CITY OF DIAMOND BAR
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

CITY OF DIAMOND BAR ~ 21825 COPLEY DRIVE ~ DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765 ~ TEL. (909) 839-7030

1. Project File: **Tentative Parcel Map No. 83773 (Planning No. PL2022-119)**

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: **City of Diamond Bar, 21810 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765**

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: **Mayuko Nakajima, Senior Planner (909)-839-7033**

4. Project location: **23901 Ridge Line Road, Diamond Bar, CA 91765 (APN: 8713-004-016)**

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: **Arun Jain, 23901 Ridge Line Road, Diamond Bar, CA 91765**

6. General Plan Designation: **Rural Residential (RR)**

7. Zoning: **Rural Residential (RR)**

8. Description of project: *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

   The applicant is requesting City approval to subdivide an existing 100,188 square-foot (2.3 gross acre) lot constructed with an existing single-family residence into two lots for the future development of a new single-family residence on the newly created lot. Proposed Parcel 1 is 48,352 square feet (1.11 gross acres) and proposed Parcel 2 is 51,836 square feet (1.19 gross acres). The existing single-family residence will remain on proposed Parcel 1 and a new single-family residence will be proposed on proposed Parcel 2 at a future time. The property is zoned Rural Residential (RR), and the underlying General Plan land use designation is also named Rural Residential.

   The average slope of the subject property is 32 percent. This project would have been categorically exempt from CEQA under Article 19, Section 15315, Class 15 (Minor Land Divisions) of the CEQA Guidelines, except for the fact that the average slope of the property is greater than 20 percent. The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan and zoning regulations, no variances or exceptions are proposed, and all public services and utilities including water supply are available to serve the project. The project site is located within *The Diamond Bar Country Estates* ("The Country Estates"), a gated residential community served by fully improved private streets and surrounded by residential development. There are no agricultural activities on or near the proposed project site. The subject property has six protected trees on-site but no protected trees are proposed for removal as part of the subdivision. The proposed project does not involve long-term

changes to land use or other growth-inducing actions that could impact compliance with or implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan. The proposed project is not expected to generate potentially significant greenhouse gases in that the future construction and occupancy of a single-family residence (which would be enabled by the proposed subdivision) would not exceed greenhouse gas significance thresholds. Upon the completion of the environmental analysis, it was determined that, as conditioned, the proposed project would have less than a significant effect on the environment.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)
North: Single-Family Residence in RR (Rural Residential) zone
South: Single-Family Residence in RR (Rural Residential) zone
West: Single-Family Residence in RR (Rural Residential) zone
East: Single-Family Residence in RR (Rural Residential) zone

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): **None**.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? **Yes, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requested consultation; refer to Tribal Cultural Resources section.**

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," or "Less Than-Significant-Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

( ) Aesthetics	( ) Agriculture & Forestry Resources	( ) Air Quality
( ) Biological Resources	(X) Cultural Resources	(X) Geology & Soils
( ) Greenhouse Gas Emissions	(X) Tribal Cultural Resources	( ) Hydrology & Water Quality
( ) Land Use / Planning	( ) Hazards & Hazardous Materials	( ) Noise
( ) Population / Housing	( ) Mineral Resources	( ) Recreation
( ) Transportation	( ) Public Services	( ) Mandatory Findings of Significance
( ) Wildfire	( ) Utilities & Service Systems	
	( ) Energy	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

( ) I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

(X) I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by, or agreed to, by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

( ) I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

( ) I find that the proposed project MAY have a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standard and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

( ) I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects 1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared By: Mayuko Nakajima Date: 7/28/2026

Reviewed By: Greg Gubman Date: 7/31/2026

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

1a) Impact Discussion: The project site is located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the scenic vistas that exist in The Country Estates such as city lights, foothills, and canyons. The proposed parcels are located along Ridge Line Road next to existing parcels with developed with single-family residences and will not impact the vistas of existing homes.

