

This page intentionally left blank.

2.0 ADDITIONAL CHANGES, REVISIONS, AND MODIFICATIONS

2.1 Introduction to Additional Changes, Revisions, and Modifications

Because they have been previously presented, this document does not again provide a detailed response to those written and oral comments received by the Lead Agency either during or following the close of the comment period on the DEIR. As authorized under CEQA, following the dissemination of the response to comments document and the end of the CEQA-noticed comment period, the Lead Agency has not sought to provide a detailed written response to each of the written and oral comments submitted to the Department, to the Commission, and/or to the Council. As indicated in the adopted minutes of the Commission’s and the Council’s public hearings and as indicated in the accompanying Department-prepared “staff reports” ([Appendix RTC2-A](#) and [Appendix RTC2-B](#), respectively), the Lead Agency previously presented written and oral responses to a wide range of comments. No further written responses to those comments have been deemed warranted by the Lead Agency and none are presented herein.

With regards to this RTC2 document, the following items are included or addressed herein: (1) additional changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR identified by the Department following the dissemination of the RTC1; (2) augmentation of the DEIR’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions analysis for the March 2010 SDSP; and (3) with regards to the January 2012 SDSP, an alternative project description and analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from that specific plan’s adoption and implementation. Each of those items is separately discussed below.

- **Additional changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR.** Based on the comments received by the Lead Agency and the Department’s continuing environmental analysis, the Lead Agency has sought to further augment the information and analysis presented in the DEIR. The changes, revisions, and other modifications to the DEIR identified herein serve only to clarify and augment the information and analysis previously provided by the Lead Agency with regards to the development of the “Site D” property.
- **Augmented GHG emissions analysis.** Effective March 18, 2010,¹ revisions to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines took effect requiring the analysis of GHG emissions in EIRs prepared after that date.² In accordance therewith, the potential environmental

^{1/} Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007) required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for addressing GHG emissions. On April 13, 2009, OPR submitted to the Secretary for Natural Resources its recommended amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines. On July 3, 2009, the Natural Resources Agency (NRA) commenced the Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking process for certifying and adopting those amendments pursuant to Section 21083.05 of the PRC. The NRA transmitted the adopted amendments and the entire rulemaking file to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on December 31, 2009. On February 16, 2010, the OAL approved the amendments and filed them with the Secretary of State for inclusion in the CCR. The amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines became effective on March 18, 2010.

^{2/} The evaluation of GHG emissions pertains to the following questions from the “environmental checklist form” contained in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines: (1) Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Question VII.a); and (2) Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs? (Question VII.B). Section 15064.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that a lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of

significance of a project’s GHG emissions must be analyzed and calculated (Section 15064.4[a], State CEQA Guidelines) and feasible mitigation considered to mitigate significant impacts (Section 15126.4[c], State CEQA Guidelines). With regards to the March 2010 SDSP, the GHG impact analysis required under statute and its associated regulations is included in Section 4.0 (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” - Greenhouse Gas Emissions) herein. Because this RTC2 document constitutes a part of the FEIR, presented herein are those additional changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR predicated by the augmentation of the GHG emissions analysis.

- **January 2012 SDSP alternative project description and environmental analysis.** Based on the comments received by the Lead Agency concerning the proposed project and its potential environmental effects during the public hearings held by the Commission and the Council following the close of the CEQA-noticed comment period, the December 1, 2010 action by the District’s Board of Trustees, and the Council’s December 7, 2010 Departmental directive, the Department subsequently prepared the January 2012 SDSP (Alternative 6) as a CEQA-related alternative to the March 2012 SDSP.

Presented as a stand-alone alternative, the January 2012 SDSP constitutes a variation of or a revision to the March 2010 SDSP and the two residential-only alternatives (Alternatives 4 and 5) already examined in the DEIR. In accordance with and subject to CEQA requirements, by its inclusion in Section 3.0 (Alternative 6: “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”), the Lead Agency may, at its discretion, elect to approve or conditionally approve the January 2012 SDSP as an alternative to either the March 2010 SDSP or other alternatives examined in the DEIR. For the purpose of CEQA compliance, both the March 2010 SDSP and each of the alternatives presented in the DEIR have been retained.

Based on the District’s election to modify the proposed project and the Council’s directive to consider a revised project description excluding commercial development, attributable in whole or in part to the potential environmental impacts associated with that commercial development and the public’s perception of those impacts, the Lead Agency’s decision-making body may, at its sole discretion, elect not to adopt the March 2010 SDSP. With regards to the March 2010 SDSP, the additional changes, revisions, and other modifications to the DEIR relating to that project may, therefore, be perfunctory³ since they may relate to a development concept which has been altered, modified, or revised in response to public comments, public policy directives, and further environmental analyses. Additional impacts now attributable to the March 2010 SDSP which were not disclosed in the DEIR, resulting from the Lead Agency’s continuing evaluation of that specific plan, provides further rationale for a possible Lead Agency decision not to move forward with that previous development concept but rather to consider other options with regards to the subject property.

As indicated in the DEIR, implementation of the March 2010 SDSP will result in significant, unmitigable construction, operational, and cumulative air quality impacts. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not, however, explicitly cited as significant therein. Although the RTC2

GHG emissions resulting from a proposed general or area plan. The State CEQA Guidelines give the lead agency the discretion to select the most appropriate tools based on substantial evidence.

³/ Pursuant to Section 21080(b)(5) of CEQA, CEQA does not apply to “[p]rojects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.” As further indicated under Section 15270 of the State CEQA Guidelines, “CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.”

analysis indicates that the March 2010 SDSP will produce a significant air quality impact with regards to GHG emissions, because the change in impact significance is the result of new agency-formulated threshold standards and not a failure on the part of the Lead Agency to quantify and disclose the presence of GHG emissions, the preliminary findings of the DEIR are not substantially altered by the subsequent analysis presented herein.

The changes, revisions, and other modifications to the DEIR identified herein, therefore, serve only to clarify and augment the information and analysis previously provided by the Lead Agency. None of the additional information presented herein constitute “substantial new information” predicated recirculation of the DEIR pursuant to Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Recirculation of the DEIR is not required when the new information merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications to an otherwise adequate document. The additional information presented herein fails to meet the standard for recirculation as prescribed in the State CEQA Guidelines.

The insertion of new or revised text into and the removal of existing text from the DEIR would logically result in changes to the pagination of subsequent pages, as required to accommodate those changes. With multiple inserts and deletions, other than through publication of a new and revised version of the DEIR, it may not be possible to precisely specify on what page a excerpt would reside or how the table of contents would ultimately be modified to reflect changes in pagination. Other than with regards to where the changes, revisions, and other modifications to the DEIR text is being inserted or deleted, the Lead Agency’s description of the additional changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR does not include amended page references to a reformatted document. If the DEIR were to be reprinted, the Lead Agency, therefore, acknowledges that some of the page referenced presented herein may vary.

2.2 Additional Changes, Revisions, and Modifications

2.2.1 Draft Environmental Impact Report

Based on written comments received on the DEIR and RTC1 and the Lead Agency’s responses thereto, the following changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR (as subsequently modified in the manner reflected in RTC1) are hereby recommended. Recommended deletions are identified through the use of strikeouts and recommended additions to the document’s text are indicated through the use of underlining. Paragraph numbers commence at the top of the page and include partial paragraphs. For the purpose of paragraph numbering, “bulleted” items are assumed to constitute a paragraph. Unless otherwise noted, page references are with regards to the DEIR. Unless where explicitly modified, those existing footnotes found in the DEIR are not repeated herein but are nonetheless retained.

Cover and Title Page

On January 3, 2012, the City of Diamond relocated its City Hall from 21825 Copley Drive to 21810 Copley Drive, Second Floor, Diamond Bar, California 91765-4178. The document cover and title page are hereby modified to reflect that change in address.

Table of Contents (pp. v and vi)

The following minor changes are made to the Table of Contents of the DEIR. Not reflected herein is the full extent of new text and tables associated with and resulting from the introduction

of the January 2012 SDSP (Alternative 6) and the augmented GHG emissions analysis of the March 2010 SDSP, as reflected in Section 3.0 (Alternative 6: “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”) and Section 4.0 (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan - Greenhouse Gas Emissions”), respectively. Because this RTC2 constitutes a component of the FEIR, the information presented therein is fully incorporated into the City’s CEQA analysis.

