

## 6.0 ALTERNATIVES

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter evaluates alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or eliminate the significant environmental impacts that would occur with the development of the proposed project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 describes the consideration and discussion of alternatives to a proposed project. The Guidelines state that an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives of the project but avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative to the project, but must consider a range of reasonable alternatives that would facilitate informed decision making and public participation.

The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason”, thus the EIR need only evaluate those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Alternatives should be limited to only those that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project. Also, an EIR should not consider alternatives with effects that cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The EIR has focused on direct and indirect effects on the environment that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Direct environmental impacts of the project are expected related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, animal life, plant life, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic and circulation. All direct impacts can be mitigated to a level that is considered less than significant with the exception of those associated with traffic and circulation, air quality and cultural resources.

The project alternatives evaluated in this section are the following:

- No-Project/No-Development Alternative
- Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative
- Super Store Costco/Sam’s Club and Wal-Mart Development Alternative
- Reduced Development Intensity Development:

The Environmentally Superior Alternative will be selected from among these alternatives and the proposed project. An alternative that is environmentally superior would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts and still be able to achieve the objectives of the planning effort. Based on the evaluation of the four alternatives in this section, implementation of the No-Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project but will not meet project objectives. The Reduced Intensity and Mixed-Use Alternatives would incrementally reduce air emissions and traffic volumes from expected vehicle trips. However, the air quality impacts would still be potentially significant.

The analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the project will be implemented with the appropriate alternatives. 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. Table 6-1 is a summary of the level of Alternative project impacts compared to the proposed project.

**Table 6-1  
Impact Comparison of Proposed and Alternative Projects**

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No-Project/ No-Development Alternative</b>	<b>Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative</b>	<b>Super Store Costco/Sam's Club Development Alternative</b>	<b>Reduced Intensity Alternative</b>
<b>Aesthetics and Visual Quality</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Similar Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Air Quality</b>	Potentially Significant	Less Impact	Greater Impact	Less Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Biological Resources</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Noise</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Greater Impact	Less Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Population and Housing</b>	Less than Significant	Less Impact	Greater Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
<b>Public Services</b>	Less than Significant	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
<b>Traffic and Circulation</b>	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Impact	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Less Impact
<b>Public Utilities and Infrastructure</b>	Less than Significant	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
<b>Overall Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Less Impact</b>	<b>Greater Impact</b>	<b>Similar Impact</b>	<b>Less Impact</b>

### 6.1.1 Project Description

The Bates Company is proposing a Specific Plan referred to as Ontario Gateway Specific Plan for the development of a mixed-use plan on approximately 41.29 acres of land. The subject property consists of two parcels of land (APNs 021-021-2520, and 2510). The project site is bounded by the I-10 Freeway to the north, Union Pacific Railroad to the south, Haven Avenue to the west, and approximately 460 feet from Ponderosa Avenue to the east. Approximately 60 percent of the proposed project site is paved and contains an approximate 200,000 square-foot metal industrial building (industrial/storage and distribution) and approximately 9,600 square feet of office space which is situated on the southern portion of the project site. The land on the northern one-third of the project site is vacant.

The proposed Ontario Gateway Specific Plan would include the demolition of existing structures and development of visitor-serving and freeway-serving commercial uses, medical-related uses, hospitality uses, business park uses, and office uses. The project site would be transformed from an industrial distribution use to a vibrant, visitor, customer, and patient-serving area. The proposed project includes the extension of East Guasti Road approximately 1400 feet east from its present termination approximately 220 feet east of Haven Avenue to connect sometime in the future to the existing East Guasti Road that terminates at the eastern boundary of the project site. In order to allow for development flexibility, the project site is divided into five different planning areas; each area with specific allowed uses (see Figure 3-3). Figure 3-4 shows the proposed Conceptual Site Plan that includes one of the possible mixed-use scenarios. The land use and development site concept plan envisioned in the proposed Ontario Gateway Specific Plan includes the following five categories:

**Mixed Use Planning Area** – The approximate 11.22-acre Mixed Use Planning Area provides for a hospital complex, a business park with secondary retail, and office uses within two different scenarios. Located on south side of the proposed extension of Guasti Road, the Planning Area extends to the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) and is adjacent to Haven Avenue. Mixed Use Scenario 1 includes a hospital/medical facility with a parking structure and emergency heliport. Ancillary commercial uses may be provided with the medical services. In Scenario 2 the focus is a Business Park with a small retail area for shops and services as the market demands.

