

1. *Executive Summary*

1.1 **INTRODUCTION**

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Ontario Plan. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the public and local and state governmental agency decision makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making. This document focuses on those impacts determined to be potentially significant as discussed in the Initial Study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the City of Ontario's CEQA Guidelines. The City of Ontario, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this DEIR was obtained from on-site field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems).



1.2 **ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES**

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by identifying feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed

1. Executive Summary

project, to the extent feasible. An EIR is intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, and adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives. The lead agency must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Format

This DEIR has been formatted as described below.

Section 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this EIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

Section 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the project, the Notice of Preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

Section 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the proposed project, the project area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, the necessary environmental clearances for the project, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Section 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. The environmental setting provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section 5. Environmental Analysis: Provides, for each environmental parameter analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the project after mitigation is incorporated, and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, Alternative Land Use Plan and a Reduced Intensity Alternative.

Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this EIR.

Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project: Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

1. Executive Summary

Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project: Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the proposed project.

Section 13. Bibliography: A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this EIR for the proposed project.

Appendices. The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the front cover) contain the following supporting documents:

- Appendix A Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
- Appendix B NOP Responses
- Appendix C Existing Conditions Report
- Appendix D Air Quality Modeling Data
- Appendix E Biological Resources Report
- Appendix F ECI Technical Background Report
- Appendix G Noise Modeling Data
- Appendix H Traffic Study
- Appendix I Water-Sewer-Drainage Studies
- Appendix J Land Use Modeling Methodology



1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared as a Program EIR in accordance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City's Rules for the Implementation of CEQA. In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3):

An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

As provided in Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project that are related either 1) geographically; 2) as logical parts of a chain of contemplated events; 3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or 4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and have generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[b]) encourages the use of Program EIRs, citing five advantages:

- 1 Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR or an individual action
- 2 Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis
- 3 Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations

1. Executive Summary

- 4 Allow the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and programwide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts
- 5 Allow reduction in paperwork

Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, Program EIRs are typically more conceptual and may contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a Project EIR. Once a Program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether an additional CEQA document needs to be prepared. However, if the Program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the Program EIR scope and additional environmental documents may not be required (Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a Program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into the subsequent activities (Guidelines Section 15168[c][1]). If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the Program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. In this case, the Program EIR still serves a valuable purpose as the first-tier environmental analysis.

1.3 PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The proposed project is The Ontario Plan, which consists of a Vision, Governance Manual, Policy Plan, City Council Priorities, Implementation Plans, and Tracking and Feedback. The primary purpose of The Ontario Plan is to integrate components of city governance documents into a single guidance system that shapes the community 20 years or more into the future. The following objectives have been established for The Ontario Plan and will aid decision makers in their review of the project and associated environmental impacts:

- Provide a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan that establishes the goals and policies that create a built environment and cultural setting that fosters the enjoyment, financial benefit, and well being of the entire community;
- Provide a streamlined, user-friendly, web-based General Plan that is easily accessible to the public;
- Designate the distribution, location, balance, and extent of land uses including residential, retail, employment, open space, and public uses;
- Link Ontario's community design goals to a broader context that includes economic development, land use, housing, community health, infrastructure, and transportation;
- Improve the balance between jobs and housing within the San Bernardino County Association of Governments subregion to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated air quality impacts consistent with regional jobs/housing balance policies;
- Provide employment and housing opportunities for the San Bernardino County Association of Governments subregion consistent with the goals of the Southern California Association of Government's Compass Blueprint Program;
- Provide for high-intensity mixed-use urban centers along the Interstate 10 corridor and within the New Model Colony that reduce vehicle trips and incorporate smart growth principles;

1. Executive Summary

- Foster the development of pedestrian and transit-oriented environments that create lively, appealing and safe pedestrian areas, active during both daytime and evening hours;
- Maintain Ontario's distinct neighborhoods and districts to foster a positive sense of identity and belonging among residents and businesses;
- Establish a framework for using and managing the City's natural resources sustainably;
- Provide for the security and safe transportation of goods and hazardous materials and maintain disaster preparedness, and response and recovery systems to reduce loss of life, injury, private property damage, infrastructure damage, economic losses, and social dislocation;
- Correlate the mobility system with the future land use patterns and buildout levels of Ontario and with other transportation planning efforts by local, state, and federal authorities;
- Address a range of mobility options in Ontario, including vehicular, trucking, freight and passenger rail, air, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit.

