

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must contain “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project”, as well as an evaluation of the “comparative merits of the alternatives”. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives that “would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly”.

### 9.1 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

This EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects associated with the Wal-Mart Supercenter, a commercial development proposed on 16.29 acres, located west of Mountain Avenue and north of Fifth Street in the northwestern section of the City of Ontario. The 1.06-acre northeastern portion of the parcel is developed with a Hollywood Video store, which will remain in place. The proposed project includes the development of an approximately 190,803-square-foot building on the western portion of the site, with parking areas on the eastern portion. Infrastructure and street improvements would also accompany the project. Operations at the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would be 24 hours, seven days a week and would include a general merchandise store, a grocery, the sale of alcoholic beverages, banking services, a game arcade, and an outside garden center.

The objectives of the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter project include the following:

- To eliminate the abandoned buildings on-site;
- To remove an aesthetically unpleasing site;
- To rehabilitate the blighted parcel to create a new mix of retail/commercial uses responsive to the City and regional markets;
- To provide retail/commercial uses to serve the needs of residents;
- To increase economic benefits to the City through job creation;
- To augment the City's economic base by providing a variety of tax-generating uses;
- To provide retail/commercial development compatible with nearby land uses;
- To implement needed roadway improvements near the site;
- To upgrade utility infrastructure with redevelopment of the site; and
- To ensure development of the project site in a manner consistent with the City's General Plan, the Redevelopment Plan for Project No. 2, and the Mountain Village Specific Plan.

### 9.2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The evaluation of the project's environmental impacts in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR concludes that the project would result in significant adverse impacts associated with several issue areas. Implementation of standard conditions and the recommended mitigation measures would reduce most of the project impacts to less than significant levels. However, air quality, noise, and traffic impacts would remain significant even after mitigation.

### 9.3 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

This section considers several alternatives to the proposed project. These alternatives are discussed below.

- **No Project Alternative.** The No Project Alternative anticipates that the project site would remain in its existing condition. No new commercial uses would come into the site but the Hollywood Video store would

continue to operate at the northeastern section of the project site. This alternative also assumes that the existing vacant commercial buildings on the site would remain unused indefinitely, as presently exists.

- **Building Reuse Alternative.** As a subset of the No Project Alternative, the Building Reuse Alternative would allow for the rehabilitation and reuse of the existing structures, to be occupied by various commercial retail businesses. While a variety of commercial uses may operate in the existing structures, the reuse of the site as a department store, toy store, key kiosk, and grocery are considered under this alternative, representing the return of previous commercial uses that occupied the existing buildings.
- **Specific Plan Alternative.** This alternative assumes that the site would be developed in accordance with the development that was existing and planned as part of the Mountain Village Specific Plan. This includes the construction of new buildings to replace the existing ones, as well as the construction of a commercial anchor, an expanded garden center, and small shops for a total floor area of 215,500 square feet, as envisioned under the Specific Plan.
- **Alternative Use.** The Alternative Use assumes that the project site would be redeveloped with land uses other than commercial land uses, such as those proposed by the project. While residential and industrial land uses may be introduced on the site, a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment are not contemplated to allow these alternative uses. Thus, redevelopment of the site with residential or industrial uses is not considered a feasible alternative. Instead, this alternative assumes that a public use (such as a senior community center) or mixed use (residential and commercial) development is constructed on the site.
- **Lower Intensity Alternative.** Under this alternative, the project site would be subject to redevelopment with a commercial development with less floor area than the proposed project. This alternative assumes the same commercial development would be constructed on the site at a lower intensity to allow the project to generate air quality impacts below SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, an approximately 64,000-square-foot shopping center, with 32,000 square feet of grocery area and 32,000 square feet of retail merchandise area would be built on the site under this alternative.
- **Alternative Sites.** Under this alternative, vacant parcels in other areas of the City, which may accommodate the proposed project and allow development of a Wal-Mart Supercenter, are considered as potential alternative sites for the project. These include an approximately 13-acre site at the southeastern corner of Haven Avenue and Fourth Street (within Ontario Center Specific Plan); a 16-acre area east of Vineyard Avenue, north of Inland Empire Boulevard and south of Fourth Street (within the Meredith International Center Specific Plan); a 15-acre site at the northeastern or southeastern corner of Edison Avenue and Euclid Avenue (within the New Model Colony); and another area at the northwestern and southwestern corners of Milliken and Edison Avenues (within the proposed Rich-Haven Specific Plan) (Chuck Mercier, personal communication, 12/15.2006).

### 9.3.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is included pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that implementation of the proposed project would not occur, and the existing conditions on-site would remain unchanged. Thus, the project site would remain in its existing underutilized condition. No new commercial uses would come into the site and the Hollywood Video store would continue to operate at the project site. This alternative also assumes that the existing vacant commercial buildings on the site would remain unused indefinitely, as presently exists.

Retaining the project site in its present condition would result in the elimination of all short-term construction and forecast long-term operational impacts, which would accompany the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter, including no increases in air pollution, noise, and traffic. If the project is not implemented, it can be assumed that existing environmental conditions would remain consistent with those identified in Section 2.0, *Environmental Setting*, of this EIR and under the Environmental Setting subsections under each issue area in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*. No new environmental impacts would occur on-site or would be generated under this alternative.

With the existing buildings deteriorating over time, it is unlikely that the site would remain underutilized indefinitely, as it is planned for commercial land uses in the Ontario General Plan Land Use Map and the Mountain Village Specific Plan. While this alternative means that no new development would occur on the site and project related environmental impacts would be avoided, this alternative would not meet any of the objectives related to the redevelopment and utilization of the project site. Without redevelopment of the project site, blighted conditions are expected to increase over time.

The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

### **Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

The No Project Alternative generally assumes that no new environmental impacts would occur on-site, since changes to existing conditions would not occur and no redevelopment would be permitted. The environmental effects that may be expected under the No Project Alternative are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** - The project site would remain in its underutilized condition and would not be redeveloped. No City approval would be needed to accommodate this alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, no new commercial uses would be introduced to the project site, which may impact adjacent land uses. This alternative would not implement the development anticipated on the site, as planned in the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan. Greater impacts on land use would occur under this alternative, than the proposed project.

**Population and Housing** – With no new development on the site, no increase in employment opportunities would occur. No changes to the City's existing population or housing stock would occur under this alternative. At the same time, without the project, goods, services, and employment for the surrounding area would also not be provided. Thus, less beneficial impacts would occur under this alternative than the proposed project.