List of Sections

4.7.3 Impact Analysis

<u>4.7.3.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>	<u>4.7-30</u>
---	---------------

6.4 Alternatives under Consideration

<u>6.4.6 Alternative 6 - “January 2012 SDSP” Alternative</u>	<u>6-21</u>
--	-------------

List of Tables

<u>3-2A City of Diamond Bar Regional Housing Needs Assessment (2008-2014)</u>	<u>3-3</u>
<u>4.7-9 Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Year</u>	<u>4.7-30</u>
<u>4.7-10 Yearly Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>	<u>4.7-31</u>

Note that the page numbers presented above are approximations and may not precisely reflect the actual pagination based on the changes, revisions, and modifications to the DEIR which are identified in RTC1 and RTC2.

Executive Summary – Significant Environmental Effects (pp. ES-3 and ES-4)

The following changes are made to the Executive Summary (Significant Environmental Effects):

Following Fourth Paragraph

- Air quality (Construction). Combined emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) are estimated at 136.02 pounds/day. This value would exceed the 75-pound/day threshold recommended by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the impact would be deemed to be significant.
- Air quality (Operational). Operationally, the proposed project is projected to create ROG, oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and carbon dioxide (CO) emissions in excess of the SCAQMD suggested daily threshold criteria.
- Air quality (Cumulative). Related project activities, in combination with the construction and operation of the proposed project, will incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the South Coast Air Basin.
- Air quality (GHG emissions). Operationally, the proposed project is projected to generate GHG emissions, specifically carbon dioxide (CO₂), at levels in excess of the SCAQMD’s suggested annual threshold of

3,000 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MTCO₂e). Because these GHG emissions result primarily from vehicle trips attributable to the proposed project, other than through a substantial reduction in the number of projected trip ends, no feasible mitigation exists to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Executive Summary – Project Alternatives (p. ES-5)

The following minor changes are made to the Executive Summary (Project Alternatives):

Following Third Paragraph

- Alternative 6 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”) constitutes a variation of or a revision to the proposed project, Alternative 4 (“Low Density Residential”), and Alternative 5 (“High Density Residential”). Alternative 6 has been formulated by the Department in response to an amended development request by the WVUSD’s Board of Trustees (Board) and the Lead Agency’s requirement to minimize the potential environmental effects attributable to development projects that the City may approve or advance. On December 1, 2010, the Board, at a noticed public meeting, took action and subsequently forwarded a recommendation to the Council that the land-use plan for the District Property be modified to specify a 100 percent residential use. As indicated in correspondence from the District to the City, dated December 2, 2010, the District made the following recommendations: (1) “Site D” be developed 100 percent residential with minimal peripheral open space, green belt and park areas with a monument to mark the entrance into Diamond Bar; and (2) the residential density be reduced to less than 20 units per acre. In response to that request, in combination with other comments received by the Lead Agency following the release of the DEIR and the Council’s subsequent directive, the Department prepared the January 2012 SDSP (as examined in RTC2) as an alternative to the March 2010 SDSP (as examined in the DEIR).

Under this alternative, 200 dwelling units and a new neighborhood park containing not less than two useable acres would be developed on the project site. Vehicular access to the residential and park uses would be provided via a signalized intersection at Cherrydale Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard or at Crooked Creek Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard. Emergency vehicular access and pedestrian access to the neighborhood park would be provided from Pasado Drive. No direct vehicular access to Brea Canyon Road is presently envisioned. No commercial uses would be authorized on the “Site D” property.

The precise location, configuration, and amenities to be included in the proposed neighborhood park will be determined at the time a tentative subdivision map is processed for the residential development. In addition, an “entry feature” will be constructed near the intersection of Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, either predominately or exclusively on the City Property. At minimum, the entry feature shall have a value not less than one-half percent of the building permit valuation of the proposed residential development.

Executive Summary – Project Alternatives (p. ES-5)

The following minor changes are made to the Executive Summary (Project Alternatives):

Fifth Paragraph

CEQA stipulates that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Based on the Lead Agency’s analysis, ~~the “public facilities,” “low-density residential”, and “high-density residential” alternatives are each considered to be environmentally superior to the proposed project. assuming that all identified significant environmental effects are given the same value, a number of the alternative development scenarios examined in the EIR would produce fewer significant environmental impacts that the March 2010 SDSP. Those alternatives that produce the fewest significant environmental effects include the “low-density residential” alternative (Alternative 4) and the “January 2012 SDSP” alternative (Alternative 6).~~

Executive Summary – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance (p. ES-11)

The following changes are made to Table ES-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) in the Executive Summary of the DEIR:

Table ES-1 (Revised)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (Continued)				
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.	<u>Less than Significant</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>None Mitigation Measures 7-6 and 7-7</u>	<u>Less than Significant</u>
<u>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.</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Mitigation Measures 7-6 and 7-7</u>	<u>Significant</u>
<u>Air Quality Impact 7-9. The project has the potential to onflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Mitigation Measures 7-6 and 7-7</u>	<u>Significant</u>

Executive Summary – Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance (p. ES-13)

The following minor changes are made to Table ES-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Level of Significance) in the Executive Summary of the DEIR:

Table ES-1 (Revised)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Effect	Significance Before Mitigation	Recommended Project Conditions	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services (Continued)				
Public Services Impact 9-6. <u>Based on the District’s 2008 fee justification study, assuming multi-family dwellings, project</u> implementation will increase enrollment within the Walnut Valley Unified School District by an estimated 34 <u>89</u> new students, including approximately 44 <u>26</u> new elementary school students (Grades K-6), 8 <u>24</u> new junior high school students (Grades 7-9), and 42 <u>39</u> new high school students (Grades 9-12).	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	Condition of Approval 9-8 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 2.12 acres (approximately 92,390 square feet) of additional parkland within the City.	Less-than Significant	Condition of Approval 9-9 <u>9-8</u>	None	Less-than Significant

Executive Summary – Recommended Conditions of Project Approval (p. ES-20)

The following minor changes are made to Table ES-3 (Recommended Conditions of Project Approval) in the Executive Summary of the DEIR:

Table ES-3 (Revised)

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF ALTERNATIVE PROJECT APPROVAL

No.	Condition of Approval
	Geotechnical Hazards
3-1	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 <u>serve to demonstrate compliance with applicable Uniform Building Code (Title 24, Part 2, CCR) standards.</u> 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.

Section 1.1 – Introduction – Purpose and Legal Authority (p. 1-1)

The following minor changes are made to Section 1.1 (Purpose and Legal Authority) in Section 1.0 (Introduction) of the DEIR:

First and Second Paragraphs

This “Draft Environmental Impact Report for the ‘Site D’ Specific Plan, SCH No. 2008021014” (DEIR), prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, serves as an informational document prepared to inform public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant or potentially significant environmental effects that may be associated with the approval of the proposed approximately ~~29.69~~ 30.36-acre (rounded to 30.4 acres) “Site D’ Specific Plan” (SDSP), including any and all discretionary actions associated therewith.

Portions of the project site are owned by the Walnut Valley Unified School District (WVUSD or District), the City, and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD or County), a division of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). The WVUSD’s governing body has determined that the District’s approximately ~~28.04~~ 28.71-acre property (School Property or District Property) is unnecessary for future school use and has declared it to “surplus.” Adjacent to that property, the City owns an approximately ~~0.93~~ 0.98-acre contiguous site (City Property) located to the north and west of the LACFCD’s existing Brea Canyon Storm Drain Channel.

Section 1.1 – Introduction – Purpose and Legal Authority (p. 1-2)

The following minor changes are made to Section 1.1 (Purpose and Legal Authority) in Section 1.0 (Introduction) of the DEIR:

Second and Third Paragraphs

The Brea Canyon Storm Drain Channel (Brea Canyon Channel), which runs generally parallel to Brea Canyon Road, separates the District Property from the City Property. The LACFCD’s approximately ~~0.75~~ 0.67-acre facility (County

“Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

Property) is presently an open box culvert which, as proposed and in accordance with the LACFCD’s “Guidelines for Overbuilding and Air Rights” and such other standards as may be established by the County, would be covered and the lands situated above that facility integrated into the design of the proposed project.

