

3. *Additional Project Alternative*

3.1 **15 PERCENT GHG REDUCTION ALTERNATIVE**

The City of Ontario has evaluated an additional alternative that reduces the intensity of land uses in order to reduce GHG emissions by 15 percent from existing conditions. The City’s existing GHG emission inventory is calculated at 5.1 million metric tons (MMTons) of GHG emissions. A 15 percent reduction from existing GHG emissions levels in the City of Ontario would be 0.8 MMTons, resulting in a GHG emissions target of 4.3 MMTons. Table 3-1 shows the GHG reduction targets based on the City’s 2006 GHG emissions inventory.

Table 3-1		
GHG Emissions Inventory – 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative		
<i>CO₂ Emissions MMTons/Year¹</i>		
Existing Land Uses in 2006	15% From Existing 2006	15% GHG Reduction Target
5.1 MMTons	0.8 MMTons	4.3 MMTons

Notes: MMTons: million metric tons

In year 2006, the City had 46,351 residential units (DOF 2008), 170,743 people (DOF 2008), and employment of 78,600 people (CEDD 2008). GHG emissions reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan would reduce GHG emissions associated with existing development in the City by 38 percent (see Appendix A). Consequently, development in the City could occur without preventing the City from reaching the GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent from existing levels. However, The Ontario Plan would allow for a maximum development intensity of 104,644 units and 257.4 million square feet of nonresidential development, resulting in a population of 361,716 (111 percent over existing) and employment of 325,794 people (313 percent over existing). To achieve the GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent from existing, an additional 3.3 MMTons of GHG emissions would need to be reduced from the City’s GHG emissions inventory. This represents a reduction of approximately 44 percent from the GHG emissions projected at post-2035 buildout of The Ontario Plan, and this reduction is in addition to the emissions reductions already assumed through energy efficiency, green building, increased fuel efficiency, increase in use of renewable energy, and decrease in water use (see Appendix A). Based on the 44 percent reduction in GHG emissions, it is estimated that the City of Ontario could allow 12,740 additional dwelling units and 66.8 million square feet of additional nonresidential development before GHG emissions from the new land uses would generate an increase in GHG emissions that outweighs the GHG emissions reductions achieved through the measures outlined in the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Scoping Plan.

Consequently, this alternative would reduce total dwelling units at buildout by 45,553 and reduce nonresidential development by 112 million square feet compared to The Ontario Plan. To accommodate this substantial decrease in land use intensity, it is estimated that the majority of land within the New Model Colony (NMC) would remain in agriculture use. This alternative would reduce agricultural, air quality, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities, as compared to the proposed project. The remaining impacts are generally the same as the proposed project. This alternative would not achieve most of the project objectives, because it would contribute less housing and employment to the region. Although the Reduced Density Alternative does not fully achieve all of the City’s objectives established for the proposed project, it would reduce many environmental impacts.



3. Additional Project Alternative

3.1.1 Aesthetics

The types of impacts associated with degradation of scenic vistas, decreased visual quality, obstruction/alteration of scenic resources within a state- or locally-designated scenic highway, and increased light and glare would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, as the overall character of buildout would be similar in the Original Model Colony area of the city but would be less dense in the NMC area. Development intensities in some areas of the City would be less under this alternative. As a result, building heights and development densities would likely be reduced. In addition, the majority of agricultural land uses in the NMC area would remain in nonurban uses as development would be severely limited. The 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would not degrade the visual character of the City, as plans and policies for maintaining the aesthetic qualities of the City would remain within the Policy Plan. This Alternative would slightly reduce potential light or glare sources due to the reduced building heights and reduction in development in the City. However, any new improvements or developments would be subject to the City of Ontario Development Code and Downtown Design Guidelines that would ensure that light and glare would be minimized. Overall, the aesthetic impacts associated with the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, though slightly reduced. Impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.2 Agricultural Resources

The Ontario Plan would have significant impacts on agricultural resources. Even though the 1999 Ontario General Plan Amendment approved the replacement of agricultural land uses in the NMC, these areas remain undeveloped. The NMC is currently used for agriculture, which would be replaced as development of The Ontario Plan occurs. Some of these areas are considered Important Farmland and/or held in Williamson Act contracts. These contracts would have to expire or be cancelled before development occurs in the NMC. The replacement of Important Farmland with urban development would result in a significant impact for both the proposed land use plan of The Ontario Plan and the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative. However, in order to limit residential and nonresidential development in the City, the majority of agricultural uses would remain. Consequently, this alternative would substantially reduce the project's significant unavoidable impact to agricultural resources. However, as some development would occur and replace Farmland, impacts would remain significant. This Alternative would substantially reduce, but not eliminate, the project's impact to Farmland.