1.4 PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.4.1 Project Location

The City of Ontario is in southwestern San Bernardino County, approximately 40 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 20 miles west of San Bernardino, and 30 miles northeast of Orange County. The City is approximately 31,958 acres, including the 8,200-acre New Model Colony in the southern portion of the City (formerly the City's Sphere of Influence), and is bounded by the Cities of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga to the north, the City of Fontana and Riverside County to the east, the City of Chino and Riverside County to the south, and the Cities of Chino and Montclair to the west. See Figure 1-1, *Regional Vicinity*, and Figure 1-2, *Citywide Aerial*. Regional circulation to and through the City is provided by Interstate 10 (I-10) and State Route 60 (SR-60) east-west, and by I-15 and SR-83 (Euclid Avenue) north-south.



1.4.2 Project Summary

The proposed project is The Ontario Plan, which includes the City of Ontario Policy Plan. The Ontario Plan is a dynamic framework for sustained and comprehensive leadership in community building. It integrates components of city governance documents that are typically disconnected. The Plan states community direction at a point in time (2009) and integrates it into a single guidance system that shapes the Ontario community 20 years or more into the future. The Ontario Plan provides for lasting policies to accommodate change. It consists of a Vision, Governance Manual, Policy Plan, City Council Priorities, Implementation Plan and Tracking and Feedback. The Ontario Plan would serve as a comprehensive update to the City of Ontario General Plan approved in 1992. Each component of The Ontario Plan is described:

The Ontario **Vision** describes the future community of Ontario. Its basic purpose is to improve the quality of life for the people of Ontario. It is the rationale and motivation for everything the City does.

The **Governance Manual** describes the foundation for conducting the public's business on behalf of the present and future people of Ontario. It explains how The Ontario Plan is a tool for decision making and communication.

City Council Priorities define the short-term direction in City actions and initiatives. They are the primary means for exercising leadership in carrying out the Plan and realizing the Vision.

1. Executive Summary

The **Policy Plan** connects intent with action through a broad range of Goals and Policies that would guide the long-term growth and development required for the City to achieve its Vision. It also satisfies the California Government Code requirement for a general plan. Figure 1-3, *Proposed Land Use Plan*, shows the proposed General Plan land use designations that guide and regulate land use patterns, distributions, densities, and intensities in the City of Ontario, including residential employment, retail, recreation, and public uses.

Implementation consists of actions taken to carry out Plan policies. This includes initiatives by the City and decisions on public and private development projects.

Tracking and Feedback allows the City to learn from experience and redirect efforts. Feedback informs the public about results and how they can be improved.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(d), this EIR considers the direct physical changes and reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes in the environment that would be caused by The Ontario Plan. Consequently, this EIR focuses on impacts from changes to land use associated with buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan, within the Policy Plan, and impacts from the resultant population and employment growth in the City. The Ontario Plan Proposed Land Use Plan for the ultimate development of the City is not linked to a timeline. However, for the purpose of this environmental analysis, buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan is forecast for the year 2035.

1.4.3 Project Elements

The Ontario Plan Policy Plan contains several elements that provide focused direction on selected topics:

The **Land Use Element** guides and regulates land use patterns, distributions, densities, and intensities in Ontario, including residential, employment, retail, recreation, and public uses.

The **Community Design Element** establishes the goals and policies that will create a built environment that fosters the enjoyment, financial benefit, and well-being of the entire community.

The **Community Economics Element** establishes goals and policies for inducing private investment in Ontario, increasing the quantity and quality of jobs, expanding and diversifying the City's revenue sources, and guiding the City's financial decisions.

The **Environmental Resources Element** guides management of Ontario's natural resources infrastructure and provides policies that support systems integration, resource conservation and regeneration, and energy independence.

The **Safety Element** provides policies to minimize exposure to man-made and natural disasters and their impacts on life, property, and commerce. It addresses geology and seismicity, flooding, hazardous materials, noise, fire hazards and prevention, emergency preparedness, and crime prevention. Airport land use compatibility is addressed in the Land Use Element.

The **Social Resources Element** provides goals and policies for the health and well-being of the Ontario community, addressing such issues as health care, education, and community services for the full spectrum of our population.

The **Mobility Element** guides the design and improvement of our multifaceted transportation system to meet the current and future needs of our residents and businesses. This element includes an evaluation of forecasts of future traffic levels and includes a variety of travel modes, including automobile traffic, transit, railroads, the airport, and nonmotorized forms of travel.

Figure 1-1 Regional Vicinity



1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

Figure 1-2 **Citywide Aerial**



1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

Figure 1-3 Proposed Land Use Plan



1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Executive Summary

The **Parks and Recreation Element** includes an analysis of existing park facilities and examines opportunities for new park space to accommodate the current and future needs of Ontario residents. It also guides the development of recreational corridors that connect local and regional recreational resources.

