

## 3. *Revisions to the Draft EIR*

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section contains revisions to the DEIR based upon (1) additional or revised information required to prepare a response to a specific comment; (2) applicable updated information that was not available at the time of DEIR publication; and/or (3) typographical errors. This section also includes additional mitigation measures to fully respond to commenter concerns as well as provide additional clarification to mitigation requirements included in the DEIR. The provision of these additional mitigation measures does not alter any impact significance conclusions as disclosed in the DEIR. Changes made to the DEIR are identified here in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and in underlined text to signify additions.

### 3.2 DEIR REVISIONS

The following text has been revised in response to comments received on the DEIR, updated information, or minor technical corrections.

---

**Pages 1-15, Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---



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~~ be similar, 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~~ 3.09 to 2.49 upon buildout of the City...

---

**Pages 3-41 through 3-43, Table 3-4, *The Ontario Plan Future Buildout Projections*, and reference to buildout statistics throughout the EIR. The buildout projections have been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR. No new significant impacts would occur as a result of minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. A memorandum prepared by Kimely-Horn Associates regarding traffic is included as Appendix D to this Final EIR.**

---

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 3-4  
The Ontario Plan Future Buildout Projections**

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Acres</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>Assumed Density/ Intensity</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Population</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Square Feet</i>	<i>Jobs</i> <sup>4</sup>
<b>Residential</b>						
Rural	267.4 <u>272.2</u>	2 du/ac	535 544	2,138 2,176		
Low Density	7,797.2 <u>7,800.0</u>	4.0 du/ac (OMC) 4.5 du/ac (NMC)	32,766 <u>32,779</u>	130,967 <u>131,018</u>		
Low-Medium Density	800.8 <u>813.5</u>	8.5 du/ac	6,807 <u>6,915</u>	27,207 <u>27,638</u>		
Medium Density	1,941.63 <u>1,941.63</u>	18.0 du/ac (OMC) 22.0 du/ace (NMC)	39,179 <u>39,184</u>	138,601 <u>138,621</u>		
High Density	238.1 <u>240.6</u>	35 du/ac	8,334 <u>8,421</u>	27,892 <u>28,185</u>		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<del>11,045.8</del> <u>11,067.9</u>		<del>87,620</del> <u>87,843</u>	<del>326,805</del> <u>327,638</u>		
<b>Mixed Use</b>						
Downtown	108.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>60% of the area at 35 du/ac</li> <li>40% of the area at 0.80 FAR for office and retail</li> </ul>	2,279	4,557	1,512,403	2,706
Euclid Avenue/Francis Street	10.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of the area at 30 du/ac</li> <li>1.0 FAR office and retail</li> </ul>	156	312	181,210	419
East Holt Boulevard	54.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25% of the area at 30 du/ac</li> <li>50% of the area at 1.0 FAR office</li> <li>25% of the area at 0.80 FAR retail</li> </ul>	412	824	1,674,011	3,763
Meredith	245.0 <u>246.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30% of the area at 40 du/ac</li> <li>70% at 1.0 FAR for office and retail uses</li> </ul>	2,940 <u>2,957</u>	5,880 <u>5,914</u>	7,470,540 <u>7,513,229</u>	16,794 <u>16,890</u>
Multimodal Center	76.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10% of the area at 60 du/ac</li> <li>90% of the area at 1.0 FAR office and retail</li> </ul>	457	914	2,987,345	5,344
Inland Empire Corridor	36.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of the area at 20 du/ac</li> <li>30% of the area at 0.50 FAR office</li> <li>20% of the area at 0.35 FAR retail</li> </ul>	368	736	352,662	768
Guasti	83.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20% of the area at 30 du/ac</li> <li>30% of the area at 1.0</li> </ul>	500	1,001	2,361,388	4,419

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 3-4  
The Ontario Plan Future Buildout Projections**

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Acres</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>Assumed Density/ Intensity</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Population</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Square Feet</i>	<i>Jobs</i> <sup>4</sup>
		FAR retail • 50% of the area at 0.70 FAR office				
Ontario Center	344.9	• 30% of the area at 40 du/ac • 50% of the area at 1.0 FAR office • 20% of the area at 0.5 FAR retail	4,139	8,278	9,014,306	22,563
Ontario Mills	239.5	• 5% of the area at 40 du/ac • 20% of the area at 0.75 FAR office • 75% of the area at 0.5 FAR retail	479	958	5,477,126	7,285
NMC west	315.78	• 30% of the area at 35 du/ac • 70% of the area at 0.7 FAR office and retail	3,315.6	6,630.2	6,740,562 6,738,427	17,210.5
NMC east	263.7	• 30% of the area at 25 du/ac • 30% of the area at 0.35 FAR for office • 40% of the area at 0.3 FAR for retail uses	1,978	3,956	2,584,524	4,439
SR-60 and Hamner	41.1	•	0	0	662,417	1,147
<b>Subtotal</b>	<del>1,779.1</del> <u>1,821.5</u>		<del>17,023</del> <u>17,039</u>	<del>34,047</del> <u>34,078</u>	<del>40,356,075</del> <u>40,396,629</u>	<del>85,715</del> <u>85,805</u>
<b>Retail/Service</b>						
Neighborhood Commercial	283.6 280.8	0.30 FAR			3,706,085 3,669,494	8,969 8,880
General Commercial	592.7 551.5	0.30 FAR			7,745,404 7,207,002	7,220 6,718
Office/Commercial	525.6	0.75 FAR			17,171,352	38,481 38,076
Hospitality	144.9	0.75 FAR			6,311,844	7,236
<b>Subtotal</b>	<del>1,546.8</del> <u>1,502.8</u>				<del>34,934,684</del> <u>34,359,692</u>	<del>61,906</del> <u>60,910</u>
<b>Employment</b>						
Business Park	1,269.3 1,261.0	0.40 FAR			22,116,283 21,971,664	38,814 38,560
Industrial	6,678.3 6,672.8	0.55 FAR			159,998,711 159,866,942	139,359 139,244
<b>Subtotal</b>	<del>7,947.6</del>				<del>182,114,995</del>	<del>178,173</del>



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 3-4  
The Ontario Plan Future Buildout Projections**

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Acres</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>Assumed Density/ Intensity</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Population</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Square Feet</i>	<i>Jobs</i> <sup>4</sup>
	7,933.8				181,838,606	177,804
<b>Other</b>						
Open Space – Non-Recreation	1,242.1 1,243.0	Not applicable				
Open Space – Recreation	1,007.6 1,004.1	Not applicable				
Open Space-Water	59.2	Not applicable				
Public Facility	98.6	Not applicable				
Public School	627.12	Not applicable				
Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT)	1,422.2	Not applicable				
Landfill	136.9	Not applicable				
Railroad	247.0	Not applicable				
Roadways	4,798.8 4,793.7	Not applicable				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<del>9,639.6</del> 9,631.8					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31,957.9</b>		<b>104,644</b> <b>104,882</b>	<b>360,851</b> <b>361,716</b>	<b>257,405,754</b> <b>256,594,928</b>	<b>325,794</b> <b>324,520</b>

Notes: FAR: Floor Area Ratio; du/ac: dwelling units per acre

Historically, citywide buildout levels do not achieve the maximum allowable density/intensity on every parcel and are, on average, lower than allowed by the general plan. Accordingly, these buildout projections do not assume buildout at the maximum density or intensity and instead are adjusted downward to account for variations in buildout intensity (see Appendix J).

<sup>1</sup> Acres are given as adjusted gross acreages, which do not include the right-of-way for roadways, flood control facilities, or railroads.

<sup>2</sup> Density/Intensity includes both residential density, expressed as units per acre, and non-residential intensity, expressed FAR, which is the amount of building square feet in relation to the size of the lot.

<sup>3</sup> Projections of population by residential designation are based on a persons-per-household factor that varies by housing type.

<sup>4</sup> Factors used to generate the number of employees by land use category are included in Appendix J.

**Page 3-16 through 3-29, Table 3-2, Policy Plan Policies, Chapter 3, Project Description. The following policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan, which are referenced throughout the EIR.**

**Table 3-2  
Policy Plan Policies**

<i>Element</i>	<i>Policies</i>
<b>Environmental Resources Element</b>	
<b>Water and Wastewater</b>	
ER1-2	Matching Supply to Use. We <del>support</del> matching water supply and quality to the appropriate use.
ER1-5	Groundwater Management. We protect groundwater quality by <del>incorporating</del> promoting strategies that prevent pollution, require remediation where necessary, capture and treat urban runoff, and recharge the aquifer.
<b>Solid Waste and Recycling</b>	
ER2-1	Waste Diversion. We <del>shall promote</del> increasing our waste diversion rate to meet or exceed AB 939 requirements.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 3-2  
Policy Plan Policies**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Policies</b>
<b>Energy</b>	
ER3-1	Conservation Strategy. We <del>require</del> <u>promote</u> conservation as the first strategy to be employed to meet applicable energy-saving standards.
ER3-2	Green Development – Communities. We encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system, <u>or similar mechanism</u> , to guide the planning and development of all new communities.
ER3-3	<del>Transportation Energy Transit and Community Facilities. We require the future development of community-wide serving facilities to promote development that reduces the energy associated with getting people to and from buildings. Community facilities should be sited in transit-ready areas that can be served and made accessible by public transit to public transportation. Conversely, we plan (and coordinate with other transit agencies to plan) future transit routes to serve existing facilities.</del>
ER3-4	Green Development – Public Buildings. We require all new and <u>substantially</u> renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet to achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.
ER3-5	Fuel Efficient and Alternative Energy Vehicles and Equipment. We <del>should</del> purchase and use vehicles and equipment that are fuel efficient and meet or surpass state emissions requirements and/or use renewable sources of energy.
<u>ER3-7</u>	<u>Building and Site Design. We require new construction to incorporate energy-efficient building and site design strategies, which could include appropriate solar-orientation, maximum use of natural daylight, passive solar, and natural ventilation.</u>
<b>Air Quality</b>	
ER4-1	Land Use. We <del>reduce</del> <u>support the reduction of</u> GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance.
ER4-3	Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Emissions Reductions. We will <del>reduce</del> <u>actively pursue the reduction of</u> GHG emissions in accordance with regional, state, and federal regulations.
ER4-5	<del>Mobile Sources in Interior Spaces. We encourage the use of low or zero emission interior mobile equipment within commercial and industrial buildings.</del> Indoor Air Quality. We will comply with State Green Building Codes relative to indoor air quality.
ER4-9	Tree Planting. We <del>protect</del> <u>support the protection of</u> healthy trees within the City and <del>the planting of</del> new trees to increase carbon sequestration and help the regional/local air quality.
<b>Land Use Element</b>	
<b>Balance</b>	
LU1-4	Mobility. We <del>require</del> <u>promote</u> development and urban design, <u>where appropriate</u> , that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.
LU1-6	Complete Community. We <del>incorporate</del> <u>encourage</u> a variety of land uses and building types in our land use <u>planning efforts</u> that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.
<b>Mobility Element</b>	
<b>Public Transit</b>	
M3-2	Transit Facilities at New Development. We require new development to provide transit facilities, such as bus shelters, <u>transit bays</u> and turnouts, as necessary.
M3-3	Transit-Oriented Development. We <u>may provide additional</u> <del>consider the provision of</del> development-related incentives to those inherent in the Land Use Plan for projects that promote transit use.
M3-10	Multimodal Transit Center. We intend to ensure the development of <del>will explore</del> development of a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes.
<b>Goods Movement</b>	
M4-2	Regional Participation. We work with regional and subregional transportation agencies <u>to regarding</u> <del>planning and implementation of</del> regional goods movement strategies, including those that improve mobility, deliver goods efficiently and minimize negative environmental impacts.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Pages 3-33, Chapter 3, *Project Description*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.

