

## 4.0 ADDENDUM TO THE UPLAND CROSSING SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT DRAFT EIR

The following section contains a set of addendum pages to the Upland Crossing Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, dated May 2006. The revisions identified in this section are the result of City of Upland staff review, and are meant to provide clarification of the issues and to correct editorial and typographical errors that were discovered after circulation of the Draft EIR. The revisions cited in this section were found by the City of Upland not to be substantial; therefore, the recirculation of the Draft EIR is not warranted.

In the following pages, headings describe the location of changes in the Draft EIR (i.e., Section 1.0, page 1-1, paragraph 2), with a brief explanation of the changes made shown in *italics*. Below this entry, are the revisions made to the Draft EIR. Additions of text are noted by the double underlining of new text, whereas deletions are shown as double strikeout text (~~old text~~).

### 4.1 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (SECTION 4.7)

#### Section 4.7, page 4.7-3, following the paragraph titled Federal Aviation Administration

*Insertion of new paragraph. The analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The California Department of Transportation has developed and published the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, with the most recent version published in 2002. The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook provides compatibility planning guidance to airport land use commissions. The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook is a guidance document and it expressly stresses that its recommendations are not binding; "However, despite the statutory references to it, the Handbook does not constitute formal state policy or regulation."<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Public Resources Code Section 21096 and its legislative history are clear that the Handbook is not state policy but simply guidance that should be used as a reference, along with other documents.

Deleted: ~~and not state policy~~

#### Section 4.7, page 4.7-5, second paragraph

*Insertion of reference to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The significance determination of the EIR does not change.*

Impacts of Safety Hazard near Airport. The proposed Project site is approximately 800 feet south of the runway at Cable Airport, and is consequently located within the airport's

<sup>1</sup> California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, January 2002, page Summary-1.

Land Use Plan. A study<sup>1</sup> was prepared to address potential aviation safety implications associated with the development of the Project site. Land use restrictions for the Project site associated with the airport's nearby proximity include compliance with Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 and the City must consider whether the proposed Project is consistent with the CACALUP requirements. Additionally, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook was consulted for guidance in determining the Project's impacts associated with airport safety hazards.

Deleted: include

**Section 4.7, page 4.7-5, fourth paragraph**

Correction of maximum building height within the Upland Crossing Specific Plan, and insertion of Project consistency discussion relative to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The significance determination of the EIR does not change.

Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 establishes a series of imaginary surfaces in the airspace surrounding a runway or helicopter landing area. No object should penetrate into any of these surfaces to ensure an obstruction free airspace for pilots using the airport. The proposed Project site does not penetrate any of these surfaces, but it does underlie parts of the Transitional Surface and the Horizontal Surface. The Horizontal Surface is 150 feet above the established airport elevation. Because the City of Upland's zoning requirements Upland Crossing Specific Plan restricts structure height on the proposed Project site to 40 45 feet, structures constructed as part of the proposed Project would not enter the Horizontal Surface area. Additionally, the Transitional Surface varies from 135 feet above the Project site to approximately 275 feet aboveground where it meets the Horizontal Surface. Structures located on-site are not expected to penetrate into the Transitional Surface area. The proposed Project does not include any uses that would produce smoke, emit electronic interference, or reflect glare. The commercial element of the Project would include lighting, but Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-3 assure that the Project's lighting will not spill over onto adjacent properties nor cause any offsite glare impact.

The Project site is located in Safety Zone 2 of the Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CACALUP), which allows residential use. Additionally, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook provides guidance for considering the land use compatibility for the Project. Within the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, there are suggested safety land use compatibility zones for a "Short General Aviation Runway" of 4,000 feet length or less, and a "Medium General Aviation Runway" of from 4,000 to 5,999 feet long. The Medium has slightly larger safety compatibility zones than the Short. The Cable Airport has a 3,864-foot-long runway, oriented northeast (R-6) – southwest (R-24). Thus, Cable Airport has a Short General Aviation Runway; however, to be conservative, the safety zones for both Short and Medium General Aviation Runway standards were analyzed.

Both classes of runway and associated safety compatibility zones were plotted relative to the Project site. Figure 4.7.1 depicts the safety compatibility zones for the Short General Aviation

Deleted: Section 4.7, page 4.7-5¶

¶ Correction of maximum building height within the Upland Crossing Specific Plan.¶

¶ Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 establishes a series of imaginary surfaces in the airspace surrounding a runway or helicopter landing area. No object should penetrate into any of these surfaces to ensure an obstruction free airspace for pilots using the airport. The proposed Project site does not penetrate any of these surfaces, but it does underlie parts of the Transitional Surface and the Horizontal Surface. The Horizontal Surface is 150 feet above the established airport elevation. Because the City of Upland's zoning requirements Upland Crossing Specific Plan restricts structure height on the proposed Project site to 40 45 feet, structures constructed as part of the proposed Project would not enter the Horizontal Surface area. Additionally, the Transitional Surface varies from 135 feet above the Project site to approximately 275 feet aboveground where it meets the Horizontal Surface. Structures located on-site are not expected to penetrate into the Transitional Surface area. The proposed Project does not include any uses that would produce smoke, emit electronic interference, or reflect glare. As development of the proposed Project site is required to comply with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 and the CACALUP, impacts associated with this issue are considered less than significant.¶

Deleted: will

Deleted: s

<sup>1</sup> Aviation Safety Implications Study of Potential Land Uses, Specific Parcels Southwest of Cable Airport, Heliplanners, July 11, 2005, Appendix H of the Upland Crossing Initial Study (located in Appendix 1 of the Draft EIR).

Figure 4.7.1 Short General Aviation Runway Hazard Zones

Runway and the Project site location, while Figure 4.7.2 depicts the safety compatibility zones for the Medium General Aviation Runway and the Project site location. The Zone 3 (Inner Turning) area overlies a part of the Project site for both scenarios. The *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* recommends limited residential development in Zone 3 but does not recommend prohibiting such use. Figure 4.7.3 is a portrayal of safety zones (Clear Zones, Safety Area 1, and Safety Area 2) as illustrated in Figure 3 of the *Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan*. For the purpose of this analysis, the flight paths have also been layered on Figure 4.7.3.