The **Housing Element** provides direction for the production, preservation, and improvement of housing in the Ontario community.

1.4.4 Changes in Proposed Plan Compared to Existing General Plan

Changes in the proposed plan, compared to the existing General Plan, include:

- Growth that contributes to the regional jobs/housing balance by providing significant office, industrial, and retail employment opportunities while focusing this growth strategically to minimize development impacts on established neighborhoods.
- The creation of a Mixed/Multi-Use land use designation, which accommodates a horizontal and/or vertical mixture of retail, service, office, restaurant, entertainment, cultural, and residential uses in key locations.
- Consolidation of New Model Colony and Original Model Colony land use designations into one system.
- The introduction of a comprehensive approach to managing resources, utilizing natural and man-made systems that are both environmentally and economically sustainable.
- Guidance for the City's responsibility to satisfy the local and subregional mobility needs of our residents, visitors, and businesses while maintaining the quality of life envisioned in The Ontario Plan.
- Policies to improve access to healthcare, nutrition, healthy environments, quality education, diverse community services and facilities, and cultural opportunities.



There are several areas that present opportunities for the City to respond to economic and demographic trends. The proposed land use plan for The Ontario Plan focuses on several key opportunity areas:

Ontario Airport Metro Center. This area is envisioned as the most intensive concentration of development in the Inland Empire and includes the convention center and hospitality area along Vineyard Avenue; Ontario Mills; Guasti Village, the events center, and major office and urban residential centers. The area benefits from major transportation facilities, including I-10 and I-15, Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport, and a variety of future transit options.

Downtown. This is the historical heart of Ontario and is a unique blend of historic, social, and cultural uses set in a compact street grid. It includes the civic center, library, diverse residential neighborhoods, and retail opportunities along Euclid Avenue, Holt Boulevard, and B Street.

New Model Colony Mixed-Use Centers. These mixed-use centers are characterized by a combination of retail, office, and residential uses in a walkable environment.

1. Executive Summary

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA states that an EIR must address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain 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.” (14 California Code of Regulations 15126.6[a]) As described in Section 7 of this DEIR, three project alternatives were identified during the scoping process and analyzed for relative impacts as compared to the proposed project:

- No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative
- Alternative Land Use Plan
- Reduced Intensity Alternative

1.5.1 No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No-Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the no-project alternative is the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the City’s existing General Plan. This alternative assumes the General Plan remains the adopted long-range planning policy document for the City. Development would continue to occur in the City in accordance with the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Specific Plans. Buildout pursuant to the existing General Plan would allow current development patterns to remain. The existing General Plan would not allow mixed-use developments in the New Model Colony, including attached residential, as envisioned in The Ontario Plan. In the current General Plan, five designations regulate residential development at densities ranging between a maximum of 2 units per acre to a maximum of 35 units per acre. Five land use designations in the current General Plan regulate retail/service and commercial development, which ranges from general neighborhood to administrative/professional commercial development. These land use designations allow other uses such as parks, childcare facilities, live-work units, utilities, and other public/institutional uses that are determined to be compatible with the needs of the surrounding neighborhood, and those that help enhance community. The current General Plan accommodates a total of 78,592 residential units, 187,036,465 square feet of commercial/industrial (nonoffice), and 56,311,511 square feet of office. The No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would have similar impacts for aesthetics, biological impacts, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, and utilities and service systems. This alternative would not reduce or eliminate the project’s significant impact to cultural resources. In addition, while this alternative substantially reduces the project’s significant impacts with regard to agricultural resources, air quality, global climate change, noise, and California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans’) transportation facilities they would not be eliminated. In addition, this alternative would result in new significant impacts to the City’s transportation network. The No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives in the City’s vision and has other potential environmental impacts resulting from its implementation. Specifically, the No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not promote mixed-use development in the Downtown and New Model Colony and does not locate a wide range of housing opportunities near regional employment and activity centers, which is consistent with Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Compass Blueprint for these areas in Ontario. Furthermore, this alternative does not accommodate as many opportunities for growth in order to improve the San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) subregion’s jobs/housing ratio.