---

... Table 3-4 estimates the future statistics based on the buildout projections of the Proposed Land Use Plan. Projections are based upon the theoretical buildout (dwelling units, population, nonresidential square-footage, and employment) of each land use designations based on a range of allowable densities. As shown in this table, buildout of the Land Use Plan is projected to accommodate approximately ~~104,644~~ 104,882 dwelling units, ~~360,851~~ 361,716 people, and ~~325,794~~ 324,520 jobs.

---

Figure 1-3, *Proposed Land Use Plan*, in Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, and Figure 3-6, *Proposed Land Use Plan*, and Figure 3-4, *Generalized and Focus Areas*, in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, have been revised based on minor revisions to the Proposed Land Use Plan.

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 1-3, *Proposed Land Use Plan*
  - Figure 3-6, *Proposed Land Use Plan*
  - Figure 3-4, *Generalized and Focus Areas*
- 

Page 4-4, Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting*, has been revised to state that the Airport Land Use Commission establishes the requirements for land use compatibility, develops the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and reviews actions around the airport in response to A15-30, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

---

The State Aeronautics Act of the California Public Utilities Code establishes statewide requirements for airport land use compatibility planning and requires nearly every county to create an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) or other alternative. San Bernardino County opted for an alternative to the commission and delegated responsibility to prepare an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALCUP) to each airport jurisdiction. The ~~Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport and Chino Airport ALUC~~ establishes the requirements for land use compatibility for designated areas near the airports. The City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics's California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Land use decisions in the vicinity of the airports are reviewed by the ~~airports~~ALUC. If the ~~airport~~ ALUC determines that any of the proposed actions are inconsistent with the ~~Airport Land Use Plan~~ ALUCP, the City, after a public hearing, may overrule the airports by a two-thirds vote of the City Council if it makes specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes stated in Public Utilities Code, Section 21670. Thereafter, the proposed action is not subject to review by the airports. A local agency that proposes to overrule the airports must first provide the airport and the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, with the proposed decision at least 45 days prior to the decision. Any comments by the airport or Division of Aeronautics must be included in the final record of the local agency's final decision to overrule the airport.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Page 5.3-18 through 5.3-26, Section 5.3, *Air Quality*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

---

#### Environmental Resources Element

##### Energy

- ER3-1 Conservation Strategy. We require ~~promote~~ conservation as the first strategy to be employed to meet applicable energy-saving standards.
- ER3-2 Green Development – Communities. We encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system, or similar mechanism, to guide the planning and development of all new communities.
- ER3-3 ~~Transportation Energy Transit and Community Facilities~~. We require the future development of community-wide serving facilities to promote development that reduces the energy associated with getting people to and from buildings. Community facilities should be sited in transit-ready areas that can be served and made accessible by public transit to public transportation. Conversely, we plan (and coordinate with other transit agencies to plan) future transit routes to serve existing facilities.
- ER3-4 Green Development – Public Buildings. We require all new and substantially renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet to achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.
- ER3-5 Fuel Efficient and Alternative Energy Vehicles and Equipment. We ~~should~~ purchase and use vehicles and equipment that are fuel efficient and meet or surpass state emissions requirements and/or use renewable sources of energy.
- ...
- ER3-7 Building and Site Design. We require new construction to incorporate energy-efficient building and site design strategies, which could include appropriate solar-orientation, maximum use of natural daylight, passive solar, and natural ventilation.

##### Air Quality

- ER4-1 Land Use. We reduce ~~support the reduction of~~ GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance.
- ER4-3 Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Emissions Reductions. We will reduce ~~actively pursue the reduction of~~ GHG emissions in accordance with regional, state, and federal regulations.
- ...
- ER4-5 ~~Mobile Sources in Interior Spaces~~. We encourage the use of low or zero emission interior mobile equipment within commercial and industrial buildings. Indoor Air Quality. We will comply with State Green Building Codes relative to indoor air quality.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

ER4-9 Tree Planting. We ~~protect support the protection of~~ healthy trees within the City and the planting of new trees to increase carbon sequestration and help the regional/local air quality.

...

#### Land Use Element

##### Balance

LU1-4 Mobility. We ~~require promote~~ development and urban design, where appropriate, that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.

LU1-6 Complete Community. We ~~incorporate encourage~~ a variety of land uses and building types in our land use planning efforts that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.

...

#### Mobility Element

##### Public Transit

M3-2 Transit Facilities at New Development. We require new development to provide transit facilities, such as bus shelters, transit bays and turnouts, as necessary.

M3-3 Transit-Oriented Development. We ~~may provide additional consider the provision of~~ development-related incentives to those inherent in the Land Use Plan for projects that promote transit use.

...

M3-10 Multimodal Transit Center. We ~~intend to ensure the development of will explore development of~~ a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes..

##### Goods Movement

M4-2 Regional Participation. We work with regional and subregional transportation agencies to regarding planning and implementation of regional goods movement strategies, including those that improve mobility, deliver goods efficiently and minimize negative environmental impacts.

...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

Page 5.3-27 through 5.3-28, Section 5.3-7, **Mitigation Measures**, in Section 5.3, **Air Quality**. Mitigation Measure 3-1 and 3-3 have been revised in response to Comment A6-2 and A6-3, from the Rutan and Tucker, LLP on behalf of Brookfield Homes.

- 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:...
- 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 filters have been 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.

Page 5.4-19, Table 5.4-2, **Sensitive Wildlife Species Known or Potentially Occurring in the City of Ontario**, Section 5.4, **Biological Resources**, has been revised to identify the potential occurrence of the San Bernardino kangaroo rat as "Low to Moderate" in response to Comment A8-2 from the California Department of Fish and Game.



**Table 5.4-2**  
**Sensitive Wildlife Species Known or Potentially Occurring in the City of Ontario**

<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Habitat</i>	<i>Federal/State Listing Status</i>	<i>Other Designations</i>	<i>Potential to Occur</i>
<i>Dipodomys merriammi parvus</i>	San Bernardino kangaroo rat	Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub and sandy loam soils, alluvial fans and flood plains, and along washes with nearby sage scrub. Prefers sandy loam substrates. Santa Ana River, Cajon Creek Wash, Lytle Creek Wash, City Creek, and upper Etiwanda Wash in San Bernardino County, and sites in western Riverside County	FE/None	CSC	Low to Moderate. Limited to no suitable habitat. Not expected.

Page 5.4-21, Section 5.4, **Biological Resources**, has been revised to identify the potential occurrence of the San Bernardino kangaroo rat as "Low to Moderate" in response to Comment A8-2 from the California Department of Fish and Game.

... An additional 13,193 acres are distributed within the Santa Ana River Wash, Lytle and Cajon creeks, and San Jacinto River. The San Bernardino kangaroo rat may potentially be present in the City. There is low to moderate potential for occurrence in the remnant alluvial wash located north of the 10 Freeway and west of Etiwanda Avenue, and in flood control channels in the same area. Focused surveys would be needed to determine presence or absence if projects are proposed in these areas.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

**Page 5.4-25, Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, has been revised to reflect that tributaries to any channels in the City are waters of the state in response to Comment A8-12, from the California Department of Fish and Game.**

---

... Riparian vegetation may also be present in the detention basins, particularly where flowing or standing water persists. These riparian resources, including any wetlands that may occur along drainages, potentially fall under the jurisdiction of the USACE and CDFG. Tributaries to any channels in the City, as well as areas that are fed by surface waters, may be jurisdictional to CDFG, to be determined on a case by case basis.

---

**Page 5.4-26 and 5.4-27, Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, has been revised to identify that the need for focused surveys would occur on a project-by-project basis in accordance with existing regulations in response to Comment A8-2 from the California Department of Fish and Game.**

---

Nearly the entire City of Ontario is developed with urban and agricultural uses, and there is very little native habitat remaining. There were approximately 2,762.5 acres, or 8.6 percent of the City's land area, of vacant land as of April 2006. Vacant land in the City has little *may have low* habitat value, however, because much of it is barren ground and does not support vegetation, and because many areas of vacant land are small, surrounded by developed urban uses, and isolated from other vacant land. *There is nonetheless a chance that some sensitive species occur in remnant or disturbed habitats, and focused surveys may be warranted for individual sites that are the subject of development proposals. The assessment of the need for focused surveys would be carried out on a project by project basis, in accordance with existing federal, state, and local regulations. This would apply equally to the OMC and NMC areas.* Most potential biological resources in the City are in the NMC area, as the balance of the City is almost entirely built out...

---

**Page 5.4-29, Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, has been revised to reflect that tributaries to any channels in the City are waters of the state in response to Comment A8-12, from the California Department of Fish and Game.**

---

... Implementation of the proposed Policy Plan would not result in direct impacts to waters of the state because The Ontario Plan does not grant specific entitlements for development. Tributaries to any channels in the City, plus areas that are fed by surface waters, are considered waters of the state and are jurisdictional to CDFG. Projects resulting in impacts to waters of the state would be subject to approval by the CDFG through Streambed Alteration Agreements and would require mitigation as determined by the CDFG for any consequent impacts.

---

**Mitigation Measure 5-1 and 5-2, Page 5.5-23, in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resources*, has been revised based on a minor technical clarification.**

---

#### **Impact 5.5-1**

5-1 Historic or potentially historic resources in the City shall be evaluated for historic significance through the City's tier system prior to the issuance of plan or development approvals in the Focus Areas.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

#### Impact 5.5-2

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 and 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 or designee 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 Archaeologist/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.

---

**Page 5.5-24, in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resource*, has been revised based on a minor technical correction that references the incorrect Impact number.**

---

The mitigation measures identified above would reduce potential impacts associated with Impact 5.2-24 to a level that is less than significant...

---

**Page 5.6-5, in Section 5.6, *Global Climate Change*, has been revised to identify the potential climate change impacts specific to Ontario.**

---

CAT and the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) use the results from the recent analysis of global climate change impacts for California under three IPCC scenarios: lower emissions (B1), medium-high emissions (A2), and high emissions (A1F1); each is associated with an increasing rise in average global surface temperatures. According to the California Energy Commission (CEC) in their 2006 report, *Our Changing Climate, Assessing the Risks to California*, global climate change risks to California include public health impacts (poor air quality made worse and more severe heat), water resources impacts (decreasing Sierra Nevada snowpack, challenges in securing adequate water supply, potential reduction in hydropower, and loss of winter recreation), agricultural impacts (increasing temperatures, increasing threats from pests and pathogens, expanded ranges of agricultural weeds, and declining productivity), coast sea level impacts (rising sea levels, increasing coastal floods, and shrinking beaches), forest and biological resource impacts (increasing wildfires, increasing threats from pest and pathogens, declining forest productivity, and shifting vegetation and species distribution), and electricity impacts (increased energy demand). Specific climate change impacts that could affect the City of Ontario include health impacts from a reduction in air quality, water resources impacts from a reduction in water supply, and increased energy demand.



