

## **SECTION 8: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **8.1 - INTRODUCTION**

The State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe a range of alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the proposed project, which would feasibly achieve most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the analysis. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, an EIR must consider a reasonable range of alternatives that are potentially feasible; an EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible.

Alternatives must be considered even if they would impede, to some degree, the attainment of project objectives or be more costly. The determination of feasibility of project alternatives may include, but not be limited to, factors such as site suitability, economic viability, infrastructure, plan consistency, regulatory and jurisdictional limitations, and control of an alternative site, if applicable.

The analysis contained in this section compares each of the alternatives to the project, and includes an analysis of each alternative with respect to each of the ten environmental issues evaluated for the proposed project. In addition, the analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the proposed project would be implemented with an alternative. However, applicable mitigation measures may be scaled to reduce or avoid the potential impacts of the alternative under consideration, and may not precisely match those identified for the proposed project.

One of the alternatives must be identified as an Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Environmentally Superior Alternative is the one that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. If the Environmentally Superior Alternative that is identified is the No Project Alternative, then an Environmentally Superior Alternative must be selected from the remaining alternatives. Section 8.6 identifies and discusses the Environmentally Superior Alternative and includes Table 8-1 that compares the impacts of the alternatives and Table 8-2 that identifies the feasibility of each project objective by alternative.

The City has eliminated one alternative from further consideration and identified four alternatives for evaluation. The reasons for eliminating alternatives and including other alternatives are discussed separately below.

The City has eliminated from further consideration the following alternative:

- Different Site Alternative.

The City has included for evaluation the following four alternatives:

- No Project Alternative - No Development;
- Agricultural Retention Alternative;
- No General Plan Amendment Alternative; and
- Reduced Residential Density Alternative.

### **8.1.1 - Alternative Eliminated from Evaluation**

Following is a discussion of the reasons the City has for eliminating the Different Site Alternative.

A Different Site Alternative would evaluate the land uses proposed by the Edenglen Project for development in a different location. However, this alternative was eliminated by the City for several reasons. A different site would be considered viable only if the proposed uses in a different location would avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant effects of the proposed project. Because the majority of the project objectives are linked to the NMC, the most likely alternative location would be one of the other NMC subareas. However, because the remainder of the NMC subareas, with the exception of the SoCALF agricultural properties located in the western portion of the NMC, are proposed for urban type development they would be expected to have similar impacts as compared to the proposed project. A few of the project objectives could be, at least theoretically, be achieved at a location outside the NMC. Any alternative locations in the vicinity of the project site that could be developed with the proposed uses could result in greater significant impacts than those associated with the project site. In addition, changing the land uses that are associated with each of the individual subareas could require all of the subareas land uses to be revised. Further evaluation of this alternative would not provide any meaningful information or environmental benefit.

This alternative was eliminated from evaluation and is not discussed further.

### **8.1.2 - Alternatives Identified for Evaluation**

Following is a discussion of the reasons the City has for including the No Project - No Development Alternative, Agriculture Retention Alternative, the No General Plan Amendment Alternative, and the Reduced Residential Density Alternative.

**No Project Alternative**

The discussion and evaluation of a No Project Alternative is required by the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the City has an obligation to comply with the provisions of CEQA by discussing and evaluating this alternative. This alternative provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed project in contrast to the environmental impacts that could result from not approving, or denying, the proposed project. Because the decision-making body of the City has discretionary authority over a proposed project and could choose to deny it, the environmental impacts of that action must be disclosed. As a result of this potential decision, the project site could remain in its current state and condition for an undetermined period of time and not be the subject of any further development proposals. Evaluation of this alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

Section 8.2 which follows, discusses and evaluates the No Project Alternative - No Development.

**Agricultural Retention Alternative**

The reason the City selected this alternative for evaluation was to determine if any significant impacts of the proposed project would be eliminated or further reduced by developing the residential and commercial land uses as proposed, but replacing the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park with agriculture uses. Evaluation of this alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

Section 8.3, following, discusses and evaluates the Agricultural Retention Alternative.