**Entertainment Planning Area** – The approximate 6.96-acre Entertainment Planning Area may include hotels, retail or office uses within two proposed scenarios. This Planning Area is located on north side of the proposed extension of Guasti Road adjacent to Haven Avenue. Scenario 1 includes two hotels with ancillary retail and services. Scenario 2 includes a possible 8-story office building with support commercial and a restaurant.

**Office Planning Area 1** – This is located north of the proposed extension of Guasti Road adjacent to the I-10 Freeway. The approximate 7.14-acre Office Planning Area 1 is envisioned to include an office building up to 10 stories in height. The building will have mainly office uses with a few service type retail businesses. A 35-foot high (three levels above finished grade) parking structure is also proposed within this Planning Area.

**Office Planning Area 2** – This approximate 3.90-acre Office Planning Area 2 is located south of the proposed extension of Guasti Road adjacent to the SPRR. The area may include a medical office or a general office. A parking structure (two levels above finished grade) is also proposed within this Planning Area.

**Auto Planning Area**–The approximate 8.17-acre Auto Planning Area is envisioned to include predominantly new vehicle sales, and may include typical accessory uses such as vehicle maintenance, repair, minor bodywork, and installation of accessories; administrative and finance offices; retail sales of parts and accessories; and automobile rental. The Auto Planning Area is north of the proposed Guasti Road extension, south of the I-10 Freeway and the eastern side of the project site.

### 6.1.2 Project Objectives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b) requires that the project description include a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. The intent is to aid the lead agency and decision makers in evaluating the project alternatives and in making findings or statements of overriding consideration, if necessary. The primary project objectives are:

- To establish a clearly recognizable commercial/medical/office/hotel/business park development that provides an economically viable addition to the City of Ontario, maintains a high quality work and client environment, and enhances the quality of life for present and future residents and visitors in the City of Ontario.
- To establish a palette of compatible architectural site designs that will provide a visually attractive entrance into the City of Ontario from I-10.
- To develop a flexible plan that meets the needs of an ever-changing business market while ensuring compliance with high standards of development.
- To provide comprehensive, understandable land use regulations and design guidelines that will result in a high-quality development within the Specific Plan area that is consistent with the goals of the proposed project.
- To provide a plan for roadways, infrastructure, and utilities to support on-site land uses as the proposed project evolves.
- To provide a cohesive pattern of land uses within the project boundaries which are compatible with the surrounding uses, including the LA/Ontario International Airport.
- To provide services to travelers along Interstate 10 and the LA/Ontario International Airport (e.g., hotels and restaurants).
- To serve the medical needs of the community by providing a hospital and medical offices.

## 6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(c) requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered and rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons for rejection.

High Rise Apartment Buildings Alternative – The consideration of high-rise apartments was not considered for further evaluation because of the site’s proximity to Interstate 10 and the LA/Ontario International Airport. Also this alternative would not be compatible with the General Plan designation of Planned Commercial for the project site.