1b) Impact Discussion: No officially designated State scenic routes or highways occur near the project site.

1c) Impact Discussion: The project site is located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development and therefore will be compatible with the surrounding uses. The project proposes to subdivide an existing lot into two lots for the development of a single-family residence on the newly created lot, and an existing single-family residence will be preserved on the remaining lot. The development of single-family homes will be subject to the City's Development Code standards and design guidelines, as well as the architectural standards established by the Homeowners Association. As such, the proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding.

1d) Impact Discussion: Light emitted from the future development of a new single-family residence will be consistent with the existing residential uses that surround the project site. As part of the development of the single-family residences, lighting will be included around the building and interior of the building. To reduce the impact on adjacent properties, any new exterior lighting will be directed away or shielded so that it is confined within the boundaries of the property pursuant to Development Code standards. Compliance with the Development Code will result in nonsignificant light and glare impacts.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. *Would the project:* a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause re-zoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)

2a) Impact Discussion: The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. There are no agricultural activities on or near the proposed project site. Project implementation would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to farmlands.

2b) Impact Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impacts would result from the future construction or operation of the proposed project.

2c) Impact Discussion: There are no forestland, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production uses that are occurring on-site or in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could conflict with existing zoning or cause of rezoning of forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

2d) Impact Discussion: The subject property is not located within forest land, and will thus have no impact in this category.

2e) Impact Discussion: There are no farmland uses that are occurring on-site or in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. *Would the project:*				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

3a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project does not involve long-term changes to land use or other growth-inducing actions that could impact compliance with or implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan. The future construction of a single-family residence will not exceed thresholds for maximum daily construction emissions for pollutants and no mitigation is required. After the completion of the construction activities, it is not anticipated that there will be an increase in emissions from operational activities of a new single-family residence. Also, a two-lot subdivision falls well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Handbook Threshold for criteria pollutants. Therefore, impacts from operational activities would be less than significant.

3b) Impact Discussion: See response 3a above.

3c) Impact Discussion: See response 3a above.

3d) Impact Discussion: The proposed project will result in the future development of a new single-family residence. The proposed project is not expected to generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Construction activity associated with the future development of a new single-family residence may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, this impact would be short-term in nature (only during construction activities) and cease upon project completion.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	( )	( )	(✓)	()
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)

4a) Impact Discussion: The project site is in an urbanized area, located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development. The property has six protected trees on-site but no protected trees are proposed for removal with the proposed subdivision. The subject property is already disturbed and past development activity on the subject property and along the Country's roadway network has eradicated habitat in areas immediately adjacent to the roads. According to the Resource Conservation Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is not identified as having species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impact to Federal or State listed or other designated species.

4b) Impact Discussion: As previously stated, the project site is located within an existing gated residential community. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on-site. According to the Resource Conservation Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is not identified as having sensitive environmental resources.

4c) Impact Discussion: No federally protected wetlands occur on-site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

4d) Impact Discussion: There may be native resident or migratory wildlife species in the canyons within The Country Estates, and nesting opportunities or raptor/wildlife foraging opportunities on the project site have been largely eradicated. According to the Resource Conservation Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is not identified as an area to serve as a wildlife movement corridor. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

4e) Impact Discussion: The property has six protected trees on-site but no protected trees are proposed for removal with the proposed subdivision. If trees are proposed for removal during construction of the proposed single-family residence, the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance requires the applicant to obtain a Tree Permit with appropriate mitigation. In light of these factors, the proposed project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

4f) Impact Discussion: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts in this regard.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	( )	(✓)	( )	( )
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	( )	(✓)	( )	( )

5a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project may have a significant adverse impact if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. This section of the CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as one listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places (per state law), included in a local register of historical resources (as defined by state law) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey (meeting the requirements of state law) or determined by the lead agency (City of Diamond Bar) to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Places. In this case, the existing site is not listed in nor eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places, not listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a historical resource survey, nor has it been determined to be historically significant by the City because it does not meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of

Historical Places. Therefore, it does not meet the definition of a historical resource contained in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and would not result in any impacts in this regard.