**Transportation and Circulation** – The vacant commercial buildings generate a minor amount of vehicle trips from security personnel. Traffic from the Hollywood Video store would remain, estimated at approximately 861 daily trips. No new trips would be added to existing traffic volumes on the surrounding or nearby roadways and freeways under this alternative. Existing traffic volumes would be maintained. The trip generation impact is less than that anticipated with the proposed project. However, improvements to abutting roadways would not be implemented, including the widening of Mountain Avenue and the construction of Hawthorne Street and Main Street through the site, which could improve traffic flows in the area. This alternative would not implement the Circulation Master Plan proposed on and near the site. Thus, greater adverse impacts would occur under this alternative, than the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – No new vehicular emissions and indirect power generation emissions would be generated by this alternative. The project site is currently contributing to air pollution in the area from the operation of the Hollywood Video store. This impact would continue under the No Project Alternative. Without redevelopment, demolition and construction activities would not be necessary, thereby eliminating the associated construction emissions, particularly suspended particulate matter, and nitrogen oxides. Also, GHG generation from the video store operations would remain. These impacts are less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Noise** – The project site generates limited noise from the Hollywood Video store activities and vehicle trips. This would continue under the No Project Alternative. No construction noise or additional vehicle noise impacts associated with redevelopment of the site would occur under this alternative. Also, no stationary noise impacts that may affect adjacent residences would be expected. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils** – No changes in topography would occur under this alternative, because no construction, grading, and excavation activities are proposed. No new development would be exposed to the seismic and geologic hazards on the site. This impact is less than that anticipated under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – No changes to existing drainage patterns would occur, and no improvements to on-site and off-site drainage are expected under this alternative. Existing street flooding along Mountain Avenue would remain since the proposed storm drain on Mountain Avenue would not be constructed. While no stormwater pollutants from commercial activities would be introduced into the storm drain system, no on-site treatment and detention of stormwater would occur. This impact is greater than the impacts anticipated under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation would remain on the site under this alternative. No removal of existing vegetation would occur, as no new landscaped areas or sidewalk and parkway improvements would be provided. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – No redevelopment would occur on the project site under this alternative. Thus, no demand for mineral resources needed to construct the proposed commercial structure and infrastructure would occur. This impact is less than the impact anticipated from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – The project site's demand for police and fire protection services is limited to those generated by the Hollywood Video store and the vacant buildings. No direct demand for schools, library, parks, or medical services is generated by the site. This would continue under the No Project Alternative. Impacts on public services would be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities** – Demand for utility services is generated by the Hollywood Video store. This would continue under the No Project Alternative. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – No hazardous materials would be brought to the site for construction, maintenance, or sale. Hazardous material use would be limited to the use of the Hollywood Video store for maintenance of the existing store, under the No Project Alternative. Asbestos and lead-based paint in

the existing vacant commercial structures would remain undisturbed. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – The project site is developed with vacant commercial buildings, the Hollywood Video store, and paved parking areas. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains are available on-site and from adjacent properties. No new structures or landscaping would be introduced on-site. The visual characteristics of the site would remain the same under the No Project Alternative. With the continued deterioration of the existing structures likely to occur over time, this impact is greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – The site would remain underutilized under this alternative, with the existing vacant commercial buildings not reused. No employment would be generated and no goods and services would be provided for the surrounding neighborhood. With the continued presence of vacant commercial buildings on the site, blighted conditions are expected to exacerbate over time. This impact is greater than those expected with the project.

**Cultural Resources** – No ground disturbance activities would occur under this alternative and no impacts to unknown archaeological resources would occur. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

The analysis shows that the No Project Alternative would have less impact than the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter on several environmental issue areas due to the preservation of existing environmental conditions. However, impacts on land use, population, transportation, hydrology, aesthetics, and socio-economic conditions would not be less than the project.

### **9.3.2 Building Reuse Alternative**

As a subset of the No Project Alternative, the Building Reuse Alternative assumes that the existing vacant commercial buildings at the site would be rehabilitated and reused for commercial purposes. This alternative assumes that no new structures or development would take place on-site. However, since the site is developed, commercial tenants may come to the site and reuse the existing vacant commercial buildings. The Hollywood Video store would remain in use. While a variety of commercial uses may operate in the existing structures, the reuse of the buildings with a department store, toy store, key kiosk, and grocery are considered under this alternative, representing the return of previous commercial uses that occupied the existing buildings. Reuse of the existing buildings also acknowledges the potential that the project site may be subject to rehabilitation and reuse in the future.

Under this alternative, no new development would occur on the site and the Hollywood Video store would remain in place. However, the existing vacant commercial buildings would be subject to reuse. These buildings have a total floor area of 201,610 square feet, which is 10,807 square feet more than the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. Thus, it can be expected that the demand-driven impacts of this alternative would also be greater than the proposed project. These impacts include vehicle trips, air quality emissions, noise, public service demands, and utility demands.

The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

**Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

The existing vacant commercial buildings on the project site would be subject to rehabilitation activities and reused for commercial uses under this alternative. This assumes that 201,610 square feet of commercial uses may be re-introduced on the site. The environmental effects that may be expected under the Building Reuse Alternative are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** – No new structures would be constructed on the project site under this alternative. Rather, a re-start of past commercial uses would occur, as the buildings are rehabilitated and reused. No changes to existing land uses would occur, although more intensive development (than the proposed project) would occur on site. This development is consistent to what is anticipated under the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan. Other on-site improvements anticipated under the Mountain Village Specific Plan would have to occur at a later date. Less impacts would occur under this alternative than under the project.

**Population and Housing** – With reuse of the existing structures, new employment would be generated at the project site under this alternative. Employment generation is expected to be greater than the project, with the larger floor area of existing structures. Impacts would be less adverse than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Transportation and Circulation** – With the re-introduction of former commercial uses on the site, this alternative is expected to result in greater traffic impacts on area roadways. Estimates of trip generation under this alternative show 10,506 vehicle trips from the former commercial uses and 861 from the video store could be expected from the site (TIA, 2007 Table 4). Thus, 2,525 more vehicle trips would be generated by this alternative than the project and area roadways would handle greater traffic volumes. Also, no roadway improvements on Mountain Avenue, Hawthorne Street, and Main Street would be implemented under this alternative. Thus, this alternative would not implement the Circulation Master Plan on and near the site. These traffic impacts are greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – The reuse of the vacant commercial buildings at the site would result in construction, vehicular and stationary air pollutant emissions. Construction emissions would be confined to the rehabilitation of existing vacant commercial structures and would be less than new construction. Long-term vehicle emissions would be greater than the proposed project since this alternative would result in more vehicle trips than the proposed project. Stationary emissions would also be slightly greater due to the larger floor area of existing buildings (AQIA, 2007 p. 21). With greater commercial floor area and the older (less energy-efficient) buildings, GHG emissions are expected to be greater under this alternative. Air quality impacts are expected to be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Noise** – Since existing building would only be rehabilitated, no noise impacts from demolition and new building construction would occur. Thus, short-term noise impacts would be less than the project. Noise generated by re-introduction of the former commercial uses would likely be greater under this alternative. This is because a higher intensity development would be operating on the site. The greater number of vehicle trips would mean more vehicular noise. The location of loading docks at the western section of the main building and the lack of a landscaped buffer and the presence of a lower perimeter wall along the

