SECTION 6

ALTERNATIVES

6 ALTERNATIVES

Public Resource Code 21061and CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR §15126.6) require that an EIR include a discussion of reasonable Project alternatives, including an evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives that "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project" and "would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the Project." Section 6.0 *Alternatives,* of this EIR, identifies three potential alternatives to the proposed Project and performs a comparative evaluation, as required by the CEQA.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to CEQA (15126.6(a)), each alternative must in some way avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects created by the proposed project and meet most of the basic project objectives, as shown above. Since this Specific Plan and DEIR are being prepared as a direct response to the implementation requirements of the GPA for the NMC, land use designations and policies of the GPA for the NMC have also been considered in the analysis of the alternatives. Land uses envisioned for the Specific Plan area include high and low density residential, and a portion of the Great Park and greenbelts.

The direct significant environmental effects that result from the proposed Project are the overall loss of designated farmland, traffic impacts and air quality impacts. Cumulatively, the Project contributes to loss of agricultural lands, and impacts to traffic, air quality, noise, and water quality. Thus, alternatives that reduce traffic and thereby reduce air quality and noise impacts may be appropriate for consideration. Alternatives that require less developed land (e.g., higher densities) so that agricultural land can be retained on the site were determined to be infeasible due to: a) the lack of long-term viability for commercial agriculture within the Chino Basin (see Agricultural Resources, III-1, herein) and, b) the lack of such an alternative's ability to meet General Plan policies, land plan and goals for development of the NMC.

It is required under CEQA that alternative site(s) be evaluated if any feasible sites exist where significant impacts can be lessened. The Project as proposed is anticipated to result in unavoidable adverse impacts related to the loss of agricultural soils, degraded air and water quality, and increased noise levels. Given the nature of the proposed development, an alternative location within the NMC or Chino Basin as a whole will not alleviate air, water quality or noise impacts. Considering the 250-acre size of the proposed Project, alternatively-located land in the Project vicinity would involve agricultural soils and property used or designated for agricultural purposes, thereby still resulting in an overall loss of farmland. The NMC Final EIR did not include any mitigation measures for the conversion of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or allow for agricultural easements or include any mitigation measures that would avoid the impacts related to agricultural productivity. Agricultural easements were considered but also rejected as feasible mitigation. Once the farmland within the Project is converted to other uses, that farmland is now effectively gone. Agricultural easements on different agricultural land will not decrease the loss of farmland for this particular Project. All it will accomplish is to impact potential future uses of other agricultural land. The easement will not create new farmland where previous farmland did not exist and thus it is not appropriate mitigation for the loss of agricultural land from the Project. Therefore, analysis of

an alternatively-located site is not considered necessary because it will not provide avoidance or mitigation of significant impacts resulting from the Project.

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (3), the "No Project" alternative could take two forms, no change from the existing uses or development into already approved land uses. The proposed Project generally meets the approved land uses for the site. For this reason, and because the proposed Project and the other alternatives address potential impacts associated with development, the No Project alternative will address continued agricultural use of the site.

For each development alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative;
- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed Project;
- Identifies the impacts of the Project that would be avoided or lessened by the alternative;
- Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic Project objectives; and,
- Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternatives and the Project.

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the Project as proposed.

6.1.1 Project Objectives

As described in Section 1.2 *Proposed Project Goals and Objectives*, the following objectives have been established for the West Haven Specific Plan and will aid decision makers in their review of the Project, the Project alternatives, and the associated environmental impacts:

The West Haven Specific Plan, proposes to meet the following goals and objectives, and address the following identified issues:

- Provide an integrated quality mixed-use planned residential and neighborhood commercial center community of appropriate density and lot sizes, supported by landscaped open spaces, landscaped pedestrian and bike paseos, an elementary school, a neighborhood park, and recreational uses.
- Provide six distinct, yet, blended residential neighborhoods with a variety of housing types, including single-family detached and attached residences, on lot sizes ranging from 3,000 to 7,200 square feet.
- Provide for the adequate planning, financing, and implementation mechanism(s) for the Project's infrastructure and community facilities to serve the master planned community.
- Establish appropriate relationships with the existing adjacent commercial and residential land uses.
- Integrate existing and proposed commercial areas into the community fabric through the pedestrian links and walkways.
- Provide for a circulation network that promotes pedestrian links and walkways as well as bicycle activity as alternative modes of transportation, while also providing for safe and efficient movement of automobile travel through the Project site, including:

- A major paseo network linking all areas of the Project. This network will connect the community's recreation spaces, but also serve to link to the master planned community to regional destinations;
- Creation of a formal primary entry at the intersection of Haven Avenue and Riverside Drive; and,
- Creation of formal secondary entries at the intersection of Haven and Chino Avenue.

