
V. ALTERNATIVES

A. Summary of the Alternatives

Under CEQA, the identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental aspect of the environmental review process. Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, the purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify alternatives to the project.

Direction regarding the definition of project alternatives is provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) as follows:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.

The CEQA Guidelines emphasize that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce significant impacts relative to the proposed project, "even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly."¹ The CEQA Guidelines further direct that the range of alternatives be guided by a "rule of reason," such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are analyzed.²

In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives should be feasible. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that:

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, ... and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site...

The CEQA Guidelines require the analysis of a "no project" alternative and an evaluation of alternative location(s) for the project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, an

¹ CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)

² Ibid, Section 15126.6(f)

environmentally superior alternative is to be designated. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.³

Based on the project objectives established for the project (refer to Section II, Project Description), environmental impacts (refer to Section IV) as well as consideration of TOP and the Grand Park Specific Plan, and consultation with Ontario planning staff, the following three alternatives were selected for evaluation.

1. No Project/No Build Alternative
2. Maximum Density as Allowed by TOP
3. Reduced Density Alternative
4. Agricultural Retention Alternative

Each of these alternatives are described and evaluated in the sections that follow. Alternative 1, No Project/No Build, assumes that the project is not approved and the project site remains unchanged from existing conditions. A No Project Alternative is required under Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible. Such potential alternatives are described below.

B. Alternatives Considered and Rejected

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration: the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that have been considered and rejected as infeasible include:

Alternative Site: The Grand Park Specific Plan site is proposed for development of urban uses, consistent with TOP, including various residential density transfers to allow for a minor redistribution of a variety of land uses to allow for consistent and compatible development in the area. Development of the proposed project on another site would not be feasible for three main reasons.

First, the development pattern that has been developed for the Grand Park Specific Plan serves to unify the surrounding development within approved or

³ Ibid, Section 15126.6(e)(2).

pending Specific Plans, which themselves are consistent with The Ontario Plan. As such, development of the Grand Park Specific Plan on the project site is necessary to complete the contiguous and unified urban development pattern in the area, and provide the necessary level of housing, schools, and regional recreation facilities envisioned for the site in The Ontario Plan.

Second, the project applicant is already in possession of a portion of the project site, the investment in which precludes the purchase of another site of comparable size and physical characteristics on which the proposed uses could be constructed. Given the existing and future development pattern in the project area (and the proposed project's contribution to that pattern) and the project applicant's ownership of the majority of the property, development of the proposed uses on another site was determined to be infeasible.

Third, consideration of an alternative site would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project. The proposed project is anticipated to result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to:

- Agriculture. The NMC Final EIR identified the conversion of agricultural land within the NMC as a significant and unavoidable impact and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- Air quality. The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Given the nature of the proposed project, an alternative location within the South Coast Air Basin would not alleviate the anticipated project-level or cumulative air quality impacts. Alternatively-located land in the project vicinity would still be within the NMC and continue to involve agricultural soils and property used or designated for agricultural purposes, thereby still resulting in an overall loss of farmland. Therefore, analysis of an alternatively-located site is not considered necessary, because it would not provide avoid, or substantially lessen the significant impacts resulting from the proposed project.

C. Analysis Format

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less, similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the project. Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine whether the project objectives, identified in Section II, Project Description, would be substantially attained by the alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)). This comparison is provided in Table V-2. The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

First, the net environmental impact significance of alternative after implementation of reasonably anticipated mitigation measures are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in the EIR.

Second, where the net impact of the alternative would be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the project, the comparative impact is said to be “less.” Where the impacts of the alternative and project would be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be “similar.” Where the alternative’s net impact would clearly be more adverse or less beneficial than the project, the comparative impact is said to be “greater.” These secondary ratings appear in parentheses in the table.

Table V-1 provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the project with the impacts of each of the proposed alternatives. Of course, there are numerous potential combinations between a respective alternative and the proposed project or between two or more alternatives. No attempt has been made to analyze all of these combinations, though it can be presumed that the impact profile of most such combinations would fall within the overall envelope of identified impacts for all of the evaluated alternatives.

Table V-1: Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Maximum Density as Allowed by TOP	Alternative 3 Reduced Density	Alternative 4 Agricultural Retention
Aesthetics/Visual Character/Light and Glare	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Greater)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)
Agricultural Resources	Significant and Unavoidable	Less Than Significant (Less)	Significant and Unavoidable (Similar)	Significant and Unavoidable (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Less)
Air Quality	Significant and Unavoidable	Less Than Significant (Less)	Significant and Unavoidable (Greater)	Significant and Unavoidable (Less)	Less Than Significant (Less)
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)
Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)
Geology and Soils	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Potentially Significant (Greater)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Potentially Significant (Greater)
Hydrology/ Water Quality	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Potentially Significant (Greater)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Potentially Significant (Greater)

Table V 1 (cont.): Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Maximum Density as Allowed by TOP	Alternative 3 Reduced Density	Alternative 4 Agricultural Retention
Land Use and Planning	Less Than Significant	Potentially Significant (Greater)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Potentially Significant (Greater)
Noise	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Greater)
Public Services - Fire	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)
Public Services - Police	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)
Public Services - Schools	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)
Public Services - Parks	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Less)
Traffic/Transportation	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Less)
Utilities - Water	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation (Similar)
Utilities - Wastewater	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)
Utilities - Solid Waste	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant (Less)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)	Less Than Significant (Similar)

D. Alternative 1 - No Project/No Development**a) Description of the Alternative**

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the Guidelines states that, “In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.” Accordingly, this Alternative provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed project in contrast to the environmental impacts that could result from not approving, or denying, the proposed project. Because the City Planning Commission and/or City Council has discretionary authority over a proposed project and could choose to deny it, the environmental impacts of that action must be disclosed. As a result of this potential decision, the project site could remain in its current state and condition for an undetermined period of time and not be the subject of any further development proposals. Evaluation of this Alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

b) Environmental Impacts**1) Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare**