The term “Site D” was originally established by the WVUSD as part of a planning process conducted by the District with regards to the identification of real properties owned by the WVUSD that it determined to be no longer necessary for school district purposes. As part of that process, multiple properties were identified, including the ~~28.04~~ 28.71-acre ~~School District~~ Property.

Section 2.1 – Project Description - Project Location (p. 2-1)

The following minor changes are made to Section 2.1 (Project Location) in Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the DEIR:

First Paragraph

The approximately ~~29.69~~ 30.4-acre project site is located within the corporate boundaries of the City Diamond Bar, an incorporated community situated along the western edge of Los Angeles County (County).

Section 2.2.2 – Project Description – Applicant’s Objectives (pp. 2-7 and 2-8)

The following minor changes are made to Section 2.2.2 (Applicant’s Objectives) in Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the DEIR:

Following Fourth Paragraph

Since the MOU and subsequent discussions between the City and the District constitute a declaration of the intent of both parties, that document and those discussions contains information that can be utilized in the formulation of Applicant-based objectives. The following Applicant-based objectives can be derived from that document and those discussions.

- District desires the disposition of the School Property to yield ~~the maximum~~ a reasonable return to the District for the benefit of its constituents and its educational mission.
- City desires that the School Property and the City Property be developed in a manner as to assure compatibility with and to meet the needs of the surrounding area and to ~~provide a desirable level of sales tax revenues to the City~~ ensure an appropriate use of the City Property and reasonable return to the City.

~~With regards to “Site D,” the property owners have established broad economic objectives and have, in general terms, determined the nature of the land use that would seek to accomplish those objectives. The City Council has established the following goal and objective for the “Site D” property for the 2009-2010 FY: “Evaluate and develop a Specific Plan for the future use of the 28 acre parcel at~~

~~Diamond Bar Blvd. and Brea Canyon Road (Site D) to incorporate a minimum of 50% of the site for retail commercial uses/residential development.”~~

~~As further indicated in the MOU, of the usable acreage on “Site D,” a minimum of 50 percent of the property be designated for residential development and 50 percent will be designated for commercial use, exclusive of necessary infrastructure. Based on those actions, the following additional Applicant-based objectives can be established.~~

- ~~With regards to the project site, pursue the establishment of site-specific land-use policies that allows, in reasonably comparable acreage, the development of both commercial and residential uses of the property, accommodating the provision of additional housing opportunities and the introduction of revenue-generating uses.~~
- ~~Establish a specific plan as the guiding land-use policy mechanism to define the nature and intensity of future development and to establish design and development parameters for the project site, so as to allow conveyance of the subject property to one or more developers and/or master builders and provide to the purchasers reasonable assurance as to the uses that would be authorized on the project site and the nature of those exactions required for those uses.~~

Section 2.4 – Project Description – Tentative Project Schedule (p. 2-18)

The following minor changes are made to Section 2.4 (Tentative Project Schedule) in Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the DEIR:

Third Paragraph

With regards to the proposed project or to any alternative development-based project examined by the Lead Agency, the tentative project schedule presented in Table 2-1 (Tentative Project Schedule) is subject to possible change or refinement based on a number of factors. Neither the City nor the District currently plan to serve in the role of the developer(s) of the project site. It is, however, the District’s intent to sell or otherwise convey the District Property and the City’s intent to assist the District by generally defining the nature and intensity of allowable land uses that the City may authorize on the District Property, obtain a productive use of the City Property, and participating in any subsequent negotiations concerning the possible use of air rights to and above the County Property through to one or more buyers following the City’s adoption of the “Site D’ Specific Plan.” Since that purchaser or those purchasers have not yet been identified, it is not possible to delineate a definitive project schedule.

Based on a variety of factors, the tentative project schedule presented in the DEIR cannot be realized with regards to either the proposed project or an alternative project. As a result, a revised implementation schedule has been formulated. That schedule is, however, subject to further refinement should the District’s plans to convey the subject property to a subsequent developer be delayed or should that developer pursue a different timeline. The extension of the project schedule is not anticipated to result in any substantive changes to the environmental analysis presented in the EIR.

Table 2-1 (Revised)
TENTATIVE PROJECT SCHEDULE¹

Activity	Commencement Date	Completion Date
Specific Plan and Tentative Map Project Approval	<u>01 / 2012</u>	<u>02 / 2012</u>
Specific Plan and Tentative Tract Map Project Approval	09 / 2009 <u>06 / 2012</u>	10 / 2009 <u>10 / 2012</u>
Final Map Approval	04 / 2010 <u>11 / 2012</u>	04 / 2010 <u>02 / 2013</u>
Site Grading	10 / 2010 <u>04 / 2013</u>	04 / 2011 <u>10 / 2013</u>
Construction	05 / 2011 <u>11 / 2014</u>	01 / 2012 <u>11 / 2014</u>
Build-Out and Occupancy	02 / 2012 <u>11 / 2014</u>	06 / 2012 <u>06 / 2015</u>
Notes: 1. Subject to further change and refinement.		

Source: TRG Land, Inc. City of Diamond Bar

Section 2.3 – Project Description - General Plan and Zone Change (p. 2-9)

The following minor changes are made to Section 2.3 (Project Description) in Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the DEIR:

Third Paragraph

The approximately 30.36-acre (rounded to 30.4 acres) project site is owned, in parts, by the Walnut Valley Unified School District (~~28.04~~ 28.71 acres), the City of Diamond Bar (~~0.93~~ 0.98 acres), and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (~~0.75~~ 0.67 acres).

Section 2.3.1 – Project Description - General Plan and Zone Change (p. 2-10)

The following minor changes are made to Section 2.3.1 (General Plan and Zone Change) in Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the DEIR:

Sixth Paragraph

Proposed is the adoption of a General Plan amendment (GPA 2007-03) from “Public Facility (PF)” and “General Commercial (C)” to “Specific Plan.” Also proposed is a corresponding zone change (ZC) from “Low Medium Residential (R-1-7,500),” “Low Density Residential (R-1-10,000),” and Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)” to “Specific Plan (SP).” The GPA and ZC would encompass and, if adopted, be applicable to the entire approximately ~~29.69~~ 30.4-acre site.

Section 3.2 – Related Projects (p. 3-3)

The following minor changes are made to Section 3.2 (Reasonably Anticipated Probable Future Projects) in Section 3.0 (Related Projects) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

State planning law requires that each municipality periodically update the housing element of its local general plan. On April 19, 2011 (Resolution No. 2011-11), the City Council adopted the “City of Diamond Bar 2008-2014 Housing Element” outlining the City’s housing strategy for the 2008-2014 time period. The updated Housing Element includes the SCAG-adopted Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2008-2014 time period, identifying the number of new housing units (by income category) needed to accommodate projected growth within the City. As reflected in Table 3-2A (City of Diamond Bar Regional Housing Needs Assessment [2008-2014]), the City’s allotted share of regional growth is represented as 1,090 new housing units.

Table 3-2A
CITY OF DIAMOND BAR
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT
(2008-2014)

Income Category	Number of Dwelling Units
<u>Very Low</u>	<u>284</u>
<u>Low</u>	<u>179</u>
<u>Moderate</u>	<u>188</u>
<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>440</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>1,090</u>

Source: City of Diamond Bar

The RHNA is a planning target and not a formal development quota. As part of the Housing Element update, each municipality is required to analyze the potential development capacity of vacant or underutilized sites and identify an “inventory” of parcels at appropriate densities that could accommodate the RNHA allocation of new housing units. The Housing Element analysis concluded that the City possessed insufficient inventory to accommodate the RHNA allocation in the “very low” and “low” income categories. As a result, the City is required to create additional opportunities for affordable housing through a rezoning program. State law recognizes that cities generally do not build housing and, while cities are not required to achieve their RHNA targets, they are required to rezone land if there is not adequate capacity to accommodate the number and type of housing units allocated in the RNHA.