western boundary would lead to greater noise impacts on the adjacent condominium units. The noise impacts under this alternative would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils** – Rehabilitation of existing structures on the site would not lead to extensive ground disturbance activities. No changes in topography would occur under this alternative, as associated with grading and excavation activities for new development. Commercial employees and patrons under this alternative would be exposed to the same geologic hazards as the proposed project. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – With reuse of the existing structures on the project site, no changes to existing drainage patterns would occur, as runoff would continue to be directed toward Mountain Avenue. No changes to the storm drain system serving the site would occur and no stormwater pollutant reduction measures would be implemented. Similarly, the storm drain line on Mountain Avenue would not be constructed and street flooding would remain. Since the site is developed and the impervious surfaces at the site would remain the same, no stormwater treatment is required and stormwater pollutants that would be generated by commercial activities on the site could impact downstream water bodies. This impact is greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation on parkways, planters, and landscaped areas on the site would remain under the Building Reuse Alternative. No disturbance to existing plant and animal habitats would occur. No new landscaping would be provided as part of building rehabilitation and reuse activities. Thus, impacts would be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – Reuse of existing vacant commercial buildings on the project site under this alternative would require limited mineral resources in the form of construction aggregates for building renovation. This demand for mineral resources would be less than the proposed project. Less impacts are anticipated under this alternative than those from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – The demand for public services under this alternative would include police and fire protection services for the re-introduction of commercial uses. No direct demand for schools, library services, parks, and medical services would be generated under this alternative. Due to the greater floor area of commercial uses under this alternative, it is expected that demand for fire and police protection services would also be greater. The Building Reuse Alternative would have impacts on public services that would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities and Service Systems** – With greater commercial floor area than the project, it is expected that a greater demand for utility services would occur under this alternative. Connections to existing infrastructure systems would be reused and no new utility lines or facilities would be constructed within the project site. Impacts on utilities would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – The reuse of vacant commercial buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would include removal of asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint prior to reuse of the existing buildings. This alternative would also include hazardous material use for building rehabilitation and maintenance, and for sale, but compliance with existing regulations would not create significant impacts to public health and safety. With generally the same uses (grocery, retail store, outdoor garden center, and toy store), impacts would be the same to what is anticipated under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – Reuse of the existing vacant commercial buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would lead to the improvement of the physical characteristics of the existing buildings, including the removal of graffiti. Views of the mountains to the north would remain the same. Existing light poles on the site would be reused. Since these lights are not downward facing and do not have shields, greater potential for light spillover on adjacent residences is expected. Also, with existing landscaping remaining the same, the planned landscaping, decorative tower, and site improvements anticipated under the Mountain Village Specific Plan would not be implemented by this alternative. Greater impacts are expected under this alternative than the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – Rehabilitation and reuse of the existing vacant commercial buildings would lead to the elimination of continuing building deterioration at the site. In addition, employment generation would occur under this alternative and the on-site commercial stores would meet the demand for grocery and merchandise stores in the market area. While a short-term oversupply of grocery stores may occur in the immediate market area, there is a shortage of this use in the larger market area. Also, a shortage of merchandise stores is present in the City and the project would meet this demand but contribute to oversupply in the market area. Projected increases in demand for grocery stores and merchandise retail stores are expected over time, which is expected to correct the oversupply situation. This impact is similar to what is expected with the proposed project.

**Cultural Resources** – The reuse of the vacant commercial buildings on the site would lead to limited ground disturbance. Thus, potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources at the site, under this alternative, would be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

The analysis shows that the Building Reuse Alternative would have the less impacts than the proposed project on land use, population, mineral resources, geology, biological resources, and cultural resources. This alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed project as they relate to transportation, air quality, noise, hydrology, public services, utilities, and aesthetics. Similar impacts on hazards and socio-economic conditions would occur under this alternative.

### **9.3.3 Specific Plan Alternative**

The Specific Plan Alternative assumes that the site would be redeveloped in accordance with the Mountain Village Specific Plan. This alternative assumes that the site would be developed in accordance with the development that was existing and planned as part of the Mountain Village Specific Plan. This includes the construction of new buildings to replace the existing ones, as well as the construction of a commercial anchor, an expanded garden center, and small shops for a total floor area of 215,500 square feet, as envisioned under the Specific Plan. While the existing buildings can be reused, as analyzed under the Building Reuse Alternative, this Alternative assumes that redevelopment of the site (as envisioned under the Redevelopment Project No. 2) and the construction of additional commercial uses (as planned under the Mountain Village Specific Plan).

This alternative assumes 208,500 square feet of new commercial floor area within a shopping center would be built on the site, with the 7,035-square-foot Hollywood Video store remaining in use. This alternative considers the impacts of commercial uses on the site that is 6,890 square feet more than the floor area of existing vacant commercial buildings and 17,697 square feet more than the floor area of the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. Thus, it can be expected that demand-driven impacts of this alternative would also be greater than the proposed project. These impacts include vehicle trips, air quality emissions, noise, public service demands, and utility



demands. The Specific Plan Alternative acknowledges the potential of the project site to be developed in the future, in accordance with the Mountain Village Specific Plan.

The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

### **Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

The existing vacant commercial buildings on the project site would be demolished and new commercial structures would be built under this alternative. This assumes that 208,500 square feet of new commercial uses may be constructed and operated on the site. The environmental effects that may be expected under the Specific Plan Alternative are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** – New commercial structures would be constructed on the project site under this alternative. No changes to existing land uses would occur, although more intensive development (than the proposed project) would occur on site. This development is consistent to what is anticipated under the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan. Other on-site improvements anticipated under the Mountain Village Specific Plan would occur under this alternative. Similar impacts would occur under this alternative to those expected with the project.

**Population and Housing** – With the construction of new commercial structures, new employment would be generated at the project site under this alternative. Employment generation is expected to be greater than the project, with the larger floor area proposed for development. Impacts would be less adverse than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Transportation and Circulation** – With the development of new commercial uses on the site, this alternative is expected to result in greater traffic impacts on area roadways. Estimates of trip generation under this alternative show 9,605 vehicle trips from the site are expected (TIA, 2007 Table 3). Thus, 763 more vehicle trips would be generated by this alternative than the project and area roadways would handle greater traffic volumes. Roadway improvements on Mountain Avenue, Hawthorne Street, and Main Street would be implemented under this alternative. The traffic impacts of this alternative are slightly greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – The construction of new commercial buildings at the site would result in construction, vehicular and stationary air pollutant emissions. Construction emissions would be greater than the proposed project, with the larger floor area under this alternative. Vehicle emissions would also be greater, since this alternative would result in more vehicle trips than the proposed project. Stationary emissions would also be greater due to the larger floor area (AQIA, 2007 p. 21). With more commercial floor area than the proposed project, greater GHG emissions are expected under this alternative. Thus, air quality impacts are expected to be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Noise** – Noise impacts from demolition and new building construction would occur under this alternative. Noise generated by new commercial uses would likely be greater under this alternative due to the larger floor area of development. The higher number of vehicle trips would also mean greater vehicular noise impacts. The noise impacts under this alternative would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new structures would lead to ground disturbance activities. However, the site is expected to remain relatively flat and changes in topography would be insignificant. Commercial employees and patrons under this alternative would be exposed to the same geologic hazards as the proposed project. This impact is the same as the impacts expected to occur under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – With the demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the project site, changes to existing drainage patterns would occur. Stormwater pollutant reduction measures would be implemented and runoff from the site would be reduced, in accordance with NPDES requirements. Also, the storm drain line on Mountain Avenue would be constructed and street flooding would be eliminated. This impact is the same as those that would occur under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation on the site would be removed under this alternative and new plant materials would be provided in landscaped areas. Disturbance of existing plant and animal habitats would occur during construction, but would be replaced by proposed landscaping. This impact is similar to what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the project site, under this alternative, would require mineral resources in the form of construction aggregates for building construction. The demand for mineral resources under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project due to the larger floor area. Greater impacts are anticipated than those expected from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – The demand for public services under this alternative would include police and fire protection services for the proposed commercial uses. No direct demand for schools, library services, parks, and medical services would be generated under this alternative. Due to the greater floor area of commercial uses under this alternative, it is expected that demands for fire and police protection services would also be greater than the demand of the proposed project. Impacts on public services would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities and Service Systems** – With greater commercial floor area than the project, it is expected that greater demands for utility services would occur under this alternative. Connections to existing utility lines would be made and facility upgrades implemented, as necessary. Impacts on utilities would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – Demolition of existing buildings would lead to the removal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. The construction of new commercial buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would include hazardous material use for building construction and maintenance, and for sale, but compliance with existing regulations would not create significant impacts to public health and safety. With generally the same commercial uses on-site, impacts would be the same to what is anticipated under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – Construction of new commercial buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would lead to a change in the visual quality of the site. Views of the mountains to the north may change but would remain available at setback areas and between buildings. With the larger floor area, less open space would be available on-site. New light poles would be downward-facing and would have shields,