Deleted: portion

Cable Airport has already established "voluntary" departure and arrival routings in the interest of airplane overflight noise abatement. These operations are published in several pilot guide books, such as the "Flight Guide" by AirGuide Publications, Inc., which shows information for Cable Airport as of 2004. There is, as well, on the Cable Airport website Visual Flight Rules Noise Abatement Arrival and Departure guidance for both Runways. (<http://www.cableairport.com/images/vfr24.gif>; <http://www.cableairport.com/images/vfr6.gif>) Compliance with these suggested procedures is "voluntary" in that the airport does not have authority to "direct" pilot operation of his/her own aircraft, because such direction is federally preempted. In point of fact, nearly all pilots will voluntarily fly the airport's requested departure and arrival routings. It is a common practice that airports request pilots to voluntarily fly suggested departure and arrival routes in the interest of both noise abatement and overflight safety.

Deleted: 24 and 6

Deleted: all

Deleted: are

Deleted: Figures 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 also depict the voluntary flight path recommended by Cable Airport.

Deleted: p

Deleted: S

Deleted: Additionally,

Deleted: flight paths are used when flying into the traffic pattern and the prevailing wind (which is normally aligned with the runway) is instead crossways to the normal flight path (i.e., the plane must fly "across the wind's direction"). Because the prevailing wind is usually aligned with the runway,

The Cable Airport guidance requests pilots departing Runway 24 to the west to turn left approximately 45 degrees to track outbound west of the San Antonio Wash and east of Claremont Boulevard (now designated Monte Vista Avenue). Following this route, which is depicted in Figures 4.7.1 through 4.7.3 in purple, airplanes should not routinely overfly the Project site, regardless of safety compatibility zone categories. Because the visual overhead traffic pattern is "standard" (i.e., left hand turns from the respective north side and south side downwinds to land either runway direction), pilots landing on Runway 6 (flight paths are depicted on Figures 4.7.1 through 4.7.3 in red) will be making their left turn from downwind to base leg and then base leg to final leg north of the Project site, and therefore should not normally overfly the Project site. The Cable Airport guide also requests that pilots arriving on Runway 24 use a 45-degree entry to the applicable southside downwind, which will not regularly overfly the Project site. Thus, aircraft turning from the base to final approach legs of the standard traffic pattern will not actually fly over the Project site.

Deleted: C

Deleted: crosswind flight paths are not frequently used

Deleted: because the prevailing wind is usually aligned with the runway

Deleted: T

Deleted: and t

Deleted: hus, the normal flight paths (in purple and red) are frequently used.

The "crosswind" flight paths are depicted in green and blue in Figures 4.7-1 through 4.7.3. The "crosswind" means an aircraft is flying across the direction of the prevailing wind, which is normally aligned with the runway. The crosswind departure flight path (depicted in green) is requested by the airport to use after takeoff on Runway 24 if headed north (e.g., to Sacramento). A pilot would depart Runway 24 and commence a climbing left turn to then cross the airport northbound above traffic pattern altitude. The blue path depicted on Figures 4.7-1 through 4.7.3 portrays the requested crosswind path to take when entering the traffic pattern from the north side of the airport (e.g., from Sacramento) when landing on Runway 24. The pilot descends from some flight altitude early enough so as to cross the airport and enter the traffic pattern at traffic pattern altitude, (before actually crossing the airport).

Deleted: for pilots

Deleted: The crosswind flight path directs a pilot to take off on

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 11 pt, Double underline

Deleted: crosswind path to take when entering the traffic pattern from the north side of the airport (e.g., from Sacramento) when landing on Runway 24. The pilot would descend from some flight

Figure 4.7.2 Medium General Aviation Runway Hazard Zones

Figure 4.7.3 Safety Zones

Lastly, it is important to note that the *Handbook* stresses that safety, unlike noise that inevitably occurs with every flight, is impossible to predict. It is not possible to know when or where an airplane incident will occur, and there is very little data on the topic. *Handbook*, p. 9-1 and 9-18. Because of this uncertainty, Federal and State regulations focus on reducing risks by controlling structures that cause flight hazards (e.g., height of buildings and electrical frequencies), but the regulations are "particularly lacking guidance regarding protection of people and property on the ground in the event of aircraft accidents." *Handbook*, p. 9-8. Much of the area within Zone 3 is already developed as residential use, and most of the CACALUP's Safety Zone 2 is developed as residential use. Local agency's balance the unknowable risk with the need to develop near airports. Because of the flight patterns surrounding Cable Airport, the City concludes that there will not be a significant safety impact in the development of the Project site. *Handbook*, p. 9-2.

- Deleted: which
- Deleted: because it
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: i.e.
- Deleted: It is important to note that
- Deleted: m
- Deleted: and b

## 4.2 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (SECTION 4.8)

### Section 4.8, page 4.8-10, fourth paragraph

*Correction of proposed drainage infrastructure, the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

~~Additional water quality treatment could generally occur at the downstream terminus of the natural drainage course. These locations could incorporate water quality basins for the treatment of dry weather flows and first flush stormwater flows. Basins constructed on the Project site could be anticipated to function as infiltration basins or extended detention basins, depending on the specific site constraints. The proponents of the Upland Crossing Specific Plan intend to use a variety of BMPs for the Project site. The efficiency of various BMPs that may be employed by the proposed Project and their general impact on water quality and aquatic habitat are identified in Table 4.8.B. With implementation of the required WQMP and BMPs, water quality impacts during the operational phase of the Project are reduced to a less than significant level.~~

Deleted: Lastly, it is important to note that the *Handbook* stresses that safety, unlike noise that inevitably occurs with every flight, is impossible to predict because it is not possible to know when or where an airplane incident will occur, and there is very little data on the topic.<sup>1</sup> Because of this uncertainty, Federal and State regulations focus on reducing risks by controlling structures that cause flight hazards (i.e., height of buildings and electrical frequencies) but the regulations are "particularly lacking [] guidance regarding protection of people and property on the ground in the event of aircraft accidents."<sup>2</sup> Local agency's balance the unknowable risk with the need to develop near airports and because of the flight patterns surrounding Cable Airport, the City concludes that there is not a significant safety risk in the development of the Project site. ¶  
¶ Based on the CACALUP and the study of the *Handbook* and local practice, the Project would not result in safety impacts associated with nearby Cable Airport. As development of the proposed Project site is required to comply with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 and the CACALUP, impacts associated with this issue are considered less than significant. ¶

### Section 4.8, page 4.8-11, second paragraph

*Correction of second paragraph for proposed drainage infrastructure on-site, the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

**Groundwater Supply and Recharge Impacts.** The installation of impermeable surfaces would incrementally reduce the amount of land available for groundwater recharge. The Project does not include measures that would facilitate recharge on-site on the eastern half of the Project site. However, the runoff generated from the eastern half of the Project site would be routed to the Upland Basin where it would be recharged into the underlying basin. The

- Deleted: 1
- Deleted: project

~~stormwater from the western half of the Project would utilize existing San Antonio Creek Channel or rely on detention infrastructure on the Project site.~~ The Project site covers an area of 31.6 acres. The amount of land rendered impermeable by implementation of the proposed Project totals approximately 0.02 percent of the groundwater basin's total recharge area of 154,000 acres. When compared to the total potential recharge area, the loss of 31.6 acres of permeable surface would not significantly affect the amount of groundwater recharge. Given this set of circumstances, impacts associated with this issue are anticipated to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

**Deleted:** ~~western half of the Project site~~

**Comment [CN1]:** Water from the west side will not be recharged in Upland.

Delete highlighted section and insert the following:

The storm water from the western half of the project will utilize existing San Antonio Creek Channel or rely on-site detention infrastructure.