Under State law, a density of at least 30 units per acre is considered necessary to facilitate development of affordable housing. As a result, in order to accommodate the RHNA allocation of “very low” and “low” income households, a total of 15.6 acres of land is needed at a density of 30 units per acre. The Housing Element update identified potential sites for rezoning to meet the City’s identified need. The City’s adopted Housing Element (Program 9) contains a commitment to rezone at least 15.6 acres of land in order to accommodate a minimum of 466 multi-family housing units with a density of 30 units per acre.

The City’s adoption of the Housing Element update^[Footnote 1] did not, in and of itself, produce a change of zone or amend an existing General Plan land-use.

Following adoption, the City will initiate the environmental studies needed to assist the Planning Commission and City Council in identifying the appropriate sites to be rezoned.^[Footnote 2] Because no sites have been formally identified and no permits have been filed for that action, the zone change identified in the adopted Housing Element has not been included as a “related project” herein and has not been considered for the purpose of cumulative impact analysis.

Footnote 1: State law mandates that cities submit draft housing elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) prior to adoption. On January 18, 2011, HCD stated that the revised draft element addressed all statutory requirements.

Footnote 2: City of Diamond Bar, Community Development Department, Agenda Report 7-1 (2008-2014 Housing Element Update [General Plan Amendment No. PL 2011-43]), April 19, 2011.

Section 4.1.1.1 - Land Use – Regulatory Setting (p. 4.1-7)

The following minor changes are made to Table 4.1-1 (Allowable Hillside Management Densities) in Section 4.1.1.1 (Regulatory Setting) in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the DEIR:

Table 4.1-1 (Revised)
ALLOWABLE HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT DENSITIES¹

Average Slope Range (%)	Density Reduction Factor	Open Space (%)	“Site D” Specific Plan	
			Acreage	Allowable Number of Units
0-25	None	None	22.7	454
26-30	0.9	10	2.0	36
31-35	0.8	20	1.4	22
36-40	0.6	30	1.0	-
Greater than 40	Development may be extremely limited	40	-	-
Total:			30.4 ²	524
Notes:				
1. Section 22.22.040 (Density), Municipal Code.				
2. Acreage calculations exceed the total project area (29.69 acres) as a result of rounding.				

Source: TRG Land, Inc. and City of Diamond Bar

Section 4.1.3.2 – Land Use - Consistency Analysis (p. 4.1-14)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.1.3.2 (Consistency Analysis) in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the DEIR:

First Paragraph

Absent a specific plan, assuming a lot-line adjustment to between equate the existing zoning with the site’s development potential, as represented in Figure 2-3 (“Site D” Specific Plan - Conceptual Land-Use Plan), approximately ~~40.09~~ 10.1-acre and ~~40.07~~ 10.1-acre portions of the property would be allotted to commercial and residential uses, respectively. The remaining approximately ~~9.53~~ 10.2-acres of the ~~29.69~~ 30.4-acre property would be used to accommodate internal circulation and would become common open space areas that, for the purpose of assessing development potential, could be assignable to either the commercial or residential acreage.

Section 4.1.3.2 – Land Use - Consistency Analysis (p. 4.1-14)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.1.3.2 (Consistency Analysis) in Section 4.1 (Land Use) of the DEIR:

Third and Fourth Paragraphs

As proposed, the Applicant seeks approval for 202 dwelling units on an approximately ~~40.07~~ 10.1-net acre building pad, representing a residential density of ~~20.06~~ 20 dwelling units per gross ~~net~~ acre (~~20.06~~ 20 DU/A). Assuming that the remaining (residual) 10.2 acres of the project site were allocated in its entirety to residential use, based on a residential area of ~~49.60~~ 20.3 gross acres (~~40.07~~ 10.1 + ~~9.53~~ 10.2 = ~~49.60~~ 20.3) and the application of the highest applicable density standards authorized in the “Low Medium Density Residential” zone (5 DU/A), a total of ~~98~~ 102 dwelling units could be constructed on the project site. This number is substantially less than the 202 dwelling units now being proposed under the “March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan.” Based on a total residential acreage of ~~49.60~~ 20.3 gross acres, the 202 proposed units represents a residential density of approximately ~~40.34~~ 10 dwelling units per gross acre (~~40.34~~ 10 DU/A). If a fractional portion of the 10.2-acre residual common areas were assigned to the commercial development, the resulting density would be less than ~~20.04~~ 20 DU/A dwelling units per net acre but would be more than ~~40.34~~ 10 DU/A dwelling units per gross acre.

As stipulated in Section 22.06.040 (Zoning District Regulations), referencing Table 202 (Zoning Consistency Matrix) therein, within the “Low Medium Density Residential (RLM)” designation, the following existing zoning districts are deemed consistent: R-1-8,000, RPD-8,000, R-A-8,000, R-1-7,500, R-1-6,000, and R-2. None of those zoning districts allow for the development of residential uses at a density of ~~40.34~~ 10 DU/A or greater. As such, the proposed residential component of the project is not consistent with the City’s existing land-use policies and a General Plan amendment (GPA) and/or zone change (ZC) would be required to accommodate that portion of the proposed project.

Section 4.2.1.2 – Population and Housing – Regional Setting (p. 4.2-6)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.2.1.2 (Regional Setting) in Section 4.2 (Population and Housing) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

The most recently completed RHNA planning period is January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2014. Due to the requirements of SB 375^[Footnote 1], SCAG is preparing the next RHNA planning cycle which will cover January 1, 2011 to September 30, 2021. As indicated in the “City of Diamond Bar 2008-2014 Housing Element,” as adopted on April 19, 2011 (Resolution No. 2011-11), the City’s current regional housing needs assessment is 1,098 dwelling units. That inventory is comprised of 143 “extremely low,” 143 “very low,” 180 “low,” 189 “moderate,” and 443 “above moderate” income units.^[Footnote 2] The increase from 1,090 to 1,098 units is the result of the City’s annexation of a 116.6-acre area of unincorporated Los Angeles County in 2009 (Annexation 2007-20) and the City’s acceptance of a RHNA transfer of eight units from the County.

Footnote 1: SB 375 (Steinberg), which became effective on January 1, 2009, requires the CARB to develop regional reduction targets for GHG emissions and prompts the creation of regional plans to reduce emissions from vehicle use throughout the California. The State's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have been tasked with creating "Sustainable Community Strategies" (SCS). The MPOs are required to develop the SCS through integrated land use and transportation planning and demonstrate an ability to attain the proposed reduction targets by 2020 and 2035.

Footnote 2: City of Diamond Bar, City of Diamond Bar 2008-2014 Housing Element, adopted April 19, 2011, Table II-27, p. II-27.

Section 4.5.1.3 - Biological Resources – Local Setting (p. 4.5-11)

The following minor changes are made to Table 4.5-2 (Plant Communities on the Project Site) in Section 4.5.1.3 (Local Setting) in Section 4.5 (Biological Resources) of the DEIR:

Table 4.5-2 (Revised)
PLANT COMMUNITIES ON THE PROJECT SITE

Plant Community	CNDDB ¹ Code	Approximate Acres
Developed	N/A	0.3
Disturbed/Ruderal	N/A	20.4
Eucalyptus Stand/Disturbed	N/A	3.6
Mule Fat Scrub	63.510.00	2.8
Ruderal/Goldenbrush Scrub	N/A	0.9
Southern Willow Scrub ²	61.208.00	0.3
California Walnut Woodland ²	72.100.01	1.5
California Walnut Woodland/Disturbed	72.100.01/N/	0.6
Total		30.4 ³

Notes:
 1. CNDDB Classification System
 2. Considered high-priority for inventory under the CNDDB.
 3. Although the project site is actually less than 30 acres in size, due to numeric rounding, a slightly larger area is depicted herein. This difference is not representative of internal variations or inconsistencies with regards to the manner in which the project is described but only the consequence of rounding numbers upward.

Source: PCR Services Corporation

Section 4.3.4 – Geotechnical Hazards – Project Conditions and Mitigation Measures (p. 4.3-46)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.3.4 (Project Conditions and Mitigation Measures – Conditions of Approval) in Section 4.3 (Geotechnical Hazards) of the DEIR:

Second Paragraph

Project Condition 3-1. 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.