5b) Impact Discussion: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 provide that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource and outline requirements for the treatment of archaeological resources if they are discovered during project implementation. It is not anticipated that any archaeological resources exist within the project site. However, in the event of accidental discovery of archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities, the project would be required to comply with General Plan Resource Conservation Cultural and Historic Resources Policies, including Policy RC-P-42, *Archaeological Resources*, which provides procedures for the management of archaeological materials on-site during development projects. Policy RC-P-43 seeks to preserve discovered archaeological resources in place to maintain the relationship between the artifacts and their archaeological context, where feasible. Policy RC-P-44 provides that preservation can be achieved through measures such as avoidance and other protections.

Should ground disturbing activities during construction encounter archaeological resources, incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would establish procedures for halting construction, retaining a qualified archaeologist to evaluate any unanticipated discovery, and implementing appropriate treatment (such as avoidance, data recovery, or other measures) if a find is determined to be significant under CEQA. Through compliance with the General Plan Resource Conservation policies and the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure:

CUL-1: Should archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) be exposed during construction activities, all construction work shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

5c) Impact Discussion: It is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project site. However, in the event of accidental discovery of unanticipated human remains during ground-disturbing activities during construction, incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, provides procedures related to the treatment of the unanticipated discovery of human remains, would ensure that the project's potential impacts to buried remains would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure:

CUL-2: In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the applicant or its construction contractor (through the on-site construction manager/contractor superintendent) shall notify the County Coroner within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within

two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California PRC, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. ENERGY. *Would the project:*				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

6a) Impact Discussion: Energy consumption associated with the supply and conveyance of water used for dust control as well as electricity used for powering lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities is assumed to be negligible for the future construction of one single-family residence.

6b) Impact Discussion: See response 6a above.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project*:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
iv) Landslides?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	( )	(✓)	( )	( )

7a-i) Impact Discussion: No active faults are known to traverse the project site and the project site is not located within, or immediate adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur within the project area. Adherence to standard engineering practices and design criteria relative to seismic and geologic hazards in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC) is required for any physical development.

7a-ii) Impact Discussion: Southern California has numerous active and potentially active faults that could produce strong ground shaking that could impact the project site. The City of Diamond Bar is in proximity to the San Andreas and Sierra Madre Fault zone. The California Building Code requires structural design and construction methods that minimize the effects of strong seismic ground shaking. The California Building Code requirements would be applied to the future construction of a single-family residence as standard conditions of project approval.

7a-iii) Impact Discussion: The project area is located within a portion of the City that is not subject to liquefaction. Therefore, project implementation is not anticipated to result in the exposure of people or structures to potential impacts related to seismic ground failure or liquefaction.

7a-iv) Impact Discussion: As required by the California Building Code, at the time of development for the construction of a single-family residence, the applicant is required to submit a detailed geotechnical investigation report that includes field exploration, laboratory testing and analyses. This report shall determine if the project site is suitable for the development of a new single-family residence. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

7b) Impact Discussion: The largest source of erosion, particularly in an urban environment is uncontrolled drainage during construction. Erosion potential during construction would be managed to the maximum extent practicable with Best Management Practices (BMPs). The future construction of a single-family residence would be required to be covered under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit; therefore, construction BMPs would be implemented on the project site during future demolition and construction activities to minimize erosion impacts. Implementation of the construction-related BMPs would reduce potential construction-related impacts to the maximum extent feasible. The

operation of the project site would not cause the loss of topsoil or erosion because the site would be landscaped and paved.

7c) Impact Discussion: See response 7a(iv) above.

7d) Impact Discussion: See response 7a(iv) above.