**Deleted:** ~~would utilize infrastructure that would encourage the infiltration or recharge of runoff.~~

#### **Section 4.8, page 4.8-12, first paragraph**

*Correction of first paragraph for proposed drainage infrastructure within the Project site. The analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

~~As indicated previously, the Upland Crossing Project proponents would develop a comprehensive water quality approach that would be implemented throughout the Project. This approach could include construction of on-site storm drain catch basins, and retention of stormwater and dry weather flows through a series of natural drainage areas acting and functioning like large vegetated swales within the Project site. The water quality basins are anticipated to function as infiltration basins or extended detention basins, depending on the specific site constraints. In the few instances that basins or vegetated swales cannot be used, other structural BMPs (such as BMPs contained in previously referenced Table 4.8.b) would be employed to achieve treatment of runoff generated on the Project site. In addition, the design and installation of the proposed drainage improvements would be required to adhere to applicable City of Upland and County of San Bernardino standards, consequently reducing impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level with no mitigation required.~~

#### **Section 4.8, page 4.8-12, second paragraph**

*Correction of proposed on-site drainage infrastructure, the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

**Drainage Capacity-Related Impacts.** The proposed Project would result in the conversion of permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces. Preliminary drainage plans include the westerly 17 acres of the Project site draining to the San Antonio Creek Channel that currently bisects the property. The Channel has been evaluated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and was determined to provide adequate flood protection for tributary areas based on existing and expected future developments in the area.<sup>1</sup> In addition, flows from the Project site are projected to be captured by the Upland Basin, which is located at Arrow Route and Monte Vista Avenue. The Upland Basin would have adequate capacity to capture and hold runoff coming from the easterly half of the Project.<sup>2</sup> ~~Preliminary drainage plans would have on-site drainage flows discharging to on-site detention basins.~~ To avoid significant impacts, on-site

<sup>1</sup> E-mail correspondence, Aaron Skeers, Madole Inc., December 6, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

storm drain facilities infrastructure would be sized to accept and handle site drainage flows that would result from Project construction as required by the NPDES permit No. CAS618036 issued to the County of San Bernardino and incorporated cities of which Upland is part of. ~~The on-site storm drainage system would detain on-site flows to pre-construction rates.~~ No significant impacts related to drainage are anticipated.

**Section 4.8, page 4.8-14, Figure 4.8.1**

*Correction of Figure 4.8.1 to show correct flood zone mapping. The correct map is shown on the following page. The proposed Project is not located within an area that is designated "Undetermined, but Possible Flood Hazard," and the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

**Section 4.8, page 4.8-16, third paragraph**

*Correction of proposed on-site drainage infrastructure, the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.*

As discussed previously, the drainage system for the Project would be designed so that runoff from off-site locations and runoff from the site after Project development ~~are~~ is treated in accordance with drainage infrastructure requirements set forth by NPDES Permit No. CAS618036. ~~equal to or less than historic conditions.~~ This same requirement would be placed on all other development in the vicinity of the Project site by the City of Upland, thus reducing the potential for cumulative impacts to less than significant. The anticipated drainage system for the Project site would accept and handle flows as described in this section, resulting in less than significant impacts. The Project's water quality impacts would be mitigated through structural BMPs ~~on-site detention basins~~ and other pollution control mechanisms. Similar requirements would be placed on all other development in the Project vicinity by the City of Upland and the RWQCB, further reducing the potential for cumulative impacts.

**Figure 4.8.1** FEMA Flood Zones (Color Figure) (*Production: This figure is different than that used in the Draft EIR -- near the top border should be an Area D*)

**4.3 LAND USE AND PLANNING (SECTION 4.9)**

**Section 4.9.2, page 4.9-4, City of Upland General Plan**

Addition of City of Upland General Plan policies:

Strategy IC Continue the use of creative planning concepts such as specific plans and mixed-use development as a means of enhancing housing diversity and choice.

The proposed Project utilizes the specific plan concept to provide a variety of detached and attached housing types.

In addition, the City of Upland General Plan Housing Element includes goals that apply to the Upland Crossing Specific Plan:

Goal 1 To assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the City's fair share of the region's housing needs for all economic segments of the population, including low- and moderate-income households.

The proposed Project develops housing that meets the City's fair share of the regional housing need as identified by the Southern California Association of Governments, discussed below.

**Section 4.9.4, page 4.9-8**

Strategy IC Continue the use of creative planning concepts such as specific plans and mixed-use development as a means of enhancing housing diversity and choice.

The Upland Crossing Specific Plan utilizes the specific planning process to develop a mixed-use commercial and residential Project to enable the City to creatively plan and design a high-quality community development that provides a diversity of housing choices.

Goal 1 To assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the City's fair share of the region's housing needs for all economic segments of the population, including low- and moderate-income households.

The Upland Crossing Specific Plan will provide the City of Upland with 355 of the 1,172 housing units forecasted to be needed under SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment within the Above Moderate Income range.

Deleted: Section 4.8, page 4.8-16, third paragraph¶

¶ Correction of proposed on-site drainage infrastructure, the analysis contained within the EIR does not change.¶

¶ As discussed previously, the drainage system for the Project would be designed so that runoff from off-site locations and runoff from the site after Project development ~~are~~ is treated in accordance with drainage infrastructure requirements set forth by NPDES Permit No. CAS618036, equal to or less than historic conditions. This same requirement would be placed on all other development in the vicinity of the Project site by the City of Upland, thus reducing the potential for cumulative impacts to less than significant. The anticipated drainage system for the Project site would accept and handle flows as described in this section, resulting in less than significant impacts. The Project's water quality impacts would be mitigated through structural BMPs on-site detention basins and other pollution control mechanisms. Similar requirements would be placed on all other development in the Project vicinity by the City of Upland and the RWQCB, further reducing the potential for cumulative impacts.¶

Deleted: the following additional

Deleted: including the following:

Deleted: n

Deleted: creativ

Deleted: g

**Section 4.9.4, page 4.9-8**

*Clarification on Project's consistency with Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan.*

**Cable Airport.** The Project site is located in Safety Zone 2 of the Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CACALUP) and federal aviation regulations require that structures within this zone do not cause interference through reflecting glare, emitting electronic interference or producing smoke. The commercial element of the Project will include lighting but Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-3 assure that the Project's lighting will not spill over onto adjacent properties nor cause any offsite glare impact. The Project does not emit electronic interference or producing smoke.