1.5.2 Alternative Land Use Plan

The Alternative Land Use Plan reduces vehicle miles traveled and associated air quality impacts by reducing nonresidential square footage by 20 percent as compared to the proposed project. Residential units would stay the same, at 104,644 dwelling units. Under the Alternative Land Use Plan, nonoffice square footage would be reduced to 151,205,037 square feet, office square footage would be reduced to 54,719,566 square feet, and total employment at buildout would be reduced to 260,635. By reducing the amount of commercial and office square footage in comparison to the amount of housing, the jobs/housing ratio is expected to improve from 3.11 to 2.49 upon buildout of the City. The alternative Land Use Plan results in similar impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, recreation, and utilities and service systems. In addition, the significant impacts to agricultural resources and cultural resources would be the same as the proposed project. However, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, global climate change, noise, and cumulative impact to Caltrans freeway segments. This Alternative does not meet the City's objective to improve regional jobs/housing balance in the SANBAG subregion to the same extent. A reduction in employment opportunities would not achieve the objectives of SCAG's Compass Blueprint because it would not reduce the jobs/housing balance within the SANBAG subregion. The primary purpose of improving the jobs/housing balance within the SANBAG subregion is to reduce vehicle miles traveled in the region. Furthermore, under this alternative, the City would not be able to meet its objective to foster the development of pedestrian- and transit-oriented environments to the same extent as the Proposed Land Use Plan.

The Alternative Land Use Plan has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. This Alternative would reduce significant unavoidable impacts to air quality, global climate change, noise, and cumulative impact to Caltrans freeway segments although they would not be eliminated. This Alternative also allows for mixed-use opportunities in the Downtown area and the NMC. The Alternative Land Use Plan is, therefore, considered environmentally superior to the proposed project.



1.5.3 Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the remaining growth potential associated with the proposed General Plan and Development Code Update by 20 percent. The 20 percent reduction was based on the total buildout of The Ontario Plan and applied on a Citywide basis. This alternative would reduce total dwelling units at buildout to 83,715, total commercial/industrial (nonoffice) square footage to 151,205,037, and office square footage to 54,719,566. Land use designations would remain the same, although allowable intensities would be reduced. This alternative would lessen impacts associated with air quality, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities by approximately 20 percent, as compared to the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in similar impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, recreation, and utilities and service systems. In addition, the significant impacts to agricultural resources and cultural resources would be the same as the proposed project. However, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, global climate change, noise, and cumulative impact to Caltrans freeway segments. The Reduced Intensity Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives. Specifically, the Reduced Intensity Alternative does not promote mixed-use development in the Downtown and New Model Colony to the same extent and does not locate a wide range of housing opportunities near regional employment and activity centers due to the reductions in density. In addition, this alternative does not meet the City's objective to improve the regional jobs/housing balance in the SANBAG to the same extent. A reduction in employment opportunities would not achieve the objectives of SCAG's Compass Blueprint because it would not reduce the jobs/housing balance within the SANBAG subregion.

1. Executive Summary

The primary purpose of improving the jobs/housing balance within the SANBAG subregion is to reduce vehicle miles traveled in the region.

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved by the lead agency are:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the area.
4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.
6. Whether there are any alternatives to the project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Prior to the preparation of the DEIR, an EIR scoping meeting was held on November 6, 2008, at the City of Ontario City Hall to determine the concerns of interested parties regarding The Ontario Plan. These and other environmental issues are fully addressed in Chapter 5 of this DEIR. No other areas of controversy are known to the Lead Agency. Table 1-1 summarizes the issues identified by respondents to the NOP and attendees of the scoping meeting. The table also provides references to the sections of this DEIR in which these issues are evaluated.

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Notice of Preparation Comment Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works	Request for Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested to receive a copy of the environmental document and any technical reports/studies when they become available. 	Not applicable
Governor's Office of Planning and Research	Notification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notification for agencies to transmit comments within 30 days. 	Not applicable
Endangered Habitats League	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested to remain on the mailing and distribution list and to support the General Plan update. 	Not applicable
South Coast Air Quality Management District	Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential air quality impacts from construction and operation. 	Section 5.3, <i>Air Quality</i>
County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Management Department	Solid Waste Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential impacts on existing landfill capacity. Identify potential impacts on traffic. Identify requirements for handling recycling and construction and demolition debris. Identify sources of hazardous waste. Identify availability of commercial waste haulers. 	Solid Waste: Section 5.17, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> Traffic: Section 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> .
Governor's Office of Emergency Services	Hazards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested information within the General Plan in accordance with state planning law related to hazards. 	Section 5.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>
California Department of Fish and Game	Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify biological resources in the existing agricultural and open space areas, with particular focus on riparian areas, coastal sage scrub, Riversidean sage scrub, and wet meadow. Identify measures to avoid sensitive biological resources. 	Section 5.4, <i>Biological Resources</i>
Public Utilities Commission	Hazards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify safety hazards associated with at-grade rail crossings. Identify measures to reduce hazards when approval is sought for new development near or in the vicinity of at-grade rail crossings. 	Hazards: Section 5.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> Traffic: Section 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
City of Chino	Agriculture, Airport Compatibility, Hydrology and Water Quality, Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address potential conversion of Chino Agricultural Preserves to nonagricultural land uses, Discuss airport land use compatibility with the Chino Airport, Analyze hydrology impacts to Mill Creek and the Prado Basin and groundwater impacts. Identify potential impacts on traffic 	Agriculture: Section 5.2, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> Airport Compatibility: Section 5.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> Hydrology: Section 5.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> Traffic: Section 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>