7e) Impact Discussion: The project would be served by the sewer system, thus there is no impact on soils inadequately capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

7f) Impact Discussion: The project site is located within an existing gated residential community. It is not located in an area likely to have unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features. However, the General Plan Resource Conservation Element's Cultural and Historic Resources policies include Policy RC-P-47, Paleontological Resources. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 implements Policy RC-P-47 by requiring work to halt, evaluation by a Qualified Paleontologist, and appropriate treatment and curation if unanticipated fossil materials are discovered during construction. Through compliance with General Plan Resource Conservation Element Policy RC-P-47 and implementation of GEO-1, the project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure:

GEO-1: Should unanticipated fossil materials be discovered by the construction crew during the course of future development, construction activity should be halted in a 50-foot radius around the discovery. The project applicant or its construction contractor, through the on-site construction manager or contractor superintendent, shall notify a Qualified Paleontologist, who shall be retained to evaluate the discovery, determine its significance, and identify any additional mitigation or treatment that may be required. Work in the area can resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given to continue with construction. Any scientifically significant paleontological resources found, including the initial unanticipated find (if it proves to be significant), should be prepared, identified, analyzed, and permanently curated in an approved repository (typically the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles). The cost of curation would be determined by the repository, and the costs of preparation and curation would be the responsibility of the project applicant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the project:*				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

8a) Impact Discussion: The scientific consensus is that greenhouse gases (GHGs) generated by human activities contribute to climate change by increasing the Earth's natural greenhouse effect.

The gases concentrate in the Earth's atmosphere and trap heat by blocking some of the long-wave energy the Earth normally radiates back into space. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation); methane from landfill wastes and raising livestock, deforestation activities; and some agricultural practices. These activities are increasing the greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere and could be accelerating global climate change. Long-term environmental consequences in California could potentially include a reduction in water supply from the Sierra Nevada snow pack, which could result in a reduction in imported water, and public health problems due to degraded air quality and more intense summer heat.

In 2005, in recognition of California's vulnerability to the effects of climate change, then Governor Schwarzenegger established Executive Order S-3-05 which set forth the following target dates by which Statewide emission of GHGs would be progressively reduced: (1) by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; (2) by 2020, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels; and (3) by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32 [AB32]; Division 25.5, Sections 38500 et seq., H&SC) 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). In June 2007, CARB directed staff to pursue 37 early actions for reducing GHG emissions under AB 32. The broad spectrum of strategies to be developed (e.g., low-carbon fuel standard, regulations for refrigerants with high-global warming potentials, 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 accordance with AB 32, CARB developed the first Scoping Plan in 2008 to outline the State's strategy to achieve 1990 level emissions by year 2020. In May 2014, the CARB released and adopted the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan to identify the next steps in reaching AB 32 goals and evaluate the progress that has been made between 2000 and 2012. A newer version of the Scoping Plan was then adopted by the CARB in December 2017 (entitled California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan). Lastly, the most recent version of the Scoping Plan was adopted by the CARB in November 2022 (entitled Final 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality) (2022 Scoping Plan), which was designed to be consistent with the long-term GHG reduction targets embedded in AB 1279. Since adoption of the 2008 Scoping Plan and the subsequent updates in 2014, 2017, and 2022, State agencies have adopted programs identified in the plan, and the Legislature has passed additional legislation to achieve the GHG reduction targets. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Building Standards (e.g., CALGreen and the 2022 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards), zero carbon electricity by 2045, and changes in the corporate average fuel economy standards (e.g., Pavley I and California Advanced Clean Cars).

Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact. The State of California, through its governor and legislature, has established a comprehensive framework for the substantial reduction of GHG emissions over the next 40-plus years. This will occur primarily through the implementation of AB 32 and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), which will address GHG emissions on a statewide, cumulative basis.