Under the No Project Alternative, no additional urban uses would be constructed on-site, and the site would remain in its current state, with ongoing dairy activities or crop production. Under this scenario, the existing dairy and agricultural properties on-site would not be improved, and those that have ceased dairy or agricultural operations would remain in an abandoned state. Remnants of past uses, including building pads, debris, overgrown vegetation, stagnant dairy ponds, abandoned structures, and high voltage transmission towers/lines would continue to degrade the visual character and quality of the site. However, existing views of the San Gabriel Mountains and remaining windrows would be maintained, including views along major roadways in the area. It is anticipated that surrounding planned and approved development would still be constructed, which would affect views from the project area, as would be the case with the proposed project. This Alternative would not improve the project area with new, well-designed urban development, but would maintain the degraded character of several of the former dairy properties that have ceased operations. As such, while views would be maintained under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project, the lack of new, visually cohesive development on the site would result in greater aesthetic impacts than those associated with the proposed project. The loss of relatively unobstructed open space would be relatively minor in the context of the project area, since the surrounding Specific Plans would be developed with urban uses, and the current degraded visual character of a large portion of the site would be improved by the provision of new urban uses. Impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than significant, but would be greater than those of the proposed project.

2) Agricultural Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the project site would remain in its current condition, and dairy and other agricultural operations would continue to operate. Although several dairy properties on the site have been removed, these properties could ultimately be utilized for agricultural operations if the market permitted. In any case, the preservation of the project site for continued agricultural operations would preclude the potential for impacts related to the loss of agricultural land and productivity in the region. As such, less than significant impacts would result under this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

3) Air Quality

Under this Alternative, the proposed development would not occur, and the existing agricultural and dairy operations occurring on-site would continue. As such, while this Alternative would not introduce new sources of air quality pollutants associated with urban development, air quality impacts related to dairy-related methane emissions and odors would continue to result from such operations. Although dairy-related greenhouse gas emissions from livestock is an existing impact, it is substantially less than that associated with the proposed project's impact on air quality. Impacts related to local and regional air quality would, overall, be less than significant under this Alternative, and substantially less than impacts associated with the proposed project.

4) Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would involve no physical changes to the project site, which would serve to maintain any existing habitat that currently exists on-site. Given the heavily disturbed nature of the site due to historic agricultural and dairy operations, very little, if any, valuable habitat exists within the project boundaries. Ongoing agricultural and dairy operations under this Alternative would not notably affect sensitive resources in the project area, including jurisdictional waters and nesting birds. Impacts to biological resources would be less than significant under this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

5) Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would involve no physical changes to the project site, which would serve to maintain any existing cultural resources currently existing on-site. Ongoing agricultural and dairy operations under this Alternative would not notably affect cultural resources in the project area, including those that may be located below grade. Structures that may be determined to be historically significant would be maintained in their current condition. Impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant under this Alternative, and therefore impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

6) Geology and Soils

This Alternative would result in no additional development on-site, aside from potential minor uses associated with ongoing agricultural and dairy-related operations. The existing

structures on-site would be exposed to seismic-related hazards during a seismic event, as is the case under existing conditions, and seismic effects on existing structures and on-site population (including livestock) would be substantially reduced relative to the proposed project. Given the lack of population that could be exposed to seismic hazards, limited number of on-site structures, and physical site and soil conditions, impacts related to geology, soils, and seismic hazards would be less than significant, and would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this Alternative, the existing recognized environmental conditions (RECs) on the project site would not be characterized and/or remediated, and ongoing agricultural and dairy activities would continue to contribute agricultural compounds and dairy-related wastes to the on-site soils and dairy ponds. Although existing RECs, including potential soil contamination, would not be remediated, given the very limited on-site population, the risk associated with these RECs is considered minimal. Groundwater contamination from the infiltration of agricultural chemicals and dairy wastes would continue to have the potential to degrade water quality in local aquifers, as removal of upper soil layers and reduction in pervious surface area on-site would not occur under this Alternative. The continued existence of RECs on the project site and potential for groundwater contamination would result in potentially significant hazardous materials impacts. Overall, impacts would be greater than the proposed project, as no remediation of potential contamination and removal of RECs would occur under the No Project Alternative.

8) Hydrology and Water Quality

Development of the No Project Alternative would result in little, if any, change in the drainage patterns of the project site. Currently the site drainage is via overland flow to the south into dairy/retention ponds. The groundwater beneath the project area is affected by dairy wastes and agricultural compounds, which would not be addressed by this Alternative, since no change in site drainage and dairy operations are anticipated to occur. Accordingly, the existing flooding potential on local streets would continue, as no stormwater drainage facilities would be constructed on-site that would connect to regional facilities, despite no net increase in impervious surface area on-site. Likewise, existing stormwater contaminants related to dairy and agricultural operations would continue to have the potential to affect off-site stormwater flows and adversely affect receiving water bodies. As such, impacts would be potentially significant, and would be greater than those associated with the proposed project.

9) Land Use and Planning

Under the No Project Alternative, the site would remain in agricultural use, unlike all the surrounding properties that have Specific Plans for urban development approved or pending, which are consistent with TOP. In that respect, this Alternative would result in an inconsistency with TOP, which designates the project area for low-, medium-, and high-density housing, the Grand Park, and two school sites. These uses are intended to complete

the land use fabric envisioned in TOP for the area, and would serve to provide consistency with, and complement, the development pursuant to the respective Specific Plans in the adjacent planning areas. As such, the No Project Alternative would create an inconsistency with TOP because it would not serve to implement TOP for the project site. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant under this Alternative, and would be greater than the impacts associated with the proposed project.