- Establish neighborhood linkages to connection portions of the Project.
- Incorporate active recreation sites for both residential and commercial areas, and link by the pedestrian paseo network.
- Provide a well-integrated neighborhood commercial center at the corner of Riverside Drive and Haven Avenue allowing community residents convenient pedestrian access to employment opportunities and day-to-day service and shopping establishments.
- Locate surface parking areas within the proposed neighborhood commercial center screened from adjacent residential uses by a landscaped pedestrian paseo or suitable landscaped setback buffer.
- Include well-landscaped sidewalk and streetscape connections to provide alternative as well as secondary pedestrian connections parallel to Riverside Drive, Haven, Turner, and Chino Avenues.
- Ensure the development of the proposed Project addresses pertinent NMC GPA policies and objectives.
- Establish a unique character for the West Haven Specific Plan community through the implementation of Design Guidelines and Development Standards specifically prepared for the West Haven Specific Plan.

6.1.2 Alternatives Selected for Further Analysis

Based on the criteria listed above, the following three alternatives have been determined by the City to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project, but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. These alternatives are analyzed in detail in the following sections:

- Alternative 1: No Project/Existing NMC GPA
- Alternative 2: 25% Reduction in Units with Same Configuration
- Alternative 3: 25% of Project in Open Space with Unit Count the Same as the Project

An EIR must identify an "environmentally superior" alternative and where the "No Project" Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed Project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed Project. This EIR found Project impacts involving agriculture, air quality, and traffic to be significant and unavoidable. Table 6.1-1,

Comparison of Project Alternatives, presents a general comparison of the three alternatives, to the proposed Project.

6.1.2.1 Alternative Eliminated from Consideration

The City has removed from consideration the Different Site Location Alternative. The Different Site Location Alternative would have evaluated the land uses proposed for the West Haven Specific Plan for development at a different location. The City elected not to further consider this alternative for several reasons. A different site would have been considered if the proposed uses at a different location would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant effects of the proposed Project. Given the Project objectives are linked to the NMC, the most likely different site location alternative would be one of the other NMC subareas. However, due to the fact that the remaining NMC subareas are proposed for urban type development then they would incur similar impacts as compared to the proposed Project. Any alternative locations in the vicinity of the Project site that could be developed with the proposed uses could result in greater significant impacts that those associated with the Project site. Further evaluation of this alternative would not provide a significant benefit to the environment.

Table 6.1.1 provides a brief summary of each alternative related to the twelve environmental issues evaluated in Section 3 of the DEIR, and includes the level of significance associated with the proposed Project in order to facilitate a thorough comparison of the alternatives. Refer to Section 3 of this document for detailed discussion of each environmental issue.

Table 6.1-1 Comparison of Project Alternatives

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Density	Alternative 3 Increased Open Space w/ Proposed DU
Agriculture	S	N	S	S
Air Quality	S	N	S	S
Biological Resources	N	N	N	N
Cultural Resources	N	N	N	N
Geology/Soils	N	N	N	N
Hazards/Hazardous Wastes	N	S	N	N
Hydrology/Water Quality	N	N	N	N
Land Use Planning and Recreational Resources	N	N	N	N
Noise	N	N	N	N
Public Services	N	N	N	N
Transportation/Traffic	S	N	S	S
Utilities Services	N	N	N	N

N No Impact or Less Than Proposed Project

S Significant Impact

L Potential Impacts reduced to Less Than Significant

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 1 NO PROJECT/EXISTING NMC GPA

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the "No Project/Existing NMC GPA" Alternative. When the Project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the "No Project/Existing NMC GPA" Alternative can serve as the continuation of such plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the "No Project/Existing NMC GPA" Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects or impacts of continued implementation of the existing NMC GPA. This Alternative assumes the existing NMC GPA baseline environmental conditions remain as the adopted long-range planning policy for the proposed Project area.