### *3. Revisions to the Draft EIR*

---

**Page 5.6-12, in Section 5.6, *Global Climate Change*, has been revised to identify that construction emissions are a part of the climate change analysis but included separately from the operational phase greenhouse gas emissions inventory.**

---

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from operational activities within the City of Ontario are shown in Table 5.6-4. For operation, the project's GHG emissions are separated into emission sources. The City of Ontario is projected to have an emissions inventory of 13.6 million MTons at buildout year 2035. In comparison, the state of California's 2020 GHG emissions target is 427 MMTons.<sup>1</sup> Emissions generated by vehicle miles traveled within the City comprise the majority of the City's GHG emissions (78 percent). Emissions from energy use, including purchased energy and energy associated with the transport, treatment, and use of water, are the next highest source of GHG emissions. No numeric threshold has been formally adopted. In addition, GHG emissions from construction activities, described above, would be added to these values.

---

**Page 5.6-16, in Section 5.6, *Global Climate Change*, has been revised based on a spelling error.**

---

The Ontario Plan would improve the SANBAG region's jobs/housing balance by attracting employment to the City and would reduce VMT by shortening commute distances...

---

**Page 5.6-17 through 5.6-23, Section 5.6, *Global Climate Change*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

---

#### **Environmental Resources Element**

##### ***Water and Wastewater***

- ER1-2      Matching Supply to Use. We ~~support~~ matching water supply and quality to the appropriate use.
- ER1-5      Groundwater Management. We protect groundwater quality by incorporating ~~promoting~~ strategies that prevent pollution, require remediation where necessary, capture and treat urban runoff, and recharge the aquifer.

##### ***Solid Waste and Recycling***

- ER2-1      Waste Diversion. We ~~shall promote increasing our waste diversion rate to~~ meet or exceed AB 939 requirements.

##### ***Energy***

- ER3-1      Conservation Strategy. We require ~~promote~~ conservation as the first strategy to be employed to meet applicable energy-saving standards.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the emissions inventory for the state of California for transportation emissions was compiled using gasoline sales obtained from the California Board of Equalization in the state in year 2007. To forecast on-road transportation emissions, CARB estimated 2020 emissions based on the growth in projected VMT derived from EMFAC2007. In comparison, The Ontario Plan's GHG emissions are based on a projection of trips and VMT traveled in the City in year 2008 and year 2035 based on the traffic analysis conducted by Kimely-Horn Associates, and assumes an increase in average vehicle trip lengths in the SCAG region in future years.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

- ER3-2 Green Development – Communities. We encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system, or similar mechanism, to guide the planning and development of all new communities.
- ER3-3 ~~Transportation Energy Transit and Community Facilities. We require the future development of community-wide serving facilities to promote development that reduces the energy associated with getting people to and from buildings. Community facilities should be sited in transit-ready areas that can be served and made accessible by public transit to public transportation. Conversely, we plan (and coordinate with other transit agencies to plan) future transit routes to serve existing facilities.~~
- ER3-4 Green Development – Public Buildings. We require all new and substantially renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet to achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.
- ER3-5 Fuel Efficient and Alternative Energy Vehicles and Equipment. We ~~should~~ purchase and use vehicles and equipment that are fuel efficient and meet or surpass state emissions requirements and/or use renewable sources of energy.
- ~~ER3-7 Building and Site Design. We require new construction to incorporate energy-efficient building and site design strategies, which could include appropriate solar-orientation, maximum use of natural daylight, passive solar, and natural ventilation.~~

#### **Air Quality**

- ER4-1 Land Use. We reduce ~~support the reduction~~ of GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance.
- ER4-3 Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Emissions Reductions. We will reduce actively pursue the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with regional, state, and federal regulations.
- ER4-5 ~~Mobile Sources in Interior Spaces. We encourage the use of low or zero emission interior mobile equipment within commercial and industrial buildings.~~ Indoor Air Quality. We will comply with State Green Building Codes relative to indoor air quality.
- ER4-9 Tree Planting. We protect support the protection of healthy trees within the City and the planting of new trees to increase carbon sequestration and help the regional/local air quality.

...

#### **Land Use Element**

##### **Balance**

- LU1-4 Mobility. We require promote development and urban design, where appropriate, that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

LU1-6 complete Community. We ~~incorporate~~ encourage a variety of land uses and building types in our land use planning efforts that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.

...

#### **Mobility Element**

##### **Public Transit**

M3-2 Transit Facilities at New Development. We require new development to provide transit facilities, such as bus shelters, transit bays and turnouts, as necessary.

M3-3 Transit-Oriented Development. We may provide additional ~~consider the provision of~~ development-related incentives to those inherent in the Land Use Plan for projects that promote transit use.

M3-10 Multimodal Transit Center. We intend to ensure the development of ~~will explore development of~~ a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes.

##### **Goods Movement**

M4-2 Regional Participation. We work with regional and subregional transportation agencies to regarding planning and implementation of regional goods movement strategies, including those that improve mobility, deliver goods efficiently and minimize negative environmental impacts.

...

---

**Mitigation Measure 6-1, Section 5.6, Global Climate Change, has been revised based on discussions with the California Attorney General to include additional strategies for cool roofs/cool pavement, diesel emission reduction strategies, Public Transit Fees and to ensure that interim development adheres to proposed measures in the Climate Action Plan.**

---

6-1 The City of Ontario shall prepare a Climate Action Plan within ~~one year~~ 18 months after adopting The Ontario Plan. The Climate Action Plan shall include an updated inventory of greenhouse gas emission sources, including those from Municipal Government Operations and the community as a whole, and a ~~quantification~~ quantifiable of the City's greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. Local measures to reduce Municipal Government Operations 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 Communities 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. The City shall monitor progress toward the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal and prepare reports every five years that detail the City's progress. Measures listed below shall be considered for

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

all new development in between the time of adoption of The Ontario Plan and adoption of the Climate Action Plan. Local measures considered in the Climate Action Plan shall include:

- 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. (Municipal Government Operations Strategy)
- Require all municipal fleet purchases to be fuel efficient vehicles for their intended use based on the fuel type, design, size, and cost efficiency. (Municipal Government Operations Strategy)
- 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. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Require that new developments design 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. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Require that cool roofs for non-residential development and cool pavement to be incorporated into the site/building design for new development where appropriate. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Evaluate the feasibility of implementing a Public Transit Fee to support Omnitrans in developing additional transit service in the City. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Require diesel emission reduction strategies to eliminate and/or reduce idling at truck stops, warehouses, and distribution facilities throughout the City. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Install energy efficient lighting (~~compact fluorescent and/or light emitting diode (LED) light bulbs~~) and lighting control systems in all municipal buildings. (Municipal Government Operations Strategy)
- Require all new traffic lights installed be ~~LEDs~~ energy efficient traffic signals. (Municipal Government Operations Strategy)
- 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. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed within the City to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use and require use of bubbler irrigation; low-angle, low-flow spray heads; or moisture sensors. (Community-Wide Strategy)
- Conduct energy efficiency audits of existing municipal buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems,



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

lighting, water heating equipment, insulation, and weatherization. (Municipal Government Operations Strategy)

---

**Page 5.8-7, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The reference to the Airport Master Plan has been updated to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan and the City's Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan in response to Comment A15-2, A15-3, and A15-27, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

---

Airport authorities and other agencies regulate aircraft activity. The City has no direct authority over airport development and operations. The State Aeronautics Act of the California Public Utilities Code establishes statewide requirements for the airport land use compatibility planning and requires nearly every county to create an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) or other alternative. San Bernardino County opted for an alternative to the ALUC and delegated responsibility to prepare an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for each airport jurisdiction. Other public agencies also provide policy guidance or promulgate standards that address regional transportation and safety issues related to airport land use compatibility planning. A land use compatibility assessments are is a part of both the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) and Chino Airport Master Land Use Plans. The Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) has not yet developed an Airport Master Plan for operations. LAWA initiated work on an Airport Master Plan for LAONT in 2004 but put the project was put on hold in 2008. The City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the California Department of Transportations (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics's California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. However, LAWA does not have the power to develop or enforce rules or restrictions on land uses surrounding the airport unless the property is owned by LAWA.

---

**Page 5.8-15, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The following technical correction has been made to the text of this section.

---

... The heliport would include an object-free area or a Final Approach and Takeoff area to define the area needed for takeoffs and landings and would be required to follow FAA regulations and the conditions of the heliport permit issued by the ~~California Department of Transportation~~ Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics (City of Ontario 2007).

LAONT is part of the Los Angeles World Airport (LAWA) system and has the capacity to provide regional air traffic for domestic and international commercial and cargo service, and the necessary support facilities for major and smaller airlines. Prior to the closure of the Ontario Army Airfield in 1995, the site was operated by the Ontario Air National Guard...

---

**Page 5.8-16, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The reference to the Airport Master Plan and ALCUP has been updated to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response in response to Comment A15-4, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

---

As the airport owner, LAWA is responsible for airport operations and planning for increased airport capacity. Airport Master Plans are developed by airport owners to assist airport owners and local jurisdictions in planning for airport growth. LAWA initiated work on an Airport Master Plan for LAONT in 2004 but put the project was put on hold in 2008. LAONT is currently drafting a Master Land Use Plan (MLUP) for the airport. The City of Ontario is preparing an ALUCP A Comprehensive Land Use Plan

---

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

~~(CLUP) that would be adopted for LAONT following the adoption of the MLUP. The Chino Airport currently has an MLUP Airport Master Plan and CLUP Comprehensive Land Use Plan..~~

---

**Page 5.8-26, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The reference to a Master “Land Use” Plan been deleted in response to Comment A15-6, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

**IMPACT 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. [THRESHOLDS H-5]**

---

**Page 5.8-26, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The following technical correction has been made to the text of this section.**

---

The Land Use Element of The Ontario Plan states that all new development surrounding LAONT and the Chino Airport should be consistent with the adopted ~~CLUP~~ ALUCP for each airport and should meet standards and recommendations of Part 77 of the FAA, adopted through Ordinance 2758 in the Ontario Municipal Code...

---

**Page 5.8-27, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The reference to a Master “Land Use” Plan been deleted in response to Comment A15-7 and A15-28, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

The safety zones around the airport are established based on Caltrans’s Division of Aeronautics guidelines and are subject to change when the ~~MLUP~~ ALUCP for LAONT is officially adopted by the City of Ontario. Both Chino Airport and LAONT would experience potentially significant impacts with regard to building compliance with airport safety zones if new development does not meet the restrictions of Part 77 of the FAA regulations...

---

**Page 5.8-27, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, has been revised to correct an incorrect reference.**

---

This heliport was analyzed in the Ontario Gateway Specific Plan EIR to determine its impacts on surrounding land uses and any interference it may have with the LAONT approach zones. For both of these issues, it was found to not have significant impacts (City of Ontario 2007). The heliport will include an object-free area or Final Approach and Takeoff that would limit the location, density, and height of the surrounding buildings. As part of the heliport permitting process, the ~~California Department of Transportation Division of Aviation~~ Caltrans’s Division of Aeronautics would review the final flight paths of the heliport to confirm that they do not interfere with the LAONT approach zones. It would be most likely that the heliport will use a north– south flight pattern to limit interference with the LAONT’s east–west flight patterns (City of Ontario 2007). There are no significant impacts with the adoption of The Ontario Plan.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

---

**Figure 5.8-1. Airport Land Use Compatibility, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The reference to the Airport Master Plan and ALCUP in Figure 5.8-1 has been updated to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response to Comment A15-5, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 5.8-1, *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*
- 

**Page 5.9-3, Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality,** has been revised to state that storm drains would be designed for the 1, 2, and 5-year storms for local drainages in response to Comment A9-4, from the City of Chino.