10) Noise

The No Project Alternative would not notably increase noise levels relative to existing conditions, as the current agricultural activities would continue on-site. Mobile-source and stationary noise impacts would therefore be substantially lower under this Alternative compared to the proposed project, given the lack of urban development and associated vehicular traffic noise, noise from residences and school playgrounds, HVAC equipment, and other noise sources. Additionally, the lack of notable on-site population under the No Project Alternative would result in considerably fewer people exposed to noise from surrounding development and roadways. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and less than impacts associated with the proposed project.

11) Public Services

Fire Protection

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no increased demand for fire protection services. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not impede the fire protection services that might occur from impacts on area traffic flow as a result of construction activities or development-related traffic. Levels of fire service would remain unchanged and not impacted by the No Project Alternative. Therefore, impacts of the No Project Alternative relative to fire services would be less than significant and less than those associated under the proposed project.

Police Protection

This Alternative would not affect existing uses or develop new uses at the project site. As there would be no increased demand for police protection services under this Alternative, the level of service would be the same as existing conditions. Furthermore, the No Build Alternative would not impact the response time of emergency vehicles that might occur from increased traffic flow in the area due to the proposed project. No construction activities would occur under this Alternative that could impact emergency vehicle response to the project site and its surrounding area. In addition, this Alternative would not increase project-related traffic as there would be no increase in the residential population that results in an increase in calls for police services. As the No Project Alternative involves no increased demand for police protection services or increase in emergency response times, impacts relative to police protection services would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project.

Schools

Since the No Project Alternative would not generate any additional students to the Mountain View School District or the Chase Joint Union High School District, there would be no increased demand on schools in the project area. Although impacts associated with the proposed project would be mitigated to a less than significant level with the payment of developer impact fees in accordance with State Law SB 50, impacts related to schools would be less than significant and less under the No Project Alternative compared to the proposed project.

Parks and Recreation

The No Project Alternative is not expected to directly or indirectly generate new residents to the project area. As a result, there would be no increase in the demand for parks and recreational facilities. However, the City is still expected to uphold the parkland requirements set forth by the Quimby Act and the Sphere of Influence General Plan. Thus, less than significant impacts to parks and recreational facilities would occur and impacts under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

12) Traffic

Under the No Project Alternative, existing on-site uses would generate no additional vehicle trips than currently occur on-site. Given the substantial reduction in traffic under this Alternative, impacts to intersections and roadway segments would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. Likewise, impacts to CMP facilities and public transit would be less than significant, given the lack of development and associated population and traffic generation. Therefore, traffic impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project.

13) Utilities and Service Systems

Water Supply

The No Project Alternative would not result in an increase of facilities or population to the project site. Hence, water demand for this Alternative would be consistent with existing conditions. While the buildout of the Grand Park project would have a projected water demand of 1,273 AFY and would be well within the projected potable water demand for the NMC as estimated by the WMP, the No Project Alternative would not lead to a change in water demand. As such, impacts would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project.

Wastewater

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing uses on the project site would generate the same amount of wastewater currently generated. Hence, no additional wastewater would be generated, and there would be no need for additional wastewater infrastructure or treatment. While impacts to wastewater generation, infrastructure, and treatment would be less than significant under the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would result in less than

significant impacts to the project site. Therefore, the impact of this Alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Solid Waste

Under the No Project Alternative, no new construction would occur and no additional solid waste would be generated. Although solid waste generation would be less than significant under the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not result in any additional solid waste generation. Therefore, the impact of this Alternative relative to solid waste generation would be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project.

E. Alternative 2 - Maximum Density As Allowed by TOP

a) Description of the Alternative

This Alternative reflects the maximum density as allowed by TOP and is intended to evaluate the potential for the maximum density as allowed by TOP. The proposed project allows up to 1,327 attached and detached low-density, medium-density and high-density dwelling units on approximately 320 acres, along with an elementary school and high school site, and the Grand Park. Under this Alternative, all aspects of the proposed project would remain the same including the land uses and distribution on the site, but the overall residential density would increase up to approximately 1,800 low-, medium-, and high-density residential units.

b) Environmental Impacts

1) Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses, which would permanently alter the physical character of the site relative to existing conditions. The existing agricultural and dairy activities and associated fields, corrals, farmhouses, and associated structures would be replaced with new residential, educational, and recreational uses. It is assumed that development of urban uses under this Alternative would be subject to development standards and design guidelines similar to those of the proposed Grand Park Specific Plan, as these standards are comparable to those under the Ontario Development Code (ODC). As such, building heights, setbacks, and landscape requirements are expected to be similar to the proposed project and to result in similar impacts to the visual character of the site and views of scenic resources, including the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and views along major thoroughfares in the area. Development on-site under this Alternative would be subject to design review, as would be the case with development pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan. Given the nature and intensity of proposed uses under this Alternative, it is assumed that light and glare impacts would be similar to the proposed project, although the reduction in residential density on the project site could incrementally lessen impacts related to nighttime lighting. Nighttime sports field lighting could be provided on the high school and elementary school campuses, as well as on the active sports fields within the Grand Park recreational space proposed as part of this Alternative. Impacts in this respect would be comparable to the proposed project.

Light and glare impacts would be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project, but light impacts would be slightly less under this Alternative than the proposed project given the reduction in residential development. Overall, however, impacts to aesthetics, views, and light and glare would be similar to the proposed project.

2) Agricultural Resources

Under this Alternative, all of the existing on-site agricultural land would be converted to urban uses, and agricultural operations on-site would cease. Given the loss of agricultural land and productivity on-site and lack of feasible mitigation measures to address such losses, impacts under this Alternative, as is the case with the proposed project, would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the proposed project in this regard.

3) Air Quality

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, the overall development proposed would be incrementally increased by the increased residential density on-site. It is anticipated that traffic-related air pollutant emissions would therefore be incrementally increased, given the increase in overall vehicle trips associated with the reduction in residential units. Likewise, stationary source emissions would be increased since the overall development intensity on the project site would increase. It is anticipated that short-term construction impacts and long-term operational impacts would be potentially significant and would require mitigation measures to address such impacts. However, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures, it is expected that vehicular emissions impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in air quality impacts that are slightly greater than those associated with the proposed project.