1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1
Notice of Preparation Comment Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
Metropolitan Water District (MWD)	Utilities and Service Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential impacts to MWD facilities associated with future development. 	Section 5.17, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
County of Riverside, Transportation and Land Management Agency, Planning Department	Traffic, Air Quality, Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential impacts on traffic. Identify potential air quality impacts and mitigation measure for operational activities. Evaluate potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. 	Traffic: Section 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> Air Quality: Section 5.3, <i>Air Quality</i> Hydrology and Water Quality: Section 5.9 <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>
County of Riverside, Transportation and Land Management Agency, Transportation Department	Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential impacts on traffic and circulation. 	Section 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians	Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests government to government consultation under SB 18. Identify potential impacts to cultural resources of the tribe. 	Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>
Gabrielino Tongva Nation	Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify potential impacts to cultural resources of the tribe. 	Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-2 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant. In addition, all feasible mitigation measures are identified for all potentially significant impacts. This table also presents the level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures.

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.1 AESTHETICS			
5.1.1 Buildout in accordance with The Ontario Plan would not substantially alter scenic vistas in the City of Ontario.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.1.2 Buildout in accordance with the proposed Land use Plan would alter the visual appearance of the city of Ontario, but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.1.3 Buildout of The Ontario Plan would generate additional light and glare, but would be minimized through adherence to the city of Ontario development code.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES			
5.2-1: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would convert the existing 3,269.3 acres of California resource agency designated prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance to residential, commercial, mixed-use, and industrial land uses.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.2-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would conflict with existing Williamson act contract lands.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.2-3: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would impact adjacent agricultural land uses in neighboring communities and cities.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.3 AIR QUALITY			
5.3.1 Buildout of the City Of Ontario in accordance with the proposed land use plan would potentially conflict with the SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.3-2: Construction activities associated with buildout of The Ontario Plan would generate short-term emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for VOC, CO, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} ; cumulatively contribute to the SoCAB nonattainment designations for O ₃ , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} ; and potentially elevate concentrations of air pollutants at sensitive receptors.	Potentially significant	3-1 The City of Ontario building department shall require that all new construction projects incorporate all feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions. Potential measures shall be incorporated as conditions of approval for a project and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require fugitive dust control measures that exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 403, such as: • Requiring use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion. • Applying water every four hours to active soil disturbing activities. • Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials. • Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 or higher exhaust emission limits. • Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. • Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes. • Using Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the South Coast Air Quality Management District's website at: http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf. 	Significant and unavoidable