3.1.3 Air Quality

This alternative would reduce both construction-related and operations-related air quality impacts associated with the proposed project.

A substantial (44 percent) reduction in residential dwelling units and nonresidential square footage would reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions compared to the Proposed Land Use Plan. Regional and local construction-related pollutant emissions associated with this alternative would be reduced because much of the NMC area would remain under agricultural production. However, as with the Proposed Land Use Plan, due to the scale of development activity associated with buildout of this alternative, emissions would still exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regional significance thresholds, cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) for O₃ and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and expose sensitive receptors to elevated concentration of air pollutants. Therefore, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project construction's significant and unavoidable impact.

3. Additional Project Alternative

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, a reduction in residential dwelling units and nonresidential square footage would result in fewer vehicle trips. As a result, mobile-source emissions would be reduced. A reduction in land uses would also reduce the amount of stationary sources. Overall, this alternative would reduce pollutant emissions from both mobile and stationary sources. However, as operational pollutant emissions associated with the Proposed Land Use Plan are projected to substantially exceed the SCAQMD's regional thresholds for criteria pollutants, a 20 percent reduction in land uses would not reduce operational pollutant emissions from this Alternative to under the regional thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, operational-related pollutant emissions would still cumulatively contribute to the SoCAB nonattainment designations for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. In addition, this alternative would not improve the jobs/housing imbalance in the San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) subregion or allow for mixed-use development in the Downtown area and New Model Colony (NMC) to the same extent as the proposed project. As a result, this alternative would increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region, though localized impacts would be reduced. In comparison to the Proposed Land Use Plan, this alternative would substantially reduce air quality impacts generated within the City by approximately 44 percent; however, as discussed above, significant and unavoidable short- and long-term impacts would remain.

3.1.4 Biological Impacts

Impacts on biological resources would be similar for both The Ontario Plan and the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, since the area planned for development does not change, with the exception of areas that would remain under agricultural production. Threatened and endangered species have been observed or are expected to exist in Ontario, as indicated in Chapter 5.4, *Biological Resources*, of the Draft EIR. However, prior to and during development, projects would be required to follow the regulations of the California and federal Endangered Species Acts, including requirements of the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding critical habitat. Even though the intensity of development would be less for the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, impacts caused by development are expected to be similar.

3.1.5 Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 44 percent; however, the amount of undeveloped acreage available for development would remain the same, with the exception of areas that would remain under agricultural production. As a result, impacts to prehistoric cultural resources would be expected to be slightly less compared to those of the proposed project. However, redevelopment in the City has the potential to affect historic resources, and impacts would be considered similar compared to that of the project under this Alternative. Ground-disturbing activities associated with buildout of the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would continue to occur in order to accommodate new development. Consequently, the potential of encountering fossil-bearing soils and rock formations, destroying below-ground paleontological resources, and affecting archaeological sites and sites of cultural significance to Native Americans would still occur, similar to the proposed project. However, cultural resources are governed on a site-by-site basis and the probability of uncovering new resources or of disturbing known resources is considered in project-level environmental review. Mitigation measures are created to lessen or negate impacts for projects that have the potential to disturb cultural resources. Therefore, implementation of the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would result in impacts slightly less than that under The Ontario Plan for prehistoric cultural resources and similar to that of The Ontario Plan for historic resources.



3. Additional Project Alternative

3.1.6 Geology and Soils

Earthquake hazards would be of similar magnitude under the 15 Percent greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Alternative as compared to the proposed project, because future development would still occur throughout the City. Other site-specific geological hazards associated with erosion, loss of topsoil, liquefaction, subsidence, landslides, and expansive soils would also be similar for this alternative relative to the proposed project. New development under both alternatives would be expected to conform to the most recent California Building Codes, which include strict building specifications to ensure structural and foundational stability. In terms of geologic hazards, this alternative would have a less than significant impact.