**No General Plan Amendment Alternative**

The reason the City selected this alternative is to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the land uses as proposed, but without the proposed general plan amendment. The proposed general plan amendment applies only to the residential component; no general plan amendment is proposed for the commercial component. Evaluation of this alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

Section 8.4, following, discusses and evaluates the No General Plan Amendment Alternative.

**Reduced Residential Density Alternative**

The reason the City selected this alternative is to evaluate the potential impacts associated with reducing the amount of residential units proposed for development. Evaluation of this alternative will

determine if any significant impacts would be eliminated or further reduced by the reduction from 584 dwelling units to a total of 277 dwelling units. This alternative assumes that the 277 dwelling units would be dispersed across the residential component of the project site.

Section 8.5, following, discusses and evaluates the Reduced Residential Density Alternative.

## **8.2 - NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE- NO DEVELOPMENT**

### **8.2.1 - Description**

This alternative compares, with the conditions existing at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, what would be reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved (i.e., denied) and without subsequent development proposals. This alternative compares the environmental effects of the property remaining in its current state against the environmental effects that would occur if the project is approved.

Under this alternative, the commercial dairy and nursery would continue in operation and the portion of the project site used for cultivated row crop production would continue to be used for an undetermined period of time.

### **8.2.2 - Impact Evaluation**

Following is a comparison of each topical area with this alternative.

#### **Agriculture**

Under the proposed project, significant and unavoidable impacts to Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland (Farmland) would result from implementation of the proposed project. In addition, the dairy and nursery would cease operations and portions of the project site would no longer be used for row crop production.

Under this alternative, the dairy and nursery could continue in operation and the remaining portion of the project site could be used for row crop agricultural production. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding the significant and unavoidable impacts to agriculture associated with the proposed project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to water quality and off-site flooding were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative continued use of the project site for agricultural production may discharge pollutants into the ground and ultimately the groundwater, and also convey pollutants off-site during heavy rain events. However, this alternative would avoid the potential for increased flooding associated with the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding the less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality associated with the proposed project.

## Biological Resources

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts were identified that are related to modification of habitat for migratory waterfowl and raptors, and direct impacts to the burrowing owl and Delhi Sands flower-loving fly if suitable habitat would continue to be available on the project site. These potentially significant impacts would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would continue to be available for use by burrowing owls and the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly, if suitable habitat would continue to be available on the project site, and raptors that may use the windrow and open fields, and migratory waterfowl that may use the existing on-site stormwater retention basin. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed project.

## Geology and Soils

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to seismically-induced ground shaking and structural damage related to building on poorly compacted soils, corrosive soils, and expansive soils were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the existing on-site structures would be subject to seismically-related groundshaking similar to the proposed project. The existing structures located on the western portion of the project site could be subjected to structural damage from poor or unstable soils similar to the proposed project. However, there are only a few structures on this portion of the project site, and the organic-rich soils are a direct result of dairy operations. This exposure to structural damage would not be equivalent to the proposed project. Because no additional structures would be built under this alternative, the potential for impacts related to structural damage that would result from construction

on poor or unstable soils would be avoided. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed project.

## **Hazards**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to exposure from lead based paints and asbestos that would result from demolition activities and from methane that may have accumulated in the soil were identified. However, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the potential exposure to persons from lead based paints and asbestos related to demolition would be avoided because no structures would be removed and methane would continue to be released into the atmosphere, rather than potentially accumulate in the soil under paving and structural foundations. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

## **Transportation and Circulation**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to an increase in traffic were identified at the study intersections for Year 2015. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, all but two of the intersections, Riverside Drive and Milliken Avenue and the future intersection of Chino Avenue and Milliken Avenue, would operate at or above established City level of service thresholds. However, the analysis determined that with the circulation-related improvements ultimately planned for the NMC, the level of service for these two intersections would operate acceptably by Year 2030, representing the estimated build-out date for the NMC.