Buildout pursuant to the existing NMC GPA will allow current development patterns to remain, although under this Alternative, continuation of the current NMC GPA will not result in the adoption of the West Haven Specific Plan. This alternative compares the environmental effects of the property remaining in its current state against the environmental effects that would occur if the Project is approved.

6.2.1 Impact Analysis

6.2.1.1 Agriculture

Implementation of the "No Project" Alternative would alleviate the proposed loss of Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland resources, thus preventing agricultural resource impacts imposed by the proposed Project's development. The proposed Project is expected to impact agricultural resources in the Project area by diminishing the continued viability of dairy production. The implementation of the proposed Project and the resulting continued buildout of the surrounding NMC will result in a significant impact because it would convert agricultural land uses to non-agricultural land uses, resulting in a substantial reduction in long-term agricultural productivity in the Chino Basin. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would result in avoiding the significant and unavoidable impacts to agriculture associated with the proposed Project.

6.2.1.2 Air Quality

Under the "No Project" Alternative no development will occur on the site, and therefore, no construction-related air quality impacts would occur. Similarly, since there would be no changes to the manner in which the site is presently used, the number of vehicle trips would also remain the same. The quantity of fugitive dust and other emissions would also be assumed to remain at existing levels. Overall, short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) air quality impacts would not occur under the "No Project" Alternative. This Alternative would avoid construction emissions of PM_{10} and NO_x emissions above threshold levels and operational air emissions of ROC from area and mobile sources above threshold levels. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would result in avoiding or lessening significant impacts to air quality associated with the proposed Project.

6.2.1.3 Biological Resources

The Project site currently provides habitat that includes, disturbed land, open agriculture fields, grazed fallow fields, and disced land. Wildlife species that occur within these habitats do so because many of these species prefer dry habitats away from human disturbance. Under the "No Project" Alternative, on-site grading activities and the introduction of domestic animals and exotic plant materials typically

associated with such Project buildout and implementation would not occur. Additionally, preservation of the site in its current condition would avoid disturbance of the remaining native and non-native habitat in its existing state. The Project site would also continue to support wintering and migratory bird populations. Under the proposed Project biological resources would be impacted by the construction and operation of the Project. As a result, selection of the "No Project" Alternative would eliminate impacts on biological resources.

6.2.1.4 Cultural Resources

The Project site has been extensively disturbed by agriculturally-driven development and currently is under dairy farm operations and associated land uses; leaving no vestiges of the Juan Batista D'Anza Trail that crossed the Project site. It is possible that significant cultural resources are present in the subsurface of the Project site, 15 feet below modern ground surface, currently occupied and covered by the large manure piles, dairy farms, and tree and plant nursery found on the Project site. Additionally, there are five structures dating from the late 1950s to the early 1960s that are potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR or the NRHP located on the Project site. Under the "No Project" Alternative, the Project site would remain undeveloped and would not be disturbed by grading or construction activities. As a result, any potentially existing cultural, historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources on the Project site would not be impacted by the "No Project" Alternative, as they would by the construction and operation of the proposed Project.

6.2.1.5 Geology/Soils

Under the "No Project" Alternative, grading would not occur on the Project site, and no new land uses would be constructed on the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not alter or impact on-site earth resources. Additionally, residential, commercial, or recreational development activities would not occur under this Alternative, and therefore, no additional uses, site users, or physical improvements would be subjected to the existing geotechnical, geologic, and seismic forces that presently affect the Project site. As a result, selection of the "No Project" Alternative would eliminate impacts from geology/soils resources and constraints the proposed Project would create.