3.1.7 Global Climate Change

This alternative would reduce both construction- and operations-related greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts associated with the proposed project.

A reduction in residential dwelling units and nonresidential square footage would reduce construction-related GHG. However, due to the scale of development activity associated with buildout of this alternative, emissions from construction-related activities would still cumulatively contribute to climate change impacts.

Under this alternative, emissions from operational-related activities would be reduced because population and employment would be capped to ensure that citywide GHG emissions with implementation of the measures outlined in the Scoping Plan would be 15 percent less than existing levels at buildout. The 44 percent reduction in residential and nonresidential development would result in fewer vehicle trips and stationary sources generated upon project buildout, and would reduce the amount of GHG emitted. This alternative would result in fewer mixed-use land uses compared to the Proposed Land Use Plan, and the potential reduction in VMT due to higher density and reduced distances between services and amenities would not be as great. However, the loss of the project's GHG potential benefits from higher concentration of mixed-use land uses would be offset by 44 percent less growth under this alternative. Because emissions reduction measures would offset the increase in GHG emissions from the proposed land uses under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, this Alternative would eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable operational GHG emissions impact since GHG emissions would be less than existing levels.

3.1.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This impact would be similar to the proposed project, though slightly reduced in the urban areas, because the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative reduces overall development intensity by 44 percent. Consequently, impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as well as those related to reasonably foreseeable upset conditions, would be slightly reduced, though already less than significant. In addition, development under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative could expose people to hazardous substances that may be present in soil or groundwater, and demolition activities could expose workers and the environment to asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint and residues.

Historically, the dairy farms in the NMC have had the highest concentration of dairy cattle in the United States. This type of industrial agriculture has burdened the San Bernardino County region with air quality problems resulting from methane from dry lot operations, water quality problems from high levels of nitrates and other water pollutants percolating into the groundwater basin and surface waters, and hazards from methane and hydrogen sulfide in manure. Therefore, impacts in the NMC area would be greater under this Alternative if agricultural uses would remain in place.

3. Additional Project Alternative

However, development under both the proposed project and this alternative would be held to federal, state, and local policies protecting humans and the environment from exposure to hazards. Compliance with the provisions of hazardous material policies in the City's Municipal Code and implementation of the existing regulations related to hazardous materials would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. For future developments on hazardous materials sites, appropriate remediation activities would be required before construction activities could be permitted. Similar to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to the project. However, impacts under this Alternative would be slightly greater in the NMC area and slightly less in the OMC, compared to the proposed project, and impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would have similar hydrology and water quality impacts to the proposed project. Although both residential and nonresidential intensity would be reduced under this alternative, similar alterations to drainage patterns and alterations to hydrological patterns would occur. Similar to the proposed project, runoff would be subject to NPDES permit standards and provisions stipulated in the Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP). If necessary, treatment would be employed to remove excess pollutants from runoff during the construction and operational phases of development. Policies that offer additional protection from water quality impairment would be adopted, and runoff would be expected to be treated to the maximum extent practicable. In terms of water quality, this alternative would have a less than significant impact, similar to the proposed project.

Since designated Open Space areas remain the same, with the exception of areas that remain under agricultural production, depletion of groundwater and percolation of pollutants into groundwater aquifers would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would increase the impervious surface groundcover over existing conditions, and increase the quantity of runoff discharged into the City storm drain system, similar to the proposed project. Policies adopted to minimize total site runoff would be implemented. Projects would be subject to additional review in order to ensure that they do not exceed the capacity of the storm drain system. It is therefore expected that the net effect would be similar, and individual projects would not exceed the capacity of the storm drain system.

This alternative would have less than significant impacts resulting from exposure to flooding as a result of a levee or dam, or effects of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, similar to the proposed project (see Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*) of the Draft EIR.

Hydrology and water quality impacts overall would be similar for this alternative in comparison to the proposed project and impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.10 Land Use and Planning

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensities would be reduced by 44 percent, although the location and designation of land uses would remain the same as those identified in The Ontario Plan. Therefore, land use impacts would be generally the same as The Ontario Plan under this alternative. Impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.11 Mineral Resources

There is one area in the City of Ontario designated Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2), where significant mineral resources are known or likely. The remainder of the City is designated MRZ-3, where the significance



3. Additional Project Alternative

of mineral deposits is unknown. Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensities would be reduced by 44 percent, although the location and designation of land uses would remain the same as those identified in The Ontario Plan. However, existing development surrounding these mineral resource zones precludes the extraction of mineral resources in these areas. Therefore, mineral resource impacts would be the same as The Ontario Plan under this alternative.