---

The San Bernardino County Stormwater Program has developed the Model Water Quality Management Plan guidance document to comply with the Santa Ana RWQCB's NPDES permit requirements. This guidance document requires that a project's post-development discharge not exceed predevelopment discharges for 1, 2, and 5, and ~~10~~-year storms; or that a project proponent carry out additional analysis and mitigation to ensure that a project not adversely impact downstream erosion, sedimentation, or stream habitat.

---

**Pages 5.9-18, Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality,** has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.

---

**Impact Analysis:** Buildout of The Ontario Plan is projected to involve the development of roughly ~~58,364~~ 58,602 residential units and ~~178,815,743~~ 178,004,917 square feet of nonresidential land uses, compared to existing conditions...

---

**Page 5.9-19, Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality,** has been revised to state that storm drains would be designed for the 1, 2, and 5-year storms for local drainages in response to Comment A9-4, from the City of Chino.

---

... Projects considered for approval under the Ontario Plan would be mandated to comply with BMPs for compliance with NPDES requirements; for example, preservation of existing vegetation. Such projects would also be mandated to comply with San Bernardino County Stormwater Program requirements that they either not increase stormwater flows from 1-, 2, and 5, and ~~10~~-year storms; or conduct additional analysis to determine impacts regarding erosion, sedimentation, or stream habitat, and must incorporate BMPs to mitigate such impacts...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Pages 5.9-19, Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.

---

**Impact Analysis:** Buildout of The Ontario Plan is forecast to involve the development of ~~58,364~~ 58,602 additional residential units and ~~178,815,743~~ 178,004,917 square feet of additional nonresidential land uses, compared to existing conditions...

---

Page 5.9-20, Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, has been revised to list potential Low Impact Development Strategies that could be incorporated in future developments in response to Comment A12-4, from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

---

In addition to the requirements above, The Ontario Plan contains policies that would promote infiltration of runoff, and groundwater recharge, including Policies ER1-5 and ER1-6. Policy ER1-6 encourages use of low impact development (LID) strategies to intercept runoff, slow the discharge rate, increase infiltration, and ultimately reduce discharge volumes to traditional storm drain systems. Potential LID strategies that could be implemented by development in the City include bioretention, dry wells, filter strips, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, inlet pollution removal devices, permeable pavement, permeable pavers, rain barrels and cisterns, soil amendments, tree box filters, vegetated buffers, vegetated roofs. Groundwater supply and management is discussed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*...



Page 5.9-24 through 5.6-23, Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

---

#### Environmental Resources Element

##### *Water and Wastewater*

ER1-5 Groundwater Management. We protect groundwater quality by incorporating promoting strategies that prevent pollution, require remediation where necessary, capture and treat urban runoff, and recharge the aquifer.

...

Page 5.10-7, Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*. The reference to the Airport Master Plan and has been updated to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response to Comment A15-8, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

---

LAONT is owned by Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). The Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) has not yet developed an Airport Master Plan for operations. LAWA initiated work on an Airport Master Plan for LAONT in 2004 and is currently developing a Master Land Use Plan that would have will provided a framework for the airport's development and use through the year 2030. However, this project was put on hold in 2008. However, the City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the California Department of Transportation

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

(Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics's *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The Ontario Plan will be consistent with the LAONT Master Plan to coordinate and organize land uses in and surrounding the LAONT. As proposed, the LAONT would be expanded to have a 1,795,000-square-foot passenger terminal, 71 aircraft passenger gates, 73 acres of rental car facilities, 30,680 public parking spaces, and 254 acres of cargo facilities (LAWA 2005). Based on the projections in the Notice of Preparation for LAWA's Airport Master Plan, proposed airport improvements would accommodate passenger growth between 28 and 30 million annual passengers (MAP) (LAWA 2004).

**Table 5.10-1, Consistency with SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Goals, Page 5.10-9, Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning. The reference to a Master "Land Use" Plan been deleted in response in response to Comment A15-9, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

**Table 5.10-1  
Consistency with SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Goals**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Goal or Policy</b>
RTP G1	Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The transportation networks in Ontario would be developed and maintained to meet the needs of local and regional transportation and to ensure efficient mobility. A number of regional and local plans and programs would be used to guide development and maintenance of transportation networks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Bernardino Congestion Management Plan</li> <li>• Master Plan of Streets</li> <li>• Transportation System Communications Master Plan</li> <li>• Through-Traffic Protection Program (for neighborhood safety and accessibility)</li> <li>• Right-Of-Way Management Plan</li> <li>• SCAG Regional Transportation Plan</li> <li>• LAONT and Chino Airport Master Land Use Plans</li> </ul>	<p><b>M1-1 Roadway Design and Maintenance.</b> Require our roadways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comply with federal, state, and local design and safety standards.</li> <li>• Meet the needs of multiple transportation modes and users.</li> <li>• Handle the capacity envisioned in the Functional Roadway Classifications Plan.</li> <li>• Maintain a peak hour Level of Service (LOS) E or better at all intersections.</li> <li>• Be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding land uses.</li> <li>• Be maintained in accordance with best practices and our Right-Of-Way Management Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>M5-1 Regional Leadership.</b> Maintain a leadership role to help identify and implement potential solutions to long-term regional transportation problems.</p> <p><b>LU1-2 Sustainable Community Strategy.</b> We integrate state, regional, and local Sustainable Community/Smart Growth principles into the development and entitlement process.</p>

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-1, Consistency with SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Goals, Page 5.10-9, Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning.** The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

**Table 5.10-1  
Consistency with SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Goals**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Goal or Policy</b>
RTP G5	Protect the environment, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency.	<b>Consistent:</b> The reduction of energy use, improvement of air quality, and the promotion of more environmentally sustainable development would be encouraged through the development of alternative transportation methods, green design techniques for buildings and neighborhoods, and other energy reducing techniques.	<p><b>ER3-2 Green Development – Communities.</b> Encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system to guide the planning and development of all new communities.</p> <p><b>ER3-3 <del>Transportation Energy Transit and Community Facilities.</del></b> <u>Promote development that reduces the energy associated with getting people to and from buildings. Community facilities should be sited in areas accessible to public transportation. Require future development of community-wide serving facilities to be sited in transit-ready areas that can be served and made accessible by public transit. Conversely, plan future transit routes to serve existing facilities.</u></p> <p><b>ER3-4 Green Development – Public Buildings.</b> Require all new and <u>substantially</u> renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.</p> <p><b>CD2-7 Sustainability.</b> Collaborate with the development community to design and build neighborhoods, streetscapes, sites, outdoor spaces, landscaping, and buildings to reduce energy demand through solar orientation, maximum use of natural daylight, passive solar and natural ventilation, building form, mechanical and structural systems, building materials, and construction techniques.</p> <p><b>M4-4 Environmental Considerations.</b> Support efforts to reduce/eliminate the negative environmental impacts of goods movement.</p>



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-1  
Consistency with SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Goals**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Goal or Policy</b>
			Also, see policies listed for GV P1.4 that address alternative transit modes included in the Policy Plan.
<b>RTP G6</b>	Encourage land use and growth patterns that complement our transportation investments and improve the cost-effectiveness of expenditures.	<b>Consistent:</b> The mobility system of The Ontario Plan would be coordinated with the future land use patterns and buildout levels of Ontario.	<p><b>LU1-2 Sustainable Community Strategy.</b> We integrate state, regional, and local Sustainable Community/Smart Growth principles into the development and entitlement process.</p> <p><b>M3-3 Transit-Oriented Development.</b> Consider the provision of <u>Provide</u> development incentives for projects that promote transit use.</p> <p><b>M1-1 Roadway Design and Maintenance.</b> Require our roadways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be compatible with the streetscape and surrounding land uses</li> </ul> <p><b>E3-1 Fiscal Impact Disclosure.</b> Require requests for City Council action to disclose the full fiscal impacts, including direct and indirect costs.</p> <p><b>E3-10 Complete Comparative Context.</b> Require that our annual budget process provide the complete comparative context for proposed new and increased funding so decision makers can fully understand the trade-offs among budget choices.</p>

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-2, Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles, Page 5.10-14, Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning.** The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

<b>Table 5.10-2</b>			
<b>Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles</b>			
<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Ontario Plan Policy</b>
<b>Improve Mobility for All Residents</b>			
<b>GV P1.3</b>	Encourage transit-oriented development.	<b>Consistent:</b> The City would work with transit agencies to develop transit corridors in the City that emphasize transit-oriented development and reduce the need for additional vehicle trips.	<p><b>LU1-2 Sustainable Community Strategy.</b> We integrate state, regional, and local Sustainable Community/Smart Growth principles into the development and entitlement process.</p> <p><b>LU1-4 Mobility.</b> <del>Promote</del> <u>Require</u> development and urban design, <u>where appropriate</u>, that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.</p>
<b>GV P1.4</b>	Promote a variety of travel choices.	<b>Consistent:</b> Public transit networks will be maintained and expanded to meet the needs of all people living in the City. Transit corridors would be established and the development of an Intermodal Transit Corridor near LAONT is being encouraged to promote the use of a variety of travel options, including, but not limited to, the use of bicycle and pedestrian paths, buses (including bus rapid transit routes), light rail, and metrolink expansion. Ontario also supports the development of high speed rail in California.	<p><b>M2-1 Bikeway Plan.</b> Maintain our Multipurpose Trails and Bikeway Corridor Plan to create a comprehensive system of on-and off-street bikeways that connect residential areas, businesses, schools, parks, and other key destination points.</p> <p><b>M2-2 Bicycle System.</b> Provide off-street multipurpose trails and Class II bikeways as our primary paths of travel and use the Class III for connectivity in constrained circumstances.</p> <p><b>M2-3 Pedestrian Walkways.</b> Require walkways that promote safe and convenient travel between residential areas, businesses, schools, parks, recreation areas, and other key destination points.</p> <p><b>M2-4 Network Opportunities.</b> Explore opportunities to expand the pedestrian and bicycle networks. This includes consideration of utility easements, levees, drainage corridors, road rights-of-way, medians, and other potential options.</p> <p><b>M3-2 Transit Facilities at New Development.</b> Require new development to provide transit facilities,</p>