6.2.1.6 Hazards/Hazardous Waste

Under the "No Project" Alternative, this property would remain as an operating dairy farm with a history of agricultural activities. Existing site environmental conditions would remain impacted by chemicals used in dairy farm operations, residual pesticides, methane (caused by animal waste), waste water, trash/debris, lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials, and groundwater impacted by nitrate and TDS. The "No Project" Alternative would have greater impacts on the built and natural environment due to its historical and existing conditions, with no clean-up of existing environmental site conditions. While the proposed Project would result in an incremental increase in the use of household and commercial chemicals by the new residences, commercial, school, and recreational uses, the proposed Project would also result in the clean-up of the property. Additionally, the proposed Project would create fewer environmental site conditions than the "No Project" Alternative.

6.2.1.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

The "No Project" Alternative would avoid or reduce impacts on water resources because no development would occur on the Project site. Development of the proposed Project could create impacts on hydrology,

hydraulic, and water quality, although these impacts can be reduced to below a level of significance by mitigations measures included Section 3.7, *Hydrology/Water Quality*, of this EIR.

6.2.1.8 Recreational Resources

Under the "No Project" Alternative, land use or zone changes will not be required as they would with the proposed Project. Under this Alternative, no physical changes would occur to the Project site's current land use and its historical condition. Under the proposed Project, landform alterations would occur: new homes, 11.7 gross acres of commercial development (including 87,000 square feet of building area and a parking lot), a 10-acre "concept" elementary school, a 5-acre "concept" neighborhood park, and the approximate 8.8 acres of paseos and pocket parks would be developed throughout the Project area. The extension of Chino Drive and Turner Avenue and the widening of Haven Avenue, and the development of a bike route system that would connect the West Haven Specific Plan to the planned bike routes throughout the remainder of the NMC, and to the planned City bike route system, would also be developed. Selection of the "No Project" Alternative avoids all of the environmental impacts associated with the land use/planning and recreational resources that would be created by the proposed Project.

6.2.1.9 Noise

Under the "No Project" Alternative, no construction activities would be undertaken on the Project site. In the absence of construction activities, adjoining property owners would not be subjected to the short-term noise of heavy equipment and associated construction activities as they would with the proposed Project. In addition, since no intensification of use would occur with the "No Project" Alternative, no additional traffic would be added to local roadways and no incremental contribution to future traffic noise would result under the "No Project" Alternative.

6.2.1.10 Public Services

The "No Project" Alternative would not change the existing service capabilities of the MVSD and CJUHSD, the City of Ontario Fire and Police Departments, City of Ontario Public Works Agency, Utilities Department, or Inland Empire Utilities Agency. There would be no increase in tax revenues to the City or School Districts that could be used to improve services and facilities. Overall, there would be no significant impact on public services from the selection of the "No Project" Alternative. However, should the "No Project" Alternative, be selected there will be no benefit from the potential increase in revenues from the Project through the various local taxes and fees that would be generated for improved public services, as would occur with the implementation of the proposed Project.

6.2.1.11 Transportation/Traffic

Under the "No Project" Alternative, intensification of on-site land uses would not occur. Therefore, no site-specific traffic impacts would result under the "No Project" Alternative. The proposed Project would result in an increase in traffic coming from the Project site, in addition to the the extension of Chino Drive and Turner Avenue, and the widening of Haven Avenue, that would create impacts on the area roadway network. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would not create transportation/traffic impacts.

6.2.1.12 Utilities/Service Systems

The "No Project" Alternative would avoid the increased demand for water, wastewater, electricity, natural gas, telephone, and/or solid waste services. Therefore, the impacts on utilities and service systems would not occur as they would if the proposed Project were developed.

6.2.2 Project Comparison

The "No Project" Alternative would eliminate all Project related impacts; however, it would not achieve the Project objectives listed in Subsection 6.1.1, *Project Objectives*. The Project objectives include providing an integrated quality mixed-use planned residential and neighborhood center community of appropriate density and lot sizes, supported by landscaped open spaces, landscaped pedestrian and bike paseos, an elementary school, a neighborhood park and recreational uses. Additionally, the proposed Project is consistent with the purpose and intent of the City's General Plan, and, the NMC GPA. The "No Project" Alternative, does not provide for the development of any of the above improvements. The "No Project" Alternative is an environmentally superior Alternative since it avoids most of the environmental impacts that would be created by the proposed Project. However, the Alternative does not meet any of the Project objectives and is not considered feasible by the City.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 2 REDUCED DENSITY