Deleted: project

In terms of land use planning, Safety Zone 2 allows residential use. In fact, most of the area within Cable Airport's Safety Zone 2 is already developed as residential use. Moreover, because of the flight patterns surrounding Cable Airport, as discussed in Section 4.7.4 above, with consideration to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook the City concludes that on balance that developing residential use within the Project site is acceptable.

**Section 4.9.4, page 4.9-8, Consistency with Plans and Policies of Southern California Association of Governments.**

Deleted: n

*Further illustration that the proposed Project meets the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.*

**Regional Housing Needs Assessment.** SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment formula for determining a locality's share of a region's housing need is the sum of household growth, vacancy need, and replacement need,<sup>1</sup> and these three components make up construction need. Based on this methodology, the City of Upland would be responsible for providing a regional fair share of housing of approximately 2,350 units as illustrated in the table below.<sup>2</sup> This table specifies the number of units and percentage assigned to each particular income level as calculated by the SCAG website's Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Numbers Calculator.

Deleted: Clarification

Deleted: p

Deleted: Needs

Deleted: Needs

Deleted: Needs

<u>Income Category</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Units</u>
Very Low Income	435	18.5%
Low Income	326	13.9%
Moderate Income	419	17.8%
Above Moderate Income	1,172	49.9%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,350</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Numbers Calculator, August 2006.

<sup>1</sup> The methodology described was developed to determine the SCAG region's total housing need, as well as to allocate shares to each jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup> SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Number Calculator, website accessed August 9, 2006, <http://api.ucla/rhna/RegionalHousingNeedsAssessment/FinalNumbers>.

Pursuant to State housing statutes, and according to income, four categories are used to classify a household. These categories are the following:

- Very Low is 0 percent to 50 percent of the County median income;
- Low is 51 percent to 80 percent of the County median income;
- Moderate is 81 percent to 120 percent of the County median income; and
- Above Moderate is over 120 percent of the County median income.

The City of Upland is located within the County of San Bernardino. Based on U.S. Census Bureau data, median household income for the County of San Bernardino is \$43,185.<sup>1</sup> The following are income ranges based on this median household income:<sup>2</sup>

- Very Low Income: a range of \$0 to \$21,592;
- Low Income: a range of \$22,024 to \$34,548;
- Moderate Income: a range of \$34,979 to \$51,822; and
- Above Moderate Income: over \$51,822.

With a cost of \$400,000 to \$500,000 per unit and 355 or 375 units proposed for the ~~Project~~ site, it is anticipated that the proposed ~~Project~~ would contribute these units in the Above Moderate Income category. As the number of units proposed for the Upland Crossing Specific Plan ~~Project~~ is less than what is prescribed for the area by SCAG, the City of Upland is contributing its fair share of housing to the region. It is consistent with the SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment identified in the final construction needs for regional fair share of housing allocations.

Deleted: project

Deleted: project

Deleted: project

#### Section 4.9 RO, page 4.9-13

*Goal 1 To assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the City's fair share of the region's housing needs for all economic segments of the population, including low- and moderate-income households.*

The Residential Overlay will provide the City of Upland with 375 of the 1,172 housing units forecasted to be needed under SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment within the Above Moderate Income range.

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau State and County Quick Facts, website accessed August 9, 2006, <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06071.html>.

<sup>2</sup> The percentages associated with the definitions of income categories for households are applied to the median income to determine the specific income ranges.

#### 4.4 NOISE (SECTION 4.11)

Deleted: 2

##### Section 4.11, page 4.11-2, fourth paragraph

Deleted: 3

*Correction regarding the location of the heliport at Cable Airport:*

The Project site is approximately 800 feet from the runway of Cable Airport, which is a ~~City of Upland~~ privately-owned general aviation<sup>1</sup> airport in the City of Upland. At the ~~east~~ west end of the airport ~~near Benson Avenue~~ is a heliport.<sup>2</sup> Occasional flights occur over the proposed Project site.

##### Section 4.11, page 4.11-13

*Correction regarding the Project's proximity to Cable Airport CNEL contour:*

Deleted: s

**Impact 4.11.1: Cable Airport Noise Impacts.** *The Project could expose people residing within the Project site to excessive noise levels from the Cable Airport. This is a significant impact.*

Although located approximately 800 feet south of the Cable Airport runway, the Project site is outside the airport's ~~60~~ 65 dBA CNEL noise contour according to the Cable Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CACALUP), Figure 6.

##### Section 4.11, page 4.11-13

Deleted: 00

Clarification of noise impacts:

In addition, the Project is consistent with the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook which recommends that 65 dBA is the appropriate threshold for residential development. Handbook, p. 7-23-30, 7-7. While the Handbook does recommends new development be located within the 60 dB, it finds new development "in hot climates where most buildings are air conditioned" to be acceptable. Handbook, p. 7-29. Thus, Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 requires air conditioning to ensure that windows and doors can remained closed from prolonged periods of time. Air conditioning along with standard building construction provides 24 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise attenuation, as suggested by the Handbook, which reduces the interior noise to less than 45 dBA as recommended. Handbook, p. 7-29 and 7-35 and 7-36.

<sup>1</sup> General aviation is all flying other than airlines and the military.

<sup>2</sup> A heliport is used or intended to be used for the arrival, landing, takeoff or departure of vertical takeoff and landing aircraft, such as helicopters.

#### 4.5 RECREATION AND PARKS (SECTION 4.14)

Deleted: 3

##### Section 4.14.2, page 4.14-4

Deleted: 4

*Addition of title of the text that follows:*

Deleted: dd the following to the first section

##### General Plan Policies.

*Explanation of the City of Upland park programs at the end of the section:*

Deleted: Add the following

City Park Programs. The City of Upland collects a Park Acquisition and Development Fee from Project proponents for residential units pursuant to Ordinance No. 1414. The City uses these fees to acquire and develop public recreation and park facilities. The current fee is \$2,052 for each residential unit unless the Project proponent provides in-lieu land dedication and parkland construction.