Under this alternative, the potential impacts related to traffic would be avoided because no development would occur that would result in additional generation of traffic. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the significant impacts to transportation and circulation that would occur in Year 2015, associated with the proposed project.

## **Noise**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to noise were identified that would result from construction-related activities and, depending on the locations of sensitive receptors, the potential to exceed established City noise standards due to an increase in traffic. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, the potential exposure to persons from construction-related noise impacts and potential to exceed City noise standards would be avoided because no development would occur that would result in additional generation of noise. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to noise associated with the proposed project.

### **Air Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to air quality that related to short-term, construction activities and to long-term operations were identified. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce many of the emissions below the thresholds identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thereby reducing the potentially significant impacts below the level of significance. However, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub> would remain above the SCAQMD thresholds for the short-term construction period. For long-term operations, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would remain above SCAQMD thresholds. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality would remain after implementation of the proposed project.

Under this alternative, the potentially significant impacts related to air quality resulting from the proposed project would be eliminated. However, the impacts to air quality that would result from continued operations of the dairy, nursery, and row crop agricultural production would not be eliminated. The existing air quality emissions on the project site were not modeled for the purposes of this evaluation, but it is assumed that under this alternative PM-10 and methane would continue to be generated. It is further assumed that had the existing emissions such as ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and SO<sub>x</sub> been modeled, they would be less than the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening significant impacts to air quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Public Services**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to impacts on school facilities were identified due to the additional school-age children that would be generated, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the additional school-age children would not be generated and would not result in the need for additional and/or expanded school facilities. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to public services associated with the proposed project.

## Utilities

Under the proposed project, no significant impacts were identified related to domestic water supply, wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity, solid waste landfill capacity, and the provision of electricity and natural gas.

Under this alternative, consumptions of natural gas and electricity would remain at their current levels, similar amounts of solid waste would be generated, wastewater would continue to be treated on-site through a septic and leach field system, and domestic water would continue to be provided from the on-site domestic well. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding the less than significant impacts to utilities associated with the proposed project.

## Cultural Resources

The possibility exists for potentially significant subsurface cultural resources to occur on the site. Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to Native American Resources, archaeological resources or paleontological resources could occur during construction-related activities. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, no development would occur and no disturbance of possible subsurface cultural resources would result. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project.

### 8.2.3 - Conclusions

This alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because the continuation of the existing uses on the project site would eliminate or lessen most of the significant impacts related to the proposed project.

## 8.3 - AGRICULTURAL RETENTION ALTERNATIVE

### 8.3.1 - Description

This alternative includes the residential and commercial land uses as proposed, but replaces the 27 acres of the project site, proposed for light industrial/business park uses with agriculture uses. This alternative includes the minor general plan amendment associated with the residential component of the proposed project and includes the development of the bicycle and pedestrian path in the SCE Corridor.



The City's Agricultural Overlay Zoning District (AOZD), contained in section 9-1.2700 of the Ontario Municipal Code, allows existing agricultural uses within the NMC to continue on an interim basis until such time as development is proposed for the subareas. Permitted uses include crop production, nurseries, and animal keeping. Conditionally permitted uses include the following: agricultural support services; animal hospitals; antennae and wireless communication facilities; apiaries; calf growing ranches; churches; dairies, educational facilities; fertilizer operations; kennels; mushroom farms; rodeos; and livestock trading. Moreover, these land uses are presented as the most likely land uses that could be allowed under this alternative. Because this range of permitted and conditionally permitted uses includes a broad range of development combinations, such as row crop production compared to an animal hospital, a single potential use has been selected from the above list that is deemed to be the most likely that would be developed under this alternative. Therefore, for purposes of this evaluation a large-scale retail nursery has been selected as the use that would be developed. This land use would likely require the development of infrastructure for water, wastewater, electricity, natural gas, and telephone service and the development of buildings and fixtures.