The Reduced Density Alternative would consists of an estimated 25% Reduction in Dwelling Units for development on the proposed Project site. However 11.7 gross acres of commercial development, a 10-acre "concept" elementary school, a 5-acre "concept" neighborhood park, and an approximate 8.8 acres of paseos and pocket parks would still be developed as part of this Alternative. This Alternative reduces the Project's total dwelling units from 753 units to 565 units, and the proposed residential allocation from 146.85 acres to 110 acres. The future buildout associated with the NMC GPA, in combination with the Reduced Density Alternative, would reduce the approximately 31,200 residential units at buildout on 5,200 acres, to 23,400 residential units at buildout on 3,900 acres. Additionally, this Alternative would allow for the extension of Chino Drive and Turner Avenue, the widening of Haven Avenue, and the development and construction of the bike route system that connects the West Haven Specific Plan to planned bike routes throughout the remainder, or future builtout NMC, as well as to the planned City bike route system.

Alternative 2 alleviates 25% of the residential density and thus reduces the intensity of some of the environmental impacts proposed to be incurred by the proposed Project. In addition, this Alternative does meet some of the Project goals and objectives (refer to Section 6.1.1, *Project Objectives*).

6.3.1 Impact Analysis

6.3.1.1 Agricultural Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative, would allow for Project development and significant and unavoidable impacts to Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland through disturbance by Project-related grading and construction activities. The implementation of this Alternative would displace the same agricultural resources as would the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the significant and unavoidable impacts to agriculture associated with the proposed Project.

6.3.1.2 Air Quality

This Alternative would reduce corresponding land uses by an estimated 25%, and therefore contribute to fewer construction- and operational-level source air emissions than the proposed Project. The reduction of dwelling units from 753 to 565 would reduce long-term emissions below the level of significance. Although this is a substantial reduction, this Alternative would still generate PM_{10} and NO_x construction emissions above threshold levels and ROC operational emissions above threshold levels. Thus, this Alternative would reduce but not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality associated with the proposed Project.

6.3.1.3 Biological Resources

The Reduced Density Alternative, would allow for Project development as in the proposed Project, but with a reduced level of residential density. Implementation of this Alternative would cause potentially significant impacts and displace existing biological resources on the Project site as the proposed Project Implementation of this Alternative would also effect the on-site basins, reservoirs, drainages, and low areas, that are subject to flooding, and are the focus of bird activity. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed Project.

6.3.1.4 Cultural Resources

Under this Alternative, the Project development and construction of residential units would be less but the same land area would be developed, as the proposed Project. The Project site would also be developed and disturbed by grading or construction activities as it would if the proposed Project were developed. The Project site has historically been extensively disturbed by development and is currently impacted by dairy farm operations and associated agricultural land uses. Cultural resources on the Project site will be impacted by the construction and operation of land uses called for by this Alternative. Therefore, monitoring will still be necessary. Possible archaeological, paleontological, and historic resources may still be present 15 feet below the modern ground surface. Additionally, the five structures dating from the late 1950s to the early 1960s will still need to be evaluated for potential CRHR or NRHP listing. Therefore, this Alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed Project.

6.3.1.5 Geology/Soils

The Reduced Density Alternative, allows for Project development and disturbance by grading and construction activities. However, this Alternative reduces future geotechnical, geologic, and seismic conditions since there will be 25% fewer residential units than the proposed Project that will be subject to future seismic events. Therefore, this Alternative results in fewer significant impacts from geology/soils than the proposed Project.

6.3.1.6 Hazards/Hazardous Waste

Under this Alternative, Project development and construction would occur with the same configuration as the proposed Project. The Project site would be developed and disturbed by grading and construction activities; but with a reduced level of residential density. This Alternative would also eliminate the impacts incurred from chemicals used in dairy farm operations, residual pesticides, methane, waste water,

trash/debris, lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials, and groundwater impacted by nitrate, and TDS, as would the proposed Project. This Alternative would also result in the clean-up of the site and with Project occupancy and use, an incremental increase in the use of household and commercial chemicals by the new residents. However, this Alternative would reduce impacts from hazards and hazardous waste by 25% from the proposed Project since fewer residential units would be developed on the Project site than would as part of the proposed Project.