4) Biological Resources

This Alternative would develop the Grand Park Specific Plan area with urban uses, as is the case with the proposed project. Any on-site biological resources, including habitat, special-status species, and jurisdictional waters would be removed, and mitigation measures would be implemented to address any significant impacts to such resources and result in less than significant impacts. As such, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

5) Cultural Resources

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, the overall development proposed would be incrementally increased by the increased residential density on-site. Because the same area would be urbanized as under the proposed project, this Alternative would have a similar potential to adversely affect any undiscovered cultural resources or potential historic resources. However, like the proposed project, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Given the similarity in development area under this Alternative, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

6) Geology and Soils

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, the entire project site would be developed with urban uses, similar in type and location to the proposed project, but reduced in terms of residential density. With the increase in development intensity, there would be more people living on-site that could be exposed to geologic or seismic hazards. Although on-site seismic conditions and potential hazards would not change relative to the proposed project, the increase in people and structures that could be subject to such risks would be incrementally increased, thereby increasing potential impacts. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, but overall, impacts under this Alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, existing dairy and agricultural activities on-site would cease, and the project site would be converted to urban uses. As is the case with the proposed project, any existing known or unknown hazardous materials contamination from agricultural activities, automotive and equipment maintenance, or dairy manure ponds would be required to be remediated to the satisfaction of affected regulatory agencies. Proposed uses under this Alternative would not be expected to handle, use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in notable quantities, similar to the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, additional residential units would be developed on-site, which may slightly increase the resident population exposed to potential impacts from a hazardous materials release in the project area. As such, impacts would be less than significant assuming compliance with applicable regulations and the requirements of affected regulatory agencies, and would be similar to those under the proposed project.

8) Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this Alternative, the project site would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but would result in the development of additional residential units. As such, development would be required to implement the permit conditions of the NPDES permit for construction activities and operation, as would be the case for the proposed project. However, given the increase in overall development intensity on-site, the potential for the introduction of urban pollutants into stormwater flows would be incrementally increased. Master Plan drainage improvements would still be required to accommodate the additional development under this Alternative, but stormwater flows leaving the site would be expected to also be incrementally increased. Overall, therefore, impacts would be less than significant and similar to those associated with the proposed project.

9) Land Use and Planning

Because development under this Alternative would be subject to approval of a Specific Plan, which must demonstrate consistency with The Ontario Plan (TOP), no conflicts with other land uses would be expected to occur, and this Alternative would not result in the division of an established community and impacts would be less than significant. Given the similarity in

overall necessary approvals and entitlements under this Alternative compared to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant and similar to those of the proposed project.

10) Noise

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, overall development intensity would be increased, and therefore associated vehicular traffic levels would also be increased. Furthermore, the increase in residential development intensity would increase the overall number of sensitive receptors located on-site that could be adversely affected by project-related noise. Given the increase in overall development intensity on-site, short-term construction impacts would also be incrementally increased, and would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. Overall, with the increase in development intensity, increase in associated traffic generation, and increase in sensitive receptor populations on-site, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and similar to those under the proposed project.

11) Public Services

Fire Protections

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, there would be a net increase of approximately 500 dwelling units. Similar to the proposed project, development would increase the demand for fire protection services within the City. Similar to the proposed project, the Applicant would also be required to pay developer fees for fire services and facilities. In addition, TOP EIR states: to ensure the provision of adequate fire protection services, the City of Ontario (City) has established a Development Impact Fee Program to provide funding for services within the City. As such, impacts associated with fire services and facilities for this Alternative would be less than significant and similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Police Protection

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, the project site would be served by the OPD. Similar to the proposed project, the OPD would reconfigure staffing needs within the eight police sectors in which the OPD is still expected to maintain adequate levels of police service to the City. Likewise, this Alternative would generate funding for police protection and services with the payment of development fees, and would be in accordance with the NMC General Plan, and the City's current standards. Hence, impacts for the Maximum Density Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Schools

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, an increase in student population would be expected. However, the proposed project and this Alternative would provide sites for the development of a new elementary school and high school to reduce overcrowding. Nevertheless, with payment of the state mandated developer impact fees established by the MVSD and CJUHSD and compliance with SB 50, school-related impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, impacts to schools would be similar to the proposed project.

Parks and Recreation

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, there would be a net increase of approximately 500 dwelling units that would fractionally increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities and would be less than significant. Thus, impacts to parks and recreation would be similar to the proposed project.

12) Traffic

The Maximum Density Alternative would increase the number of average daily trips as compared with the proposed project, which is a result of the increase in residential development under this Alternative. Given a circulation system and other improvements in the project area similar to those of the proposed project, this Alternative would result in similar traffic system impacts but would still require mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. Public transit impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project under this Alternative. Impacts related to CMP facilities and on-site circulation would also be less than significant and similar to those of the proposed project. Overall, traffic impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project's impacts.

13) Utilities and Service Systems

Water Supply

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, there would be an increase in the number of proposed residential dwelling units. As this would not change the amount of acreage designated for residential use, this increase is expected to increase water demand as well. Compared to the proposed project, it is expected that the water demand would slightly increase under the Maximum Density Alternative. Hence, the water demand would still be well within the projected potable water demand for the Grand Park and NMC as estimated by the WMP. Since the water demand would not be significantly greater than the proposed project under the Reduced Density Alternative, impacts would remain less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Wastewater

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, it is estimated that additional wastewater would be generated. The development and residents in the project area would still be subject to article 7 of the Ontario Municipal Code requiring that every person or entity with property in the City and served by the City sewer connection pay a sewer service charge. Funds from collected service charges would be used as permitted by the California Health and Safety Code Section 5471, including repairs, replacements, operation, maintenance, construction, and reconstruction of the sewerage system. Therefore, the Alternative would be in compliance with Article 7 of OMC and impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project's impacts.