In addition, there are no data presented in the NMC Final EIR that address the economic viability of some of the identified agricultural uses on a relatively small portion of land that would ultimately be surrounded by urban development.

All other components of the proposed project would remain the same.

### **8.3.2 - Impact Evaluation**

Following is a comparison of each topical area with this alternative.

#### **Agriculture**

Under the proposed project, significant and unavoidable impacts to Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland (Farmland) would result from implementation of the proposed project. In addition, the dairy and nursery would cease operations and portions of the project site would no longer be used for row crop production.

Under this alternative, the portion of the eastern half of the project site that is proposed for light industrial/business park uses would not be developed as proposed and would be developed with a retail nursery. Because a retail nursery would require permanent improvements and temporary fixtures, portions of this portion of the project site may be permanently converted. However, because portions of the eastern part of the project site are not classified as Farmland, some permanent improvements associated with the nursery could be located on the portions of the eastern half of the project site classified as urban and built-up and other lands, and allow the above-ground fixtures to be

built on the portion of the project site classified as Farmland, thereby eliminating permanent conversion of Farmland should this use be discontinued in the future.

Under this alternative, the development of the portion of the project site proposed for residential and community commercial uses would result in the permanent conversion of Farmland, which would still be a significant impact to agricultural resources. Therefore, this alternative would lessen but not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts related to agriculture associated with the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to water quality and off-site flooding were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The development of a portion of the project site as a retail nursery would require surface infrastructure such as parking lots and drive aisles for service vehicles that would result in water quality impacts and the potential for off-site flooding. However, due to the type of development, the amount of impervious surfaces developed under this alternative use would likely be significantly less than the proposed light industrial/business park uses that are proposed, and the potential for surface runoff containing urban pollution would be slightly reduced.

Therefore, this alternative would not result in lessening the less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts were identified that are related to modification of habitat for migratory waterfowl and raptors, and direct impacts to the burrowing owl and Delhi Sands flower-loving fly if present on the project site. These potentially significant impacts would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to biological resources. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would also require conversion of the existing row crop production that is used in

combination with the windrow for foraging habitat, and that could be used by burrowing owls and the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly, if present on the project site. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed project.

## **Geology and Soils**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to seismically-induced ground shaking and structural damage related to building on poorly compacted soils, corrosive soils, and expansive soils were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to geology and soils. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would require permanent structures and the above-ground fixtures that would be subject to seismically-induced ground shaking and potential structural damage from poor or unstable soils. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed project.

## **Hazards**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to exposure to persons from lead based paints and asbestos that would result from demolition activities and from methane that may have accumulated in the soil were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to hazards. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses could require the demolition of the existing nursery structures, or expansion of these structures, which would result in similar impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

## **Transportation and Circulation**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to an increase in traffic were identified at the study intersections for Year 2015. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, all but two of the intersections, Riverside Drive and Milliken Avenue and the future intersection of Chino Avenue and Milliken Avenue, would operate at or above established City

level of service thresholds. However, the analysis determined that with the circulation-related improvements ultimately planned for the NMC, the level of service for these two intersections would operate acceptably by Year 2030, representing the estimated build-out date for the NMC.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would result in the generation of traffic identical to the residential and commercial component of the proposed project. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would likely result in fewer vehicle trips than the light industrial/business park uses of the proposed project, but would not likely result in the elimination or lessening of the significant impacts to traffic that would occur in Year 2015. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening significant impacts to transportation and circulation associated with the proposed project.

## **Noise**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to noise were identified that would result from construction-related activities and, depending on the locations of sensitive receptors, the potential to exceed established City noise standards due to an increase in traffic. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, the potential exposure to persons from construction-related noise impacts and potential to exceed City noise standards associated with the residential and community commercial uses would be identical to the proposed project. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses that would result in construction-related noise impacts similar to the proposed project. However, these impacts would likely be less because this alternative would require fewer buildings. In addition, because this alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project, the potential to exceed established noise standards could be lessened. Therefore, this alternative would result in lessening the less than significant impacts to noise associated with the proposed project but would not avoid them altogether.