Deleted: project

Deleted: A

Deleted: p

##### Section 4.14.4, page 4.14-5

*Amplification of the Park Acquisition and Development Fee:*

Formatted: Font: Italic

The proponent of the proposed Project will pay the full per unit Park Acquisition and Development Fee.

##### Section 4.14, page 4.15-5

*Clarification that the Project proponent would provide Park Acquisition and Development Fees for the proposed Project.*

Deleted: project

Deleted: will

In addition, the proponent of the proposed Project will pay the City's Park Acquisition and Development Fee of \$2,052 for each residential unit. This fee will assist the City in providing public recreation and park facilities within the City of Upland.

Deleted: c

Mitigation Measure. ~~As~~ Though the implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant decrease in the existing park acreage to population ratio nor result in substantial impacts to existing parks, the following mitigation measure will further reduce impacts to existing neighborhood and regional parks to ~~are~~ less than significant:

REC & PARKS-1 Upon issuance of building permits, the proponent of the proposed Project shall pay to the City of Upland a Park Acquisition and Development Fee of \$2,052 per residential unit.

*Clarification that the trails that are included within the proposed Project site are public trails, and that they affect the City of Upland parkland ratio slightly.*

#### 4.14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses impacts and mitigation measures for recreation and parks. The proposed Project would include 2.5 acres of open space (1.5 acres of public trails and 1.0 acre of ~~extended private~~ recreational areas) in Planning Areas 2 and 3); however, for the purpose of analysis of the City of Upland parkland ratios, this private recreation acreage of the proposed Project is not included. ~~These 1.0 acre of private recreation areas~~ would be provided for the exclusive use of the Upland Crossing Specific Plan residential occupants. The 1.5 acres of public trails, however, is included in the City of Upland park acreages and ratios.

**Deleted:** 4 RO7 Recreation and parks impacts would be essentially the same for the proposed Project with Residential Overlay as for the proposed Project without the Residential Overlay. The only slight difference between the two scenarios would be an additional 55 residents in the Residential Overlay, for a total of 1,035 residents on the site. The parkland ratio would change slightly,<sup>1</sup> but not to the point where there would be a change in the ratio of approximately 1.9 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. ~~No mitigation measures are required for recreation and park activities, as there are no significant impacts. ¶~~

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

**Formatted:** Keep lines together

**Formatted:** Keep with next, Keep lines together

**Deleted:** ~~extended~~

#### Section 4.14, page 4.14-5, footnote number 3

*Correction of footnote for parkland per population ratio:*

The parkland divided by the 2000 population of the City of Upland (128.5 divided by 68,393) and multiplied by 1,000 would result in ~~1.89~~ 1.88 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. With an addition of 980 residents and 1.5 acres of public trails, the ratio would change to ~~1.85~~ 1.87 acres of parkland per 1,000 people.

#### Section 4.14.4 RO page 4.15-7

*Clarification that the Project proponent would provide Park Acquisition and Development Fees for the proposed Project with Residential Overlay.*

Recreation and parks impacts would be essentially the same for the proposed Project with Residential Overlay as for the proposed Project without the Residential Overlay. The only slight difference between the two scenarios would be an additional 55 residents in the Residential Overlay, for a total of 1,035 residents on the site. The parkland ratio would change slightly,<sup>2</sup> but not to the point where there would be a change in the ratio of approximately 1.9 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. ~~No mitigation measures are required for recreation and park activities, as there are no significant impacts.~~ In addition, the proponent of the proposed Project will pay the City's Park Acquisition and Development Fee of \$2,052 for each residential unit. This fee will assist the City in providing public recreation and park facilities within the City of Upland.

Mitigation Measure. ~~As~~ Though the implementation of the proposed Project with Residential Overlay would not result in a significant decrease in the existing park acreage to

<sup>2</sup> The parkland divided by the 2000 population of the City of Upland (128.5 divided by 68,393) and multiplied by 1,000 would result in 1.878847 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. With an addition of 1,035 residents, the ratio would change to 1.85 acres of parkland per 1,000 people.

population ratio nor result in substantial impacts to existing parks, the following mitigation measure will further reduce impacts to existing neighborhood and regional parks to ~~are~~ less than significant:

**REC & PARKS-1 RO** Upon issuance of building permits, the proponent of the proposed Project with Residential Overlay shall pay to the City of Upland a Park Acquisition and Development Fee of \$2,052 per residential unit.

Formatted: Keep with next, Keep lines together

**Section 4.14, page 4.14-7, footnote number 1**

*Correction of footnote for parkland per population ratio for the proposed Project with Residential Overlay:*

The parkland divided by the 2000 population of the City of Upland (128.5 divided by 68,393) and multiplied by 1,000 would result in ~~1.878847~~ 1.88 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. With an addition of 1,035 residents and 1.5 acres of public trails, the ratio would change to 1.857 acres of parkland per 1,000 people.

**4.6 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC (SECTION 4.15)**

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

**Section 4.15, page 4.15-21, third paragraph**

Removal of reference to heliport's location at the east end of the airport:

**Air Traffic Patterns.** The proposed Project site is approximately 800 feet south of the runway at Cable Airport, a general aviation airport with a heliport ~~at the east end~~.

**Section 4.15, page 4.15-21 and 22**

Formatted: Keep with next, Keep lines together

Correction of maximum building height within the Upland Crossing Specific Plan, and insertion of Project consistency discussion relative to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The significance determination of the EIR does not change.

Deleted: . /

Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 establishes a series of imaginary surfaces in the airspace surrounding a runway or helicopter landing area, so that there is an obstruction free airspace for pilots using the airport, no object should penetrate into any of these surfaces. The proposed Project site does not penetrate any of these surfaces, but it does underlie parts of the Transitional Surface and the Horizontal Surface. The Horizontal Surface is 150 feet above the established airport elevation. Because the ~~City of Upland's zoning requirements~~ Upland Crossing Specific Plan restricts structure height on the proposed Project site to ~~40~~ 45 feet, structures constructed as part of the proposed Project would not enter the Horizontal Surface area. Additionally, the Transitional Surface varies from 135 feet above the Project site to approximately 275 feet aboveground where it meets the Horizontal Surface. Structures

located on-site are not expected to penetrate into the Transitional Surface area. The proposed Project does not include any uses that would produce smoke, emit electronic interference, or reflect glare.

Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.7, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook was utilized as guidance for considering the land use compatibility for the Project. As discussed in Section 4.7 both the Short and Medium General Aviation Runway safety zones were plotted for Cable Airport. Using the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook safety zones for both Short and Medium General Aviation Runway standards, the Zone 3 (Inner Turning) area overlies a portion of the Project site for both scenarios. The California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook recommends limited residential development in Zone 3 but does not prohibit such use. Using the Handbook as guidance, and considering the voluntary guidance requests (discussed in detail in Section 4.7) for flight paths, it was determined that planes utilizing Cable Airport would not normally fly over the Project site. As planes would not normally fly over the Project site, and ~~As~~ development of the proposed Project site is required to comply with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 and ~~the City must evaluate whether the Project is consistent with the CACALUP, the Project would not result in changes to air traffic patterns that could result in an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that could result in substantial safety risks.~~ Development of the proposed Project would not alter or affect the frequency or pattern of air traffic at Cable Airport; therefore, impacts are less than significant for this issue.

Deleted: sh

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-24, Impact 4.15.2

*Addition of SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road and Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard intersections to list of intersections forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 plus Project scenario:*

**Impact 4.15.2.** ~~Four-Six~~ intersections are forecast to exceed the level of service threshold or exceed the significance criteria for increases to intersection capacity utilization in the Year 2006 With Project scenario, creating a significant impact. These intersections are:

- Access B/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F p.m. peak hour);
- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in a.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

**Impact Analysis:** Trips generated by the proposed Project were added to the baseline Year 2006 without Project volumes, resulting in the Year 2006 plus Project volumes shown in Figure 4.15.5. As shown in Table 4.15.F, ~~three-five~~ intersections that would be forecast to

exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 without Project scenario are also forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 plus Project scenario. These ~~three-five~~ intersections are as follows:

- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in a.m. peak hour); and
- SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

These levels of service deficiencies are also forecast to occur in the Year 2006 without the Project; thus, the Project does not produce them alone. For the intersections of Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard and the SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road, the intersections are operating at below LOS standards before and after implementation of the Project. However, the addition of Project traffic to these intersections does not cause an increase of over 0.01 in intersection capacity utilization of the two intersections. Per the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program guidelines, the impact of the Project at these two intersections are considered insignificant. Therefore, no mitigation measures have been identified at these locations. For the remaining three intersections (Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard, Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route, Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road) ~~Nonetheless,~~ the Project does contribute to the level of service deficiencies, resulting in a significant impact, and mitigation is required.

Deleted: the Project does not create a significant impact and therefore no

Additionally, the Project creates a Project-specific impact at a ~~fourth-sixth~~ intersection, Access B/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour), resulting in a forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 plus Project scenario. The level of service deficiency created at this intersection by the Project would be a significant impact, requiring mitigation.

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-28, following TRANS-5

*Insertion of an additional mitigation measure:*

TRANS-a Prior to issuance of first occupancy permits, the applicant shall submit plans for review, receive approval, and construct a second westbound left turn lane at the Foothill Boulevard/Monte Vista Avenue intersection.

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-28, Impact 4.15.3

*Addition of SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road intersection to list of intersections forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2025 plus Project scenario:*

**Impact 4.15.3.** ~~Eleven-Twelve~~ study intersections are forecast to exceed the level of service standards or exceed the significance criteria for increases to intersection capacity utilization in the year 2025 plus Project scenario, creating a significant impact. These intersections are:

- Monte Vista Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/11<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Arrow Highway (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Monte Vista Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Off-ramp (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Access A (LOS D in a.m. peak hour and LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Access B/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/9<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

**Impact Analysis:** As indicated previously, development of the traffic volumes for the year 2025 plus Project scenario are described in detail in the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (Appendix 7). The resulting year 2025 plus Project traffic volumes are shown Figure 4.15.6. An intersection level of service analysis was conducted for the 2025 plus Project scenario volumes. The resulting levels of service are shown in Table 4.15.G. As indicated, ~~eleven-twelve~~ of the study intersections are forecast to operate at unsatisfactory levels of service in the year 2025 plus Project scenario. These intersections are as follows:

- Monte Vista Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/11<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Arrow Highway (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Monte Vista Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Off-ramp (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Access A (LOS D in a.m. peak hour and LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Access B/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/9<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~

- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in p.m. peak hour) ~~and~~
- SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

While the intersection of SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road is operating at below LOS standards before and after implementation of the Project, the addition of Project traffic to this intersection does not cause an increase of over 0.01 in intersection capacity utilization of the intersection. Per the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program guidelines, the impact of the Project at this intersection is considered to be insignificant. Therefore, no mitigation measures have been identified at this location. For the remaining intersections, the Project contributes to these levels of service deficiencies, which are considered to be significant cumulative impacts requiring mitigation.

Deleted: For the

Deleted: the Project does not create a significant impact and

Deleted: therefore

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-39

Insertion of reference to the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The significance determination of the EIR does not change.

Air Traffic Patterns. Impacts to air traffic patterns would be the same as with the proposed Project with the Residential Overlay. The CACALUP, and Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77, were utilized to ascertain the Project's impacts associated with air traffic patterns. Additionally, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook was consulted for guidance in determining the Project's impacts associated with air traffic patterns. Development of the Project site is required to comply with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulation, Part 77 and the CACALUP; consequently, the Project would not result in changes to air traffic patterns that could result in an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that could result in substantial safety risks. Development of the proposed Project with Residential Overlay would not alter or affect the frequency or pattern of air traffic at Cable Airport; therefore, impacts are less than significant for this issue.

Deleted: in determined

Deleted: As

Deleted: d

Deleted: which

#### **Section 4.15, page 4.15-40, Impact 4.15.2 - RO**

*Addition of four intersections to list of intersections forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 plus Project scenario:*

***Impact 4.15.2-RO*** Five intersections are forecast to exceed LOS standards in the Year 2006 with Project scenario. Of these five intersections, One intersection is forecast to exceed the significance criteria for increases to intersection capacity utilization in the Year 2006 With Project scenario, creating a significant impact. The intersection of Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road intersection, located within Los Angeles County is forecast to operate at LOS F in both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Trips generated by the proposed Project were added to the baseline Year 2006 without Project volumes, resulting in the Year 2006 plus Project volumes shown in Figure 4.15.2-RO.

As shown in Table 4.15.B-RO, ~~one-five intersections is~~ are forecast to operate at ~~an~~ unsatisfactory levels of service. These intersections are as follows:

- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in a.m. peak hour);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours); and
- SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

These levels of service deficiencies are also forecast to occur in the Year 2006 without the Project; thus, the Project does not produce them alone. For the intersections of Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard, Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard, Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route, and the SR-210 Ramps/Baseline Road, the Project does not create a significant impact, as the addition of Project traffic does not cause an increase of over 0.01 in intersection capacity utilization of the intersection. Per the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program guidelines, the impact of the Project at these four intersections are considered insignificant. Therefore, no mitigation measures have been identified at these locations.