Solid Waste

Under the Maximum Density Alternative, additional solid waste would be generated by the project. This alternative must still be consistent with applicable regulations including the State of California Waste Management and the City Municipal Code. The Reduced Density Alternative would result in less than significant impacts, and impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

F. Alternative 3 - Reduced Density

a) Description of the Alternative

This Alternative is intended to evaluate the potential for reduced environmental impacts associated with an approximate 25 percent reduction in the number of residential dwelling units proposed on the site. The proposed project allows up to 1,327 attached and detached low-density, medium-density and high-density dwelling units on approximately 320 acres, along with an elementary school and high school site, and the Grand Park. Under this Alternative, the land use distribution on the site would remain, but the overall residential density would be reduced by 25 percent, resulting, for example, in the elimination of one of the High-Density planning areas, which has the potential for development of up to 995 residential units.

b) Environmental Impacts

1) Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses, which would permanently alter the physical character of the site relative to existing conditions. The existing agricultural and dairy activities and associated fields, corrals, farmhouses, and associated structures would be replaced with new residential, educational, and recreational uses. It is assumed that development of urban uses under this Alternative would be subject to development standards and design guidelines similar to those of the proposed Grand Park Specific Plan, as these standards are comparable to those under the Ontario Development Code (ODC). As such, building heights, setbacks, and landscape requirements are expected to be similar to the proposed project and to result in similar impacts to the visual character of the site and views of scenic resources, including the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and views along major thoroughfares in the area. Development on-site under Alternative 3 would be subject to design review, as would be the case with development pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan. Given the nature and intensity of proposed uses under this Alternative, it is assumed that light and glare impacts would be similar to the proposed project, although the reduction in residential density on the project site could incrementally lessen impacts related to nighttime lighting. Nighttime sports field lighting could be provided on the high school and elementary school campuses, as well as on the active sports fields within the Village Green recreational space proposed as part of this Alternative. Impacts in this respect would be comparable to the proposed project. Light and glare impacts would be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project, but light impacts would be slightly less under this Alternative than the proposed

project given the reduction in residential development. Overall, however, impacts to aesthetics, views, and light and glare would be similar to the proposed project.

2) Agricultural Resources

Under this Alternative, all of the existing on-site agricultural land would be converted to urban uses, and agricultural operations on-site would cease. Given the loss of agricultural land and productivity on-site and lack of feasible mitigation measures to address such losses, impacts under this Alternative, as is the case with the proposed project, would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the proposed project in this regard.

3) Air Quality

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the overall development would be incrementally reduced by the lower residential density on-site. It is anticipated that traffic-related air pollutant emissions would therefore be incrementally reduced, given the reduction in overall vehicle trips associated with the reduction in residential units. Likewise, stationary source emissions would be reduced since the overall development intensity on the project site would be reduced, despite the reduction in acreage relative to the proposed project. It is anticipated that short-term construction impacts and long-term operational impacts would be potentially significant and would require mitigation measures to address such impacts. However, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures, it is expected that construction-period impacts and vehicular emissions impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in air quality impacts that are less than those associated with the proposed project.

4) Biological Resources

This Alternative would develop the Grand Park Specific Plan area with urban uses, as is the case with the proposed project. Any on-site biological resources, including habitat, special-status species, and jurisdictional waters would be removed, and mitigation measures would be implemented to address any significant impacts to such resources. As such, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project. Mitigation would be required to address impacts to biological resources and reduce them to a less than significant level, but overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project.

5) Cultural Resources

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but reduced in terms of residential density. Because the same area would be urbanized as under the proposed project, this Alternative would have a similar potential to adversely affect any undiscovered cultural resources or potential historic resources. However, like the proposed project, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Given the similarity in development area under this Alternative, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

6) Geology and Soils

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the entire project site would be developed with urban uses, similar in type and location to the proposed project, but reduced in terms of residential density. With the reduction in development intensity, there would be fewer people living on-site that could be exposed to geologic or seismic hazards. Although on-site seismic conditions and potential hazards would not change relative to the proposed project, the reduction in people and structures that could be subject to such risks would be incrementally reduced, thereby reducing potential impacts. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, but overall, impacts under this Alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, existing dairy and agricultural activities on-site would cease, and the project site would be converted to urban uses. As is the case with the proposed project, any existing known or unknown hazardous materials contamination from agricultural activities, automotive and equipment maintenance, or dairy manure ponds would be required to be remediated to the satisfaction of affected regulatory agencies. Proposed uses under this Alternative would not be expected to handle, use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in notable quantities, similar to the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, fewer residential units would be developed on-site, which would reduce the resident population exposed to potential impacts from a hazardous materials release in the project area. As such, impacts would be less than significant assuming compliance with applicable regulations and the requirements of affected regulatory agencies, and would be similar to those under the proposed project.

8) Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this Alternative, the project site would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but would result in the development of fewer residential units. As such, development would be required to implement the permit conditions of the NPDES permit for construction activities and operation, as would be the case for the proposed project. However, given the reduction in overall development intensity on-site, the potential for the introduction of urban pollutants into stormwater flows would be incrementally reduced. Master Plan drainage improvements would still be required to accommodate development under this Alternative, but stormwater flows leaving the site would be expected to also be incrementally reduced. Overall, therefore, impacts would be less than significant and similar to those associated with the proposed project.

9) Land Use and Planning

Because development under this Alternative would be subject to approval of a Specific Plan, which must demonstrate consistency with The Ontario Plan (TOP), no conflicts with other land uses would be expected to occur, and this Alternative would not result in the division of an established community and impacts would be less than significant. Given the similarity in

overall necessary approvals and entitlements under this Alternative compared to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant and similar to those of the proposed project.