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-2  
Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Ontario Plan Policy</b>
			<p>such as bus shelters, <u>transit bays</u>, and turnouts, as necessary.</p> <p><b>M3-4 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridors.</b> Work with regional transit agencies to implement BRT service to target destinations and along corridors, as shown in the Transit Plan.</p> <p><b>M3-5 Light Rail.</b> Support extension of the Metro Rail Gold Line to Ontario, and will work to secure station locations adjacent to the Meredith site and at the proposed multimodal transit center.</p> <p><b>M3-6 Metrolink Expansion.</b> Advocate expansion of Metrolink service to include the Downtown and the multimodal transit center.</p> <p><b>M3-7 High Speed Rail.</b> Encourage the development of high-speed rail systems that would enhance regional mobility in southern California and serve the City of Ontario.</p> <p><b>M3-8 Feeder Systems.</b> Work with regional transit agencies to secure convenient feeder service from the Metrolink station and the proposed multimodal transit center to employment centers in Ontario.</p> <p><b>M3-9 Ontario Airport Metro Center Circulator.</b> Explore development of a convenient mobility system, including but not limited to a shuttle service, people mover, and shared car system, for the Ontario Airport Metro Center.</p> <p><b>M3-10 Multimodal Transit Center.</b> <del>Explore</del> <u>Intend to ensure the</u> development of a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes.</p>

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-2**

**Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Ontario Plan Policy</b>
<b>Foster Livability in All Communities</b>			
<b>GV P2.2</b>	Promote developments which provide a mix of uses.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Ontario has 11 mixed-use districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downtown District</li> <li>• Euclid and Francis District</li> <li>• Holt District</li> <li>• Meredith District</li> <li>• Hospitality District</li> <li>• Ontario Festival District</li> <li>• Guasti District</li> <li>• Ontario Center District</li> <li>• Ontario Mills District</li> <li>• NMC South District</li> <li>• NMC East District</li> </ul> <p>These all support a mix of residential, commercial, and employment uses in which people can live, work, and play.</p>	<p><b>LU1-6 Complete Community.</b> <del>Encourage</del> <u>Incorporate</u> a variety of land uses and building types <u>in our land use planning efforts</u> that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate in Ontario.</p>
<b>Enable Prosperity for All People</b>			
<b>GV P3.3</b>	Ensure environmental justice regardless of race, ethnicity or income class.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Various elements of The Ontario Plan, including the Housing and Land Use Elements provide policies to improve community prosperity by facilitating and encouraging balanced growth are minimizing adverse environmental impacts through the use of buffers and land use regulations to prevent the placement of hazardous operations near any area where people live or work. These practices would be used equitably across all neighborhoods despite race, ethnicity, or income.</p> <p>Areas in the City could potentially create environmental justice issues, such as placing high density housing near the I-10 freeway. However, The Ontario Plan provides numerous policy direction and guidance regarding noise reduction, safety and protection from hazards uses, or other types of mitigation to reduce the environmental impacts on these communities.</p>	<p><b>H1-3 Community Amenities.</b> We shall provide adequate public services, infrastructure, open space, parking and traffic management, pedestrian and bicycle routes, and public safety for neighborhoods consistent with City master plans and neighborhood plans.</p> <p><b>H2-6 Infill Development.</b> We support the revitalization of neighborhoods through the construction of higher-density residential developments on underutilized residential and commercial sites.</p> <p><b>H4-3 Rental Assistance.</b> We support the provision of rental assistance for individuals and families earning extremely low, very low, and low income with funding from the state and federal government.</p> <p><b>LU1-6 Complete Community.</b> We <del>encourage</del> <u>incorporate</u> a variety of land uses and building types <u>in our land use planning efforts</u> that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate in Ontario.</p> <p><b>LU2-1 Land Use Decisions.</b> We site land uses to minimize adverse impacts</p>



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-2  
Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Ontario Plan Policy</b>
			<p>between uses.</p> <p><b>LU2-2 Buffers.</b> We require new uses to provide mitigation or buffers between existing uses where potential adverse impacts could occur.</p> <p><b>LU2-3 Hazardous Uses.</b> We regulate the development of industrial and similar uses that use, store, produce, or transport toxic substances, air emissions, other pollutants, and hazardous materials.</p> <p><b>LU2-4 Regulation of Nuisances.</b> We regulate the location, concentration and operations of potential nuisances.</p> <p><b>LU2-5 Regulation of Uses.</b> We regulate the location, concentration, and operations of uses that have impacts on surrounding land uses.</p> <p><b>LU2-6 Infrastructure Compatibility.</b> We require infrastructure to be aesthetically pleasing and in context with the community.</p>
<b>Promote Sustainability for Future Generations</b>			
<b>GV P4.3</b>	Develop strategies to accommodate growth that use resources efficiently, eliminate pollution and significantly reduce waste.	<b>Consistent:</b> The City is aiming to improve its waste diversion to exceed AB 393 requirements. Recycling and the use of recycled products are encouraged at the home, for commercial and business sectors, and in industrial areas. Methods for reducing waste in Ontario include recycling of construction, consumer, green, and liquid waste and utilizing these waste products to generate renewable energy that reduces impacts on landfills and wastewater treatment facilities.	<p><b>ER2-1 Waste Diversion.</b> <del>Promote increasing our waste diversion rate to meet</del> or exceed AB 939 requirements.</p> <p><b>LU1-4 Mobility.</b> <del>Promote</del> <u>Require</u> development and urban design, <u>where appropriate</u>, that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.</p>
<b>GV P4.4</b>	Utilize “green” development techniques	<b>Consistent:</b> Green building construction would be used where viable to create green buildings and neighborhoods. All new and renovated City buildings over 10,000 square feet in size would be required to meet LEED Silver standards. Other forms of development that encourage a more green infrastructure would be the increased development of public transit, transit-oriented development, and the inclusion of	<p><b>ER3-2 Green Development – Communities.</b> Encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system, <u>or similar mechanism</u>, to guide the planning and development of all new communities.</p> <p><b>ER3-3 Transportation Energy Transit and Community Facilities.</b> <del>Promote development that reduces the energy associated with getting people to and</del></p>

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.10-2  
Consistency with Compass Blueprint Regional Growth Principles**

<b>Policy Number</b>	<b>SCAG Policy</b>	<b>Compliance with Policy</b>	<b>Sample Related Ontario Plan Policy</b>
		bikeways and pedestrian walkways, all being included in The Ontario Plan.	<p><del>from buildings. Community facilities should be sited in areas accessible to public transportation. Require future development of community-wide serving facilities to be sited in transit-ready areas that can be served and made accessible by public transit. Conversely, plan future transit routes to serve existing facilities.</del></p> <p><b>ER3-4 Green Development – Public Buildings.</b> Require all new and substantially renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.</p> <p><b>CD2-7 Sustainability.</b> Collaborate with the development community to design and build neighborhoods, streetscapes, sites, outdoor spaces, landscaping and buildings to reduce energy demand through solar orientation, maximum use of natural daylight, passive solar and natural ventilation, building form, mechanical and structural systems, building materials, and construction techniques.</p> <p>Also see the Policy Plan policies listed under SCAG policy GV P1.4 above.</p>



Page 5.10-22 and 5.10-23, Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*. The reference to the Airport Master Plan and has been updated to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response to Comment A15-10; airport safety regulations in response to Comment A15-27 and A15-29; and the airport projections provided by Iteris for LAONT in response to Comment A15-14 and A15-16, from the Los Angeles World Airports.

Airport operations and their accompanying noise and safety hazards require careful land use planning on adjacent lands to ensure the safety of residents and passengers, and to protect Ontario businesses and property owners from the potential hazards that could be created by airport operations. ~~Generally, airports have restrictions on land uses surrounding airports that control the density and intensity of buildings. The Federal Aviation Administration and Caltrans Division of Aeronautics provide guidance for land use safety near airport. With adherence to these restrictions guidelines,~~ high concentrations of people are not being exposed to potential airplane accidents along runways or near airports while airplanes are departing and arriving. There are also ~~restrictions guidelines~~ on the placement of housing, schools, and other sensitive land uses near airports because of the noise pollution caused by airplanes.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

#### LAONT

Arriving and departing flights out of LAONT fly over the eastern portion of Ontario. The Proposed Land Use Plan of The Ontario Plan would place residential, business park, and industrial land uses within the safety zone of the LAONT and Chino Airport, putting people working or living within the vicinity of the airport at risk if these developments do not meet standards and recommendations. Since LAONT is anticipated to accommodate up to ~~1.6~~ 2.5 million annual tons (MAT) of cargo and ~~25~~ 30 million annual passengers (MAP) by year ~~2020~~ 2035, this is could potentially place large numbers of people near a high activity airport (LAWA 2005 2004). ~~The land uses around LAONT would need to be consistent with the regulations of the Airport Master Land Use Plan (MLUP). Currently, the MLUP for LAONT has not yet been completed. The Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) has not yet developed an Airport Master Plan for operations. LAWA initiated work on an Airport Master Plan for LAONT in 2004 but put the project was put on hold in 2008. The City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics's California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. However, LAWA does not have the power to develop or enforce rules or restrictions on land uses surrounding the airport unless the property is owned by LAWA.~~ The Proposed Land Use Plan includes three overlays for the LAONT: a Restricted Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Area Overlay, a Clear Zone Overlay, and an Airport Influence Overlay. The Restricted FAR Area Overlay corresponds with the Clear Zone of LAONT and would restrict the maximum FAR to 0.25. The Clear Zone Overlay is at the end of the airport runway and would prohibit structures to ensure compatibility with the LAONT. Furthermore, the Airport Influence Overlay identifies the required notification/disclosure areas around the LAONT and Chino airports. Consequently, The Ontario Plan ensures compatibility with the LAONT.

#### Chino Airport

The ~~MLUP~~ Airport Master Plan for Chino Airport was implemented in 2003. The Ontario Plan would adopt an interim Chino Airport Overlay over the area influence by the Chino Airport. This area can be seen in Figure 5.8-1 in section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and extends northeast of the airport from Merrill Avenue to Edison Avenue. Generally, it includes most of the land area east of Grove Avenue and west of Archibald Avenue, south of Merrill Avenue...

---

**Page 5.10-27 through 5.10-34, Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

---

#### Land Use Element

##### Balance

- LU1-4 Mobility. We ~~require~~ promote development and urban design, where appropriate, that reduces reliance on the automobile and capitalizes on multimodal transportation opportunities.
- LU1-6 Complete Community. We incorporate ~~encourage~~ a variety of land uses and building types in our land use planning efforts that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.

...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

#### Environmental Resources Element

##### Air Quality

ER4-1 Land Use. We reduce support the reduction of GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance.

...

##### Mobility Element

##### Public Transit

M3-2 Transit Facilities at New Development. We require new development to provide transit facilities, such as bus shelters, transit bays and turnouts, as necessary.

M3-3 Transit-Oriented Development. We may provide additional ~~consider the provision of~~ development-related incentives to those inherent in the Land Use Plan for projects that promote transit use.

M3-10 Multimodal Transit Center. We intend to ensure the development of ~~will explore development of~~ a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes.

...

---

**Page 5.11-2, in Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, has been revised based on updated Mineral Resource Maps from the California Geologic Survey to delete the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector.**

---

~~There are two~~ is one areas in the City of Ontario that are is designated by the California Geological Survey as Resource Sectors containing construction aggregate of “regional significance” (SMARA 2006). ~~These are This is the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector and the Day Creek Fan, Mira Loma Area Resource Sector, which are is~~ shown on Figure 5.11-1.

