approval have been identified by the Lead Agency.

With regard to sports lighting in public park settings, illumination levels associated with night sports are typically higher than typically encountered in the nighttime environment. Recommended levels for recreational sports range from 200 to 500 lux (20 to 50 foot candles).<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup>/ Candlepower is the unit of luminous intensity. An ordinary candle has a luminous intensity horizontally of approximately one candlepower (candela). If surrounded by a transparent sphere of one-foot radius, the amount of

As indicated by the Illuminating Engineers Society of North America (IESNA), with regards to sports lighting, “[t]here are limited choices for outdoor lighting systems compared with the selection for lighting applications. Since there is usually no surface to redirect the light bounced from the playing area, outdoor lighting systems primarily consist of direct distribution floodlights aimed at the playing surface.”<sup>91</sup> The IESNA further notes that since outdoor lighting is generally visible far beyond facility boundaries, careful consideration should be given to spill light encroaching on neighboring property and light that contributes to sky glow.<sup>92</sup>

Spill light is defined as the light shining beyond the area to be illuminated, caused either by the uncontrolled direct component of luminaires or from light reflected from the task being illuminated. The California Energy Commission (CEC) defines “light trespass” as “unwanted light from a neighboring property. Any source of light can create trespass, but complaints are related mostly to sports lighting, billboards, and street lighting. Light trespass is annoying, but it can also become a nuisance or even a serious health and safety risk if it adversely affects visibility for other tasks. Light trespass may also be a source of glare, including disabling, discomfort, veiling luminance, and annoyance glare that can also be serious public health and safety risk.”<sup>93</sup>

Based on the limited size of the proposed neighborhood park, high-intensity sports lighting is not presently assumed. In the absence of final plans for site development, the project has the potential to introduce new source of substantial light and glare that could adversely impact off-site areas. Section 22.16.050 of the Municipal Code applies to outdoor lighting for exterior fixtures, intensity, security lighting, shielding, and recreational sporting areas. In addition, a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 12-1) has been formulated to ensure that lighting levels do not adversely impact abutting sensitive receptors and/or motorists traveling along adjoining roadways. Compliance with existing City policies, in combination with the implementation of the recommended measure, will reduce potential visual impact to a less-than-significant level.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative aesthetic impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new aesthetic impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified aesthetic effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the aesthetic analysis is presented herein.

### **3.3.13 Growth Inducement**

Under the March 2010 SDSP, a total of up to 202 dwelling units and 153,985 gross leasable square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Under the January 2012 SDSP, on-site commercial uses would be eliminated and a total of up to 200 dwelling units, plus a public park containing not less than two useable acres, would be developed on the approximately 30.4-acre site. From a growth-inducement perspective, the physical change

---

luminous energy (flux) emanating from the surface of the sphere is one lumen. One lumen of luminous energy incident on one square foot of area, therefore, produces an illumination of one footcandle. When the area is expressed in square feet, the resulting illumination is expressed in footcandles; when the area is expressed in square meters, the illumination is expressed in lux. Stated mathematically: footcandles = (lumens/square feet of area) and lux = (lumens/square meters of area).

<sup>91/</sup> Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, Recommended Practice for Sports and Recreational Area Lighting, RP-6-01, 2001, p. 18.

<sup>92/</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93/</sup> California Energy Commission, California Outdoor Lighting Standards Synopsis, February 1, 2002, p. 1.

## “Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

---

between the March 2010 SDSP and the January 2012 SDSP represents a net reduction of two dwelling units, the elimination of on-site commercial use and its associated parking and accompanying hardscape, and the introduction of a new neighborhood park generally within the same development footprint.

With regards to both the environmental setting and threshold of significance criteria, as presented in the DEIR, except as otherwise noted herein, the Lead Agency has not identified any substantive changes, revisions, or other modifications to the growth-inducement analysis as may be required to adequately describe that setting and those criteria. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, for this topical issue, any associated changes to the environmental impacts and/or level of significance of those environmental effects, as identified in the DEIR, are presented in Table RTC2-3 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance).

Presented below is the revised growth-inducement impact and the additional analysis which is deemed to be most germane to an assessment of this alternative. Unless otherwise identified herein, the information and analysis presented in the DEIR remains applicable to the assessment of the potential growth-inducing impacts of the January 2012 SDSP.