10) Noise

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, overall development intensity would be reduced, and therefore associated vehicular traffic levels would also be reduced. Furthermore, the reduction in residential development intensity would reduce the overall number of sensitive receptors located on-site that could be adversely affected by project-related noise. Given the reduction in overall development intensity on-site, short-term construction impacts would also be incrementally reduced, and would be less than significant with mitigation. Overall, with the reduction in development intensity, reduction in associated traffic generation, and reduction in sensitive receptor populations on-site, impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and less than those under the proposed project.

11) Public Services

Fire Protection

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, there would be a net decrease of 332 dwelling units. Similar to the proposed project, the Applicant would also be required to pay developer fees for fire services and facilities. In addition, TOP EIR states: to ensure the provision of adequate fire protection services, the City of Ontario (City) has established a Development Impact Fee Program to provide funding for services within the City. Fees collected from developers are placed in a fire services fund that can be expended for the acquisition or construction of new fire services facilities and for the improvement or expansion of the City's existing fire service capabilities, provided that such expenditure from the fund has been authorized by the City Council. The fire department receives impact fees from residential, commercial, and industrial development in the Original Model Colony (OMC) and the New Model Colony (NMC) for both existing and proposed facilities. As such, impacts associated with fire services and facilities for this Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project and less than significant.

Police Protection

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the project site would be served by the OPD. Similar to the proposed project, the OPD would reconfigure staffing needs within the eight police sectors in which the OPD is still expected to maintain adequate levels of police service to the City. Likewise, this Alternative would generate funding for police protection and services with the payment of development fees, and would be in accordance with the NMC General Plan, and the City's current standards. Impacts for the Reduced Density Alternative would be less than significant. Although fewer calls for service would be expected than for the proposed project, impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Schools

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, a decrease in the student population would be expected. The proposed project and this Alternative would provide sites for the development

of a new elementary school and high school. With payment of the state mandated developer impact fees established by the MVSD and CJUHSD and compliance with SB 50, school-related impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, impacts to schools would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Parks and Recreation

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, there would be a net decrease of 332 dwelling units. This Alternative would slightly decrease the demand for parks and recreational facilities and would be less than significant. This would slightly decrease the demand for parks and recreational facilities, and impacts would be less than those under the proposed project.

12) Traffic

The Reduced Density Alternative would decrease the number of average daily trips, which is a result of the reduction in residential development under this Alternative. Given a circulation system and other improvements in the project area similar to those of the proposed project, this Alternative would result in fewer traffic system impacts but would still require mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. Public transit impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative, but would be reduced relative to the proposed project since fewer people would utilize public transit, it is assumed, without the additional residential units. Impacts related to CMP facilities and on-site circulation would also be less than significant and less than those of the proposed project. Overall, traffic impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's impacts.

13) Utilities and Service Systems

Water Supply

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, there would be a 25 percent reduction in the number of proposed residential dwelling units. Though this would not change the amount of acreage designated for residential use, this 25 percent reduction is expected to decrease water demand. Compared to the proposed project, it is expected that the water demand would be less under the Reduced Density Alternative. Hence, the water demand would still be well within the projected potable water demand for the Grand Park and NMC as estimated by the WMP, resulting in less than significant impacts. Since the water demand would not be more than the proposed project under the Reduced Density Alternative, impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Wastewater

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, it is estimated that less wastewater will be generated. The development and residents in the project area would still be subject to article 7 of the Ontario Municipal Code requiring that every person or entity with property in the City and served by the City sewer connection pay a sewer service charge. Funds collected from service charges would be used as permitted by the California Health and Safety Code Section 5471, including repairs, replacements, operation, maintenance, construction, and

reconstruction of the sewerage system. Therefore, the Alternative would be in compliance with Article 7 of OMC and impacts would be less than and similar to the proposed project's impacts.

Solid Waste

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, less solid waste will be generated by the project. This Alternative must still be consistent with applicable regulations including the State of California Waste Management and the City Municipal Code. The Reduced Density Alternative would result in less than significant impacts, and impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project.

G. Alternative 4 - Agriculture Retention Alternative

a) Description of the Alternative

This Alternative preserves the residential, school, and park land uses, but includes an agriculture land use. Approximately 25 percent of the project area (80 acres) would be retained for agriculture. The City's Agricultural Overlay Zoning District (AOZD), contained in section 9-1.2700 of the Ontario Municipal Code, allows existing agricultural uses within the NMC to continue on an interim basis until development is proposed and includes dairies as a conditionally permitted use among the many agricultural land uses. The existing dairy represents the most likely land use that could be allowed to continue on the site under this Alternative. Therefore, for purposes of this Alternative evaluation, an existing dairy, occupying approximately 80 acres, would be retained. The proposed school sites, totaling approximately 60 acres would be retained. The proposed park would be retained and reduced in size to approximately 90 acres. This Alternative would include low- and medium density residential over approximately 90 acres, providing approximately 1,022 dwelling units—a reduction of 305 units. All other components of the proposed project would remain the same.

a) Environmental Impacts

1) Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses, which would permanently alter the physical character of the site relative to existing conditions. Approximately 75 percent The existing agricultural and dairy activities and associated fields, corrals, farmhouses, and associated structures would be replaced with new residential, educational, and recreational uses; however approximately 25 percent of these areas would be preserved for agricultural use. It is assumed that development of urban uses under this Alternative would be subject to development standards and design guidelines similar to those of the proposed Grand Park Specific Plan, as these standards are comparable to those under the Ontario Development Code (ODC). As such, building heights, setbacks, and landscape requirements are expected to be similar to the proposed project and to result in similar impacts to the visual character of the site and views of scenic resources, including the

San Gabriel Mountains to the north and views along major thoroughfares in the area. The existing aesthetic values within the retained agriculture land use would be sustained.