Section 4.7.1.1 – Air Quality – Regulatory Setting (p. 4.7-3)

The following minor changes are made to Table 4.7-1 (Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants) in Section 4.7.1.1 (Regulatory Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Table 4.7-1
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Primary Standard	Major Pollutant Sources
Ozone (O ₃)	1 hour	0.09 ppm	*	Motor vehicles, paints, coatings, and solvents.
	8 hours	0.070	0.075 ppm	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 hour	20 ppm	35 ppm	Internal combustion engines, primarily gasoline-powered motor vehicles.
	8 hours	9.0 ppm	9 ppm	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Annual Average	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm	Motor vehicles, petroleum-refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft, ships, and railroads.
	1 hour	0.18 ppm	*	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	Annual Average	*	0.03 ppm	Fuel combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.
	1 hour	0.25 ppm	*	
	24 hours	0.04 ppm	0.14 ppm	
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³	*	Dust and fume-producing construction, industrial, and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g. wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
	24 hours	50 µg/m ³	150 µg/m ³	
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	15 µg/m ³	Dust and fume-producing construction, industrial, and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g. wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
	24 hours	*	35 µg/m ³	
Lead (Pb)	Monthly	1.5 µg/m ³	*	Present source: lead smelters, battery manufacturing & recycling facilities. Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.
	Quarterly	*	1.5 µg/m ³	
	<u>3-Month Average</u>	<u>0.15 µg/m³</u>	<u>0.15 µg/m³</u>	
Sulfates (SO ₄)	24 hours	25 µg/m ³	*	Industrial processes.
Notes: ppm: parts per million µg/m ³ : micrograms per cubic meter * = standard is not applicable for this pollutant/duration by this entity.				

Source: California Air Resources Board

Section 4.7.1.1 – Air Quality – Regulatory Setting (p. 4.7-3)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.1.1 (Regulatory Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following Second Paragraph

California Code of Regulations

Energy conservation standards for new residential and non-residential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission in June 1977 and most recently revised in 2008 (Title 24, Part 6, CCR). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy-efficiency technologies and methods. The 2006 “Appliance Efficiency Regulations” (Title 20, Sections 1601 through 1608), dated December 2006, were adopted by the California Energy Commission (CEC) on October 11, 2006 and approved by the California Office of Administrative Law on December 14, 2006. The regulations include standards for both federally-regulated and non-federally regulated appliances.

On April 23, 2008, the CEC adopted the “2008 Building Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings – Regulations/Standards”^[Footnote 1] (2008 Energy-Efficiency Standards) and the Building Standards Commission approved them for publication on September 11, 2008. The 2008 Energy-Efficiency Standards authorizes locally-adopted energy standards (Section 10-106). As authorized therein: “Local governmental agencies may adopt and enforce energy standards for newly constructed buildings, additions, alterations, and repairs provided that the Commission finds that the standards will require buildings to be designed to consume no more energy than permitted by Part 6. Such local standards include, but are not limited to, adopting the requirements of Part 6 before their effective date, requiring additional energy conservation measures, or setting more stringent energy budgets.”^[Footnote 2]

Footnote 1: California Energy Commission, 2008 Building Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings – Regulations/ Standards, CEC-400-2008-001-CMF, December 2008; California Energy Commission, Reference Appendices for the 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, CEC-400-2008-004-CMF, December 2008, revised June 2009.

Footnote 2: *Ibid.*, Section 10-106, p. 10.

Section 4.7.1.2 – Air Quality – Regional Setting (p. 4.7-10)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.1.2 (Regional Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following First Paragraph

The United States Supreme Court, in Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency (2007), ruled that carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other GHGs are pollutants

under the federal Clean Air Act which the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) must regulate if it determines they pose an endangerment to public health and welfare. On April 24, 2009, the USEPA issued a proposed finding that GHGs contribute to air pollution that may endanger public health and welfare. That finding was finalized in December 2009 and became effective on January 14, 2010.

Section 4.7.1.2 – Air Quality – Regional Setting (p. 4.7-10)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.1.2 (Regional Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following Fourth Paragraph

New guidelines for the analysis and mitigation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions under CEQA took effect on March 18, 2010. 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, 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: (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.

Section 4.7.1.3 – Air Quality – Local Setting (p. 4.7-13)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.1.3 (Local Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

The data show recurring violations of both the State and federal O₃ standards and no clear trend is apparent, though the recent years show reductions from historic levels. The data also indicate that the area regularly exceeds the PM₁₀ standards. Additionally, PM_{2.5} has exceeded the federal standard ~~six~~ 23 times in the last five years that it has been monitored. Neither the CO nor the NO₂ standards have been violated in the last five years at this station.

Section 4.7.1.3 – Air Quality – Local Setting (p. 4.7-14)

In order to reflect the most recent five years of available data (2005-2009), the following Table 4.7-3 (Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Summary), as revised, replaces the existing Table 4.7-3 (Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Summary) (2002-2006) in Section 4.7.1.3 (Local Setting) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Table 4.7-3 (Revised)
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY
(Pomona/Walnut Valley and Southwest San Bernardino Valley Monitoring Stations)¹

Pollutant/Standard	Number of Days Threshold Were Exceeded and Maximum Levels During Such Violations				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Ozone					
State 1-hour > 0.09 ppm	26	32	<u>19</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>25</u>
State 8-hour > 0.07 ppm	18	30	<u>25</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>37</u>
Federal 1-hour > 0.12 ppm	4	6	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Federal 8-hour > 0.08/ <u>0.075</u> ppm ²	11	16	<u>18</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>23</u>
Max. 1-hour conc. (ppm)	0.140	0.150	<u>0.153</u>	<u>0.141</u>	<u>0.138</u>
Max. 8-hour conc. (ppm)	0.112	0.128	<u>0.108</u>	<u>0.110</u>	<u>0.099</u>
Carbon Monoxide					
State 8-Hour ≥ 9.1 ppm	0	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Federal 8-Hour ≥ 9.5 ppm	0	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Max 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	4	3	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)	2.5	2.1	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>
Nitrogen Dioxide					
State 1-Hour ≥ 0.18 ppm	0	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.08	0.10	<u>0.10</u>	<u>0.11</u>	<u>0.10</u>
Inhalable Particulates (PM₁₀)³					
State 24-Hour > 50 µg/m ³	31.7	27.4	<u>24.1</u>	<u>24.2</u>	<u>14.5</u>
Federal 24-Hour > 150 µg/m ³	0	0	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Max. 24-Hour Conc. (µg/m ³)	74	78	<u>115</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>70</u>
Inhalable Particulates (PM_{2.5})³					
Federal 24-Hour > 65/35 µg/m ³	0.9	6.5	<u>5.9</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>2.6</u>
Max. 24-Hour Conc. (µg/m ³)	87.8	53.7	<u>72.8</u>	<u>54.2</u>	<u>46.9</u>

Table 4.7-3 (Continued)(Revised)
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY

(Pomona/Walnut Valley and Southwest San Bernardino Valley Monitoring Stations)¹

Notes:

1. Ozone, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen dioxide are as measured at the Walnut/Pomona Valley monitoring station. PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} particulates are monitored at the Southwest San Bernardino Valley monitoring station.
- ~~2. NS – No standard.~~
2. In 2007 this standard was reduced from 0.08 ppm to 0.075 ppm. The presented 2007 and newer values represents compliance with the newer 0.075 ppm standard. There were no violations of the prior 0.08-ppm standard in 2007.
3. Percent of samples exceeding standard. In 2006 this standard was reduced from 65 µg/m³ to 35 µg/m³. The presented 2006 and subsequent values represent compliance with the newer 35 µg/m³ standard.

ppm: parts per million; µg/m³, micrograms per cubic meter

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Section 4.7.2 – Air Quality – Threshold of Significance Criteria (p. 4.7-18)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.2 (Threshold of Significance Criteria) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following Sixth Paragraph

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 CO₂ equivalent (MTCO₂e) per year for industrial projects; or (2) 3,000 MTCO₂e per year for commercial or residential projects.^[Footnote]

In selecting the identified threshold of significance criteria for GHG emissions for the proposed 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 criteria of 3,000 MTCO₂e will be applied to proposed project and to those alternatives selected by the Lead Agency for more detailed evaluation.