6.3.1.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

The Reduced Density Alternative, would allow for Project development and disturbance of the Project site by grading and construction activities, with development occurring with the same general configuration, but with a reduced level of residential density. The impacts on hydrology and water quality are expected to be less from this Alternative, than from the proposed Project, since less residential development would occur.

6.3.1.8 Land Use/Planning and Recreational Resources

This Alternative would require the same changes in land use and zoning as the proposed Project. This Alternative would reduce the Project's total dwelling units from 753 units to 565 units, and the proposed residential allocation from 146.85 acres to 110 acres. The future buildout associated with the NMC GPA, in combination with this Alternative, would also result in a reduction from approximately 31,200 residential units at buildout on 5,200 acres, to 23,400 residential units at buildout on 3,900 acres. Fewer residential units would be built under this Alternative. Therefore, less impacts on adjacent land uses and recreational activities would be created by this Alternative, than by the proposed Project.

6.3.1.9 Noise

Under this Alternative, Project construction and operation would occur within almost the same configuration as the proposed Project. The Project site would be disturbed by grading or construction activities; but with a reduced level of residential density. This Alternative would result in a 25%reduction in Project related traffic. Therefore, the associated noise impacts from this Alternative would be reduced from noise generated by construction and operation of the proposed Project.

6.3.1.10 Public Services

Schools

The Reduced Density Alternative, allows for Project development and disturbance by grading and construction activities, with the planned development occurring with the same general configuration as the proposed Project, but with the reduced level of residential density. This Alternative would reduce the projected West Haven Specific Plan population from 2,500 to 1,875, producing approximately 344 fewer students, and reducing impacts on MVUSD and CJUHSD's future service capabilities, than the proposed Project. applicant fees collected by the school districts would be less, but they are expected to offset the Project impacts on new school construction under Alternative 2, although a school would still need to be built.

Library

Alternative 2 would decrease the Project demand for library services by 25% than the proposed Project would. Therefore, this Alternative would reduce the impact on local libraries more than the proposed Project would.

Fire and Police Department

This Alternative is anticipated to result in less of an impact on Fire and Police Department-related impacts as identified for the proposed Project since 25% fewer homes would be developed as part of this Project. The City of Ontario Police Department provides services to the Project site is currently operating at capacity. This Alternative would require one additional police officer to meet the City's police standard. The proposed Project would result in the need for four additional sworn police officers and 2.5 non-sworn civilian support personnel police officers. The tax revenue generated by the payment of property taxes to the City for the development of Alternative 2, would increase the City's operating budget so a new police officer could be hired by the City. Additional tax revenue would need to be raised by the development of the proposed Project to fund additional fire and police personnel.

6.3.1.11 Transportation/Traffic

The Project traffic study predicts that several intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS in 2003 and 2015, without the Project. Two additional intersections would also operate at unacceptable LOS with the Project. Alternative 2 proposes an estimated 25% reduction in the number of residential dwelling units. Thus, Alternative 2 would reduce traffic impacts on area intersections than would otherwise occur with development of the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative would create fewer impacts on traffic than the proposed Project.

6.3.1.12 Utilities/Service Systems

The Reduced Density Alternative, would reduce the amount of electrical, gas and telephone services needed from local suppliers. Additionally, less domestic water, wastewater, and recycled water service would also be needed by this Alternative than would be needed by the proposed Project. The development of this Alternative at a reduced residential density would create fewer impacts on utility and service system than the proposed Project.

6.3.2 Project Comparison

Based on the information presented in Section 6.2.1, the Reduced Density Alternative will result in fewer impacts on the built and natural environment than those associated with proposed Project; and less than the environmental impacts associated with the "25% of the Project in Open Space with the Unit Count the Same as the Project" (unit densities of 4.6 du/ac with a 12 du/ac parcel) Alternative, discussed below.