preventing light spillover on adjacent residences. Also, more landscaping than existing is expected on the site, as planned under the Mountain Village Specific Plan. Similar impacts are expected under this alternative as the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – Demolition of the existing buildings and construction of new buildings would lead to the elimination of blighted conditions at the site. In addition, employment generation would occur and the proposed commercial stores would meet the demand for grocery and merchandise stores in the market area. While a short-term oversupply of merchandise stores may occur in the market area, there is a shortage in the region and projected increases in demand are expected over time. With no grocery store proposed, no oversupply of grocery stores in the City is expected. The socio-economic impact of this alternative is expected to be similar to those of the proposed project.

**Cultural Resources** – The demolition of existing vacant commercial structures and construction of new commercial buildings on the site would lead to ground disturbance, which may impact buried cultural resources. Thus, potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources at the site, under this alternative, would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

The analysis shows that the Specific Plan Alternative would have more beneficial impacts than the proposed project on population, due to increased employment. This alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed project as they relate to transportation, air quality, noise, mineral resources, public services, and utilities. Similar impacts on land use, geology, hydrology, biological resources, hazards, aesthetics, socio-economic conditions, and cultural resources would occur under this alternative.

#### **9.3.4 Alternative Use**

The Alternative Use assumes that the project site would be redeveloped with land uses other than the commercial land uses proposed by the project. A number of commercial retail or service uses, as allowed under the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan, may be developed on the site. Other public, institutional, and mixed use developments may also be developed subject to a conditional use permit. While residential and industrial land uses may be introduced on the site, a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment are not contemplated to allow these alternative uses. Thus, redevelopment of the site with residential or industrial uses is not considered a feasible alternative. Instead, this alternative assumes that a public use (such as a senior community center) or mixed use (residential and commercial) development is constructed on the site.

For purposes of analysis, this alternative assumes the development of a community center for senior programs on the site or a mixed use residential and commercial development. While approximately 208,500 square feet of total floor area may be developed on the site under the Mountain Village Specific Plan, the City is unlikely to need a senior community center of that size. Thus, the senior community center is expected to have approximately 100,000 square feet of floor area, while the mixed use development would have 208,500 square feet of floor area. The mixed use development has a FAR of 0.31, which is less than the FAR of 0.40 allowed under the Specific Plan on the 15.23-acre portion of the site, with the Hollywood Video store remaining in place. The mixed use development would consist of approximately 104,500 square feet of commercial retail uses on the first floor and 80 residential units on the upper floors, each unit with approximately 1,300 square feet of floor area.

Under this alternative, it can be expected that demand-driven impacts would be less for the senior community center but greater for the mixed use development than the proposed project. The change in impacts are mainly due to the vehicle trips generated by each use, the associated air quality emissions of the vehicle trips, vehicle

noise generation, public service demands, and utility demands. The Alternative Use considers the potential that the project site can be developed with other land uses, as allowed under the Mountain Village Specific Plan.

The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

### **Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

The existing vacant commercial buildings on the project site would be demolished and a senior community center or a mixed use residential-commercial structure would be built on the site, under this alternative. This assumes that an approximately 100,000-square-foot senior community center or 104,500 square feet of commercial retail uses and 80 dwelling units would be constructed and operated on the site. The environmental effects that may be expected under the Alternative Use are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** – New structures would be constructed on the project site under this alternative, at a lower or higher intensity than the proposed project. The senior community center or mixed use development are allowable land uses under the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan. Other on-site improvements anticipated under the Mountain Village Specific Plan would be implemented under this alternative. Similar impacts would occur under this alternative than those expected under the project.

**Population and Housing** – The senior community center would not increase the resident population of the site or the City but would create jobs. Employment generation of the senior community center is expected to be less than the project due to the low intensity use. Assuming one employee per 500 square feet, the 100,000-square-foot community center would generate 200 jobs. With the alternative use of a mixed use development on the site, occupancy of the 80 new dwelling units would lead to approximately 305 residents at the site (based on 3.808 persons per household) and 209 commercial jobs from the 104,500 square feet of commercial retail uses (based on one employee per 500 square feet). Employment generation of the community center is expected to be less than the project due to the smaller floor area. Employment impacts would be less beneficial than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Transportation and Circulation** – With the development of a senior community center on the site, this alternative is expected to result in less traffic impacts on area roadways. This is mainly due to the smaller floor area of development at the site and the less intensive land use. A mixed use development on the site would also result in less traffic impacts due to less trips generated by retail uses within a shopping center (approximately 5,050 trips) over a discount superstore, even with the additional 80 housing units (approximately 500 trips). Roadway improvements on Mountain Avenue, Hawthorne Street, and Main Street would be implemented under this alternative. The traffic impacts of this alternative are expected to be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – The construction of new buildings at the site would result in construction, vehicular and stationary air pollutant emissions. Construction emissions would be less with the senior community center and greater with the mixed use development than the proposed project, due to the size of the buildings that may be constructed under this alternative. Vehicle emissions would be less for both the senior community center and mixed use development, since this alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips to and from the site than the proposed project. GHG emissions with the senior center and a mixed

use development would be less due to less vehicle trips from the alternative land uses. The air quality impacts of this alternative are expected to be less than those of the proposed project.