Footnote: 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 MTCO₂e/year [metric tons CO₂ equivalent] for industrial projects where the 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 MTCO₂e/year), commercial projects (1,400 MTCO₂e/year), and mixed use projects (3,000 MTCO₂e/year) and option #2 – a single numerical threshold for all non-industrial projects of 3,000

MTCO2e/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.”

Section 4.7.3.1 – Air Quality – Construction Impacts (p. 4.7-20)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.3.1 (Construction Impacts) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Eighth Paragraph

As noted, the project involves the construction of 202 multi-family units on approximately 10.1 acres of land and 153,985 square feet of commercial uses also on 10.1 acres. The remainder of the site (approximately ~~9.49~~ 10.2 acres) is to include infrastructure and open space and was combined in the acreage calculations by assuming that the residential and commercial component each occupy an area of ~~14.85~~ approximately 15.2 acres.

Section 4.7.3 – Air Quality – Impact Analysis (p. 4.7-30)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.3 (Impact Analysis) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

4.7.3.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project’s augmented GHG emissions analysis, as intended for inclusion in Section 4.7.3.4 (Greenhouse Gas Emission) of the DEIR, is presented in Section 4.0 (“March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan” – Greenhouse Gas Emissions) in the Lead Agency’s “Response to Comments No. 2” (January 2012).

Section 4.7.5 – Air Quality – Significant Unavoidable Adverse Effects (p. 4.7-31)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.5 (Significant Unavoidable Adverse Effects) in Section 4.7 (Air Quality) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

The approval, construction, operation, occupancy, use, and habitation of the proposed project will result in the creation of significant, unmitigated construction, operational, ~~and~~ cumulative air quality, and GHG emission-related impacts. Based on the continuing presence of significant, unmitigated environmental effects, a Statement of Overriding Considerations would be required should the City elect to approve the project as now proposed and based on the recommended mitigation measures.

Section 4.9.3 – Public Services – Impact Analysis (p. 4.9-26)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.3 (Impact Analysis) in Section 4.9 (Public Services) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

Public Services Impact 9-6. Based on the 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 34 89 new students, including approximately 44 26 new elementary school students (Grades K-6), 8 24 new junior high school students (Grades 7-9), and 42 39 new high school students (Grades 9-12).

Section 4.9.3 – Public Services – Impact Analysis (p. 4.9-27)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.7.3 (Impact Analysis) in Section 4.9 (Public Services) of the DEIR:

Following First Paragraph

As indicated in the WVUSD’s 2008 “Justification Report for the Walnut Valley Unified School District,”^[Footnote] the WVUSD has determined that, on average: (1) each new single-family dwelling unit constructed within the District’s boundaries will generate ~~0.768~~ 0.682 new students; and (2) each new multi-family dwelling unit constructed within the District’s boundaries will generate ~~0.152~~ 0.443 new students; and (3) ~~each new apartment constructed within the District’s boundaries will generate 0.120 new students.~~ Under the multi-family category, each new multi-family dwelling unit constructed within the District would generate ~~0.053~~ 0.128 new Grade K-5 students, ~~0.039~~ 0.121 Grade 6-8 students, and ~~0.059~~ 0.193 Grade 9-12 students. Based on that student generation rate, the proposed 202-unit housing project (assuming ~~the multi-family rates of 0.152 students per unit~~) will add around 34 89 students, including 44 26 new elementary school students (Grades K-6), 8 24 new ~~junior high~~ middle school students (Grades 7-9), and ~~42~~ 39 new high school students (Grades 9-12).

Conversely, under the single-family category, each new single-family dwelling unit constructed within the District’s boundaries would generate 0.225 new Grade K-5 students, 0.170 Grade 6-8 students, and 0.288 Grade 9-12 students. Based on that student generation, the proposed 202-unit housing project (assuming single-family rates) will add around 138 students, including 45 new elementary school students (Grades K-6), 34 new middle school students (Grades 7-9) , and 58 new high school students (Grades 9-12).

Footnote: Calwell Flores Winters, Inc., 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 ~~March 2006~~ February 2008, ~~March 2006~~ February 2008.

Section 4.13.1.2 – Growth Inducement – Regional Setting (p. 4.13-3)

The following minor changes are made to Section 4.13.1.2 (Regional Setting) in Section 4.13 (Growth Inducement) of the DEIR:

Following Fifth Paragraph

In January 2008, SCAG released the “Draft 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan: Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future” (Draft 2008 RCP). As indicated therein, it is SCAG’s policy to promote the development of “specific plans, zoning overlays and other tools to stimulate desired land-use changes within 2% Strategy Opportunity Areas.”^[Footnote 1] In October 2008, SCAG adopted the 2008 “Regional Comprehensive Plan” (2008 RCP). The 2008 RCP acknowledged that the SCAG region is “still growing – the region is expected to add another seven million residents by 2035. The new arrivals are members of our own growing families and those attracted by the strong regional economy and we can expect this growth regardless of the land use decisions we make.”^[Footnote 2] As indicated in the 2008 RCP, SCAG recognized that growth is both inevitable and will occur independent of local and/or regional land-use decisions. However, “by linking responsible land use and transportation planning, we can accommodate growth while maintaining the region’s mobility, livability, prosperity and sustainability.”^[Footnote 3]

Footnote 1: Southern California Association of Governments, Draft 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan: Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future, January 2008, Policy LU-1.1, p. 20.

Footnote 2: Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan – Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future, October 2, 2008.

Footnote 3: *Ibid.*

Section 6.4 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternatives under Consideration (p. 6-5)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4 (Alternatives under Consideration) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Fourth Paragraph

Based on the multiple General Plan and zoning designations that have been established for various portions of the project site, it is evident that the City has or, at the time of the adoption of those public policy documents, had a variety of diverse visions for that property. In recognition of those existing land-use policies, in addition to the proposed project, a total of ~~four~~ five development-based and one no-development scenarios have been considered by the Lead Agency. Excluding the “no project” and “high-density residential” alternatives, each alternative development-based scenario bears a relationship to City’s existing “land-use classification system.” In addition to the “no project” alternative, the ~~four~~ five development-based alternatives evaluated by the City are identified below and the land-use assumptions associated with each of those alternatives are presented in Table 6-1 (Land-Use Assumptions for Project Alternatives).

Section 6.4 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternatives under Consideration (p. 6-6)

The following minor changes are made to Table 6-1 (Land-Use Assumptions for Project Alternatives) in Section 6.4 (Alternatives under Consideration) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Note: A revised Table 6-1 (Land-Use Assumptions for Project Alternatives) has been included herein. Because Table 6-1 is presented in landscape format, that revised exhibit is presented later in this section and not directly below.

Section 6.4 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternatives under Consideration (p. 6-9)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4 (Alternatives under Consideration) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Following Third Paragraph

- Alternative 6 (“January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”) constitutes a variation of or a revision to the proposed project, Alternative 4 (“Low Density Residential”), and Alternative 5 (“High Density Residential”). Alternative 6 has been formulated by the Department in response to an amended development request by the WVUSD’s Board of Trustees (Board) and the Lead Agency’s requirement to minimize the potential environmental effects attributable to development projects that the City may approve or advance. On December 1, 2010, the Board, at a noticed public meeting, took action and subsequently forwarded a recommendation to the Council that the land-use plan for the District Property be modified to specify a 100 percent residential use. As indicated in correspondence from the District to the City, dated December 2, 2010, the District made the following recommendations: (1) “Site D” be developed 100 percent residential with minimal peripheral open space, green belt and park areas with a monument to mark the entrance into Diamond Bar; and (2) the residential density be reduced to less than 20 units per acre.^[Footnote] In response to that request, in combination with other comments received by the Lead Agency following the release of the DEIR and the Council’s subsequent directive, the Department prepared the January 2012 SDSP (as examined in RTC2) as an alternative to the March 2010 SDSP (as examined in the DEIR).