The City of Diamond Bar Climate Action Plan adopted in 2019 reinforces the City's commitments to reduce GHG emissions. The City's Climate Action Plan introduces emissions targets for 2030 of 6.0 MTCO2e per capita and for 2040 of 4.0 MTCO2e per capita. Nevertheless, the currently proposed project is not expected to generate potentially significant greenhouse gases by subdividing an existing lot for the future construction of a new single-family residence. Therefore, no new significant impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are necessary at this time.

8b) Impact Discussion: See response 8a above.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:* a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

9a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Small amounts of hazardous materials may be found in solvents and chemicals used for cleaning,

building maintenance, and landscaping. The materials would be similar to those found in common household projects or pesticides. Hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

9b) Impact Discussion: The proposed uses are not anticipated to result in the creation of health hazards following compliance with health and safety regulations. The proposed uses would not use, generate or dispose of hazardous materials in large quantities. As stated above, hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

9c) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not involve the transport, use, handling, or disposal of notable quantities of hazardous materials, aside from normal household chemicals and landscaping applications. Therefore, the proposed project would not pose a health risk to nearby schools, and no significant impacts to schools would result from the future construction and operation of the development of a new single-family residence.

9d) Impact Discussion: The project site is located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development. The existing uses do not use, handle, or store hazardous materials. Future development of a new single-family residence would not create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

9e) Impact Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is Brackett Field Airport, which is approximately 7.2 miles northeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.

9f) Impact Discussion: Emergency vehicles would continue to have access to project related and surrounding roadways upon completion of a new single-family residence. The future development of a new single-family residence would not impact access to emergency response. In addition, the future development of a new single-family residence would not place temporary or permanent barriers on existing roadways or reconfigure existing roadways. Therefore, no impacts would result from the construction and operation of a future development of a new single-family residence.

9g) Impact Discussion: Most homes in The Country Estates are within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity zones. The project site is not at a greater risk than other homes within *The Country,* and is at less risk than homes abutting wildlands. In addition, at the time of development, a fuel modification plan is required and subject to the review and approval of the County of Los Angeles, Fire Department's Prevention Bureau - Forestry Division.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

10a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project will not be allowed to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for storm water discharges associated with future construction activity. Compliance with Statewide NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges associated with future construction activity which would prevent storm water pollution from impacting waters of the U.S. in the vicinity of the project area, will be required.

10b) Impact Discussion: See response 10a above.

10c-i) Impact Discussion: There are no streams or rivers nearby. The Public Works/Engineering Department has reviewed the preliminary hydrology report conducted by Civil Trans Inc., dated June 5, 2026, which includes supporting hydraulic and hydrological data. The proposed project

will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10c-ii) Impact Discussion: The Public Works/Engineering Department has reviewed the preliminary hydrology report conducted by Civil Trans Inc., dated June 5, 2026, which includes supporting hydraulic and hydrological data. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10c-iii) Impact Discussion: See response 10c(ii) above.

10c-iv) Impact Discussion: See response 10c(ii) above.

10d) Impact Discussion: The proposed project site is approximately 24 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and there are no large bodies of water within the vicinity of the project site that would cause inundation by flood hazard, tsunami, seiche and risk release of pollutants. Additionally, the City of Diamond Bar is not subject to any major flood hazards, or potential inundation due to nearby dam failures. The Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map designated the entire City as within a Flood Zone "X". Flood Zone "X" is identified as an area of 0.2 percent annual chance of flood. Therefore, no impacts would result from the future construction and operation of the proposed project.

10e) Impact Discussion: At the time of development, the project is required to implement an LID Plan prepared for the site, which is designed to comply with the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit, the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region, and the City of Diamond Bar Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (DBCC Section 8.12.1610). The project would not use groundwater directly, is not located in a designated groundwater recharge area, and its potable water demand would remain within the projections of the WVWD 2020 UWPM, so it would not interfere with sustainable groundwater management. Due to limited scope of ground disturbance, brief period of construction, and adherence to any Geotechnical Report recommendations and applicable existing regulations, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any water quality control or groundwater management plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:*				
a) Physically divide an established community?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

11a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project site would not disrupt or physically divide an established community. The project site is located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development.