## **Air Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to air quality related to short-term, construction activities and to long-term operations were identified. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce many of the emissions below the thresholds identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thereby reducing the potentially significant impacts below the level of significance. However, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub> would remain above the SCAQMD thresholds for the short-term construction period. For long-term operations, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would remain above SCAQMD thresholds. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation

measures, significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality would remain after implementation of the proposed project.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to air quality. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would require short-term construction activities and long-term operational activities. The short-term construction activities would have similar emissions to those of the proposed project, but would likely generate lesser quantities because there would be fewer buildings proposed for construction. The long-term operations of a retail nursery would require consumption of natural resources, similar to the proposed project, but a reduced consumption of these resources. This alternative would result in emissions and vehicular trips, which are the greatest single-source of air quality emissions. This type of land use would generate vehicular trips from employees, consumers, and commercial vehicles for deliveries. However, the amount of vehicle trips associated with this land use would be less than the proposed light industrial/business park uses thereby reducing the air quality impacts. Therefore, this alternative would result in avoiding or lessening significant impacts to air quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Public Services**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to impacts on school facilities were identified due to the additional school-age children that would be generated by the proposed project. However, this impact would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure.

Under this alternative, the residential and commercial component would be developed identical to the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to school facilities. The development of a retail nursery on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would not result in the development of dwelling units that would generate additional students. The amount of students that would be generated under this alternative would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts school facilities associated with the proposed project.

### **Utilities**

Under the proposed project, no significant impacts were identified related to domestic water supply, wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity, solid waste landfill capacity, and the provision of electricity and natural gas.

Under this alternative, consumptions of natural gas and electricity, solid waste generation rates, and estimated demand for domestic water supply and wastewater treatment would be identical to the residential and community commercial component of the proposed project. Replacing the proposed light industrial/business park uses with a retail nursery would require the same utilities, but at a reduced level. Therefore, this alternative would result in lessening the less than significant impacts to utilities associated with the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

The possibility exists for potentially significant subsurface cultural resources to occur on the site. Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to Native American Resources, archaeological resources or paleontological resources could occur during construction-related activities. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, development would occur as proposed on the portion of the project site designated for residential and commercial uses, but would not occur on the portion of the project site designated for light industrial/business park uses. The portion of the project designated for light industrial/business park uses would instead be retained with agricultural uses. For purposes of this evaluation, a large-scale retail nursery has been selected. The portion of the project site proposed for residential and commercial development would result in impacts to cultural resources identical to the proposed project. Because the portion of the project site proposed for agricultural retention would require the development of buildings and infrastructure, impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project are anticipated. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project.

### **8.3.3 - Conclusions**

This alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because the retention of agricultural uses on the portion of the project site proposed for light industrial/business park uses would reduce some of the potentially significant impacts related to the proposed project, but would not reduce these impacts below the level of significance. Retention of a portion of the project site with an agricultural use, however, could result in land use incompatibility with the proposed residential and community commercial uses.

## **8.4 - NO GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT ALTERNATIVE**

### **8.4.1 - Description**

One of the components of the proposed project is a general plan amendment (refer to Exhibit 3-8 in Section 3.3.1 of this document), which proposes to relocate two of the three residential designations

on the project site. This alternative evaluates the proposed project without the general plan amendment component. All other components of the proposed project will remain the same. This alternative is essentially the same as a No Project - Allowed Development alternative.

## **8.4.2 - Impact Evaluation**

### **Agriculture**

Under the proposed project, significant and unavoidable impacts to Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland (Farmland) would result from implementation of the proposed project. In addition, the dairy and nursery would cease operations and portions of the project site would no longer be used for row crop production.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and result in conversion of the entire project site. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the significant and unavoidable impacts to agriculture associated with the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to water quality and off-site flooding were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts were identified that are related to modification of habitat for migratory waterfowl and raptors, and direct impacts to the burrowing owl and Delhi Sands flower-loving fly if present on the project site. These potentially significant impacts would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the overall configuration that would result in the same impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed project.