***Growth-Inducing Impact 13-2.*** ~~The construction of 202 200 new dwelling units and the introduction of 153,985 square feet of commercial use will increase the City’s population by an estimated 662 656 individuals, require an estimated 72 construction workers to complete, and directly create an estimated 462 new permanent jobs create an estimated 158 indirect and induced job opportunities.~~

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Less-than-significant impact.*

With regards to construction-term demands for goods and services, as indicated in the URBEMIS2007 user’s guide, construction-worker commute trip generation can be estimated by using the following equations: (1) single-family residential trips = 0.72 trips/unit x number of units; (2) multi-family residential trips = 0.36 trips/unit x number of units; and (3) commercial and retail trips = 0.32 trips/1,000 square feet of development.<sup>94</sup> Assuming, for the purpose of this analysis, that each “building construction worker commute trip” equates to a construction worker and that a “multi-family” housing product is developed, construction of the 200 housing units would require an estimated 72 construction workers.

Construction workers may impose short-term demands on local businesses, such as nearby restaurants. Those localized demands will, however, cease upon completion of construction activities. A wide range of businesses now exists near the project site. Construction-term demands on those businesses are not anticipated to be so substantial as to warrant business expansion based solely on project-related activities. Since construction jobs are, by definition, short-term in duration, they are generally not the type of employment opportunities that predicate substantial increased localized demands for goods and services. With regards to the types of commercial uses typically patronized by construction workers, there exist sufficient existing businesses operating within the City and in the general project area to adequately serve those short-term demands. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

---

<sup>94/</sup> *Op. Cit.*, Software User’s Guide: URBEMIS2007 for Windows, Version 9.2 – Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects, p. A-11.

With regards to long-term employment, once inhabited, jobs associated with housing include, but are not limited to, landscape and pool maintenance, interior designers, and associated construction trades. Jobs indirectly related to housing include medical professionals, manufacturers and retailers, and associated service providers. Each new residence will, therefore, incrementally increase existing demands for manufacturing, service-related, and professional jobs. It is estimated that each job created through residential construction supports an additional 1.2 jobs.<sup>95</sup> Based on that ratio, the alternative project’s 72 estimated construction jobs would result in an additional 86 indirect and induced jobs.

The size of the project is not sufficient to predicate any substantial in-migration of new workers into the general project area. The project’s incremental contribution to localized, regional, and national employment opportunities would not create substantial significant secondary impacts.

Because the January 2012 SDSP includes no commercial component, the projected number of alternative-based direct, indirect, and induced jobs (158) is substantially less than anticipated under the March 2010 SDSP (608). As a result, employment-based growth-inducing impacts would be substantially less under this alternative than under the March 2010 SDSP. Since none of the threshold of significance criteria would be exceeded, the identified impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is recommended or required.

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the January 2012 SDSP will not result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, and cumulative growth-inducing impacts. With regards to the January 2012 SDSP, the Lead Agency has neither identified any new growth-inducing impacts nor determined that any of the previously identified growth-inducing effects will increase in severity over those levels identified in the DEIR. Except as otherwise noted, no further augmentation of the growth-inducement analysis is presented herein.

---

<sup>95</sup>/ Sacramento Regional Research Institute, *The Economic Benefits of Housing in California*, June 2006, pp. iii and 12.

## **4.0 “MARCH 2010 ‘SITE D’ SPECIFIC PLAN” - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

As indicated in Section 2.0 (Additional Changes, Revisions, and Other Modifications) herein, with regards to the March 2010 SDSP, presented below is a new Section 4.7.3.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) which is intended for incorporation into the DEIR. Computer modeling results for GHG emissions are presented in Appendix RTC2-I (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – CalEEMod Emissions Model) herein. The information presented herein does not address the January 2012 SDSP. An analysis of both criteria and GHG emissions attributable to the January 2012 SDSP is presented in Section 3.0 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative) and in Appendix RTC2-H (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” Alternative – CalEEMod Emissions Model).