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.3-3: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would generate Long-term emissions that exceed SCAQMD'S regional significance thresholds for VOC, CO, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} and cumulatively contribute to the SOCAB nonattainment designations for O ₃ , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} .	Potentially significant	3-2 The City of Ontario shall evaluate new development proposals within the City and require all developments to include access or linkages to alternative modes of transportation, such as transit stops, bike paths, and/or pedestrian paths (e.g., sidewalks).	Significant and unavoidable
5.3-4: Increase in traffic congestion in the City of Ontario at buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.3-5: Approval of residential and other sensitive land uses within 500 feet of I-10, I-15, or SR-60 would result in exposure of persons to substantial concentrations of Diesel Particulate Matter.	Potentially significant	3-3 The City of Ontario shall evaluate new development proposals within the City for potential incompatibilities with regard to the California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (April 2005). New development that is inconsistent with the recommended buffer distances shall only be approved if all feasible mitigation measures, such as high efficiency Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filters have incorporated into the project design to protect future sensitive receptors from harmful concentrations of air pollutants as a result of proximity to existing air pollution sources.	Significant and unavoidable
5.3-6: Conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses would temporarily expose residents to objectionable odors.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available	Significant and unavoidable
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
5.4-1: Development in accordance with the proposed policy plan land use designations could result in the loss of sensitive species.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.4-2: The proposed policy plan would not have substantial adverse impacts to surface water areas, or to riparian or aquatic vegetation in surface water areas or flood control channels. Detention basins would be designated open space – non-recreation and open space – parkland.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4-3: The proposed policy plan would not have substantial adverse impacts to jurisdictional waters. Flood control channels and detention basins would be designated open space – non-recreation or open space – parkland.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4-4: No regional wildlife movement corridors have been identified in the City; and therefore to the project would not result in substantial adverse effects to wildlife movement.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.4-5: The Ontario Plan would not conflict with the requirements of the Delhi sands flower-loving fly Ontario recovery unit or critical habitat for the San Bernardino kangaroo rat.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
5.5-1: The Ontario Plan polices, state and federal regulations, and the City's Historic preservation Ordinance would ensure that historical resources classified as Tier I or Tier II would not be impacted on a programmatic level; however, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Plan could threaten historic resources classified as Tier III, especially within growth focus areas.	Potentially significant	5-1 Historic or potentially historic resources within the City shall be evaluated for historic significance through the City's Tier System prior to the issuance of development approvals.	Significant and unavoidable
5.5-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan could impact archaeological resources or paleontological resources.	Potentially significant	5-2 In areas of documented or inferred archaeological and/or paleontological resource presence, City staff shall require applicants for development permits to provide studies to document the presence/absence of such resources. On properties where resources are identified, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements: a) Archaeologists and/or paleontologist shall be retained for the project that will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities. b) Should any cultural/scientific resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director is satisfied that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources. c) Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by a San Bernardino County Certified Professional Archaeologists/Paleontologist. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates, and other special studies; submit materials to a museum for permanent curation; and provide a comprehensive final report including catalog with museum numbers.	Less than significant
		5-3 Upon receipt of an application for a Specific Plan or a project that requires a General Plan amendment subject to CEQA and within the City's jurisdiction, the City's	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>representative shall consult with the relevant tribe(s)' representative(s) to determine if the proposed project is within a culturally sensitive area to the tribe. If sufficient evidence is provided to reasonably ascertain that the site is within a [tribal] culturally sensitive area, then a cultural resources assessment prepared by an archaeologist shall be required. The findings of the cultural resources assessment shall be incorporated into the CEQA documentation. A copy of the report shall be forwarded to the Tribe(s). If mitigation is recommended in the CEQA document, the procedure described in MM 5-4 shall be followed.</p> <p>5-4 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for a Specific Plan or project that requires a General Plan amendment which the CEQA document defines cultural resource mitigation for potential tribal resources, the project applicant shall contact the designated tribe(s) to notify them of the grading, excavation, and monitoring program. The applicant shall coordinate with the City of Ontario and the tribal representative(s) to develop mitigation measures that address the designation, responsibilities, and participation of tribal monitors during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities; scheduling; terms of compensation; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site. The City of Ontario shall be the final arbiter of the conditions for projects within the City's jurisdiction.</p>	
5.5-3: Grading activities in the City of Ontario would comply with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 so as to not disturb human remains.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.6 Global Climate Change			
5.6-1: Buildout of the City of Ontario would generate greenhouse gas emissions that would significantly contribute to global climate change impacts in California.	Potentially significant	6-1 The City of Ontario shall prepare a Climate Action Plan within one year after adopting The Ontario Plan. The Climate Action Plan shall include an updated inventory of greenhouse gas emission sources and a quantification of the City's greenhouse gas emissions target. Local measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the City's control by a minimum of 15 percent from business-as-usual shall be detailed in the Climate Action Plan and shall include discretionary approvals and a mechanism for revision in order to be consistent with the Regional Communities	Significant and unavoidable

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>Strategy once adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Climate Action Plan shall quantify the approximate greenhouse gas emissions reductions of each measure and measures shall be enforceable. Local measures considered in the Climate Action Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require all new or renovated municipal buildings to seek Silver or higher Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard, or compliance with similar green building rating criteria. • Require all municipal fleet purchases to be fuel efficient vehicles for their intended use based on the fuel type, design, size, and cost efficiency. • Require that new development projects in Ontario that require demolition prepare a demolition plan to reduce waste by recycling and/or salvaging a nonhazardous construction and demolition debris. • Require that new developments design new buildings to be energy efficient by siting buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping, and sun screening to reduce energy required for cooling. • Install energy efficient lighting (compact fluorescent and/or light emitting diode light bulbs) and lighting control systems in all municipal buildings. • Require all new traffic lights installed be light emitting diodes (LEDs) traffic signals. • Require the use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation in all new development and on public property where such connections are within the service boundaries of the City's reclaimed water system. • Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed within the City to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use and shall require use of bubbler irrigation, low-angle, low-flow spray heads, and moisture-sensors. • Conduct energy efficiency audits of existing municipal buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (HVAC), lighting, water heating equipment, insulation, and weatherization. <p>6-2 Pursuant to a goal of overall consistency with the Sustainable Communities Strategies, the City of Ontario shall evaluate new development with the development</p>	