11b) Impact Discussion: In accordance with Title 21 of the City of Diamond Bar's City Code, the project applicant has requested the approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide an existing lot into two lots for the future development of a single-family residence on the newly created lot. If the subdivision is approved, the applicant shall submit a Development Review application for the approval of the project's architectural and site design. With the approval of these entitlements, the development of the proposed project would be in compliance with all applicable City of Diamond Bar's land use plan, policy, and regulations.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)

12a) Impact Discussion: The project site is not identified as a site with known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to mineral resources.

12b) Impact Discussion: The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan, because the site contains no known mineral resources.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE. *Would the project result in:*				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)

13a) Impact Discussion: There will be a temporary increase in noise levels during the future construction of the single-family residence, but it will not be substantial and shall remain within

noise limits established by the City. The City of Diamond Bar's City Code, Chapter 8.12 Division 3, Section 8.12.720 prohibits construction-related noise between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Construction activity is prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Noise from the short-term (less than ten days) operation of mobile construction equipment may not exceed a maximum of 85 dB. Additionally, the proposed subdivision for the development of a new single-family residence is compatible with the single-family residential uses that surround the project site. The proposed use is not expected to exceed noise levels set forth in the Municipal Code for residential uses. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

13b) Impact Discussion: Future construction activities have the potential to create groundborne vibration and/or groundborne noise levels. However, any impacts would be temporary and of minimal duration. Additionally, implementation of the construction hours would restrict these activities to daytime hours only. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

13c) Impact Discussion: Construction of the proposed project would have no impact with regard to airports. The project area is not located within two miles of any public airport or within an airport land use plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)

14a) Impact Discussion: The increase of a new single-family residence is not significant in the context of the City as a whole or substantial for the area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

14b) Impact Discussion: The project site is an existing lot with an existing single-family residence that is proposed to remain, therefore will not displace housing for substantial numbers of people as a result of this project.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project:*				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
b) Fire protection?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Police protection?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Schools?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
e) Parks?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
f) Other public facilities?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

15 a-e Impact Discussion: The marginal increase of a new residential unit from the proposed project are well within those anticipated in the City's General Plan, and would not require the provision of new or altered governmental facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, park, or other public facilities. However, the applicant is required to pay school fees to the Walnut Valley Unified School District (WVUSD) as part of the building permit process in order to help meet the potential funding needs created by the proposed increase in population, and the WVUSD would receive Average Daily Attendance (ADA) funding for any children attending public schools. Additionally, the project will be conditioned to pay park fees in accordance with Diamond Bar City Code Section 21.32.040. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. RECREATION. *Would the project:*				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

16a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not trigger the new construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Due to the marginal increase of a new residential unit from the proposed project, there may be some increased use of existing neighborhood recreational facilities, but it would not be expected to be significant or to significantly increase the physical deterioration of the facilities. In addition, the project site is located within a gated residential

community that offers many amenities for their residents, including a swimming pool, board room, club house, community park, and tennis courts. The property owners would pay Homeowners Association dues to maintain the facilities within the Association. Additionally, the project will be conditioned to pay park fees in accordance with Diamond Bar City Code Section 21.32.040. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

16b) Impact Discussion: See response 16a above.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. TRANSPORTATION. *Would the project:*				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

17a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project is limited to the subdivision of one parcel into two lots. The subdivision itself would not alter the existing circulation system, change roadway configurations, or affect transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Any future development on the newly created lot would be subject to separate review for consistency with applicable City standards and regulations.

Bicycle Facilities: The General Plan identifies an existing and planned bicycle network consisting of Class I paths, Class II bike lanes, and Class III routes on selected City streets. Bicycle facilities are primarily provided along major corridors such as Diamond Bar Boulevard, Golden Springs Drive, and other arterials and collectors. Ridge Line Road is a local residential street and is not identified for dedicated bikeway facilities in the General Plan's circulation diagram or bicycle network map. The project would not modify any striped bike lanes or designated bikeways on nearby arterials.