### **4.7.3.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

In 2005, in recognition of California’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change, then Governor Schwarzenegger established Executive Order S-3-05, which sets forth the following target dates by which Statewide emission of greenhouse gases<sup>1</sup> (GHG) would be progressively reduced: (1) by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; (2) by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and (3) by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

In 2006, California passed Assembly Bill 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), as codified in Section 38500 *et seq.* in Division 25.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective Statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing an approximate 25 percent reduction in emissions). To achieve this target, future development must be planned and implemented in the most GHG-efficient manner possible. GHG efficient development reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by supporting compact, dense, mixed-use, pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, transit-oriented development.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) demonstrates California’s commitment to reducing the rate of GHG emissions and the State’s associated contribution to climate change, without intent to limit population or economic growth within the State. To achieve the goals of AB 32, which are tied to GHG emission rates of specific benchmark years (i.e., 1990), California would have to achieve a lower rate of emissions per unit of population and per unit of economic activity than it has now. Further, in order to accommodate future population and economic growth, the State would have to achieve an even lower rate of emissions per unit than was generated in 1990. The goal to achieve 1990 quantities of GHG emissions by 2020 means that this will need to be accomplished in light of 30 years of population and

---

<sup>1/</sup> GHGs include those gases that contribute to the natural greenhouse effect (such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and water), as well as gases that are only man-made and that are emitted through the use of modern industrial products (such as HFCs and CFCs). The most important greenhouse gas in human-induced global warming is CO<sub>2</sub>. While many gases have much higher global warming potential (GWP) than carbon monoxide, CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for about 85 percent of the GWP of all GHG emissions emitted by the United States.

economic growth in place beyond 1990. As a result, proposed general and area plans that would not require new development to achieve its fair share of reductions in GHG emissions would conflict with the spirit of the policy decisions contained in AB 32, potentially impeding California’s ability to comply with the mandate.

In June 2007, pursuant to the provisions of AB 32, CARB directed its staff to pursue 37 early actions for reducing GHG emissions. The broad spectrum of strategies to be developed - including a low carbon fuel standard, regulations for refrigerants with high global warming potentials (GWP), guidance and protocols for local governments to facilitate GHG reductions, and green ports - reflects that the serious threat of climate change requires action as soon as possible.

In addition to approving the GHG reduction strategies, CARB directed its staff to further evaluate early action recommendations made at its June 2007 meeting and to report back within 6 months. The general sentiment of CARB suggested a desire to try to pursue greater GHG emissions reductions in California in the near-term. Since the June 2007 CARB hearing, CARB staff has evaluated all 48 recommendations submitted by stakeholder and internally-generated staff ideas and published the “Expanded List of Early Action Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California.” Based on its additional analysis, CARB staff recommended the expansion of the early action list to a total of 44 measures. Nine of the strategies meet the AB 32 definition of “discrete early action measures,” defined as measures that will be in place and enforceable by January 1, 2010. The discrete early action items included: (1) a low carbon fuel standards for ethanol, biodiesel, hydrogen, electricity, compressed natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, and biogas; (2) restrictions on high global warming potential refrigerants; (3) landfill methane capture; (4) Smartway truck efficiency; (5) port electrification; (6) reduction of perfluorocarbons from the semiconductor industry; (7) reduction of propellants in consumer products; (8) tire inflation; and (9) sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) reductions from non-electricity sector.

The 2020 target reductions are currently estimated to be 174 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e).<sup>2</sup> In total, the recommended early actions have the potential to reduce GHG emissions by at least 42 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e emissions by 2020, representing about 25 percent of the estimated reductions needed by 2020. The CARB adopted Resolution 07-55 in December 2007, approving 427 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e as the Statewide GHG emissions limit for 2020, which is equivalent to the 1990 emissions level. The measures are in the sectors of fuels, transportation, forestry, agriculture, education, energy efficiency, commercial, solid waste, cement, oil and gas, electricity, and fire suppression.

Promoted as the critical implementation tool for AB 32, Senate Bill (SB) 375 (2008) introduced numerous changes in California’s land-use and transportation planning process. By firmly linking land-use planning, transportation planning,

---

<sup>2/</sup> The GHG pollutants are those recognized by the State under AB 32. The most common GHGs emitted in association with land-use developments include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). All GHGs can be reported on a common currency of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e). In order to obtain the CO<sub>2</sub>e, an individual GHG is multiplied by its GWP. The GWP designates on a pound-for-pound basis the potency of the GHG compared to CO<sub>2</sub>.

## **“Site D” Specific Plan**

City of Diamond Bar, California

---

affordable housing, and CEQA to GHG reductions, SB 375 placed additional planning responsibilities on metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) throughout the State, which are now charged with preparing sustainable land-use plans known as “sustainable community strategies” (SCSs). The SCS is a preferred growth scenario that must be designed to achieve certain GHG reduction goals for transportation emissions and becomes the land-use allocation for transportation modeling in future regional transportation plans (RTPs). Future RTP funding decisions must be consistent with the SCS, creating strong incentive for local governments to participate in these efforts in order to ensure funding for needed system improvements.