**Noise** – Noise impacts from demolition and new building construction would occur under this alternative. Stationary noise generated by alternative uses on the site would likely be less for the senior community center and mixed use development, due to the smaller size of development. The lower number of vehicle trips expected under this alternative would also mean less vehicular noise. However, residents of the 80 units at the site would be exposed to noise impacts from the commercial uses on the lower floor and vehicle noise on driveways and parking lots on-site. Thus, noise impacts under this alternative would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new structures would lead to ground disturbance activities. However, the site is expected to remain relatively flat and changes in topography would be considered less than significant. Residents, employees, and patrons under this alternative would be exposed to the same geologic hazards as the proposed project. This impact is the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – With the demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the project site, changes to existing drainage patterns would occur. Stormwater pollutant reduction measures would be implemented and runoff from the site would be reduced. Also, the storm drain line on Mountain Avenue would be constructed under this alternative and street flooding would be eliminated. This impact is the same as those anticipated under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation on the site would be removed under this alternative and new plant materials would be provided in landscaped areas. Disturbance of existing plant and animal habitats would occur during construction. New landscaped areas and replacement habitat areas would be provided under this alternative use. This impact is similar to what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the project site, under this alternative, would require mineral resources in the form of construction aggregates for building construction. The demand for mineral resources would be lesser than the proposed project due to the smaller floor area for the senior community center. Slightly greater demand for mineral resources would occur with the mixed use development due to the greater floor area of the proposed building. Impacts would be the same under this alternative, as anticipated from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – The demand for public services under this alternative would include police and fire protection services for the proposed senior community center or mixed use development. Demand for schools, library services, and parks would be generated by the 80 dwelling units under this alternative. Due to the higher daytime and nighttime population under this alternative, it is expected that demand for fire and police protection services would be greater than the demand of the proposed project. Impacts on public services would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities and Service Systems** – With the higher daytime and nighttime population at the site, it is expected that a greater demand for utility services would occur under this alternative. Connections to existing utility lines would be made and facility upgrades implemented, as necessary. Impacts on utilities would be greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would include hazardous material use for building construction and maintenance, and for sale, but compliance with existing regulations would not create significant impacts to public health and safety. With the anticipated smaller volume of hazardous materials that would be stored and available for sale on-site, impacts would be less than those anticipated under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – Construction of a senior community center or mixed use development on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would lead to a change in the visual quality of the site. Views of the mountains to the north may change but would remain available at setback areas and between buildings. With the smaller floor area for the senior community center, more open space would be available on-site. With a two-story mixed use development, obstruction of mountain views would be greater under this alternative. New light poles would be downward-facing and would have shields, preventing light spillover on adjacent residences. Also, more landscaping than existing is expected on the site, as planned under the Mountain Village Specific Plan. Similar impacts are expected under this alternative as the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – Demolition of the existing buildings and construction of new buildings would lead to the elimination of blighted conditions at the site. In addition, employment generation would occur with the proposed senior community center or mixed use development. The commercial retail stores under the mixed use development of this alternative would meet some of the demand for merchandise stores in the market area. While a short-term oversupply of merchandise stores may occur in the market area, there is a shortage in the City and demands are projected to increase in the future. Demand for housing in the area would be met by the proposed 80 dwelling units. The senior community center would generate jobs and meet the needs of senior residents in the City and surrounding area. Impacts of this alternative would be less than those of the proposed project due to the smaller floor area of commercial development and lower employment generation.

**Cultural Resources** – The demolition of existing vacant commercial structures and construction of new buildings on the site would lead to ground disturbance, which may impact buried cultural resources. Thus, potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources at the site, under this alternative, would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

The analysis shows that the Alternative Use would have ~~the~~ less adverse impacts than the proposed project on transportation, air quality, socio-economic conditions, and hazards. This alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed project as they relate to population and housing, noise, public services, and utilities. Similar impacts on land use, geology, hydrology, biological resources, mineral resources, aesthetics, and cultural resources would occur under this alternative.

### 9.3.5 Lower Intensity Alternative

Under this alternative, the project site would be subject to redevelopment with a commercial development project with less floor area than the proposed project. This alternative assumes the same commercial development would be constructed on the site. However, the site would be developed at a lower intensity to ensure the project generated air quality impacts fall below SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, an approximately 64,000-square-foot shopping center, with 32,000 square feet of grocery area and 32,000 square feet of retail merchandise area would be built on the site under this alternative.

With a lower development intensity commercial development on the site, this alternative is expected to reduce potential air quality impacts to levels below SCAQMD thresholds. The lower intensity development would maintain the majority of the site as a parking area or landscaped area, which would not reflect the existing development intensity in the surrounding area or as planned under the Mountain Village Specific Plan and allowed under the Ontario General Plan.

The Lower Intensity Alternative would reduce the demand-driven impacts of the project, including traffic, air pollutants, noise, public service demand, and utilities demand. The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

### **Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

The Lower Intensity Alternative assumes that a 64,000-square-foot grocery and retail store or a smaller Wal-Mart Store would be built on the site, reducing the environmental impacts on the site and surrounding area. The environmental effects that may be expected under the Lower Intensity Alternative are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** - The project site would be redeveloped with a new building but would remain in its underutilized condition. Under the Lower Intensity Alternative, new commercial uses would be introduced to the project site, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would implement the development anticipated on the site, as planned in the Ontario General Plan and Mountain Village Specific Plan, but at a lower intensity. The same impacts on land use would occur under this alternative as the proposed project.

**Population and Housing** – With a smaller commercial development on the site, the increase in employment opportunities would also be less than the project. Some goods, services, and employment for the surrounding area would be provided. No direct changes to the City's existing population or housing stock would occur under this alternative. With less employment and goods and services, less beneficial impacts would occur under this alternative than the proposed project.

**Transportation and Circulation** – The traffic from the Hollywood Video store would remain, with new vehicle trips generated by the 64,000-square-foot commercial development project. New vehicle trips would be added to existing traffic volumes on the surrounding or nearby roadways and freeways, under this alternative. The trip generation impact is less than that anticipated with the proposed project. However, improvements to abutting roadways would be implemented, which would improve traffic flows in the area. This alternative would implement the Circulation Master Plan proposed on and near the site. Thus, less adverse impacts would occur under this alternative, than the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – New vehicular emissions and indirect power generation emissions would be generated by the site. The proposed commercial development would contribute air pollution in the area, under this alternative. However, with a smaller commercial floor area, air quality impacts would be less. Demolition and construction activities would generate short-term construction emissions. Operational impacts from vehicles, stationary equipment, and indirect power and gas generation would result in long-term air pollutant emissions. Based on the SCAQMD screening table (CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993 p. 6-10), a 64,000-square-foot shopping center would result in air quality impacts below thresholds.

With less floor area and vehicle trips, less GHG emissions would also be expected. Thus, this alternative would result in air quality impacts that are less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Noise** – The proposed commercial development would generate noise from demolition and construction activities. With the smaller floor area, less construction noise impacts are expected. Stationary noise and vehicle noise impacts associated with the lower intensity development would occur under this alternative. However, impacts are expected to be less and nuisance noise on adjacent residences would also be less. This alternative would generate noise impacts that are expected to be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils** – Changes in topography would occur under this alternative, due to construction, grading, and excavation activities. The lower intensity development would be exposed to the seismic and geologic hazards on the site. This impact is the same as that anticipated under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – Changes to existing drainage patterns would occur, as improvements to on-site and off-site drainage are implemented under this alternative. Existing street flooding along Mountain Avenue would be eliminated with the construction of the proposed storm drain along the site boundaries, similar to the proposed project. Stormwater pollutants from commercial activities at the site would be introduced into the storm drain system, and on-site treatment and detention of stormwater would occur. With fewer parked vehicles on the site and less intensive commercial uses, this impact is expected to be less than the impacts anticipated under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation would be removed from the site under this alternative. With a smaller commercial structure, it is expected that more parking and landscaped areas would be provided, resulting in more habitat areas available for local animal species and birds. This impact is less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – Redevelopment of the site would occur under this alternative, with the construction of a smaller building. Mineral resources would be needed to construct the proposed commercial structure and infrastructure. However, with the smaller building, the needed mineral resources would be less. Impacts under this alternative would be less than the impacts anticipated from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – This alternative's demand for police and fire protection services would be limited to the size of development and the number of patrons and employees at the site. No direct demand for schools, library, parks, or medical services would be generated by this alternative. With the smaller commercial development and less employees and patrons, impacts on public services would be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities** – Demand for utility services would be generated by the Lower Intensity Alternative. This demand is expected to be less due to the smaller floor area of development. Impacts on utilities would be less under this alternative than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – Demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings on the site, as anticipated under this alternative, would include hazardous material use for building construction and maintenance, and for sale, but compliance with existing regulations would not create significant impacts to public health and safety. With the anticipated smaller volume of hazardous



materials that would be stored and available for sale on-site, impacts would be less than those anticipated under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – The project site would be redeveloped with a new commercial buildings, with extensive parking areas and landscaped areas. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains would be opened at the site and from adjacent properties, as a smaller structure and more landscaping areas are introduced on-site. The visual characteristics of the site would change under this alternative, but impacts are expected to be less than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – The site would be redeveloped under this alternative, leading to the removal of blighted conditions due to the existing vacant commercial buildings. New employment would be generated and some goods and services would be provided for the surrounding neighborhood. With the smaller floor area of development, potential for closure of retail and food stores in the area is expected to be less. However, with the redevelopment of the site and the provision of employment, goods, and services to the community, beneficial impacts on socio-economic factors would also be less than those expected with the project.