Pedestrian Facilities: The project site is located within an existing gated residential community, surrounded by residential development. There are no existing or planned sidewalks within The Country Estates. At the time development is proposed, the project would construct pedestrian walkways connecting the residential building, open space areas and to the Ridge Line Road frontage. The project would not remove existing sidewalks or crosswalks, would not create new barriers to pedestrian travel, and would provide new pedestrian connections that are compatible with the City's circulation policies. As such, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

17b) Impact Discussion: The project involves the subdivision of one parcel into two lots, allowing for the future development of one additional single-family residence consistent with the City's

General Plan land use designation and zoning. The project is an infill residential development within an urbanized area served by existing roadways, utilities, and public services. The addition of one dwelling unit would generate a minimal number of daily vehicle trips and would not cause a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, impacts related to VMT would be less than significant.

17c) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not create any hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Access to the project site would be required to comply with all City design standards, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

17d) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not significantly impact the adequacy of existing and future emergency services. The roadways and driveways are existing and will not be relocated. The proposed project would be constructed according to City of Diamond Bar and County of Los Angeles requirements for emergency access. Therefore, significant impacts would not result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:* a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	( )	(✓)	( )	( )
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	( )	(✓)	( )	( )

18a(i)-(ii) Impact Discussion: AB 52 requires that lead agencies evaluate a project's potential impact on "tribal cultural resources," which include "[s]ites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources." AB 52 also gives lead agencies the discretion to determine, based on substantial evidence, whether a resource qualifies as a "tribal cultural resource." AB 52 applies

whenever a lead agency adopts an environmental impact report, mitigated negative declaration, or negative declaration.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding tribal cultural resources. Under AB 52 the lead agencies are required to "begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project." Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. A notification list was obtained from the Native American Heritage Commission and the City sent notices to the Tribes on January 6, 2026, informing them of the opportunity to request consultation. On January 20, 2026, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requested formal consultation in writing and within the required timeframe, in accordance with AB 52. The Tribe indicated that the project area lies in an area where the ancestral territories of the Kizh (Kitc) Gabrieleño's villages adjoined and overlapped. On February 19, 2026, the Tribe provided substantial evidence materials and requested tribal cultural resources mitigation measures for the project, including measures addressing Native American monitoring and the treatment of unanticipated discoveries.

Consultation Outcome

On February 19, 2026, consultation was completed pursuant to AB 52, and the City considered the Tribe's information and recommendations in evaluating the project's potential to affect tribal cultural resources. Although no tribal cultural resources are known to be present on the project site based on previous record and background research, ground-disturbing activities could expose previously unidentified tribal cultural resources because the project area is within the Tribe's traditional and cultural territory. The Tribe provided substantial evidence materials and requested mitigation measures addressing Native American monitoring and procedures for unanticipated discoveries, and the City incorporated the Tribe's requested mitigation measures verbatim into this IS/MND and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Additionally, in the unlikely event that tribal cultural resources are found, the resources would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws, including Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.98, Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) and CEQA Guidelines section 15120(d), any confidential tribal cultural resources information provided during consultation would be maintained in a confidential manner and would not be disclosed in the public IS/MND. With implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-3, the project's potential impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:

TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities

A. The project applicant/lead agency shall retain a Native American Monitor from or approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project at all project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

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

C. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe.

D. On-site tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Kizh from a designated point of contact for the project applicant/lead agency that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the Kizh to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact Kizh TCRs.

TCR-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resource Objects (Non-Funerary/Non-Ceremonial)

A. Upon discovery of any TCRs, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Kizh monitor and/or Kizh archaeologist. The Kizh will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, in the Tribe's sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

TCR-3: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary or Ceremonial Objects

A. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute.

B. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the project site, then Public Resources Code 5097.9 as well as Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed.

C. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2).

D. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods.

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

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:* a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

19a) Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts and would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have a less than significant impact on the need to construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Additionally, the following agencies reviewed the proposed project and have stated it is prepared to provide its services:

- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County correspondence dated February 3, 2023
- Walnut Valley Water District correspondence dated February 7, 2023
- Southern California Edison correspondence dated March 13, 2023
- Southern California Gas Company correspondence dated March 8, 2023

19b) Impact Discussion: See response 19a above.

19c) Impact Discussion: The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County reviewed the proposed project and, in a correspondence dated February 3, 2023, states it is prepared to provide wastewater service to this project.

19d) Impact Discussion: Refuse and recycling service is provided by Valley Vista Services for single-family residential developments. The company transports collected materials to their own processing facility, the Grand Central Recycling and Transfer Station located in the City of Industry. Because the Grand Central Recycling and Transfer Station is a transfer and processing facility and not a landfill, it does not have a set expiration year or a finite volumetric capacity. Unlike landfills, a transfer station operates as a daily transit point. Waste is brought in, sorted for recycling, consolidated, and hauled away to regional landfills within 48 hours. All solid waste materials generated at the project site would be disposed of in accordance with applicable state, federal, and local statutes and regulations.

19e) Impact Discussion: See response 19d above.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. WILDFIRE. *Would the project:*				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	( )	( )	( )	(✓)
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

20a) Impact Discussion: The City of Diamond Bar does not have an adopted emergency evacuation plan; however, the City facilitates the coordination of emergency response efforts through its Emergency Operations Center (EOC), which is a central location of authority that allows for face-to-face coordination and decision making between City staff and outside organization. The project does not propose to modify and would not interfere with the EOC. Future construction activities would be located on the project site. No lane closures are expected to be required during construction activities. As a result, future construction activities would not impair or interfere with emergency response or emergency evacuation.

20b) Impact Discussion: At the time when a single-family residential development is proposed, the project will be required to prepare a Fuel Modification Plan which shall be reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire District (LACFD) to review location of structures, type of construction, topography, slope, amount and arrangement of vegetation and overall site setting. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

20c) Impact Discussion: At the time a single-family residential development is proposed, the project will be required to obtain approval from the HOA and any other applicable agencies for potential impacts to their facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

20d) Impact Discussion: At the time when a single-family residential development is proposed, the project will be required to submit a detailed geotechnical investigation report that includes field exploration, laboratory testing and analyses. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	( )	( )	(✓)	()
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	( )	( )	(✓)	( )
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	( )	( )	(✓)	( )

21a) Impact Discussion: The project site does not contain the habitat of a fish or wildlife species and therefore future construction of the proposed project would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Likewise, approval of the proposed project is not anticipated to eliminate examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

21b) Impact Discussion: The cumulatively considerable impacts of the individually limited project are not expected to be significant and are in keeping with the long-range considerations of the City's General Plan. With the mitigation measures and conditions of project approval, the cumulative impact of the individually limited project impacts will not be considerable.

21c) Impact Discussion: With the mitigation measures and conditions of project approval, no substantial direct or indirect adverse environmental effects on human beings can be expected from this project.

SOURCES CITED IN THE EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Planning No. PL2022-119

1. City of Diamond Bar 2040 General Plan and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report certified December 17, 2019, Addendum No. 1 dated August 11, 2022 and Addendum No. 2 dated March 17, 2026

2. Diamond Bar City Code

3. City of Diamond Bar Transportation Study Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled and Level of Service Assessment dated November 2025.

4. Tentative Parcel Map No. 83773

5. Hydrology Report prepared by Civil Trans Inc. dated June 5, 2026

6. Letter from Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians (Kizh Nation) Tribe Dated February 19, 2026

7. All documents cited above are available for review at the City of Diamond Bar, Community Development Department, 21810 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765. The office hours are Monday through Thursday between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., and Friday between 7:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.