SB 375 also established guidelines for travel forecasting models that assure they are responsive to development density, transit service levels, induced travel and land development, and bicycle and pedestrian travel. The CARB is required to review each region’s SCS to verify that the land-use allocation used in the RTP will achieve regional GHG reduction targets established by the CARB.

New guidelines for the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions under CEQA took effect on March 18, 2010. Sections 15183.5(a) and (b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines provide that if a general or area plan is adopted pursuant to a certified EIR that considers GHG emissions and if the plan and its EIR incorporate development policies, standards, and mitigation measures achieving GHG reductions that result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions, this could alleviate the need to evaluate and mitigate GHG’s at the project-level for projects that are found to be consistent with the general or area plan.

Section 15064.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines governs the determination of the significance of GHG emissions. In its “Final Statement of Reasons” for Section 15064.4, the Resources Agency emphasized that, consistent with established CEQA practice, “there is no iron-clad definition of ‘significance’” for GHG emissions. Within the framework of Section 15064.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency has considerable discretion in judging the significance of GHG emissions.

To make its determination of significance, the lead agency must first determine the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project. Based on its review of the facts, the lead agency may quantify GHG emissions or use qualitative analysis or performance standards. For purposes of quantifying GHG emissions, the lead agency has discretion under Section 15064.4 “to select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate.”

After determining (whether quantitatively, qualitatively or based on a performance standard) the amount of GHG emissions from a project, the lead agency must determine the significance of the GHG emission, taking into the consideration, among other factors, the following matters specified in Section 15064.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines: (1) the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; (2) whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and (3) the extent to which the project

complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a Statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. The Resources Agency clarified in its “Final Statement of Reasons” that the new guidelines are “not intended to imply a zero net emissions threshold of significance.”

Prior to February 2011, the SCAQMD recommended the use of the Urban Land Use Emissions Model (URBEMIS) for estimating emissions from land-use development projects. In February 2011, the SCAQMD released a new analysis tool, the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), capable of calculating both criteria and GHG emissions.

With regards to GHG emissions, the State CEQA Guidelines suggest that a project would normally be judged to produce a significant or potentially significant effect on the environment if the project were to: (1) generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; and/or (2) conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Those impacts are separately addressed below.

***Air Quality Impact 7-8.*** *The project has the potential to generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Significant.*

To provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents, the SCAQMD has convened a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group. The SCAQMD is in the process of establishing a threshold for GHG emissions to determine a project’s regional contribution toward global climate change impacts for California. On December 5, 2008, SCAQMD adopted an annual threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) for residential and commercial projects for which it is the lead agency under CEQA.

### **Construction**

In accordance with the provisions of the proposed specific plan, the use of renewable and recyclable materials will be mandated for the construction of all structures. Additionally the project shall divert any construction or demolition waste away from landfills in accordance with the standards set by the City. Where possible, porous or pervious pavement should be used for walks and driveway surfaces and parking areas and pavement materials should be a light color to reflect heat and reduce the heat island effect.

Construction activities would consume fuel and result in the generation of greenhouse gases. Construction CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions are as projected using the CalEEMod emissions model. Modeling results are presented in Appendix RTC2-1 (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – CalEEMod Emissions Model) and in Table 4.7-9 (Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Year). The

CalEEMod emissions model indicates that construction (unmitigated) could generate approximately 764.26 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2013, 910.28 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2014, and 223.97 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2015. All of these values are well under the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year and the impact of constructing the March 2010 SDSP on GHG emissions is less than significant.

Table 4.7-9  
**CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION BY YEAR**  
(metric tons/year)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> e
2013	762.82	0.07	0.00	764.26
2014	908.80	0.07	0.00	910.28
2015	223.56	0.02	0.00	223.97
Construction Total (Multiple Year)	---	---	---	1,895.18
Threshold	---	---	---	3,000.00
Exceeds Threshold?	---	---	---	No

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

The results of the GHG emissions modeling are not strictly comparable with that associated with criteria pollutants in that those emissions were based on the URBEMIS2007 construction listings and timetable default values, whereas this GHG emissions analysis uses SCAQMD’s 2011 CalEEMod model that includes far more GHG sources than the previous model.