---

**Page 5.11-5, in Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, has been revised based on updated Mineral Resource Maps from the California Geologic Survey to delete the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector.**

---

##### *Former Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector (Sectors D-14 and D-15)*

The former Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector within the City of Ontario have been removed from the MRZ-2 in the latest update to the California Geologic Survey P-C maps (CGS 2007). The Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector consisted of the urbanized portions of Deer and Day fans in the Claremont-Upland P-C Region. The Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector spans an area of 9,546 acres, comprising portions of the cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Fontana, and Ontario. Mineral Resource Sectors D-14 and D-15 in the City of Ontario constitute approximately 434 acres of the Deer and Day Fans Resource



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

~~Sector. Limited data indicate that sand and gravel resources may only extend from the surface to 30 or 40 feet below ground surface. Nonpermitted aggregate resources are estimated at 680 tons in the entire Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector.~~

~~Industrial parks and residential areas have already encroached into much of this Resource Sector. In fact, since the mineral land classification was conducted in 1987, Resource Sector D-15 has been developed with nonmineral land uses and is no longer available for mineral extraction. Only Resource Sector D-14, spanning approximately 268 acres, remains vacant. However, urban development surrounds this Resource Sector on all sides and resource extraction may not be feasible due to the proximity of the neighboring residences.~~

---

**Page 5.11-6, in Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, has been revised based on updated Mineral Resource Maps from the California Geologic Survey to delete the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector.**

---

Prior to permitting a use that would threaten the potential to extract minerals in a MRZ-2, the City of Ontario is required under SMARA to prepare a statement specifying its reasons for permitting the proposed use, and consider the importance of these minerals to their market region as a whole and not just their importance to the City. The ~~two~~ MRZ-2 areas in the City ~~have that has~~ been designated by the California Geological Survey as containing construction aggregate of regional significance: ~~the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector of the Claremont Upland P-C Region; and is~~ the Day Creek Fan, Mira Loma Area Resource Sector in the San Bernardino P-C Region. ~~Mineral Resource Sectors D-14 and D-15, part of the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector, total approximately 434 acres in area and are in the City adjacent to the northern boundary. Nonpermitted aggregate resources are estimated at 680 tons in the entire Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector. Resource Sector D-15 has been developed and is not available for mineral extraction. Resource Sector D-14, approximately 268 acres, remains vacant; however, it is entirely surrounded by residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The use of Resource Sector D-14 for mineral extraction is likely to be infeasible because of adjacent residential uses. The proposed Ontario Plan would include a Mixed Use land use designation for Resource Sector D-14, which is currently vacant. The City of Ontario, under Ontario Plan Policy ER5-4, would prohibit future mining operations where such operations are incompatible with existing or proposed adjacent land uses. Policy ER5-4 is not expected to substantially limit the availability of mineral resources for extraction, as existing Mineral Resource Sectors in the City have either been developed or are bounded by land uses incompatible with mining. Consequently, impacts are less than significant.~~

---

**Figure 5.11-1, *Mineral Resource Zones*, Section 5.11, *Mineral Resources*, has been revised based on updated Mineral Resource Maps from the California Geologic Survey.**

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 5.11-1, *Mineral Resource Zones*

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

**Page 5.12-10, Section 5.12, Noise, has been revised to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response to Comments A15-12, the airport projections provided by Iteris for LAONT in response to A15-14 and A15-17, and revisions to the contribution of airport noise in response to Comment A15-25, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

The airport contributes a large majority of to the ambient noise environment of the City. LAONT is centrally located in the City, and few areas in the northern portion of the City are unaffected by noise generated by the airport or aircraft overflights. The airport is a medium-hub, full-service airport. Traffic at the airport includes general aviation, commercial passenger aviation, and air cargo freight movement. LAONT is a member of the Los Angeles World Airport (LAWA) system. The airport is anticipated to accommodate up to ~~1.6~~ 2.5 million tons of cargo and 30 million annual passengers by year 2035~~0~~ (SCAG 2004a and LAWA 2004~~5~~). LAWA is currently developing a initiated work on an Airport Master Land Use Plan for LAONT in 2004 that ~~will~~ would have provided a framework for the airport's development and use through the year 2030. However, this project was put on hold in 2008. The City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the California Department of Transportations (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics's *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*.

Figure 5.12-3, *Airport Noise Contours*, shows the noise contour map for LAONT, which describes average annual noise levels generated by the airport in terms of dBA CNEL through 20320...

---

**Pages 5.12-26, Section 5.12, Noise, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---



Industrial noise is less intermittent and can have moderate to high levels on a continual basis. The Ontario Plan proposes ~~159,998,711~~ 159,866,942 square feet of industrial land uses at buildout...

---

**Page 5.12-36, Section 5.12, Noise, has been revised to delete the reference to year 2030 for the noise contours in response to Comment A15-14, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

As shown in Figure 5.12-3, by 2030 noise-sensitive land uses would be located within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of LAONT. Residents and other sensitive receptors in the noise contour would be exposed to excessive noise levels from airport operations. Consequently, indoor and exterior noise environments would be exposed to elevated noise levels from aircraft overflights. Impacts would be significant.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Page 5.12-37, in Section 5.12, *Noise*, has been revised based on a minor technical correction that references the incorrect Impact number.

---

**IMPACT 5.4412-6: 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. [THRESHOLD N-5 AND N-6]**

---

Page 5.12-38 through 5.10-39, Section 5.12, *Noise*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

---

#### Mobility Element

##### Goods Movement

M4-2 Regional Participation. We work with regional and subregional transportation agencies to regarding planning and implementation of regional goods movement strategies, including those that improve mobility, deliver goods efficiently and minimize negative environmental impacts.

...

Pages 5.12-26, Section 5.12, *Noise*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.

---

Industrial noise is less intermittent and can have moderate to high levels on a continual basis. The Ontario Plan proposes ~~159,998,711~~ 159,866,942 square feet of industrial land uses at buildout...

---

Pages 5.13-13 through 5.13-14, Section 5.13, *Population and Housing*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.

---

Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in a total buildout potential of ~~535~~ 544 rural, ~~32,766~~ 32,779 low density, ~~6,807~~ 6,915 low-medium density, ~~39,179~~ 39,184 medium density, and ~~8,334~~ 8,421 high density residential units in the City, in addition to ~~17,023~~ 17,039 mixed-use units, for a total of 104,644 residential units (see Table 3-4). Consequently, The Ontario Plan accommodates a total of ~~360,851~~ 361,716 people. According to DOF, in 2008, the population of the City of Ontario was approximately 173,690. Buildout in accordance with The Ontario Plan would therefore result in a population increase of ~~187,161~~ 188,026 people, an approximate increase of 108 percent, or a 4.9 percent annual population increase. As a result, the anticipated growth rate from The Ontario Plan

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

buildout would be the highest historical rate of population increase for the City (see Table 5.13-1). The Proposed Land Use Plan also provides for a total of ~~1,568~~ 1,503 acres of Retail/Service (Neighborhood General, General Commercial, Office/Commercial, Hospitality, and Administrative/Professional Commercial) and ~~7,948~~ 7,934 acres of employment uses (Business Park and Industrial). The land use plan could generate approximately ~~325,794~~ 324,520 employment opportunities in the City.

#### City of Ontario Jobs/Housing Ratio

... In comparison, the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in a population increase of approximately ~~189,900~~ 190,765, or ~~112~~ 111 percent from 2005 to 2035. This equates to an average increase in population of 3.7 percent per year.

**Table 5.13-12**  
**Comparison of SCAG 2035 and The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections**

	SCAG Projections for City of Ontario		The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections
	2005	2035	2035
Population	170,951	337,095	<del>360,851</del> 361,716
Employment	107,790	187,671	<del>325,794</del> 324,520
Households	44,518	91,936	<del>104,644</del> 104,882
Jobs/Housing Ratio	2.42	2.04	<del>3.11</del> 3.09

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035

The number of jobs projected at buildout of The Ontario Plan would also be higher than SCAG's projections for year 2035. The Proposed Land Use Plan would create ~~325,794~~ 324,520 jobs as compared to SCAG's 174,924 jobs. As a result, the City's jobs/housing ratio with buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would be substantially higher at buildout (~~3.11~~ 3.09) than projected by SCAG for the year 2035 (2.04). Therefore, buildout of The Ontario Plan would result both population and employment growth that has not been forecast by SCAG.

**Pages 5.13-14, Section 5.13, *Population and Housing*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

Table 5.13-13 compares population, household, and employment projections for the City of Ontario to SCAG's 2008 RTP projections for the City and the SANBAG subregion in 2035. Buildout under The Ontario Plan would increase SCAG projections for the City by ~~23,756~~ 24,621 people, ~~138,123~~ 136,849 employees, and ~~12,708~~ 12,946 households...



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 5.13-13  
Comparison of SCAG 2035 and The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections  
for City of Ontario and SANBAG Subregion**

	<b>SCAG Projections for City of Ontario</b>	<b>The Ontario Plan Buildout Projections</b>	<b>Difference Between SCAG and Ontario Plan</b>	<b>SCAG Projections for SANBAG Subregion</b>	<b>SANBAG Plus Difference</b>
Population	337,095	<del>360,851</del> 361,716	<del>23,756</del> 24,621	3,133,801	<del>3,157,557</del> 3,158,422
Employment	187,671	<del>325,794</del> 324,520	<del>138,123</del> 136,849	1,254,749	<del>1,392,872</del> 1,391,598
Households	91,936	<del>104,644</del> 104,882	<del>12,708</del> 12,946	972,561	<del>985,269</del> 985,507
Jobs/Housing Ratio	2.04	<del>3.11</del> 3.09	-	1.29	1.41

Source: SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast 2035

**Page 5.13-16 through 5.13-19, Section 5.13, Population and Housing. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

#### **Environmental Resources Element**

##### **Air Quality**

ER4-1 Land Use. We reduce support the reduction of GHG and other local pollutant emissions through compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development and development that improves the regional jobs/housing balance...

##### **Balance**

LU1-6 Complete Community. We incorporate ~~encourage~~ a variety of land uses and building types in our land use planning efforts that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario.

...

**Page 5.14-5, 5.14-9, 5.14-18, and 5.14-24 Section 5.14, Public Services. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

#### **Land Use Element**

##### **Balance Policies**

LU1-6 Complete Community. We incorporate ~~encourage~~ a variety of land uses and building types in our land use planning efforts that result in a complete community where residents at all stages of life, employers, workers, and visitors have a wide spectrum of choices of where they can live, work, shop, and recreate within Ontario...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

**Pages 5.14-8, Section 5.14, *Public Services*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

Future growth in accordance with The Ontario Plan is expected to increase demand for police services within the City of Ontario, particularly in the NMC. The projected 2020 population of 208,000, which would require 291 officers. The 2035 population projection for the City upon buildout of The Ontario Plan would be ~~360,851~~ 361,716 people, based on the land use types and densities of the Proposed Land Use Plan (see Table 5.9-3 in Section 5.9, *Land Use and Planning*). Assuming 1.4 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, a population of ~~360,851~~ 361,716 would require ~~5065~~ 5065 sworn officers. This is ~~2154~~ 2154 more officers than needed by a population of 208,000. As a result, additional police equipment, facilities, and personnel would be required to provide adequate response times, acceptable public service ratios, and other performance objectives for law enforcement services.