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		6-3 pattern set forth in the Sustainable Communities Strategies plan, upon adoption of the plan by the Southern California Association of Governments. The City of Ontario shall participate in the County of San Bernardino's Green Valley Initiative.	
5.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
5.7-1: Residents, workers, and visitors in the city could be subjected to seismic hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, and seismically induced settlement.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.7-2: Hazards arising from ground subsidence, compressible soils, expansive soils, and erosion exist or could exist in the City.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.7-3 The City Of Ontario Is served by regional wastewater treatment facilities, and development pursuant to the proposed Ontario Plan is not expected to involve the use of septic tanks.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
5.8-1: Buildout in accordance with The Ontario Plan would involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials; however, these activities would be in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-2: Properties in the City Of Ontario that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites would comply with federal, state, and local regulations.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.8-3: In accordance with Article 29 of the Ontario Municipal Code, Airport zoning regulations, consistency reviews of the proposed land uses with Airport master Land Use plans of Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport and the Chino Airport would prevent significant impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-4: The Heliport included in the gateway specific plan would be near the LAONT eastern approach zones and Buildout of The Ontario Plan would place commercial and office land uses in this area; however, there would not be any significant impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-5: The buildout of The Ontario Plan would not affect the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.8-6 Ontario is designated a moderate fire hazard zone; however, adherence to existing regulations and review of building plans by the Ontario Fire Department would reduce risks from urban and wildland fire threats to the City.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
5.9-1: Development pursuant to The Ontario Plan would increase surface water flows into drainage systems within the watershed; however, stormwater infrastructure would be designed to accommodate stormwater flows in accordance with the San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.9-2: Development pursuant to The Ontario Plan would increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the city; however, creation of additional impermeable areas within the NMC would not hinder the groundwater recharge efforts of the Chino Basin Watermaster.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9-3: Portions of the city would be located within the 100-year flood hazard zone; However the City would require structures to be located above the base flood elevation.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9-4: Buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase concentrations of pollutants During construction Activities; however pollutant discharges would be minimized through implementation of Best Management practices detailed in the Water Quality Management Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9-5: Parts of the City Of Ontario are in the dam inundation area for San Antonio dam; However, probability of catastrophic failure is low and Emergency evacuation procedures are in place in the event of dam failure.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.9-6: Implementation of The Ontario Plan would not create hazards of inundation by seiche or mudflow.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
5.10-1: The Proposed Land Use Plan would not divide an established community.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.10-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would not conflict with applicable plans.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.10-3: The proposed project would not conflict with the adopted Oakmont Industrial Group Habitat Conservation Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES			
5.11-1: Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.12 NOISE			
5.12-1 Buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in an increase in traffic on local roadways in the City of Ontario, which would substantially increase the existing noise environment.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
5.12-2 Noise-sensitive uses could be exposed to Elevated noise levels from transportation sources of noise.	Potentially significant	12-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any project that involves a noise sensitive use within the 65 dBA CNEL contour along major roadways, freeways, railroads, or the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport, the project property owner/developers shall retain an acoustical engineer to conduct an acoustic analysis and identify, where appropriate, site design features (e.g., setbacks, berms, or sound walls) and/or required building acoustical improvements (e.g., sound transmission class rated windows, doors, and attic baffling), to ensure compliance with the City's Noise Compatibility Criteria and the California State Building Code and California Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24 and 21 of the California Code of Regulations).	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.12-3: Construction activities associated with buildout of the individual land uses associated with the Proposed land Use Plan would expose vibration-sensitive uses to strong levels of groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	12-2 Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, occurring near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses (i.e., exceed the Federal Transit Administration vibration-annoyance criteria of 78 VdB during the daytime), additional requirements, such as use of less vibration intensive equipment or construction techniques shall be implemented during construction (e.g., drilled piles to eliminate use of vibration-intensive pile driver).	Significant and unavoidable
5.12-4: Vibration-sensitive land uses along the Union Pacific Railroad corridor would be exposed to strong levels of groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	12-3 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any project that involves a vibration-sensitive use directly adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad or Southern California Regional Rail Authority main lines shall retain an acoustical engineer to evaluate potential for trains to create perceptible levels of vibration indoors. If vibration-related impacts are found, mitigation measures, such as use of concrete, iron or steel, or masonry materials to ensure that levels of vibration amplification are within acceptable limits to building occupants shall be implemented. Pursuant to the Federal Transit Administration vibration-annoyance criteria, these acceptable limits are defined as 78 VdB during the daytime and 72 VdB during the nighttime for residential uses, 84 VdB for office uses, and 90 VdB for workshops.	Less than significant
5.12-5: Construction activities associated with buildout of the individual land uses associated with the Proposed land Use Plan would substantially elevate noise levels in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses.	Potentially significant	12-4 Construction activities associated with new development that occurs near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential noise impacts. Mitigation measures such as installation of temporary sound barriers for adjacent construction activities that occur adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive structures, equipping construction equipment with mufflers, reducing non-essential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes shall be incorporated into the construction operations to reduce construction-related noise to the extent feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
5.12-6: Noise-sensitive land uses within the 65 DBA CNEL noise contour of the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport would be exposed to substantial levels of airport-related noise.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure 12-1 would require projects within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of the LAONT, roadway, freeways, or railroads to prepare an acoustical report that details required noise attenuation features to ensure compliance with Title 21. However, exterior noise may continue to exceed the noise compatibility criteria for the City of Ontario.	Significant and unavoidable