- Alternative 2 would decrease unit density on the site by approximately 25% and as such would have a comparable reduction in impacts on/from: geology/soils resources and constraints; hazards and hazardous wastes; land use/planning and recreational resources; noise; transportation; and utilities/service systems.
- Alternative 2 would have the same or less impact on the Project site and its development, as the proposed Project on/from: air quality and public services.

- Alternative 2 would have the same impact on the Project site and its development, as the proposed Project on/from: agricultural resources; biological resources; cultural resources; and, hydrology/water quality.

Furthermore, this Alternative meets most of the Project goals and objectives and exceeds several objectives focused on enhancing the West Haven Specific Plan community future environment. Although this Alternative does not provide for the Project's anticipated unit density (refer to Table 2.3-2, *Residential Lot Development), the* Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project, as well as Alternative 3, and is a feasible Alternative to the Project.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 3 INCREASED OPEN SPACE WITH PROPOSED PROJECT DWELLING UNITS

This Alternative proposes an "Increased Open Space with Proposed Project DU" (Figure 6.1-1) as the proposed Project (unit densities will be 4.6 du/ac with a 12 du/ac parcel). This Alternative also addresses pertinent City NMC GPA policies and objectives. This Alternative encourages integration of open spaces with the mixed-use planned residential and neighborhood commercial center community of appropriate density and lot sizes (refer to Section 6.1, *Proposed Project Objectives)*. Additionally, this Alternative complies with the City's General Plan *Aesthetic, Cultural, Open Space and Recreational Resources* Element's stated goal of "maintaining and enhancing open space resources of Ontario" (Goal 1.0), evidenced by the Alternative's residential unit count remaining the same at 753 units.

6.4.1 Impact Analysis

6.4.1.1 Agricultural Resources

This Alternative calls for the construction and operation of the proposed Project, but Alternative 3 would provide 25% more open space than the proposed Project or Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would, therefore, displace the same amount of agricultural resources, and would create the same impacts on agricultural resources as the proposed Project.

6.4.1.2 Air Quality

This Alternative does not provide a reduction in land use that would lessen or eliminate contributions to mobile source air emissions. Alternative 3 would generate the same construction emissions of PM_{10} and NO_x, and operational air emissions of ROC from area and mobile sources above threshold levels, as the proposed Project Alternative. Thus, the predicted air quality impacts attributable to the proposed Project would also occur under Alternative 3.

6.4.1.3 Biological Resources

Alternative 3 provides for the construction and implementation of the proposed Project on lands occupied by biological resources, as the proposed Project. Therefore, existing biological resources that currently exist on the Project site will still be displaced. Wintering and migratory bird populations that frequent the on-site basins, reservoirs, drainages, and low areas on the Project site will also be impacted with Alternative 3. Implementation of Alternative 3 would have the same impact on biological resources as would the proposed Project.

6.4.1.4 Cultural Resources

Under Alternative 3, the historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources on the Project site, including the D'Anza Trail and possible archaeological and paleontological resources 15 ft below the ground surface will be disturbed. Although open space is not proposed as part of Alternative 3 for the northern section of the Project site where the D'Anza Trail once traversed, cultural monitoring would still need to take place regardless of where land is disturbed and the Project is developed. Therefore, implementation of Alternative 3 would not have a greater impact on Cultural Resources than would the proposed Project.

6.4.1.5 Geology/Soils

Alternative 3 would include the construction and operation of the same residential, commercial, and recreational improvements as the proposed Project, although additional acres of the Project site would remain in open space. Under Alternative 3, planned development would incorporate building setbacks, other design features, and mitigation measures to reduce geology and soil impacts as the proposed Project. Anticipated impacts of Alternative 3 on earth resources and impacts from geotechnical, geologic, and seismic forces that presently affect the Project site would be comparable to those of the proposed Project.

6.4.1.6 Hazards/Hazardous Waste

Under Alternative 3, Project development would have a different configuration than the proposed Project, with 25% of the Project site left in open space. The buildout of Alternative 3 would result in the clean up of chemicals used in dairy farm operations, residual pesticides, methane gas, waste water, trash/debris, lead-based paint, asbestos-containing materials, and groundwater impacted by nitrate, and TDS as the proposed Project. This Alternative would also result in the same amount of use of household and commercial chemicals by the new residences, commercial, and school use as would occur with the proposed Project.