**Cultural Resources** – The demolition of existing vacant commercial structures and construction of a new building on the site would lead to ground disturbance, which may impact buried cultural resources. Thus, potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources at the site, under this alternative, would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

The analysis shows that the Lower Intensity Alternative would have fewer impacts than the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter on most environmental issue areas due to the lower intensity of commercial development that would be built and operated on the site. However, impacts on population would be less beneficial and impacts on land use, geology, and cultural resources would be the same as that of the proposed project. This Alternative neglects to address a number of the specific objectives identified for the project site by failing to optimize the redevelopment potential of the site.

### **9.3.6 *Alternate Site Alternative***

Where consideration of alternate sites is warranted for a proposed project, CEQA requires that the analysis first consider if any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened if the project was located at another site. Only the locations that avoid or substantially lessen significant effects need to be considered. If no alternative sites are feasible, reasons for this conclusion must be included in the EIR. The EIR need not discuss sites which are infeasible, remote, or speculative.

While vacant lands are present in the City, there are no large underutilized or unoccupied commercial parcels in the City, which may be redeveloped with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter (Retail Center Guide, 2006). Thus, alternative sites for the project would have to consist of vacant, commercially-zoned property, approximately 16 acres in size.

There are no large areas of vacant land in the northwestern section of the City of Ontario, near the project site, which may serve as alternative sites to the project. Vacant sites in the northeastern portion of the City, capable of accommodating the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter, are limited to an approximately 13-acre parcel at the southeastern corner of Haven Avenue and Fourth Street (within Ontario Center Specific Plan) and a 16-acre area east of Vineyard Avenue, north of Inland Empire Boulevard and south of Fourth Street (within the Meredith International Center Specific Plan) (Chuck Mercier, pers. comm. 12/15/2006). The Haven site is located adjacent to a mix of residential and commercial uses, with vacant land to the north, office uses to the northeast, a multi-family residential

development to the east, office uses to the south, retail commercial uses and vacant land to the west, and office uses to the northwest. The Vineyard site is also located near commercial (north and northwest) and residential uses (west and northeast), but the 16-acre portion of Urban Commercial area where the project could be sited is surrounded by vacant land.

In addition, the southern section of the City (New Model Colony) contains agricultural lands and undeveloped lands that may accommodate the proposed project. Two areas have been designated for Regional Commercial uses, which would be able to accommodate the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. One area is at the northeastern or southeastern corner of Edison Avenue and Euclid Avenue and the other area is at the northwestern and southwestern corners of Milliken and Edison Avenues (within the proposed Rich-Haven Specific Plan) (Ontario SOI GPA, 1998 Figure 3-6 - Land Use Plan). The development of these alternative sites with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would prevent the creation of environmental impacts at the project site, and instead transfer potential impacts to another site in the City.

Other vacant areas to the north and west of the site are located within the cities of Upland and Montclair and outside the jurisdiction of the City of Ontario. While these areas may serve as alternative sites for the proposed project, the City has no control over the development or redevelopment of lands outside its jurisdiction.

While the project may possibly be developed at another location, the development of the Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter on alternative sites in the City would not reduce the impacts of the project on transportation, air quality, noise, public services, and utilities. Impacts on air quality would also remain significant even after mitigation, similar to the proposed project.

The environmental impacts of this alternative are briefly discussed below, along with a comparison of impacts with the proposed project.

### **Environmental Analysis of Alternative**

Under this alternative, the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would not be constructed on the site, but on alternative sites at the northeastern and southern sections of the City. The environmental effects that may be expected under this alternative are discussed by issue area below.

**Land Use and Planning** – The proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would be constructed on an alternative site that is also designated for General Commercial or Regional Commercial land uses under the Ontario General Plan. Changes to existing land uses would occur, as vacant land or underutilized land is developed with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. However, existing conditions at the project site would remain. On-site improvements anticipated under the applicable Specific Plans for the alternative sites would be implemented. Similar impacts would occur under this alternative than under the project.

**Population and Housing** – With the construction of the same commercial structure at another site, employment generation is expected to be the same as the proposed project. Impacts would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project. However, displacement impacts may occur at the alternative site on Edison and Euclid Avenue, due to the presence of existing businesses and dwelling units.

**Transportation and Circulation** – The trip generation of the Wal-Mart Supercenter would be the same on the alternative site as the project site. However, development on the alternative sites would impact a different set of roadways and intersections. Depending on the existing traffic volumes at the roadways

and intersections near the alternative sites, different traffic and roadway improvements would be needed under this alternative. These impacts would be similar than those anticipated under the proposed project.

**Air Quality** – No or minor demolition emissions are expected on alternative sites, which are largely vacant. Construction emissions would be the same as the proposed project, with the same floor area under this alternative. Vehicle emissions would also be the same, since this alternative would result in the same number of vehicle trips as the proposed project. Stationary emissions would be the same due to the same floor area and uses proposed. GHG emissions are also expected to be the same with the same vehicle trip generation and building floor area. Sensitive receptors (such as a residential development) which are located near the alternative sites may be subject to adverse air quality impacts associated with construction emissions. With fewer residences adjacent to the alternative sites, air quality impacts are expected to be less than the impacts of the proposed project.

**Noise** – The noise impacts associated with construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on the alternative sites would change over what may be expected under the proposed project. With alternative site as largely vacant land, no or minor demolition noise impacts would be expected under this alternative. With a different set of roadways and traffic distribution, project-related vehicle noise impacts would have a different effect. Depending on their presence, sensitive receptors (such as a residential development) which are located near the alternative sites may be subject to adverse noise impacts associated with construction and stationary noise sources. With fewer residences near alternative sites, noise impacts are expected to be less than the impacts of the proposed project. Also, if existing roadway noise levels near the alternative sites do not exceed City standards, the project would not contribute to continued violation of noise standards.

**Geology and Soils** – Construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on an alternative site would lead to ground disturbance activities. However, the alternative sites are comparable to the project site and changes in topography would be insignificant. Commercial employees and patrons under this alternative would be exposed to similar site-specific geologic and seismic hazards. This impact is the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** – With the construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on an alternative site, changes to existing drainage patterns would occur at that site. Potential for stormwater pollution would occur during construction and operation of the Wal-Mart Supercenter at the alternative sites, similar to the project. Stormwater pollutant reduction measures would be implemented and runoff from the developed site maintained at existing vacant conditions. Storm drain system improvements would be implemented as needed to prevent street flooding. This impact is the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

**Biological Resources** – Existing vegetation on the alternative sites would be removed. Since the alternative sites are largely vacant, current use of these alternative sites for foraging and animal habitat are greater. Under this alternative, new plant materials would be provided in landscaped areas, similar to the project. Disturbance of existing plant and animal habitats would occur during construction but more plants and animals are likely to be disturbed on alternative undeveloped sites. This impact is greater than what would occur under the proposed project.