3.1.12 Noise

This alternative would reduce both construction- and operation-related noise impacts associated with the proposed project.

Under this alternative there would be less residential and nonresidential development planned, thereby eliminating potential short-term noise impacts from construction of these developments. Additionally, the reduction in construction activities would also reduce potential short-term vibration impacts to sensitive receptors. However, due to the scale of development activity associated with buildout of this alternative, because construction activities associated with any individual development may still occur near existing sensitive receptors, and because noise disturbances may occur for prolonged periods of time, construction noise impacts from buildout of this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable. Consequently, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable construction noise and vibration impact.

Furthermore, this alternative would also reduce long-term noise impacts from mobile and stationary sources. The reduction of land uses would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by new development and would therefore reduce the project's contribution to traffic noise on local roadways. The overall number of stationary sources would also be reduced under this alternative. This alternative could result in more agricultural uses compared to the Proposed Land Use Plan, and noise associated with agricultural operations may impact nearby sensitive receptors. However, operation of heavy agricultural equipment would be less frequent and shorter in duration compared to the daily noise levels the proposed project would introduce. Overall, this alternative would reduce short- and long-term noise impacts by approximately 44 percent. Consequently, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable operational noise and vibration impacts.

However, due to the scale of development, buildout of this alternative could still potentially expose sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels and strong levels of vibration from construction and result in an increase in traffic on the local roadways that substantially increases the existing noise environment. Additionally, under this alternative, sensitive land uses within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport (LAONT) would still be exposed to substantial levels of airport-related noise. Consequently, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's short- and long-term noise impacts.

3.1.13 Population and Housing

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 44 percent. However, the jobs/housing balance in the City at buildout would remain the same under The Ontario Plan since the overall balance of residential and nonresidential uses would remain the same under this Alternative. The 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would have similar impacts as compared to the proposed project, and impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.14 Public Services

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 44 percent. Under this alternative, impacts associated with fire protection, law enforcement, and library services would

3. Additional Project Alternative

be less compared to the proposed project, since there would be less development at full buildout. Demands for fire, police, and library services would be updated as part of the City's annual budget process. As a result, this alternative is considered to have a less than significant impact in terms of the provision of fire, police, and library services, and its impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to school services would be less than significant through provision of SB 50 fees, and since fewer students would be generated. In general, impacts would be similar to or slightly less than the proposed project, and would remain less than significant.

3.1.15 Recreation

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 44 percent and 45,553-fewer housing units would be built. As a result, less parkland would be required to serve the projected population at buildout. In general, impacts would be similar to or slightly less than the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

3.1.16 Transportation and Traffic

The 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would generate approximately 44 percent fewer trips and VMT than the Proposed Land Use Plan. However, under the Proposed Land Use Plan, all intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS and therefore intersections under this alternative would also operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS). While this alternative would reduce overall vehicle trips, a reduction in land uses would result in fewer mixed-use and higher-density developments. As a result, alternative forms of transportation (i.e., walking, non-motorized modes of transportation, and public transit) could be impacted by the loss of infrastructure and critical mass needed to support it. However, this alternative would still include the plans and policies for alternative forms of transportation found in the Proposed Land Use Plan. Additionally, under this alternative, adequate parking would still be provided, circulation improvements would still adhere to roadway design standards that would preclude the construction of any unsafe features, and implementation of the alternative would not impact air traffic patterns. In addition, because this alternative reduces VMT and trips, it would substantially reduce project-related impacts to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) facilities. Overall, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable impact to cumulative impacts on Caltrans freeway segments.



3.1.17 Utilities and Service Systems

Under the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative, development intensity would be reduced by 44 percent. Because the vast majority of water demand is associated with landscape irrigation, this alternative's reduction in density would increase demand for water in the City. However, impacts would remain less than significant.

3.1.18 Conclusion

The 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative would result in similar impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, recreation, and utilities and service systems. However, this alternative would substantially reduce but not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, air quality, noise, and cumulative impact to Caltrans freeway segments. In addition, this alternative would eliminate the project's operational phase GHG emissions impact because GHG emissions would be capped at 15 percent of existing levels through limitations on residential and nonresidential development.