Under this alternative, 200 dwelling units and a new neighborhood park containing not less than two useable acres would be developed on the project site. Vehicular access to the residential and park uses would be provided via a signalized intersection at Cherrydale Drive and Diamond Bar Boulevard or at Crooked Creek and Diamond Bar Boulevard. Emergency vehicular access and pedestrian access to the neighborhood park would be provided from Pasado Drive. No direct vehicular access to Brea Canyon Road is presently envisioned. No commercial uses would be authorized on the “Site D” property

The precise location, configuration, and amenities to be included in the proposed neighborhood park will be determined at the time a tentative subdivision map is processed for the residential development. In addition, an “entry feature” will be constructed near the intersection of Diamond Bar Boulevard and Brea Canyon Road, either predominately or exclusively on the City Property. At minimum, the entry feature shall have a value not less than one-half percent of the building permit valuation of the proposed residential development.

Footnote: Letter from Nancy Lyons, President, Board of Trustees, Walnut Valley Unified School District to Carol Herrera, Mayor, City of Diamond Bar (Re: Recommendation for and Use Development on Site D), December 2, 2010.

Section 6.4.1 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternative 1: “No Project” Alternative (p. 6-11)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4.1 (Alternative 1 – “No Project” Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Second Paragraph

- ◇ Air quality (Cumulative). Independent of the Lead Agency’s actions concerning the project site, related project activities will continue to incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the SCAB. However, with regards to criteria emissions, since site-specific contributions will not add to those conditions, cumulative air quality impacts would be deemed to be less than significant.
- ◇ Air quality (GHG emissions). Since no site-specific construction activities would occur under this alternative and since no new uses would be introduced onto the project site, thus producing no new operational emissions, no GHG emissions would be generated and no significant GHG-related impacts would result therefrom.

Section 6.4.2 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternative 2: “Public Facilities” Alternative (p. 6-13)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4.2 (Alternative 2 – “Public Facilities” Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Seventh Paragraph

- ◇ Air quality (Cumulative). Related project activities, in combination with the construction and operation of the proposed project, would incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the SCAB. Under the SCAQMD’s recommended methodology, development activities that generate significant air quality impacts, including criteria and/or GHG emissions, are also assumed to generate significant cumulative air quality impacts.
- ◇ Air quality (GHG emissions). Implementation of this alternative will result in the generation of approximately 2,478 daily trip ends during a typical weekday. Based on the CalEEMod modeling results for Alternative 6 (January 2012 SDSP), which generates only about 1,182 daily trip ends, GHG emissions would be predicted to exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold standard of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year and the resulting impact would remain both individually and cumulatively significant after mitigation.

Section 6.4.3 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternative 3: “Community Commercial” Alternative (p. 6-15)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4.3 (Alternative 3 – “Community Commercial” Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Second Paragraph

- ◇ Air quality (Cumulative). Related project activities, in combination with the project’s construction and operation, would incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the SCAB. Under the SCAQMD’s recommended methodology, development activities that generate significant air quality impacts, including criteria and/or GHG emissions, are also assumed to generate significant cumulative air quality impacts.
- ◇ Air quality (GHG emissions). Under this alternative, 307,969 square feet of commercial use would be developed on the project site. Based on a doubling of the trip generation assumptions (Table 4.6-5) associated with the commercial component of the proposed project (March 2010 SDSP), approximately 16,184 daily trip ends would be generated during a typical weekday. Based on the CalEEMod modeling results for Alternative 6 (January 2012 SDSP), which generates only about 1,182 daily trip ends, GHG emissions would be predicted to exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold standard of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year and the resulting impact would remain both individually and cumulatively significant after mitigation.

**Section 6.4.4 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternative 4: “Low-Density Residential”
Alternative** (pp. 6-15 and 6-16)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4.4 (Alternative 4 – “Low-Density Residential” Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Fourth Paragraph

- ◇ ~~Air Quality (Construction). Under the proposed project, combined emissions of ROG were estimated at 136.02 pounds/day. Since this value exceeds the SCAQMD’s recommended threshold criteria, construction term impact would be deemed to be significant. Under this alternative, on-site development activities may be substantially decreased (60 dwelling units compared to 153,985 square feet of comparable commercial use and 202 dwelling units). However, because mass grading of the project site would be required to create building pads and an on-site circulation system, maximum daily construction activities would be anticipated to be similar. As a result, construction term air quality impacts would be assumed to be similar to those associated with the proposed project and would, therefore, remain significant. Assuming a similar grading plan, based on the CalEEMod emission modeling conducted for the “January 2012 SDSP” alternative, it can be reasonably concluded that any residential development project of comparable or lesser size and scale would produce similar construction-term air quality impacts. Under this alternative, a total of 60 dwelling units would be constructed on the project site (compared to 200 units under the “January 2012 SDSP” alternative). As a result, short-term air quality impacts are assumed to be less than significant.~~
- ◇ Air quality (Operational). Operationally, the project is projected to create ROG, oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and carbon dioxide (CO) emissions in excess of the SCAQMD suggested daily threshold criteria.

As indicated in Table 4.6-5 (Project Traffic Equations) and Table 4.6-6 (Project Traffic Forecast) herein, residential condominium and townhouse projects are projected to generate substantially lower volumes of peak hour and daily vehicle

trips that retail shopping center projects. Similarly, although some differences exist based on the type of residential development proposed, projects with fewer dwelling units can be assumed to generate a lesser number of peak hour and daily vehicle trips than projects with a greater number of dwelling units. As a result, under this alternative, mobile source emissions would be substantially reduced. For the purpose of this alternatives analysis, it is assumed that operational air quality impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- ◇ Air quality (Cumulative). Related project activities, in combination with the project’s construction and operation would incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the SCAB. Under the SCAQMD’s recommended methodology, development activities that do not generate significant air quality impacts, including criteria and/or GHG emissions, are also assumed not to generate significant cumulative air quality impacts. Because construction and operational air quality impacts are assumed not to exceed SCAQMD’s recommended threshold standards, cumulative impacts would not be deemed significant.
- ◇ Air quality (GHG emissions). Under this alternative, 60 dwelling units would be developed on the project site. Based on the trip generation assumptions (Table 4.6-5) associated with the residential component of the proposed project (March 2010 SDSP), approximately 352 daily trip ends would be generated during a typical weekday. Based on the CalEEMod modeling results for Alternative 6 (January 2012 SDSP), which generates about 1,182 daily trip ends, GHG emissions would be predicted not to exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold standard of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year and the resulting impact, both individually and cumulatively, would be less than significant.

Section 6.4.5 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternative 5: High-Density Residential”
Alternative (p. 6-21)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4.5 (Alternative 5 – “High-Density Residential” Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Fifth Paragraph

- ◇ Air quality (Cumulative). Related project activities, in combination with the construction and operation of the proposed project, would incrementally contribute to regional air emissions within the SCAB. Under the SCAQMD’s recommended methodology, development activities that generate significant air quality impacts, including criteria and/or GHG emissions, are also assumed to generate significant cumulative air quality impacts.
- ◇ Air quality (GHG emissions). Under this alternative, 404 dwelling units would be developed on the project site. Based on the trip generation assumptions (Table 4.6-5) associated with the residential component of the proposed project (March 2010 SDSP), approximately 2,367 daily trip ends would be generated during a typical weekday. Based on the CalEEMod modeling results for Alternative 6 (January 2012 SDSP), which generates only about 1,182 daily trip ends, GHG emissions would be predicted to exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended GHG threshold standard of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year and the resulting impact would remain individually and cumulatively significant after mitigation.

Section 6.4.6 – Alternatives Analysis – Alternatives under Consideration (p. 6-21)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.4 (Alternatives under Consideration) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Following Fifth Paragraph

6.4.6 Alternative 6 – “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”

The January 2012 SDSP is presented in and the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of that project alternative is provided in Section 3.0 (Alternative 6: “January 2012 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”) in the Lead Agency’s “Response to Comments No. 2” (January 2012).