Comment [FB2]: Amanda, to answer your question, yes, these are all in LA County.

Deleted: and

Deleted: 1

The intersection of Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road intersection, located within Los Angeles County, is forecast to operate at LOS F in both a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the Year 2006 with Project scenario. This intersection is also forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2006 without Project scenario. Because this level of service deficiency is forecast to occur in the Year 2006 without Project scenario, the Project does not produce it alone. Nonetheless, the Project does contribute to the level of service deficiency, resulting in a significant impact and mitigation is required.

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-44, following TRANS-4 RO

*Insertion of an additional mitigation measure:*

TRANS-a RO Prior to issuance of first occupancy permits, the applicant shall submit plans for review, receive approval, and construct a second westbound left turn lane at the Foothill Boulevard/Monte Vista Avenue intersection.

#### Section 4.15, page 4.15-44, Impact 4.15.3 - RO

*Addition of four intersections to list of intersections forecast to exceed the level of service standard in the Year 2025 plus Project scenario:*

**Impact 4.15.3-RO** ~~Six-Ten~~ study intersections are forecast to exceed the level of service standards or exceed the significance criteria for increases to intersection capacity utilization

in the year 2025 plus Project scenario, creating a significant cumulative impact. These intersections are:

- Monte Vista Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/11<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS D in a.m. peak hour and LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Arrow Highway (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Monte Vista Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Off-ramp (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Claremont Boulevard/9<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour); ~~and~~
- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour); and
- SR-210 ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

Development of the traffic volumes for the year 2025 plus Project scenario (with the Residential Overlay) are described in detail in the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (Appendix 7). The resulting year 2025 plus Project traffic (with Residential Overlay) volumes are shown Figure 4.15.3-RO. An intersection level of service analysis was conducted for the 2025 plus Project (with Residential Overlay) scenario volumes. The resulting levels of service are shown in Table 4.15.C-RO. As indicated, ~~six-ten~~ of the study intersections are forecast to operate at unsatisfactory levels of service in the year 2025 plus Project scenario. At four of the intersections, although the intersections are operating at unsatisfactory levels of service, the addition of Project traffic does not cause an increase of over 0.01 in intersection capacity utilization of the intersections. Per the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program guidelines, the impact of the Project at these four intersections are considered insignificant. Therefore, no mitigation measures have been identified. These intersections are as follows:

Deleted: Project does not create a significant impact.

- Indian Hill Boulevard/Foothill Boulevard (LOS E in p.m. peak hour);
- Mills Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Claremont Boulevard/6<sup>th</sup> Street-Arrow Route (LOS E in p.m. peak hour); and
- SR-210 ramps/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).

For the remaining six intersections, the Project has a significant impact. These intersections are as follows:

- Monte Vista Avenue/Foothill Boulevard (LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/11<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS D in a.m. peak hour and LOS F in p.m. peak hour);
- Monte Vista Avenue/Arrow Highway (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours);

- Monte Vista Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Off-ramp (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hours).
- Monte Vista Avenue/Baseline Road (LOS F in a.m. and p.m. peak hour) ; and
- Claremont Boulevard/9<sup>th</sup> Street (LOS F in p.m. peak hour).

The Project contributes to these levels of service deficiencies, which are considered to be significant cumulative impacts requiring mitigation.

#### **4.8 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (SECTION 4.16)**

##### **Section 4.1.6.4, page 4.16-14, Water Supply and Water Facilities Impacts.**

*Further explanation of no requirement for a Water Supply Assessment and deletion of unnecessary footnote:*

Deleted: *Modify the first sentence of this section as follow*

Deleted: *s*

The Upland Crossing Specific Plan is an infill<sup>+</sup> development, ~~that~~ and it does not trigger the need for preparation of a Water Supply Assessment.

~~<sup>+</sup> California Environmental Quality Act, § 21061.0.5: "Infill site" means a site in an urbanized area that meets either of the following criteria: (a) The immediately adjacent parcels are developed with qualified urban uses or at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses and the remaining 25 percent of the site adjoins parcels that have previously been developed for qualified urban uses, and the site has not been developed for urban uses and no parcel within the site has been created within the past 10 years; or (b) The site has been previously developed for qualified urban uses.~~

#### **4.9 ADDITIONAL TOPICS REQUIRED BY CEQA (SECTION 5.0)**

##### **Section 5.3.1, page 5-3.**

*Addition to the end of the first paragraph for clarification that the proposed Project will be within SCAG forecasts.*

Additionally, the proposed Project will provide the City of Upland with 355 of the 1,172 housing units forecasted to be needed under SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment within the Above Moderate Income range.

##### **Section 5.3.2, page 5-3.**

*Addition to the end of the first paragraph for clarification that the proposed Project with Residential Overlay ~~would~~ be within SCAG forecasts.*

Deleted: *will*

Additionally, the Residential Overlay ~~would~~ provide an additional 20 residential units toward the 1,172 housing units forecasted to be needed under SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment within the Above Moderate Income range.

Deleted: *will*

Deleted: *s*

**Section 5.4**

*Addition of the following section to clarify the proposed Project's energy impacts and the City's review of its efforts to achieve the goal of conserving energy.*

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: the its

**5.4 ENERGY CONSERVATION**

Formatted: Keep with next, Keep lines together

There are no adopted thresholds for energy use pursuant to CEQA; however, California's homes and buildings are relatively energy efficient today, compared to those in other states and many countries of the world.<sup>1</sup> Since the passage of the Warren-Alquist Act in 1975, homes and buildings in California have been made increasingly efficient, due to periodically updated State-mandated efficiency requirements. The Upland Crossing Specific Plan Project has incorporated standard Title 24 California Energy Code building construction applications to conserve energy. The following required practices<sup>2</sup> are examples of avoidance or reduction of inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy:

Deleted: project

- Water piping and cooling system line insulation thickness and conductivity requirements;
- Residential lighting requirements; and
- Water heater requirements.

**Water Piping and Cooling System Line Insulation Thickness and Conductivity.** Insulation requirements apply to all cooling system refrigerant suction, chilled water, and brine lines. To meet pipe insulation requirements, exceptions are established for piping that penetrates framing members, piping installed in walls that are insulated, and in attics with a minimum of four inches of attic insulation on top of the piping.