## **Geology and Soils**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to seismically-induced ground shaking and structural damage related to building on poorly compacted soils, corrosive soils, and expansive soils were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to geology and soils. Because the majority of poor soil conditions are located on the western portion of the project site, relocating the residential components would not avoid the poor soil conditions. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed project.

## **Hazards**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to exposure from lead based paints and asbestos that would result from demolition activities and from methane that may have accumulated in the soil were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to hazards. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

## **Transportation and Circulation**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to an increase in traffic were identified at the study intersections for Year 2015. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, all but two of the intersections, Riverside Drive and Milliken Avenue and the future intersection of Chino Avenue and Milliken Avenue, would operate at or above established City level of service thresholds. However, the analysis determined that with the circulation-related improvements ultimately planned for the NMC, the level of service for these two intersections would operate acceptably by Year 2030, representing the estimated build-out date for the NMC.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to hazards. The relocation of the residential uses would generate the same amount of vehicle trips, but may result in a slight redistribution of traffic among the Primary Access Intersections due to the relocation of residential



densities on the project site. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening significant impacts to transportation and circulation in relation to the proposed project.

### **Noise**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to noise were identified that would result from construction-related activities and, depending on the locations of sensitive receptors, the potential to exceed established City noise standards due to an increase in traffic. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to noise. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

### **Air Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to air quality related to short-term, construction activities and to long-term operations were identified. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce many of the emissions below the thresholds identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thereby reducing the potentially significant impacts below the level of significance. However, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub> would remain above the SCAQMD thresholds for the short-term construction period. For long-term operations, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would remain above SCAQMD thresholds. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality would remain after implementation of the proposed project.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to air quality. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Public Services**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to impacts on school facilities were identified due to the additional school-age children that would be generated, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses that would result in the generation of school-age children as the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to public services. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to public services associated with the proposed project.

### **Utilities**

Under the proposed project, no significant impacts were identified related to domestic water supply, wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity, solid waste landfill capacity, and the provision of electricity and natural gas.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to utilities. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to utilities associated with the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

The possibility exists for potentially significant subsurface cultural resources to occur on the site. Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to Native American Resources, archaeological resources or paleontological resources could occur during construction-related activities. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, two of the three residential designations would be relocated within the boundaries of the residential component; no other changes would occur under this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project.

### **8.4.3 - Conclusions**

This alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because the relocation of the residential components would not eliminate or lessen any of the significant impacts related to the proposed project.

## **8.5 - REDUCED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

### **8.5.1 - Description**

This alternative evaluates a reduction in the amount of dwelling units proposed for development. Specifically, this alternative eliminates the attached, higher-density dwelling units and would only

develop the lower-density detached dwelling units. This alternative does not change the proposed SCE Corridor Trail or the commercial component. However, this alternative would require a general plan amendment in order to allow for the detached dwelling units to be evenly dispersed across the western portion of the project site. This alternative assumes that the same land area that would be developed under the proposed project would also be developed under this alternative, resulting in an overall reduced density of dwellings on the western half of the project site. The total number of dwelling units that could be developed under the NMC General Plan is 584, which is the same as the proposed project. Because this alternative would eliminate the attached dwelling units, which represent a total of 307 dwelling units (refer to Table 3-2 in section 3 of this document), this alternative would result in a total of 277 detached single-family units that could be developed.