6.4.1.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

The impacts on hydrology and water quality are expected to be less for Alternative 3, than for the proposed Project, since 25% less of the site's open space would be developed. The impacts on hydrology and water quality are expected to be less from this Alternative than from the proposed Project since more of the Project site would be left in open space than would be the proposed Project.

6.4.1.8 Land Use/Planning and Recreational Resources

Under the "Increased Open Space with Proposed Project DU" Alternative, the same changes in land use and zoning would be required as for the proposed Project. The construction of approximately 11.7 gross acres of commercial development, the 10-acre "concept" elementary school, the 5-acre "concept" neighborhood park, and the approximate 8.8 acres of paseos and pocket parks throughout the Project area and the adjacent utility easements would still occur as would for the proposed Project. The extension of Chino Drive and Turner Avenue and the widening of Haven Avenue, and the development of a bike route system that connects the West Haven Specific Plan to planned bike routes throughout the remainder of the NMC, and to the planned City bike route system would also occur. This Alternative would provide for the recreational facilities and/or services as the proposed Project. Therefore, parks and recreational

facilities, under Alternative 3, would be provided at the same parkland-to-population ratio as the proposed Project. However, this Alternative would provide more open space than the proposed Project, with the open space area available for recreational uses.

6.4.1.9 Noise

Under Alternative 3, the primary source of noise in the Project area is still roadway traffic. This Alternative would not result in a reduction in Project traffic. Therefore, the associated noise impacts from these mobile sources would not be reduced by Alternative 3. This Alternative would increase noise in the residential portion of the Project since the density in this area would be greater due to the 25% more open space on the Project site. Therefore, this Alternative could create more noise impacts than the proposed Project.

6.4.1.10 Public Services

Schools

Alternative 3 would not reduce the projected West Haven Specific Plan school population. This Alternative would generate the same school-age population as the proposed Project. Alternative 3, like the proposed Project, would generate approximately 287 new students for the "Concept School" proposed to be developed on the Project site. Additionally, applicant fees collected for the school are expected to offset the impacts of the new school's construction. Therefore, this Alternative would not create any greater impacts on schools as the proposed Project.

Library

Alternative 3 would generate the same demand on library services as the proposed Project. Local libraries are expected to accommodate potential increases in library cardholders generated by Alternative 3, as they would by cardholders generated by the proposed Project.

Fire and Police Department

Alternative 3 would generate the same impact on fire and police services as the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative is anticipated to result in the same Fire Department-related impacts and would result in the need for additional police officers as identified for the proposed Project. However, the tax revenue generated by the payment of property taxes by new Project development would increase the City's operating budget so new police officers could be hired by the City.

6.4.1.11 Transportation/Traffic

Alternative 3 would generate the same amount of traffic as the proposed Project. Under this Alternative, the Project traffic analysis predicts that several intersections would still operate at unacceptable LOS in 2003 and 2015. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have the same impacts on transportation/traffic as the proposed Project.

6.4.1.12 Utilities/Service Systems

Alternative 3 will not impact the City's ability to obtain utility and service systems from SCE, SCG, Verizon, and the IEUA. This Alternative would provide for an increase in the density of residential development of the proposed Project. However, this would not impact service providers' ability to

provide services to the Project site. Development of Alternative 3 would have the same impacts on utilities and service systems as the proposed Project.

6.4.2 Project Comparison

Based on information presented in Section 6.3.1 Alternative 3 would result in environmental impacts similar to or less than those associated with the proposed Project.

- Alternative 3 would create fewer environmental impacts than the proposed Project would since 25% less of the site would not be developed and would be left in open space.
- Alternative 3 would create comparable impacts with the proposed Project on agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous wastes, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and demands for public services because the same land uses would be developed as part of Alternative 3 as would be by the proposed Project.

Alternative 3 would result in the reduction by 25% of the number of residential units that would be built in the open space area on the Project site, reducing the environmental impacts. This Alternative would also meet most of the Project objectives and exceed several objectives focused on enhancing the natural environment on the site. Alternative 3 would be considered the most environmentally sensitive Alternative, after the No Project Alternative and Alternative 2.