Development on-site under the Agriculture Retention Alternative would be subject to design review, as would be the case with development pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan. Given the nature and intensity of proposed uses under this Alternative, it is assumed that light and glare impacts would be similar to the proposed project, although the retention of approximately 80 acres of agricultural land would moderately lessen impacts related to nighttime lighting. Nighttime sports field lighting could be provided on the high school and elementary school campuses, as well as on the active sports fields within the Village Green recreational space proposed as part of this Alternative. Impacts in this respect would be comparable to the proposed project. Light and glare impacts would be less than significant, as is the case with the proposed project, but light impacts would be less under this Alternative than the proposed project given the retention in agricultural uses which has minimal lighting. Overall, however, impacts to aesthetics, views, and light and glare would be similar to the proposed project.

2) Agricultural Resources

Under this Alternative, 80 acres of existing on-site agricultural land would be retained, while approximately 240 acres would be converted to urban and recreational uses. The loss of the balance of agricultural land and productivity on-site would be unavoidable. Retention of 25 percent of project area for agricultural would mitigate impacts to agricultural resources to a less than significant level. The impacts to agricultural resources would be similar in nature, but reduced in magnitude compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in agricultural impacts that are less than those associated with the proposed project.

3) Air Quality

Under this Alternative, 80 acres of agricultural use would be retained, while residential land use would be reduced by 17 acres (305 less dwelling units), and park use reduced by 40 acres. It is anticipated that traffic-related air pollutant emissions would therefore be incrementally reduced, given the reduction in overall vehicle trips associated with the reduction in these uses. Likewise, stationary source emissions would be somewhat reduced since the total number of residential units would be reduced. It is anticipated that short-term construction impacts and long-term operational impacts would be potentially significant and would require mitigation measures to address such impacts. However, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures, it is expected that construction-period impacts and vehicular emissions impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in air quality impacts that are less than those associated with the proposed project.

4) Biological Resources

This Alternative would develop the Grand Park Specific Plan area with urban uses, and retain a portion of the existing agricultural use. Most of the on-site biological resources, to the extent present, including habitat, special-status species, and jurisdictional waters would still be removed. Mitigation measures would be implemented to address any significant impacts to such resources. As such, impacts would be similar to those associated with the proposed project. Mitigation would be required to address impacts to biological resources and reduce them to a less than significant level, but overall, this Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project.

5) Cultural Resources

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but retain a portion of the project area for agricultural use. Cultural resources within the retained agricultural portion of the project are likely to be maintained in their current condition. This Alternative would have a similar potential to adversely affect any undiscovered cultural resources or potential historic resources, but over a reduced area. Like the proposed project, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Impacts to cultural resources under the Agriculture Retention Alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

6) Geology and Soils

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the project area would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but retain a portion of the project area for agricultural use. The reduction in residential and recreation land use would correlate to a reduction in people and structures that could be exposed to geologic or seismic hazards. Although on-site seismic conditions and potential hazards would not change relative to the proposed project, the reduction in people and structures that could be subject to such risks would be incrementally reduced, thereby reducing potential impacts. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, but overall, impacts under this Alternative would be similar those associated with the proposed project.

7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, 25 percent of the site would be retained for agricultural use, while the balance would be converted to urban uses. The existing RECs within the retained agriculture would not be further characterized or remediated and ongoing agricultural and dairy activities would contribute agricultural compounds and dairy-related wastes to the on-site soils and dairy ponds. This current condition is generally mitigated by a limited on-site population; however, this Alternative would place residential, school and recreations uses adjacent to agricultural uses increasing the potential for exposure of the project population to RECs. In addition, continued agricultural use may contribute to groundwater contamination and degradation of water quality in local aquifers.

For the developed portion of the project, any existing known or unknown hazardous materials contamination from agricultural activities, automotive and equipment maintenance, or dairy manure ponds would be required to be remediated to the satisfaction of affected regulatory agencies. Urban uses under this Alternative would not be expected to handle, use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials in notable quantities, similar to the proposed project. However, under this Alternative, there would be fewer residential units, which would reduce the resident population exposed to potential impacts from a hazardous materials release in the project area.

Nonetheless, the potential exposure of project area population to adjacent RECs, combined with the potential contribution to groundwater degradation represents a potentially significant impact under the Agricultural Retention Alternative. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant, and would be greater than those for the proposed project.

8) Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this Alternative, the majority of the project site would be developed with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but would result in the development of fewer residential units, and a portion of the site would be retained for agriculture. The developed portion of the site would be required to implement the conditions of the NPDES permit for construction activities and operation, as would be the case for the proposed project. The reduction in residential land use acreage would incrementally reduce the potential for the introduction of urban pollutants into stormwater flows, compared to the proposed project. Master Plan drainage improvements would still be required to accommodate development under this Alternative, and stormwater flows leaving the site would be incrementally reduced. However, Master Plan drainage design would be constrained by the presence of the on going agricultural retained within the project area under this Alternative, and may reduce effectiveness. The existing stormwater contaminants related to the retained dairy and agricultural operations would continue to have the potential to affect off-site stormwater flows and adversely affect receiving water bodies. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant, and would be greater than those associated with the proposed project.

9) Land Use and Planning

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, a portion of the site would be retained in continued agriculture use, while the balance would be subject to approval of a Specific Plan, which must demonstrate consistency with The Ontario Plan (TOP). The continued agriculture use would result in an inconsistency with TOP, which designates the project area for low-, medium-, and high-density housing, the Grand Park, and two school sites. These uses are intended to complete the land use fabric envisioned in TOP for the area, and would serve to provide consistency with, and complement, the development pursuant to the respective Specific Plans in the adjacent planning areas. As such, the Agriculture Retention Alternative would create an inconsistency with TOP because it would not serve to implement TOP for the project site. In addition, the presence of the retained agriculture adjacent to residential, school and recreation use under this alternative is likely to produce land use

conflicts between this uses (noise, odor, vector nuisance). Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant under this Alternative, and would be greater than the impacts associated with the proposed project.