---

**Page 5.14-15 through 5.14-16, Section 5.14.3.3, *School Services*, in Section 5.14, *Public Services*. The following text has been revised to reflect updated information in response to Comment A10-5, from the Chino Valley Unified School District, and minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

**Impact Analysis:** Each district that serves the City of Ontario assesses its needs individually based on student generation factors from residential development, and charges developers accordingly. Based on ~~2006-2007~~ 2007-2008 data for the entire service area, CJUHSD has 11 schools and ~~25,113~~ 25,108 students, CVUSD has 35 schools and ~~47,715~~ 33,047 students, CSD has 4 schools and 2,836 students, MVSD has four schools and 2,976 students, and OMSD has 33 schools and ~~23,309~~ 23,307 students (Education Data Partnership 2009). The schools within the City of Ontario, including private schools, had a combined student enrollment of 37,798 students for the 2007–2008 school year. Buildout of The Ontario Plan would involve the construction of ~~104,644~~ 104,882 new residential units.



**Pages 5.14-17, Section 5.14, *Public Services*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

Future student generation in Ontario is based on the buildout potential of the Proposed Land Use Plan: ~~33,301~~ 33,323 single-family detached units (rural and low density), ~~45,986~~ 46,099 single-family attached residential units (low-medium and medium density), and ~~25,357~~ 25,460 multifamily units (high density). Based on the student generation rates above, future student population in Ontario at buildout would range from approximately ~~41,910~~ 41,980 students<sup>2</sup> to ~~73,144~~ 73,289 students.<sup>3</sup> Student population in

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on elementary school student generation rates from CUSD, middle school student generation rates from CVUSD, and high school student generation rates from CJUSD.

<sup>3</sup> Based on elementary school student generation rates from MVSD, middle school student generation rates from MVSD, and high school student generation rates from CVUSD.

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Ontario would increase at most by ~~35,346~~ 25,491 students over the 2007–2008 enrollment of 37,798 students.

---

**Pages 5.14-20, Section 5.14, *Public Services*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

...The anticipated population of Ontario at approximate buildout year ~~2025~~ 2035 would be ~~360,851~~ 361,716 and the total square footage of existing and proposed library services would be 116,409-square feet, which equals 0.32 square foot of library space per capita.

---

**Figure 5.14-2, *Ontario School Districts*, in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, has been revised based on a minor revision to the Chaffey Joint Union High School District Boundaries.**

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 5.14-2, *Ontario School Districts*

---

**Pages 5.15-11, Section 5.15, *Recreation*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

... Under this Act, and pursuant to the City's Code, residential subdivisions must dedicate parkland or pay in-lieu fees to enable the City to acquire a ratio of three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents (Municipal Code Section 9-2.1515). Based on this ratio and a projected buildout population for The Ontario Plan of ~~360,851~~ 361,716, a total of ~~1,083~~ 1,085 acres of parkland would be required at buildout. A proposed policy included in The Ontario Plan would increase this requirement to five acres per 1,000 residents (PR1-5). Based on this updated policy, buildout of The Ontario Plan would result in a need for approximately ~~1,804~~ 1,809 acres of parkland at buildout. However, this standard would apply to new development only. Since the City of Ontario is anticipated to grow by approximately ~~187,161~~ 188,026 people, new development would result in a demand for ~~936~~ 940 acres, for a total demand of ~~1,457~~ 1,461 acres.

---

**Pages 5.15-12, Section 5.15, *Recreation*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

Based on The Ontario Plan future buildout projections, the ~~1,0048~~ acres designated for Open Space falls short of the City's existing Park Dedications and In-Lieu Fee Regulations for parkland acquisition by ~~75~~

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

81 acres, and ~~449-457~~ acres short of the proposed standard for new development. However, there are 180 acres...

---

**Pages 5.15-12, Section 5.15, *Recreation*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR.**

---

The Ontario Plan guides growth in development within the City and is not a development project. The Ontario Plan includes expansion of the equestrian and hiking trails, and improved bikeways throughout the City. The City has 592 acres of parkland, and buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan would provide 1,004~~8~~ acres. Including the Great Park in the NMC, The Ontario Plan would result in an additional ~~416~~ 412 acres of park facilities...

---

**Figure 5.15-1, *Existing and Proposed Park Facility*, Section 5.15, *Recreation*, has been revised based on an update to park facilities in the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 5.15-1, *Existing and Proposed Park Facilities*
- 

**Pages 5.16-22, Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan. The change to the Proposed Land Use Plan would increase housing units by 238 dwelling units, increase population by 865 people, and decrease employment in the City by 1,274 employees as analyzed in the Draft EIR. As the increase in population is offset by the decrease in population, the changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan would result in impacts similar to or less than that described in the Draft EIR. A memorandum prepared by Kimely-Horn Associates regarding traffic is included as Appendix D to this Final EIR.**

---

**Impact Analysis:** A total of ~~404,644~~ 104,882 dwelling units (both single and multifamily housing) and ~~257,405,754~~ 256,594,928 square feet of nonresidential uses (commercial, industrial, and office uses) are projected for buildout of the Proposed Land Use Plan. This would be an increase of ~~58,364~~ 58,602 residential units and ~~478,845,743~~ 178,004,917 square feet on nonresidential uses over existing conditions and ~~26,052~~ 26,290 residential units and ~~44,057,777~~ 13,246,951 square feet of nonresidential uses over the current General Plan buildout. Overall, the Proposed Land Use Plan is projected to generate 3,053,263 daily trips City-wide, an increase of 13 percent over the current General Plan (2,702,272 daily trips City-wide) and 142 percent increase over existing conditions (1,263,405 daily trips City-wide). The following is the analysis of the impact of the Proposed Land Use Plan on intersection LOS.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

**Page 5.16-36, Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, has been revised to reflect the current status of LAONT's Airport Master Plan in response to Comments A15-13 and the airport projections provided by Iteris for LAONT in response to A15-14, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

The LAONT is anticipated to accommodate up to ~~4-6~~ 2.5 million tons of cargo and 30 million annual passengers by year 2035~~0~~ (~~SCAG 2004a and LAWA 20045~~). As described in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, LAONT ~~is currently drafting a Master Land Use Plan (MLUP) for the airport-initiated work on an Airport Master Plan in 2004 that would have provided a framework for the airport's development through year 2035. However, this project was put on hold in 2008. The City of Ontario is preparing an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for LAONT in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics's *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The MLUP is expected to be adopted mid-2009. It will designate development goals and work with the policies and objectives of The Ontario Plan. The Land Use Element of The Ontario Plan states that all new development surrounding LAONT and the Chino Airport should be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan for each airport and should meet standards and recommendations of Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations, adopted through Ordinance 2758 in the Ontario Municipal Code...~~

---

**Page 5.16-43 through 5.16-47, Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

---

#### **Mobility Element**

##### **Public Transit**

- M3-2 Transit Facilities at New Development. We require new development to provide transit facilities, such as bus shelters, transit bays and turnouts, as necessary.
- M3-3 Transit-Oriented Development. We may provide additional ~~consider the provision of~~ development-related incentives to those inherent in the Land Use Plan for projects that promote transit use.
- M3-10 Multimodal Transit Center. We intend to ensure the development of ~~will explore development of~~ a multimodal transit center near LAONT to serve as a transit hub for local buses, BRT, the Gold Line, high-speed rail, the proposed Ontario Airport Metro Center circulator, and other future transit modes.

##### **Goods Movement**

- M4-2 Regional Participation. We work with regional and subregional transportation agencies to ~~regarding planning and implementation of regional goods movement strategies, including those that improve mobility, deliver goods efficiently and minimize negative environmental impacts.~~

...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

Mitigation Measure 16-1, Page 5.16-46, in Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic*, has been revised based on a minor technical clarification.

---

#### Impact 5.16-1

16-1 The Mobility Element of the Ontario Plan shall be consistent with the traffic study prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates in 2009. Table 5.16-6 shows the recommended lane geometry for the Proposed Land Use Plan.

---

Figure 5.16-1, *Existing Truck Routes*, and Figure 5.16-10, *Proposed Truck Routes*, Section 5.16, *Transportation and Traffic* have been revised to remove the arrow indicating the local truck route on Philadelphia in the City of Ontario in response to Comment A5-2, from the City of Fontana.

---

See Appendix E, *Revised Figures*:

- Figure 5.16-1, *Existing Truck Routes*
  - Figure 5.16-10, *Proposed Truck Routes*
- 

Page 5.17-18 through 5.17-19, Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.

---

#### Environmental Resources Element

##### Water and Wastewater

ER1-2 Matching Supply to Use. We support matching water supply and quality to the appropriate use.

...

---

Page 5.17-20, Section 5.17.1, *Water Supply and Distribution Systems*, in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*. Mitigation Measure 17-1 has been revised in response to Comment A11-6, from the Inland Empires Utilities Agency.

---

17-1 The City shall include a policy in the Policy Plan that requires water conservation measures for development projects to improve water use efficiency and reduce overall water demand. Reduce potable water demand, through conservation measures, including but not limited to:

- 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 drought contingency plans to assist citizens and businesses reduce water use during water shortages and emergencies.



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

- 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~~AB 1881.

---

**Pages 5.17-23, Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

As shown in the buildout projections for The Ontario Plan, there is an anticipated residential buildout of ~~104,644~~ 104,882 dwelling units and a total of ~~257,405,754~~ 256,594,928 square feet of nonresidential development...

---

**Pages 5.17-29 through 5.17-30, Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

**Impact Analysis:** Increases in population in the City of Ontario would result in increases in solid waste disposal needs. Upon buildout of the Ontario Plan, the City's maximum population could reach ~~360,186~~ 361,716, as determined by the projected population of the Proposed Land Use Plan...

As a result, buildout of the Ontario Plan would result in the generation of ~~2,011~~ 2,017 tons per day of solid waste in the City (see Table 5.17-4). This would be ~~1,003~~ 1,003 more tons per day (~~368,488~~ 366,451 more tons per year) of solid waste than in 2007. To reduce waste disposal, AB 939 requires every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000...

**Table 5.17-4  
Household and Business Waste Disposal Rates**

<b>Source</b>	<b>2007 Waste Stream (tons/year)</b>	<b>Generation Rate</b>	<b>General Plan Population Projections<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Buildout Waste Stream (tons/year)</b>
Household	66,590	0.37 tons/resident/year	<del>360,851</del> <u>361,716</u>	<del>133,515</del> <u>133,835</u>
Business	210,868	1.85 tons/employee/year <sup>2</sup>	<del>325,794</del> <u>324,520</u>	<del>602,719</del> <u>600,362</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>367,466</b> <b>(1,008 tons/day)</b>	NA	NA	<b>736,234</b> <u><b>734,197</b></u> <b>(2,017</b> <u><b>2,011</b></u> tons/day)

Source: CIWMB 2005

<sup>1</sup> The Ontario Plan future buildout projections

<sup>2</sup> Based on SCAG employment estimates for Ontario for 2007 (113,982 employees).