## **8.5.2 - Impact Evaluation**

### **Agriculture**

Under the proposed project, significant and unavoidable impacts to Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland (Farmland) would result from implementation of the proposed project. In addition, the dairy and nursery would cease operations and portions of the project site would no longer be used for row crop production.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and result in conversion of the entire project site. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the significant and unavoidable impacts to agriculture associated with the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to water quality and off-site flooding were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts were identified that are related to modification of habitat for migratory waterfowl and raptors, and direct impacts to the burrowing owl and Delhi Sands flower-loving fly if present on the project site. These potentially significant impacts

would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with a similar overall configuration that would result in the same impacts as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed project.

### **Geology and Soils**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to seismically-induced ground shaking and structural damage related to building on poorly compacted soils, corrosive soils, and expansive soils were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to geology and soils. Because the majority of poor soil conditions are located on the western portion of the project site, reducing the amount of dwelling units proposed for development would not avoid the poor soil conditions. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed project.

### **Hazards**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to exposure from lead based paints and asbestos that would result from demolition activities and from methane that may have accumulated in the soil were identified, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in identical impacts related to hazards. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

### **Transportation and Circulation**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to an increase in traffic were identified at the study intersections for Year 2015. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, all but two of the intersections, Riverside Drive and Milliken Avenue and the future intersection of Chino Avenue and Milliken Avenue, would operate at or above established City

level of service thresholds. However, the analysis determined that with the circulation-related improvements ultimately planned for the NMC, the level of service for these two intersections would operate acceptably by Year 2030, representing the estimated build-out date for the NMC.

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project, but would reduce the number of proposed dwelling units from 584 to 277, which would result in a corresponding reduction in the number of trips that would be generated. The reduction of 307 dwelling units eliminates the higher-density dwelling units, typically associated with lower trip generation factors than the lower-density dwelling units that would be developed under this alternative. Under this alternative, it is estimated that the total daily trip generation for the project site would be reduced from 18,230 daily trips to 15,700 daily trips resulting in a substantial reduction in the number of vehicle trips. However, the reduction in vehicle trips corresponding to the reduction in the proposed number of dwelling units would not be enough to eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts remaining after implementation of the proposed project.

## Noise

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to noise were identified that would result from construction-related activities and, depending on the locations of sensitive receptors, the potential to exceed established City noise standards due to an increase in traffic. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project and would result in similar impacts related to noise. However, because fewer dwelling units would be developed, there would result in a corresponding reduction in noise. Therefore, this alternative would result in lessening the less than significant impacts to hazards associated with the proposed project.

## Air Quality

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to air quality related to short-term, construction activities and to long-term operations were identified. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce many of the emissions below the thresholds identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thereby reducing the potentially significant impacts below the level of significance. However, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub> would remain above the SCAQMD thresholds for the short-term construction period and CO would be below the level of significance. For long-term operations, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would remain above SCAQMD thresholds. With the

implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality would remain after implementation of the proposed project.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as in the proposed project, but with fewer dwelling units. The reduction in dwelling units from 584 to 277 would reduce all long-term emissions below the level of significance. Under this alternative, NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC would remain above the thresholds of significance for short-term emissions. Therefore, this alternative would reduce but not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality associated with the proposed project.

### **Public Services**

Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts related to impacts on school facilities were identified due to the additional school-age children that would be generated, but would be reduced below the level of significance with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as the proposed project, but would result in a reduction of the generation of school-age children because of the reduction in the number of dwelling units as the proposed project. In addition, demand on other public services such as police, fire, library, and parks and recreation would also be reduced. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to public services associated with the proposed project.

### **Utilities**

Under the proposed project, no significant impacts were identified related to domestic water supply, wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity, or the provision of electricity and natural gas. Cumulatively considerable impacts associated with solid waste facilities were identified.

Under this alternative, the project site would still be developed with the same urban type uses as the proposed project, but would result in a decreased demand on utilities such as water, wastewater, electricity, natural gas, and waste management. Therefore, this alternative would not result in lessening the less than significant impacts to utilities, and would not eliminate the cumulatively considerable impact on solid waste facilities associated with the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

The possibility exists for potentially significant subsurface cultural resources to occur on the site. Under the proposed project, potentially significant impacts to Native American Resources, archaeological resources or paleontological resources could occur during construction-related

activities. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced below the level of significance.