### **Operations**

The March 2010 SDSP includes a number of GHG-related requirements that constitute specific plan-imposed design features of the project. The environment and project sustainability requirements outlined therein are key components of the March 2010 SDSP. The City has formulated policies addressing sustainable development which specify development goals and other actions which will be updated from time to time. As indicated in the March 2010 SDSP, a fundamental strategy for this project is to create a “green” and sustainable community.

While there is no formal definition of “green” site design, the term implies a site structure that is friendlier to its occupants and the environment and is more resource efficient. In general, “green” building design entails the implementation of the following related community goals: energy efficiency, healthy indoor air quality, waste reduction, water efficiency, and reduced environmental impacts. To this end, the City will require that the project be reviewed by a third-party consultant to determine if the proposed development meets the certification requirements of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)<sup>3</sup> or an equivalent program be attained by the project.

---

<sup>3/</sup> Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) consists of a suite of rating systems for the design, construction, and operation of high performance “green” buildings, homes, and neighborhoods. Developed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC), LEED is intended to provide building owners and operators a concise framework for identifying and implementing practical and measurable “green” building design, construction, operations, and maintenance solutions.

As outlined below, specific design features have been included in the March 2010 SDSP. Where appropriate, the following design features were included in the CalEEMod emissions modeling analysis and were used to replace the model's default values.

- **Water Use:** (1) The use of drought-resistant plant materials, reclaimed water for all public landscape irrigation purposes, water-saving systems, and the use of stormwater filtering systems, where feasible and appropriate; (2) Landscaping water usage will be reduced by using drought tolerant, California-friendly plant material and irrigation systems that measure the local weather condition and respond to current conditions; (3) The use of turf will be discouraged and, if used, will only be allowed in community recreation areas; (4) Rainwater can be diverted with a roof collection system and used to irrigate drought-tolerant gardens<sup>4</sup>; and (5) All development will comply with water-saving features such as utilizing low-flow showerheads, faucets, and water closets.<sup>5</sup>
- **Energy:** (1) Reduction of energy usage can be accomplished by using passive solar techniques and low-energy lighting; to reduce energy costs, passive solar techniques shall be utilized, such as incorporating roof overhangs, awnings, trellises, and shade trees to selectively control heat gain, installation of windows to catch breezes and provide cross ventilation; (2) The residential structures will be required to obtain LEED or equivalent certification; (3) All structures will be oriented to take advantage of solar orientation<sup>6</sup>; (4) The residential project will be required to meet a 50 percent solar requirement<sup>7</sup>; and (5) As appropriate, appliances shall be “Energy Star” qualified appliances.<sup>8</sup>
- **Outdoor Lighting:** (1) As much as possible, outdoor lighting shall be designed to prevent glare, light trespass, and sky glow; permanently installed lighting shall not blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness; (2) Be energy-efficient and shielded so that all glare is confined within the boundaries of the site; (3) Use timers, where acceptable, to turn outdoor lights off during hours when they are not needed; (4) Be appropriate in height, intensity, and scale to the uses they are serving; (5) Use no more intensity than absolutely necessary; and (6) Where appropriate, use light emitting diode (LED) fixtures.<sup>9</sup>

During the project's operational life, the majority of GHG emissions, specifically CO<sub>2</sub>, are due to vehicle travel and energy consumption. It is projected that all emission sources, including mobile, area source, energy, waste, and water conveyance, approximately 14,276.99 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e would be generated on an

---

<sup>4</sup>/ For these measures, the 100 percent the use of reclaimed and grey water for exterior watering within public areas was used in the modeling effort. Although the CalEEMod emissions model allows for a reduction, because the actual areas of turf are undetermined at this time, no reduction was taken for “turf reduction.” Additionally, the model default value of 6.1 percent reduction in water use was assumed for irrigation controls.

<sup>5</sup>/ For this measure, low-flow bathroom and kitchen faucets, toilets, and showers were assumed using the model default control efficiencies of 32, 18, 20, and 20 percent, respectively.

<sup>6</sup>/ For these measures, buildings were assumed to exceed existing Title 24 standards by 10 percent.

<sup>7</sup>/ For these measures 50 percent of the electricity is assumed to be generated on the project site.

<sup>8</sup>/ For this measure, energy-efficient clothes and dishwasher, fans, and refrigerators are assumed using model default control efficiencies of 30, 15, 50, and 15 percent, respectively.