Although the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative meets some of the objectives established for the project and eliminates the local GHG emissions impact, this Alternative would result in local GHG reduction benefits at the expense of regional GHG reduction benefits. The City of Ontario is a major participant in SCAG's

3. Additional Project Alternative

Compass Blueprint program. The City is a major destination for many of the region's inhabitants, and three major inhabitants transportation routes (I-10, I-15, and SR-60), two major rail lines, and one major airport (Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport [LAONT]) lie within the City's boundaries. SCAG projects the City to accommodate a large portion of employment (nonresidential square footage) in order to reduce commute travel within the San Bernardino County subregion. In addition, development of housing closer to these employment centers furthers SCAG's regional goals as the NMC area is within the Strategic Growth Area identified by SCAG, reducing the need to develop at the urban fringe. Therefore, this alternative would not advance California's goal of developing and fostering sustainable communities that reduce GHG emissions, as population and employment within the San Bernardino County subregion would need to be accommodated elsewhere.

Table 3-2 summarizes the impacts of this Alternative compared to the proposed project and Table 3-3 describes which project objectives are met by this Alternative.

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>15 Percent GHG Reduction</i>
Aesthetics	Less Than Significant	(-)
Agricultural Resources	Significant and Unavoidable	(-)
Air Quality		
Short-Term	Significant and Unavoidable	(-)
Long-Term		(-)
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant	(-)
Cultural Resources	Significant and Unavoidable	(=)
Geology and Soils	Less Than Significant	(=)
Global Climate Change	Significant and Unavoidable	(-) (1)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	(-)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Than Significant	(-)
Land Use and Planning	Less Than Significant	(=)
Mineral Resources	Less Than Significant	(=)
Noise		
Short-term	Significant and Unavoidable	(-)
Long-term		(-)
Population and Housing		
Local Population/housing	Less Than Significant	(=)
Regional Population/housing		(+)
Public Services	Less Than Significant	(-)
Recreation	Less Than Significant	(-)
Transportation/Traffic		
Caltrans	Significant and Unavoidable	(-)
City		(-)
Utilities and Service Systems	Less Than Significant (with mitigation)	(=)

(-) The alternative would result in less impacts than the proposed project.
 (+) The alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project.
 (=) The alternative would result in the same/similar impacts as the proposed project.
 (1) Eliminates a significant impact.
 (2) Introduces a new significant impact.

3. Additional Project Alternative

**Table 3-3
Ability of the 15 Percent GHG Reduction Alternative to Meet the Project Objectives**

Project Objective	Proposed Project	15 Percent GHG Reduction
Provide a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan that establishes the goals and policies that create a built environment and cultural setting that fosters the enjoyment, financial benefit, and well being of the entire community.	Yes	Yes
Provide a streamlined, user-friendly Web-based General Plan that is easily accessible to the public.	Yes	Yes
Designate the distribution, location, balance, and extent of land uses including residential, retail, employment, open space, and public uses.	Yes	Yes
Link Ontario's community design goals to a broader context that includes economic development, land use, housing, community health, infrastructure, and transportation.	Yes	Yes
Improve the balance between jobs and housing within the New Model Colony and Citywide to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated air quality impacts consistent with regional jobs/housing balance policies.	Yes	No
Foster the development of pedestrian and transit-oriented environments that create lively, appealing, and safe pedestrian areas, active during both daytime and evening hours.	Yes	No
Maintain Ontario's distinct neighborhoods and districts to foster a positive sense of identity and belonging among residents and businesses.	Yes	Yes
Establish a framework for using and managing the City's natural resources sustainably.	Yes	Yes
Provide for the security and safe transportation of goods and hazardous materials.	Yes	Yes
Maintain disaster preparedness, response and recovery systems that reduce loss of life, injury, private property damage, infrastructure damage, economic losses, and social dislocation.	Yes	Yes
Correlate the mobility system with the future land use patterns and buildout levels of Ontario and with other transportation planning efforts by local, state, and federal authorities.	Yes	Yes
Address a range of mobility options in Ontario, including vehicular, trucking, freight and passenger rail, air, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit.	Yes	Yes



3. Additional Project Alternative

This page intentionally left blank.