---

**Page 5.17-31, Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

---

#### **Environmental Resources Element**

##### **Solid Waste and Recycling**

- ER2-1 Waste Diversion. We ~~shall promote increasing our waste diversion rate to meet or exceed AB 939 requirements...~~

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

**Page 5.17-33 through 5.17-34, Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*. The following select policies have been revised based on changes to the Policy Plan.**

---

#### **Environmental Resources Element**

##### ***Energy***

- ER3-1 Conservation Strategy. We require ~~promote~~ conservation as the first strategy to be employed to meet applicable energy-saving standards.
- ER3-2 Green Development – Communities. We encourage the use of the LEED Neighborhood Development rating system, or similar mechanism, to guide the planning and development of all new communities.
- ER3-4 Green Development – Public Buildings. We require all new and substantially renovated City buildings in excess of 10,000 square feet to achieve a LEED Silver Certification standard, as determined by the US Green Building Council.
- 

**Page 7-4, Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*, has been revised to reflect that LAWA does not have the power to develop or enforce rules or restrictions on land uses surrounding the airport unless the property is owned by LAWA in response to A15-27 and A15-31, from the Los Angeles World Airports.**

---

... While this alternative would be consistent with the objectives of The Ontario Plan, residential land use intensities around I-10 and in Downtown Ontario are capped by limitations of the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics's *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* and the Federal Aviation Administration. As a result of safety and noise concerns from aircraft operations, the ~~airport~~ City would restricts land uses around the airport. The ~~airport~~ City would also restricts the types of uses and building height surrounding the airport in order to ensure adequate air space for landings and takeoffs...

---

**Pages 7-5, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---



### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**Table 7-1  
Buildout Statistical Summary**

	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative Land Use Plan</i>	<i>Reduced Intensity Alternative</i>
Dwelling Units	<del>104,644</del> 104,882	78,592	104,644	83,715
Population	<del>360,851</del> 361,716	296,992	360,851	288,681
Square Feet (nonoffice)	<del>189,006,296</del> 188,502,611	187,036,465	151,205,037	151,205,037
Square Feet (office)	<del>68,399,458</del> 68,092,317	56,311,511	54,719,566	54,719,566
Employment	<del>325,794</del> 324,520	292,641	260,635	260,635
Jobs/Housing Ratio	<del>3.11</del> 3.09	3.72	2.49	3.11

Sources: Buildout statistics for The Ontario Plan (2009); The Ontario General Plan (1992); The Ontario General Plan Amendment (1999).

**Pages 7-9, Chapter 7, Alternatives, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

Since designated Open Space areas remain the same (2,339 acres in the existing General Plan and ~~2,308.9~~ 2,306.3 acres in the Proposed Land Use Plan), depletion of groundwater and percolation of pollutants into groundwater aquifers would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

**Pages 7-9, 7-16 and 7-22, Chapter 7, Alternatives, has been revised based on updated Mineral Resource Maps from the California Geologic Survey to delete the Deer and Day Fans Resource Sector.**

~~There are two is one~~ areas in the City of Ontario designated Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2), where significant mineral resources are known or likely. ~~One of these areas is in the northwestern and northern portion of the City, and the second is along the eastern City boundary; these two areas total approximately 6,132 acres, that is, 19 percent of the area of the City.~~ The remainder of the City is designated MRZ-3, where the significance of mineral deposits is unknown...

**Pages 7-10, Chapter 7, Alternatives, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

...As a result, because there would be fewer residential uses under the No Project alternative compared to the Proposed Land Use Plan, demands for fire, police, and library services would be reduced. In addition, there would be ~~26,052~~ 26,290 fewer units under this alternative. Impacts to school services would be less than significant through the application of SB 50 fees on project applicants...

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

---

---

**Pages 7-11, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

Under the No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, the City would continue to function under the direction of the General Plan. As shown on Table 7-1, buildout under the General Plan would result in ~~33,153~~ 31,879 fewer jobs, ~~63,859~~ 64,724 fewer residents, and ~~26,052~~ 26,290 fewer dwelling units than under The Ontario Plan...

---

**Pages 7-12, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

The Alternative Land Use Plan would reduce the nonresidential land use square footage allowed by The Ontario Plan by 20 percent. The number of residential units would be ~~the same as~~ similar to that proposed in The Ontario Plan (~~104,644~~104,882 units), as would the amount of acreage in the City planned for development. With the amount of commercial and office square footage reduced in comparison to the amount of housing, the jobs/housing ratio would be expected to improve from ~~3.11~~ 3.09 to 2.49 upon buildout of the City. Nonoffice square footage (including nonoffice mixed use, commercial, and industrial) would be reduced from ~~189,006,296~~ 188,502,611 to 151,205,037 square feet. Office square footage would be reduced from ~~68,399,458~~ 68,092,317 to 54,719,566 square feet. The total number of jobs associated with Alternative Land Use Plan would be 260,635, which is 20 percent less than the ~~325,794~~ 324,520 associated with the land use plan included in The Ontario Plan.

---

**Pages 7-17, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

...Under this alternative, the jobs/housing balance in the City at buildout would improve from ~~3.11~~ 3.09 to 2.49...

---

**Pages 7-18, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

Under the Alternative Land Use Plan, nonresidential development intensity would be reduced by 20 percent, although the buildout population would remain the same. As shown on Table 7-1, buildout under the Alternative Land Use Plan would result in ~~65,159~~ 63,885 fewer jobs than buildout conditions under The Ontario Plan...

---

**Pages 7-23, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 20 percent. As shown on Table 7-1, buildout under the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in ~~65,159~~ 63,885 fewer jobs and ~~20,929~~ 21,167 fewer housing units than buildout conditions under The Ontario Plan. Under this alternative, the jobs/housing balance in the City at buildout would ~~stay the same,~~ at be 3.11, slightly more than ~~as~~ under The Ontario Plan...

---



### *3. Revisions to the Draft EIR*

---

---

**Pages 7-23, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 20 percent and ~~20,929~~ 21,167 fewer housing units would be built...

---

**Pages 7-24, Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, has been updated based on minor changes to the Proposed Land Use Plan.**

---

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 20 percent. As shown on Table 7-1, buildout under the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in ~~65,159~~ 63,885 fewer jobs and ~~20,929~~ 21,167 fewer housing units than buildout conditions under The Ontario Plan...

Mitigation Measure 16-1, Table 1-2, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation*, Page 1-19, Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, has been revised for the intersection of Etiwanda Avenue and Airport Drive in response to Comment A5-5, from the City of Fontana; and for the intersection of Edison Avenue and Euclid Avenue in response to Comment A9-12.

**Table 5.16-6  
Lane Geometry at Study Intersections with Recommended Improvements**

Intersection	N-S Street	E-W Street	Enhanced	Northbound Approach					Southbound Approach					Eastbound Approach					Westbound Approach				
				L	L+T	T	T+R	R	L	L+T	T	T+R	R	L	L+T	T	T+R	R	L	L+T	T	T+R	R
Etiwanda Ave. and Airport Dr.	Etiwanda Ave.	Airport Dr.	Y	<u>1</u> 2	0	3	0	1	<u>1</u> 2	0	<u>3</u> 2	0	1	2	0	<u>1</u> 2	1	<u>0</u> 1	<u>1</u> 2	0	<u>2</u> 1	0	2
Edison Ave. and Euclid Ave.	Euclid Ave.	Edison Ave.	Y	1	0	3	1	0	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	<u>3</u> 2	1	0	1	0	3	<u>1</u> 0	1

Table 1-2, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance after Mitigation*, Page 1-19, Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, has been revised to reflect the correct table reference in response to A15-21 for Impact 5.16-1, from the Los Angeles World Airports, and minor technical corrections to the Draft EIR.

**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
<b>5.3 AIR QUALITY</b>			
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 <sub>x</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , and PM <sub>2.5</sub> ; cumulatively contribute to the SoCAB nonattainment designations for O <sub>3</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , and PM <sub>2.5</sub> ; 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"> <li>Require fugitive dust control measures that exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 403, such as:</li> <li>Requiring use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.</li> <li>Applying water every four hours to active soil disturbing activities.</li> <li>Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.</li> </ul>	Significant and unavoidable

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**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>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 or higher exhaust emission limits.</li> <li>Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.</li> <li>Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.</li> <li>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: <a href="http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf">http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf</a>.</li> </ul>	
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
<b>5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
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 <u>plan or</u> development approvals.	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>
5.5-2: Buildout of The Ontario Plan could impact archaeological resources or paleontological resources.	Potentially significant	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Archaeologists and/or paleontologist shall be retained for the project that will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.</li> <li>b) Should any cultural/scientific resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director or designee is satisfied that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>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 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 a 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</p>	Less than significant

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**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
		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.	
<b>5.6 GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
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	<p>6-1 The City of Ontario shall prepare a Climate Action Plan within <del>one year</del> <u>18 months</u> after adopting The Ontario Plan. The Climate Action Plan shall include an updated inventory of greenhouse gas emission sources, <u>including those from Municipal Government Operations and the community as a whole</u>, and a <u>quantification quantifiable of the City's greenhouse gas emissions reduction</u> target. Local measures to reduce <u>Municipal Government Operations</u> 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. <del>and shall include discretionary approvals and a mechanism for revision in order to be consistent with the Communities Strategy once adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments.</del> The Climate Action Plan shall quantify the approximate greenhouse gas emissions reductions of each measure and measures shall be enforceable. <u>The City shall monitor progress toward the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal and prepare reports every five years that detail the City's progress. Measures listed below shall be considered for all new development in between the time of adoption of The Ontario Plan and adoption of the Climate Action Plan.</u> Local measures considered in the Climate Action Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. <u>(Municipal Government Operations Strategy)</u></li> <li>• Require all municipal fleet purchases to be fuel efficient vehicles for their intended use based on the fuel type, design, size, and cost efficiency. <u>(Municipal Government Operations Strategy)</u></li> <li>• Require that new development projects in Ontario that require demolition prepare a demolition plan to reduce waste by recycling and/or salvaging a</li> </ul>	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>nonhazardous construction and demolition debris. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require that new developments design 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. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Require that cool roofs for non-residential development and cool pavement to be incorporated into the site/building design for new development where appropriate. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Evaluate the feasibility of implementing a Public Transit Fee to support Omnitrans in developing additional transit service in the City. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Require diesel emission reduction strategies to eliminate and/or reduce idling at truck stops, warehouses, and distribution facilities throughout the City. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Install energy efficient lighting (<del>compact fluorescent and/or light emitting diode (LED) light bulbs</del>) and lighting control systems in all municipal buildings. (<u>Municipal Government Operations Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Require all new traffic lights installed be LEDs energy efficient traffic signals. (<u>Municipal Government Operations Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• 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. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed within the City to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use and require use of bubbler irrigation; low-angle, low-flow spray heads; or moisture sensors. (<u>Community-Wide Strategy</u>)</li> <li>• Conduct energy efficiency audits of existing municipal buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, lighting, water heating equipment, insulation, and weatherization. (<u>Municipal Government Operations Strategy</u>).</li> </ul>	

### 3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

**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>
		6-2 Pursuant to a goal of overall consistency with the Sustainable Communities Strategies, the City of Ontario shall evaluate new development with the development pattern set forth in the Sustainable Communities Strategies plan, upon adoption of the plan by the Southern California Association of Governments.  6-3 The City of Ontario shall participate in the County of San Bernardino's Green Valley Initiative.	
<b>5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
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
<b>5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>			
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 in 2009. Table 5.16-65 shows the recommended lane geometry for the Proposed Land Use Plan.	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>
<b>5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>			
<p>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.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Work cooperatively with all developers to incorporate conservation measures into project designs (such as those recommended by the California Urban Water Conservation Council).</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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 <del>AB 325</del> <u>1881</u>.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

### *3. Revisions to the Draft EIR*

---

*This page intentionally left blank.*