<sup>9</sup>/ For these measures, a 10 percent lighting energy reduction was used in the CalEEMod emissions model.

annual basis.<sup>10</sup> The resulting operational impact (unmitigated), exceeds the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year and the impact is considered potentially significant. As shown in Table 4.7-10 (Yearly Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions), once the project’s proposed energy and water conservation measures are included and the CalEEMod emissions model rerun, for all sources (i.e., mobile, area source, energy, waste, and water conveyance), estimated operational GHG emissions are reduced to approximately 13,156.21 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year. This value remains over the suggested annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e and the impact of GHG emissions attributable to the March 2010 SDSP is significant.

Table 4.7-10  
**YEARLY OPERATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**  
 (metric tons/year)

Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> e
Mobile Sources	11,634.85	0.46	0.00	11,644.45 <sup>1</sup>
Electricity	822.41	0.02	0.01	825.08 <sup>2</sup>
Natural Gas	270.79	0.01	0.00	272.44 <sup>2</sup>
Landscape Maintenance	5.02	0.01	0.00	5.13 <sup>3</sup>
Fireplaces	130.97	0.00	0.00	131.77 <sup>3</sup>
Water Use	143.99	0.60	0.02	161.67 <sup>4</sup>
Waste Disposal	51.68	3.05	0.00	115.83 <sup>5</sup>
Operational Total (Single Year)	13,059.71	4.15	0.03	13,156.21
Threshold	---	---	---	3,000.00
Exceeds Threshold?	---	---	---	Yes
Notes: 1. Appendix RTC2-I, 4.1 (Mitigation Measures Mobile – Mitigated/Unmitigated), p. 19 of 28. 2. Appendix RTC2-I, 5.1 (Mitigation Measures Energy – Mitigated), p. 20 of 28. 3. Appendix RTC2-I, 6.2 (Area by Subcategory – Mitigated), p. 24 of 28. 4. Appendix RTC2-I, 7.2 (Water by Land Use – Mitigated), p. 26 of 28. 5. Appendix RTC2-I, 8.2 (Waste by Land Use – Mitigated), p. 28 of 28.				

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences

In order to mitigate GHG emissions to the maximum extent feasible, a number of mitigation measures have been identified in the DEIR. As outlined therein, those measures include: (1) The Applicant shall specify the installation of energy efficient lighting, air conditioning, water heaters, and appliances for all residential and commercial uses (Mitigation Measure 7-6); and (2) The Applicant shall specify the installation of energy efficient street lighting (Mitigation Measure 7-7). Those or comparable measures were incorporated into the CalEEMod emission model. As evidenced by the model output, the resulting value remains substantially in excess of the SCAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold standard of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year and the impact, therefore, remains significant after mitigation.

<sup>10</sup>/ Appendix RTC2-I (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – CalEEMod Emissions Model), 2.2 (Overall Operational – Unmitigated Operational), p. 3 of 28.

***Air Quality Impact 7-9.*** *The project has the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.*

***Level of Significance before Mitigation.*** *Significant.*

Under CEQA, an impact can also be potentially significant if the project does not comply with the applicable plans necessary for the reduction of greenhouse gases. Similar to criteria pollutants, projects that generate de minimus GHG emission levels (i.e., less than 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year) and do not result in a significant impacts or can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level would be deemed to be in compliance with local and regional policies regarding GHG emissions. With regards to the March 2010 SDSP, project-related GHG emissions are projected to be in excess of the threshold criteria and are, therefore, considered to be cumulatively significant.

The project is subject to the requirements of AB 32 and the requirements set forth therein. Similar to mandatory adherence to existing SCAQMD requirements (e.g., Rule 403 for dust control), adherence to SB 32, and those measures outlined therein, would be requisite and, as such, are not mitigation under CEQA.

### **Construction**

As demonstrated above, construction emissions are estimated at no more than 910.28 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year. This value is well below the annual threshold value of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e and the cumulative impact of construction-term GHG emissions to climate change is less than significant. As such, construction activities would not conflict with existing plans and policies.

### **Operations**

Based on the CalEEMod emissions model, the March 2010 SDSP would result in the generation of approximately 14,276.99 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year before mitigation and 13,156.21 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year after mitigation. These values exceed the suggested 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year threshold and the impact to climate change remains significant.





**Environmental Impact Sciences**

**26051 Via Concha**

**Mission Viejo, California 92691-5614**

**(949) 837-1195**