Under this alternative, the number of proposed dwelling units would be decreased from 584 dwelling units to 277 dwelling units; the commercial component is not proposed to be changed. However, this alternative assumes that the same land area as the proposed project would be developed. Therefore, this alternative would not result in avoiding or lessening the less than significant impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project.

### **8.5.3 - Conclusions**

This alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because the reduction in the number of proposed dwelling units would not eliminate or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts related to the proposed project.

## **8.6 - ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

As previously discussed in Section 8.1, the State CEQA Guidelines requires that one of the alternatives be identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, if the Environmentally Superior Alternative identified is the No Project Alternative, then an Environmentally Superior Alternative must also be identified from the remaining alternatives.

Table 8-1 provides a summary of each alternative related to the eleven environmental issues evaluated in Section 5 of the DEIR, and includes the level of significance associated with the proposed project in order to facilitate a thorough comparison of the alternatives. Refer to Section 5 of this document for a detailed discussion of each environmental issue.

**Table 8-1: Impact Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project - No Development Alternative</b>	<b>Agricultural Retention Alternative</b>	<b>No General Plan Amendment Alternative</b>	<b>Reduced Residential Alternative</b>
Agricultural Resources	SIG	L	L	S	S
Biological Resources	LTS	L	S	S	S
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	S	S	S	S
Geology and Soils	LTS	L	S	S	S
Hazards	LTS	L	S	S	S
Transportation and Circulation	SIG	L	S	S	L
Noise	LTS	L	L	S	L
Air Quality	SIG	L	L	S	L
Public Services	LTS	L	S	S	L
Utilities	LTS	L	L	S	L
Cultural Resources	LTS	L	S	S	S
Abbreviations: L Lesser impact than the proposed project S Similar impact as the proposed projects G Greater impact than the proposed project LTS Less Than Significant SIG Significant					

A project alternative must be able to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project. Table 8-2 provides an assessment of the ability of each of the alternatives to achieve the basic objectives identified in Section 3.4 of the DEIR. For reference, the objectives are repeated in this table.



Table 8-2: Objective Feasibility Comparison

Objectives	No Project - No Development Alternative	Agricultural Retention Alternative	No General Plan Amendment Alternative	Reduced Residential Density Alternative
OBJ-1 Implement the vision of the NMC General Plan, which is designed to be a place of diversity that includes the following: a mix of residential neighborhoods with a variety of housing options; regional serving centers that provide retail, professional office, medical facilities, high-density housing, entertainment complexes, and hotel and conference facilities; employment centers; and a Town Center that serves as the principal center of activity and the common focal point for all NMC neighborhoods and districts.	No	No	Yes	No
OBJ-2. Provide land uses that are compatible with surrounding land uses and that are consistent with the policies for specific plans identified in the NMC General Plan.	No	No	Yes	Yes
OBJ-3. Develop a variety of housing types within the residential component available for a range of lifestyles and prices that implement the housing policies of the NMC General Plan.	No	Yes	Yes	No
OBJ-4. Incorporate the opportunity for residential units to accommodate a live-work environment with living areas on the second floor and home office areas on the first floor in order to promote traditional neighborhood development concepts and to reduce vehicular trips due to job commutes.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
OBJ-5. Linkage of the SCE Corridor trail to the City's Master Plan of trails.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OBJ-6. Provide infrastructure to serve the project in a timely manner consistent with NMC-programmed infrastructure plans.	No	No	Yes	Yes
OBJ-7. Provide employment opportunities on the project site.	No	No	Yes	Yes
Abbreviations: No Unable to feasibly attain the objective. Yes Able to feasibly attain the objective				

Based on the analysis contained in this section, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No Project - No Development Alternative. The Environmentally Superior Alternative from the

remaining four alternatives, which include the proposed project, is the Agricultural Retention Alternative.