**Residential Lighting.** At least 50 percent of the lighting wattage in kitchens are required to be high efficacy (e.g., fluorescent). In addition, recessed luminaries in insulated ceilings are required to be airtight. Lighting in bathrooms, garages, laundry rooms, and utility rooms are required to be high efficacy or controlled by a "manual-on" occupant sensor. Lighting in other indoor spaces are required to be high efficacy or controlled by a dimmer switch. Outdoor lighting permanently mounted to a building is required to be high efficacy or be controlled by a motion sensor with an integral photosensor. Lighting installed in common areas with four or more dwelling units are required to be high efficacy or be controlled by an occupant sensor.

Deleted: are

**Water Heaters.** For water heaters serving individual dwelling units, either a single gas-storage type water heater, 50 gallons or smaller, with no recirculation pumps and meeting the

<sup>1</sup> California Energy Commission, *Options for Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings, Commission Report*, CEC-00-005-39-CMF, December 2005.

<sup>2</sup> California Energy Commission, *2005 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, Standards/Regulations*, P400-03-001F, September 2004, Effective Date, October 1, 2005.

mandatory insulation requirements for storage tanks and hot water pipes to the kitchen, or instantaneous gas water heaters are required. For systems serving multiple dwelling units, a central recirculating water heating system with gas water heaters including timer controls are required. Hot water pipes from the water heater to the kitchen fixtures that are ¾ inch or greater in diameter are required to be insulated.

Conclusion. With the integration of State-mandated energy requirements, the Upland Crossing Specific Plan Project would reduce wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, and maintenance activities.

Deleted: project

#### 4.10 ALTERNATIVES (SECTION 6.0)

##### Section 6.3.2, page 6-19, Alternative 6

Further explanation of the Public Park Alternative:

Deleted: Add the following text.

Recreation and Parks. For the Public Park Alternative, the impacts to Recreation and Parks would be somewhat greater than the proposed Project. The Public Park Alternative would include dedication of public parkland that would be credited toward an in-lieu reduction of the Project proponent's Park Acquisition and Development Fees. Thus, the Public Park Alternative would provide less recreation and park benefits than the proposed Project, which would provide the following:

Deleted: §

- Land, development and maintenance costs for a 1.0-acre private park to serve the future residents of the proposed Project;
- 1.5 acres of public trails; and
- Payment of the full City Park Acquisition and Development Fee to be used by the City for the acquisition and development of public parks.

Formatted: LSA Bullet, Left, Indent: Left: 0.75", Don't keep with next, Don't keep lines together, Tabs: 0.75", List tab

Deleted: (i)

Deleted: (ii)

Deleted: (iii)

Thus, Alternative 6's impact to Recreation and Parks would be somewhat greater than that of the proposed Project because the benefits the alternative would provide would be less than the benefits the proposed Project would provide.

##### Section 6.3.2, page 6-20, Alternative 6, second paragraph

Additional explanation following the sentence at the end of the second paragraph.

Deleted: the

Deleted: sentence

Lastly, development of this alternative would result in somewhat greater recreation and park impacts compared to the proposed Project.

**4.11 REFERENCES (SECTION 8.0)**

Deleted: 6

**Section 8.0, page 8-4**

Deleted: 0

*Insertion of new reference.*

**State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics**

*California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.*

**4.12 PREPARERS (SECTION 9.0)**

Deleted: 7

**Section 9.0, page 9-1**

Deleted: 1

*Insertion of new preparer.*

**ADDITIONAL CONSULTANT**

R. Austin Wiswell.....Aviation Consultant

**4.12 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT**

Deleted: 6

*Missing page 12.*

Deleted: 8

Page 12 of the Archaeological Survey Report (Appendix 3 of the Draft EIR) was inadvertently deleted from the Draft EIR. The missing page is provided on the next page.

Greenwood and Associates recorded a single resource within the boundaries of the northwest basin (our west basin). This resource (CHB-1) was described as a "can dump" consisting of 30 hole-in-cap cans, a scatter of glass, an old telephone box, baby food jars and coil cans. There was also a scatter of miscellaneous metal. This site covered an area of 15 square meters. The deposits were shallow (>10 cm) and appeared to date to the 1930s. Greenwood and Associates concluded that this site was the result of secondary deposition and probably did not originate on the property and Greenwood and Associates deemed the site insignificant. The San Bernardino County Museum, Archaeological Information Center, reassigned this site as CA-SBR-7792H. The site was mapped just north of the Eleventh Street alignment and west of the San Antonio Creek Channel.

Greenwood and Associates also recorded a single resources within the northeastern basin (our east basin). This site, CHB-2, was described as a sparse scatter of amethyst glass, whiteware ceramics, and some red California terra cotta. These items were found on a bladed surface with no depth. Greenwood and Associated concluded that this area was too disturbed to retain any integrity and declared the area insignificant. Nonetheless, the San Bernardino County Museum, Archaeological Information Center reassigned the site as CA-SBR-7793H and mapped it in the northeastern corner of the basin.

Although not specifically discussed in the Greenwood and Associates reports, the alignment of Foothill Boulevard is a significant resource, listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a part of Old National Trails Highway (NRHP-E-OHP-3926) and recognized as a California Historic Landmark (No. 781; see Hogan 1992:3). This particular portion of Foothill Boulevard/Route 66 was improved between 1931-32 (possibly as early as 1929), resulting in the construction of the at least two bridges over San Antonio Creek. Subsequently, following the flooding of 1938, three bridges were present, resulting in the presence of one longer and two shorter crossings. All three crossings are considered ineligible or listing as a historical resource and, therefore, no adverse impact will result from alternations to these bridges.

With respect to paleontological resources, Dr. McLeod of the Natural history Museum of Los Angeles County prepared a paleontological overview for the project area. In his research, he concluded that the project area is within an area of recent surficial alluvium unlikely to yield paleontological specimens. No known fossil deposits are known for the general area. The nearest such specimens are from the Chino area (well to the south) and in older Quaternary deposits Dr. McLeod recommends that excavations exceeding the depths of the recent alluvial deposits (which is highly unlikely) be monitored for paleontological resources (see Appendix D).

The recent intensive survey of the Foothill Blvd./Monte Vista Avenue project area (Upland Crossings) resulted in a determination that the entire project area is highly disturbed and consists of fill soils introduced to the property between 1991 and 2004. The quarrying activities resulted in the excavation to two relatively deep cavities (55 feet +/-) which have since been backfilled. The fill materials have been compacted and consist of sands, cobbles, and boulders. There is no evidence on the property or in the historic records that the area was ever under cultivation.

**Comment [FB3]:** Do not change any grammatical or syntax errors on this page – original text from McKenna study.