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING			
5.13-1: The proposed project would accommodate population growth in the project area.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.13-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would not displace people or housing, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES			
FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES			
5.14-1: The Ontario Fire Department would expand accordingly in response to the demand for fire protection facilities and personnel caused by the introduction of new structures, residents, and workers into the city's boundaries upon Buildout of The Ontario Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
POLICE PROTECTION			
5.14-2: Although Buildout in accordance with The Ontario Plan would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the City boundaries, increasing the Demand for Police protection facilities and personnel, development fees would cover police department expansion.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
SCHOOL SERVICES			
5.14-3: Construction of new schools and/or classroom facilities for up to 35,346 additional students generated by buildout of the Proposed land Use Plan would be accommodated through assessment of School impact fees, government Code Section 65995.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
LIBRARY SERVICES			
5.14-4: Buildout of the Ontario plan includes the construction of an additional 44,409 square feet of library space.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.15 RECREATION			
5.15-1: Buildout of the proposed land use plan would generate additional residents that would increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities, but would not result in a significant impact.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.15-2: Project implementation would result in environmental impacts from the provision of new and/or expanded recreational facilities, but impacts would not be considered significant.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
5.16-1: Trips generated as a result of buildout the Proposed Land Use Plan would cause a deficient level of service for the existing area intersections without implementation of the recommended lane geometry improvements. In addition, buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would also cumulatively contribute to the cumulatively significant freeway level of service impact that is already projected to occur in the future.	Potentially Significant	16-1 The Mobility Element of The Ontario Plan shall be consistent with the traffic study prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Table 5.16-5 shows the recommended lane geometry for the Proposed Land Use Plan.	Significant and unavoidable
5.16-2 Air traffic patterns would not be changed by The Ontario Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-3: Circulation Improvements under the recommended circulation plan would be designated to adequately address potential hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-4: Parking standards provided in the City of Ontario's Development Code would ensure adequate parking is provided for under The Ontario Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.16-5: The recommended circulation plan of the proposed land use plan would comply with adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
5.17-1: The buildout of The Ontario Plan would create a four percent greater need for water supply than previously assessed in the City of Ontario Urban Water Management Plan (2005). This increase in development could create a potentially significant impact on sources of potable and nonpotable water in the City.	Potentially significant	17-1 The City shall include a policy in the Policy Plan that requires the use of water conservation measures on development projects to improve water use efficiency and reduce overall water demand. Reduce potable water demand through conservation measures, including but not limited to, the following: a) Work cooperatively with all developers to incorporate conservation measures into project designs (such as those recommended by the California Urban Water Conservation Council). b) Continue to develop and implement water drought contingency plans to assist citizens and businesses in reducing water use during periods of water shortages and emergencies. c) Revise the City Code to include a Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance to encourage, or as appropriate, require the use of water-efficient landscaping consistent with AB 325.	Less than significant
		17-2 The City shall include a policy in the Policy Plan that maximizes the use of recycled water as an irrigation (non-potable) water source for landscaping, parks and other irrigation opportunities in all areas of the City and require use of recycled water in dual system office and industrial uses in selected urban areas of the City, where available and feasible.	
		17-3 The City shall include a policy in the Policy Plan that the City participate through the Chino Basin Water Master and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency in regional efforts to develop finding additional sources of water for groundwater recharge such as capture of stormwater runoff, recycled water, or other sources to ensure that the Chino Basin stays in long-term hydraulic balance and sustainability and that adequate additional local water sources would be available to increase the flexibility of the City's water supply.	

**Table 1-2
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.17-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would generate additional wastewater which would be adequately treated in accordance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and California department of public health requirements.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.17-3: Storm drainage systems would be expanded to accommodate growth associated with the buildout of The Ontario Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.17-4: Buildout of The Ontario Plan would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacities to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant
5.17-5: Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.