10) Noise

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the residential and recreational land use would be reduced, and therefore associated vehicular traffic levels would be reduced. Furthermore, the reduction in residential dwelling units would reduce the overall number of sensitive receptors located on-site that could be adversely affected by project-related noise. Given the reduction in overall development area, short-term construction impacts would also be incrementally reduced, and would be less than significant with mitigation. The placement of residential, school and recreation adjacent to retained agricultural may expose the new urban uses to early morning noise, and closer proximity to odors under this Alternative compared to the proposed project. With mitigation, overall impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant, but be greater than those under the proposed project.

11) Public Services

Fire Protection

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, there would be a net decrease of 305 dwelling units. Levels of fire service would remain unchanged within the retained agriculture portion of the project, however, the project overall would require increased fire protection under this alternative. For developed areas, similar to the proposed project, the Applicant would also be required to pay developer fees for fire services and facilities. In addition, TOP EIR states: to ensure the provision of adequate fire protection services, the City of Ontario (City) has established a Development Impact Fee Program to provide funding for services within the City. Fees collected from developers are placed in a fire services fund that can be expended for the acquisition or construction of new fire services facilities and for the improvement or expansion of the City's existing fire service capabilities, if such expenditure from the fund has been authorized by the City Council. The fire department receives impact fees from residential, commercial, and industrial development in the Original Model Colony (OMC) and the New Model Colony (NMC) for both existing and proposed facilities. As such, impacts associated with fire services and facilities for this Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project and less than significant.

Police Protection

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the project site would be served by the OPD. There would be no increased demand for police protection services within the retained agriculture portion of the project, however, the overall project would require an increased demand under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, the OPD would reconfigure staffing needs within the eight police sectors in which the OPD is still expected to maintain adequate levels of police service to the City. Likewise, this Alternative would generate funding for police protection and services with the payment of development fees, and would be in accordance with the NMC General Plan, and the City's current standards. Impacts for

the Agriculture Retention Alternative would be less than significant. Although fewer calls for service would be expected than for the proposed project, impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Schools

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, the reduction in total dwelling units would be expected to generate less student population compared to the proposed project. The proposed project and this Alternative would provide sites for the development of a new elementary school and high school. With payment of the state mandated developer impact fees established by the MVSD and CJUHSD and compliance with SB 50, school-related impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, impacts to schools would be similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Parks and Recreation

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, there would be a net decrease of 305 dwelling units. This Alternative would slightly decrease the demand for parks and recreational facilities and would be less than significant. This would slightly decrease the demand for parks and recreational facilities, and impacts would be less than those under the proposed project.

12) Traffic

An Agriculture Retention Alternative would decrease the number of average daily trips, which is a result of the reduction in residential and, to a lesser extent, park development, under this Alternative. Given a circulation system and other improvements in the project area similar to those of the proposed project, this Alternative would result in fewer traffic system impacts but would still require mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. Public transit impacts would be less than significant under this Alternative, but would be reduced relative to the proposed project since fewer people would utilize public transit, it is assumed, without the additional residential units. Impacts related to CMP facilities and on-site circulation would be less than significant and less than those of the proposed project. Overall, traffic impacts under this Alternative would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's impacts.

13) Utilities and Service Systems

Water Supply

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, water use within the retained agriculture would continue consistent with the existing land use; within the developed portion of the project, there would be a 23 percent reduction in the number of proposed residential dwelling units. The reduction in dwelling units under this Alternative is expected to decrease overall water demand, compared to the proposed project. Hence, the water demand would still be well within the projected potable water demand for the Grand Park and NMC as estimated by the WMP, resulting in less than significant impacts. Since the water demand would not be more

than the proposed project under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Wastewater

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, it is estimated that less wastewater will be generated. The development and residents in the project area would still be subject to article 7 of the Ontario Municipal Code requiring that every person or entity with property in the City and served by the City sewer connection pay a sewer service charge. Funds collected from service charges would be used as permitted by the California Health and Safety Code Section 5471, including repairs, replacements, operation, maintenance, construction, and reconstruction of the sewerage system. Therefore, the Alternative would comply with Article 7 of OMC and impacts would be less than and similar to the proposed project's impacts.

Solid Waste

Under the Agriculture Retention Alternative, less solid waste will be generated by the project. This Alternative must still be consistent with applicable regulations including the State of California Waste Management and the City Municipal Code. The Reduced Density Alternative would result in less than significant impacts, and impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project.

H. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Table V-2 provides a comparison of the alternatives to the project objectives. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative is provided in the narrative above. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to “avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects” of the project.

Of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would reduce several of the impacts occurring under the proposed project to no impact or levels that are less than significant. However, as indicated above, this Alternative would not meet any of the identified objectives established for the proposed project.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative from the remaining alternatives, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that the Reduced Density Alternative would be the

environmentally superior alternative. This Alternative would reduce more project impacts than any remaining alternatives, but it would not fully meet all of the project objectives.

Table V-2: Project Objective Comparison of Alternatives

Project Objective	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Maximum Density as Allowed by TOP	Reduced Density Alternative	Agricultural Retention Alternative
Create a livable community that enhances an outdoor lifestyle with interconnected sidewalks, pedestrian and bicycle trails, recreational uses, schools, and a diverse mix of housing types and architectural styles.	Fully Met	Not Met	Fully Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
Design a circulation system serving bicyclists and pedestrians as well as motorists.	Fully Met	Not Met	Fully Met	Fully Met	Fully Met
Provide for adequate community facilities, such as an elementary school, high school, water, sewer, and storm drain facilities, and new on- and off-street bike paths.	Fully Met	Not Met	Fully Met	Fully Met	Partially Met
Provide new parks, open space, trails, and greenbelts.	Fully Met	Not Met	Fully Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
Promote a unique character and sense of place within the Grand Park Specific Plan.	Fully Met	Not Met	Fully Met	Partially Met	Partially Met