**Mineral Resources** – Construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on an alternative site would require mineral resources in the form of construction aggregates for building construction. This demand for

mineral resources would be the same as that of the proposed project due to the same floor area as the proposed project. Impacts on mineral resources would be the same as anticipated from the proposed project.

**Public Services** – The demand for public services under this alternative would include police and fire protection services for the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. No direct demand for schools, library services, parks, and medical services would be generated under this alternative, similar to the project. Due to the same floor area and uses under this alternative, it is expected that demand for fire and police protection services would also be the same as the proposed project. No direct impacts on schools, libraries, and parks are expected, similar to the project. Impacts on public services would be similar to what would occur under the proposed project.

**Utilities and Service Systems** – With the same land uses and floor area as the proposed project, it is expected that the same demand for utility services would occur under this alternative. Connections to existing utility lines would be made and facility upgrades implemented, as necessary. Impacts on utilities would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

**Hazards and Human Health** – The construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on an alternative site would include hazardous material use for building construction and maintenance, and for sale, but compliance with existing regulations would not create significant impacts to public health and safety. Impacts on hazardous material uses in former agricultural areas, as found in the alternative sites at the southern section of the site, including exposure to chemical residues from fertilizers and pesticides, may occur on alternative sites. Remediation would have to be implemented, as necessary. However, impacts would be the same to what is anticipated under the proposed project.

**Aesthetics** – Construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on alternative sites would lead to a change in the visual quality of the alternative sites. Views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north and northeast would change as the alternative vacant sites are replaced with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter building, but views are expected to remain available at setback areas and between buildings. With the same uses and floor area, light sources would be the same. Similar impacts are expected under this alternative as the proposed project.

**Socio-Economic Conditions** – Construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter on an alternative site would not lead to the elimination of vacant commercial buildings at the site. Employment generation would occur in the City and the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would meet the demand for grocery and merchandise stores in the market area. While a short-term oversupply of food stores may occur in the immediate area, there is a shortage in the larger market area. Also, an oversupply of merchandise stores in the market area would occur, similar to the project. This oversupply would be short-term, as projected increases in demand for food stores and merchandise stores are expected over time. Since largely vacant land would be utilized under this alternative, blighted conditions at the site or other areas of the City would not be removed. This impact is less beneficial than the impacts of the proposed project.

**Cultural Resources** – Construction of the Wal-Mart Supercenter at an alternative site would lead to ground disturbance, which may impact buried cultural resources. Due to the site-specific nature of cultural resources, it is not known if significant cultural resources are present on the alternative sites. Thus, potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources under this alternative would be the same as what would occur under the proposed project.

The alternative sites offer different advantages in terms of avoiding or reducing the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project on site-specific resources. The alternative sites also bring in their own site-specific characteristics and constraints that would affect the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. The analysis shows that the Alternative Sites would have the greater impacts than the proposed project as they relate to biological resources. All other impacts would remain similar to the proposed project. This alternative would not reduce the impacts of the project on air quality, traffic, public services, utilities, and noise; although the air quality and noise impacts on adjacent sensitive receptors (residences) may be less. Impacts on air quality would also remain significant even after mitigation, similar to the proposed project.

#### 9.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative among all of the alternatives considered, including the proposed project. If the No Project Alternative is selected as environmentally superior, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Table 9-1, *Comparison of Alternatives*, identifies the comparative impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project by issue area, with **bold text** in the unshaded boxes representing less impacts, shaded boxes representing greater impacts, and plain text in unshaded boxes representing similar impacts. Thus, the alternative with a greater number of **bold texts** than shaded boxes or plain text in unshaded boxes would be environmentally superior to the project. Alternatively, one with a higher number of shaded boxes than unshaded boxes would have greater impacts than the project.

TABLE 9-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES						
Proposed Project	No Project	Building Reuse	Specific Plan	Alternative Use	Lower Intensity	Alternative Sites
<b>Land Use and Planning</b> 190,803-square-foot Wal-Mart Supercenter	No new development; not consistent with Mountain Village Specific Plan (greater impact)	<b>Existing buildings rehabilitated and reused (less impact)</b>	New commercial structures built on-site (same impact)	Senior community center or mixed use development (same impact)	64,000-square-foot commercial use (same impact)	190,803-square-foot Wal-Mart Supercenter (same impact)
<b>Population and Housing</b> 450 jobs; goods and services for the area	No new jobs created; no goods and services (less beneficial impact)	<b>More jobs than project; goods and services for the area (less impact)</b>	<b>More jobs than project; goods and services for the area (less impact)</b>	Fewer jobs created; new residents (less beneficial impact)	Fewer jobs; goods and services for the area (less beneficial impact)	450 jobs; goods and services for the area (same impact)
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b> 7,981 new vehicle trips; increase in traffic volumes on area streets	No vehicle trips; no roadway improvements (greater impact)	10,506 new vehicle trips; increase in traffic volumes on area streets (greater impact)	9,605 new vehicle trips; increase in traffic volumes on area streets (greater impact)	<b>6,000 vehicles trips or less; roadway improvements (less impact)</b>	<b>3,000 vehicles trips; roadway improvements (less impact)</b>	7,981 new vehicle trips; increase in traffic volumes on other streets (same impact)
<b>Air Quality</b> Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary emissions	<b>No construction emissions; no new vehicle, stationary and GHG emissions (less impact)</b>	Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary emissions and GHG emissions (greater impact)	Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary emissions and GHG emissions (greater impact)	<b>Less trips mean less demolition, construction, vehicle, GHG, and stationary emissions (less impact)</b>	<b>Less trips and floor area mean less demolition, construction, vehicle, GHG, and stationary emissions</b>	<b>No demolition emissions; fewer sensitive receptors; same GHG emissions (less impact)</b>