Section 6.5 – Alternatives Analysis – Environmentally Superior Alternative (pp. 6-22 and 6-23)

The following minor changes are made to Section 6.5 (Environmentally Superior Alternative) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Third Paragraph

CEQA stipulates that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Assuming that all identified significant environmental effects are assigned the same value, as indicated in Table 6-3 (Comparative Evaluation of Project Alternatives), the “public facilities,” the “low-density residential” (Alternative 4), and the high-density residential “January 2012 SDSP” (Alternative 6) alternatives, followed by the “public facilities” (Alternative 2) and the “high-density residential” (Alternative 5) alternatives, are each considered to be environmentally superior to the proposed project (March 2010 SDSP). Since the economic feasibility of the “low-density residential” alternative (Alternative 5) cannot be determined at this time, the environmentally superior development-oriented options are the “public facilities” and “high-density residential,” is the “January 2012 SDSP” (Alternative 6) alternative.

Section 6.5 – Alternatives Analysis – Environmentally Superior Alternative (p. 6-22)

The following minor changes are made to Table 6-3 (Comparative Evaluation of Project Alternatives) in Section 6.5 (Environmentally Superior Alternatives) in Section 6.0 (Alternatives Analysis) of the DEIR:

Note: A revised Table 6-3 (Comparative Evaluation of Project Alternatives) has been included herein. Because Table 6-3 is presented in landscape format, that revised exhibit is presented later in this section and not directly below.

Section 8.0 – References (pp. 8-1 through 8-8)

The following additional documents are hereby included among the list of documents cited in Section 8.0 (References) in the DEIR:

“Site D” Specific Plan

City of Diamond Bar, California

- American Planning Association, City Parks Forum Briefing Paper 04: How Cities Use Parks to Create Safer Neighborhoods, 2003.
- California Department of Transportation, Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol, January 1996.
- California Energy Commission, California Outdoor Lighting Standards Synopsis, February 1, 2002.
- Calwell Flores Winters, Inc., 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, February 2008.
- City of Diamond Bar, City of Diamond Bar Recreation Trail and Bicycle Route Master Plan, Final Draft, 2001.
- County of Los Angeles Public Works (Alta Planning + Design), County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, Final Plan – December 2011.
- County of Los Angeles (ICF International), Final Program Environmental Impact Report - County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan, January 2012.
- Federal Housing Administration, Condominium Project Approval and Processing Guide, June 30, 2011.
- 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.
- Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, Recommended Practice for Sports and Recreational Area Lighting, RP-6-01, 2001.
- 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.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Air Quality Thresholds of Significance Handbook, December 2009, Revised April 2011.
- Sasaki Transportation Engineers, WVUSD Site D, All Residential Alternative, City of Diamond Bar, January 11, 2012.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, et al., CalEEMod™ Technical Paper – Methodology Reasoning and Policy Development of the California Emission Estimator Model, July 2011.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, California Emission Estimator Model User’s Guide, Version 2011.1.1, February 2011.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans, December 8, 2008.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Emission Reduction Control Technology, Table III – Mitigation Measures: Level 1, 2 & 3 Retrofits for Off-Road Engines, Revised September 2009.

- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds, Undated.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, June 2003.
- Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan – Helping Communities Achieve a Sustainable Future, October 2, 2008.
- 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.

2.2.2 “March 2010 ‘Site D’ Specific Plan”

No substantive changes have been made to or are proposed with regards to the March 2010 SDSP, as described in the DEIR. That planning document and its associated entitlements (e.g., Tentative Tract No. 70687), identified as the “proposed project” in the DEIR and RTC1, remain under consideration by the City and constitute one of a number of potential development option for the “Site D” property under consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

Table 6-1 (Revised)
LAND-USE ASSUMPTIONS FOR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Land Use	Proposed Project	Project Alternatives					
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
		No Project ¹	Public Facilities	Community Commercial	Low-Density Residential	High-Density Residential	January 2012 SDSP
Project Acreage (gross acres)	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Total Developed Acres (gross acres)	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	-	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Retained Open Space (gross acres)	-	<u>29.7</u> <u>30.4</u>	-	-	-	-	-
Developable Area (net acres)	20.2	-	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.2	-
<u>Developable Area (gross acres)</u>	<u>30.4</u>	-	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Residential Acreage (net acres)	10.1	-	-	-	20.2	20.2	-
<u>Residential Acreage (gross acres)</u>	<u>15.2</u>	-	-	-	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Number of Dwelling Units	202 DU	0 DU	0 DU	0 DU	60 DU	404 DU	<u>200 DU</u>
Residential Density (units/net acres)	20	-	-	-	3	20	-
<u>Residential Density (units/gross acres)</u>	<u>13.3</u>	-	-	-	<u>2</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>9.9</u>
Commercial Acreage (net acres)	10.1	-	-	20.2	-	-	-
<u>Commercial Acreage (gross acres)</u>	<u>15.2</u>	-	-	<u>30.4</u>	-	-	-
Commercial Square Footage	153,985 S.F.	-	-	307,969	-	-	-
Other Non-Residential and Non-Commercial Square Footage (square feet or acreage)	-	-	73,000 SF School 147,000 SF Church	-	-	-	<u>2-Acre Neighborhood Park</u>

Table 6-1 (Revised) (Continued)
LAND-USE ASSUMPTIONS FOR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Land Use	Proposed Project	Project Alternatives					
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
		No Project ¹	Public Facilities	Community Commercial	Low-Density Residential	High-Density Residential	January 2012 SDSP
Commercial Floor Area Ratio	0.35 ²	-	0.25 ³	0.35 ⁴	-	-	-
General Plan Amendment Required	Yes <u>City and District Properties</u>	No	City Property	District Property	<u>City and District Properties</u>	City and District Properties	<u>City and District Properties</u>
Zone Change Required	Yes <u>City and District Properties</u>	No	City Property	District Property	City Property	City and District Properties	<u>City and District Properties</u>
Specific Plan Approval Required	Yes	No	No ⁵	No ⁵	No ⁵	No ⁵	<u>No⁵</u>

Notes:

1. A “no project” alternative is specifically required under CEQA.
2. Calculated by dividing the commercial acreage identified in the March 2010 SDSP (10.1 net acres or 439,956 square feet) by the commercial square footage identified therein (153,885).
3. Calculated by dividing the net developable area (20.2 net acres or 879,912 square feet) by the total square footage (220,000).
4. Calculated by dividing the total net site area (20.2 net acres or 879,912 square feet) by the commercial square footage (307,969).
5. None of these alternatives preclude the development of a specific plan; however, because only a single land use is proposed, development could proceed absent the City’s consideration of a specific plan.

Source: TRG Land, Inc. City of Diamond Bar

Table 6-3 (Revised)
COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Significant Environmental Effect	Proposed Project	Project Alternative					
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
		No Project	Public Facilities	Community Commercial	Low Density Residential	High Density Residential	<u>January 2012 SDSP</u>
Environmental Considerations							
Air Quality (Construction)	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Significant	<u>Not Significant</u>	Significant	<u>Not Significant</u>
Air Quality (Operational)	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	<u>Not Significant</u>
Air Quality (Cumulative)	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Significant	<u>Not Significant</u>	Significant	<u>Not Significant</u>
<u>Air Quality (GHG Emissions)</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>Not Significant</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>Not Significant</u>	<u>Significant</u>	<u>Not Significant</u>
Number of Unmitigated Significant Impacts	<u>3</u> <u>4</u>	0	3	<u>3</u> <u>4</u>	<u>2</u> <u>0</u>	<u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Attainment of Stated Objectives							
Lead Agency	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>Yes</u>
Applicant	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>Yes</u>
Feasibility							
Economic ¹	Unknown ²	No	Unknown ²	Unknown ²	Unknown ²	Unknown ² Yes ³	<u>Yes³</u>
Legal	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>Yes</u>
Socially	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>Yes</u>
Technologically	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>Yes</u>
Environmentally Superior Alternative							
	-	Superior	Superior	-	Superior	Superior	<u>Superior</u>
Notes:							
1. No detailed economic analysis, marketing study, or real property appraisal of the proposed project or the examined alternatives were developed by the Lead Agency or provided to the Lead Agency by the Applicant.							
2. Subject to an economic feasibility and/or additional market analysis.							
3. Economic feasible is assumed based on District's December 2, 2011 correspondence to the City.							

Source: Environmental Impact Sciences City of Diamond Bar