**TABLE 9-1**  
**COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Building Reuse</b>	<b>Specific Plan</b>	<b>Alternative Use</b>	<b>Lower Intensity</b>	<b>Alternative Sites</b>
					<b>(less impact)</b>	
<b>Noise</b> Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary noise	<b>No construction noise; no new vehicle and stationary noise (less impact)</b>	Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary noise (greater impact)	Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary noise (greater impact)	Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary noise on site residents (greater impact)	<b>Demolition, construction, vehicle, and stationary noise (less impact)</b>	<b>No demolition noise; fewer sensitive receptors (less impact)</b>
<b>Geology and Soils</b> Soil disturbance due to grading and excavation activities	<b>No grading or excavation activities (less impact)</b>	<b>Building rehabilitation only (less impact)</b>	Soil disturbance due to grading and excavation activities (same impact)	Soil disturbance due to grading and excavation activities (same impact)	Soil disturbance due to grading and excavation activities (same impact)	Soil disturbance due to grading and excavation activities (same impact)
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b> Changes in the existing drainage pattern; reduced runoff; construction of storm drain line, creation of urban pollutants	No changes in runoff volume and pollutants; no construction of storm drain (greater impact)	No changes in runoff volume; new pollutants; no construction of storm drain (greater impact)	Change existing drainage pattern; reduced runoff; construction of storm drain line, urban pollutants (same impact)	Change existing drainage pattern; reduced runoff; construction of storm drain line, urban pollutants (same impact)	<b>Change existing drainage pattern; reduced runoff; construction of storm drain line, urban pollutants (less impact)</b>	Change existing drainage pattern; reduced runoff; construction of storm drain line, urban pollutants (same impact)
<b>Biological Resources</b> Existing vegetation would be removed and landscaping materials introduced	<b>No change in existing vegetation (less impact)</b>	<b>No change in existing vegetation (less impact)</b>	Existing vegetation would be removed and landscaping materials introduced (same impact)	Existing vegetation would be removed and landscaping materials introduced (same impact)	<b>Existing vegetation would be removed and more landscaped areas (less impact)</b>	Existing vegetation would be removed and landscaping materials introduced (greater impact)
<b>Mineral Resources</b> Mineral resources needed for construction	<b>No demand for mineral resources (less impact)</b>	<b>Minor demand for mineral resources (less impact)</b>	Mineral resources needed for construction (greater impact)	Mineral resources needed for construction (same impact)	<b>Mineral resources needed for construction (less impact)</b>	Mineral resources needed for construction (same impact)
<b>Public Services</b> Demand for police and fire services	<b>No change in existing demand for public services (less impact)</b>	Demand for police and fire services (greater impact)	Demand for police and fire services (greater impact)	Demand for police, fire, school, library and parks (greater impact)	<b>Demand for police and fire services (less impact)</b>	Demand for police and fire services (same impact)
<b>Utilities</b> Utility services and connections needed	<b>No change in demand for utility services (less impact)</b>	Demand for utility services (greater impact)	Demand for utility services (greater impact)	Demand for utility services (greater impact)	<b>Demand for utility services (less impact)</b>	Demand for utility services (same impact)
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b> Hazardous material use for construction, maintenance and for sale	<b>No new hazardous material use (less impact)</b>	Hazardous material use for reconstruction, maintenance and for sale (same impact)	Hazardous material use for construction, maintenance and for sale (same impact)	<b>Hazardous material use for construction, maintenance and for sale (less impact)</b>	<b>Hazardous material use for construction, maintenance and for sale (less impact)</b>	Hazardous material use for construction, maintenance and for sale (same impact)

TABLE 9-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES						
Proposed Project	No Project	Building Reuse	Specific Plan	Alternative Use	Lower Intensity	Alternative Sites
<b>Aesthetics</b> Visual change from new building; new sources of light and glare	<b>No changes to visual characteristics of the vacant site (less impact)</b>	Minor change in visual quality of site; use of existing light sources (greater impact)	Visual change from new building; new sources of light and glare (same impact)	Visual change from new building; new sources of light and glare (same impact)	<b>Visual change from smaller building; new sources of light and glare (less impact)</b>	Visual change from new building; new sources of light and glare (same impact)
<b>Socio-economic Conditions</b> Removal of blighted conditions; new jobs; short-term oversupply of retail and food stores	Blighted conditions will remain; no new employment (greater impact)	Remove blighted conditions, new jobs; short-term oversupply of retail and food stores (same impact)	Remove blighted conditions, new jobs; short-term oversupply of retail stores (same impact)	<b>Remove blighted conditions, new jobs, short-term oversupply of retail stores (less impact)</b>	<b>Remove blighted conditions, new jobs, less oversupply of retail and food stores (less impact)</b>	Blighted conditions remain; new jobs; short-term oversupply of retail and food stores (greater impact)
<b>Cultural Resources</b> Ground disturbance may affect unknown resources	<b>No ground disturbance would occur (less impact)</b>	<b>Limited ground disturbance would occur (less impact)</b>	Ground disturbance may affect unknown resources (same impact)	Ground disturbance may affect unknown resources (same impact)	Ground disturbance may affect unknown resources (same impact)	Ground disturbance may affect unknown resources (same impact)

The environmental analysis of alternatives above indicates that, through a comparison of potential impacts from each of the alternatives and the proposed project, the No Project Alternative could be considered superior because no new environmental impacts would be introduced to the project site and the surrounding area. However, the existing conditions at the site are not superior to the proposed project. The site is developed with vacant commercial buildings that have been slowly deteriorating over time. Retaining the site in its underutilized condition (with only the Hollywood Video store in use) would not be consistent with the Mountain Village Specific Plan or the Ontario General Plan. No new jobs would be generated and no retail goods and services for the surrounding residential communities would be provided.

The proposed roadway improvements on Mountain Avenue would also not occur under this alternative. This could lead to future traffic congestion on this Major Arterial and would not be consistent with the City's Circulation Master Plan. The No Project Alternative would also not lead to the construction of the storm drain line on Mountain Avenue that would alleviate street flooding. This alternative would also not meet any of the project objectives for the redevelopment of the site.

Aside from the No Project Alternative, the Lower Intensity Alternative would also be considered environmentally superior. The Lower Intensity Alternative would result in the same commercial uses on the site. Thus, the environmental impacts of this project would generally be the same as the impacts associated with the proposed project. However, with less commercial floor area (approximately one-third the size of the proposed project), demand-driven impacts would be substantially less. This would result in less impacts on traffic, air quality, noise, public services, and utilities. This alternative would also reduce air quality impacts to less than significant levels.

In addition, the Lower Intensity Alternative would meet the project's objectives, as identified in Section 3.1, *Objectives of the Project*, of this EIR as successfully as the proposed project. These objectives include:

- To eliminate the abandoned buildings on-site (existing vacant buildings would be demolished)

*Alternatives (continued)*

---

- To remove an aesthetically displeasing site (site would be improved);
- To rehabilitate the blighted parcel to create a new mix of retail/commercial uses responsive to the City and regional markets (commercial uses would be introduced on-site);
- To provide retail/commercial uses to serve the needs of residents (commercial uses would serve local residents);
- To increase economic benefits to the City through job creation (jobs would be created on-site);
- To augment the City's economic base by providing a variety of tax-generating uses (sales tax and tax increment would be generated);
- To provide retail/commercial development compatible with nearby land uses (commercial use similar to those along Mountain Avenue);
- To implement needed roadway improvements near the site (Mountain Avenue would be widened to improve traffic flow);
- To upgrade utility infrastructure with redevelopment of the site (utility connections would be replaced and the proposed storm drain would alleviate existing street flooding)
- To ensure development of the project site in a manner consistent with the City's General Plan, the Redevelopment Plan for Project No. 2, and the Mountain Village Specific Plan (lower intensity commercial use is allowed under General Plan and Specific Plan)

However, the outcomes offered by this Alternative are limited when compared to the proposed project, to the extent that:

- The Alternative fails to fully respond to the demands of the local and regional market by only partially addressing the identified demand for general merchandise retailers in the market area.
- A smaller commercial / retail footprint will result in lower employment generation.
- The tax generation potential of the project site will not be fully exploited, reducing the City's economic base.
- The lower development intensity fails to reflect the development intensity in surrounding areas as intended in the Redevelopment Plan for Project No. 2 and the Mountain Village Specific Plan.

While fewer jobs would be generated by this alternative, the oversupply of food stores in the City and of merchandise stores in the market area would not be as large as the project's and could potentially avoid the closure of competing retail shops and food stores. The Lower Intensity Alternative would meet the objectives of the proposed project to a lesser degree, with an accompanying reduction in environmental impacts. Thus, it is also considered an environmentally superior alternative.