## 6.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED FOR EVALUATION

Four alternatives were evaluated as alternatives to the proposed project. These are:

- No-Project/No-Development Alternative: The No Project/No Development Alternative would allow the continued existence of the manufacturing warehouse/distribution facility on-site. While this alternative would not meet the project objectives, CEQA requires the alternative to be analyzed. This alternative is similar to the discussion of existing conditions for each issue addressed in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Evaluation (e.g., aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, etc.).
- Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative: Under this alternative the project site would be developed with approximately 10-acres of neighborhood commercial and approximately 124 medium density single-family residences. While this alternative would not meet the project objectives, the alternative was considered feasible.
- Super Store Costco/Sam’s Club Development Alternative: Under this alternative the project site would be developed as a superstore such as Costco/Sam’s Club and Wal-Mart. This would not require a zone change.
- Reduced Development Intensity Development: The Reduced Intensity Alternative would allow for the development of a similar project by eliminating one or more uses, or by reducing the size of one or more of the proposed uses. Under this alternative the proposed project would not include the general offices proposed under the Office Planning Area 1. This project would meet most of the project objectives and would not require a zone change.

## 6.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

### 6.4.1 No-Project/No-Development Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be developed. The existing site would continue to accommodate the industrial building and office.

### Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Under the No-Project/No-Development Alternative, the existing building material company would continue to operate at the project site. The views of the project site from the surrounding areas would continue to consist of views of trucks and the industrial building. The No-Project/No-Development Alternative is anticipated to have more impact on aesthetics and visual quality, as no contemporary new development would replace the industrial structures near the freeway. However, the undeveloped northern one-third of the project site would not have new light and glare impacts. Overall, impacts would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Air Quality

Under this Alternative, no demolition or construction activity would occur; therefore, construction related air quality impacts would not be created. Operation emissions from on-site activities and from new vehicle trips would not occur, therefore, the No-Project/No-Development Alternative would have no impacts to air quality.

### Biological Resources

The No-Project/No-Development Alternative would not result in additional development of the project site. Therefore, existing biological resources on-site and in the immediate vicinity of the site would not be adversely impacted.

### Cultural Resources

The No-Project/No-Development Alternative would not result in any site disturbing activities. Therefore, impacts to any potential human remains or archaeological resources would not be a concern.

### Geology and Soils

Under the No-Project/No-Development Alternative, no grading or any other soil disturbing activities would occur that could result in soil erosion. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, no new commercial uses would be developed and therefore impacts from transportation or storage of hazardous materials are not anticipated.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

This Alternative would not result in construction of or an increase in impervious surfaces and the potential increase in urban pollutants such as oil and grease. Stormwater runoff would remain unchanged, and no new sources of urban pollutants would be generated.

### Noise

The No-Project/No-Development Alternative would not result in a new source of noise, as conditions would remain unchanged.

### Population and Housing

The No-Project/No-Development Alternative would not result in any indirect population growth. No impact would occur.

### Public Services

The No-Project-No-Development Alternative would not generate a need for additional public services.

### Traffic and Circulation

Under this alternative, new land uses are not proposed and therefore, additional vehicle trips would not be generated. Vehicle trips currently generated by the existing land uses would remain unchanged.

### Public Utilities and Infrastructure

The No-Project-No-Development Alternative would not generate a need for additional Public Utilities or Infrastructure, as new growth is not proposed.

### Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The No-Project/No-Development Alternative would not meet the project goal of establishing a recognizable commercial/medical/office/hotel/business park development that provides an economically viable addition to the City of Ontario, maintains a high quality work and client environment, and enhances the quality of life for present and future residents and visitors in the City of Ontario. The City of Ontario is a fast growing community and it would lose a large share of jobs that would help in meeting the needs of an ever-changing business market.

Other project goals are to provide services to travelers along Interstate 10 and the LA/Ontario International Airport (e.g., hotels and restaurants) and to serve the medical needs of the community by providing a hospital and medical offices. Under this alternative no medical facilities would develop that would have helped the City in meeting its need for growing demand for medical facilities as the City of Ontario continues to expand.

In summary, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior as no development and related adverse impacts would occur, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives listed above.

## **6.4.2 Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative**

Under this alternative the project site would be developed with approximately 10-acres (80,000 SF) of neighborhood commercial and approximately 124 (4 dwelling units per acre) medium density single-family residences on the remaining 31± acres.

### Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Under this alternative, Aesthetics and Visual Quality would be similar to those addressed with the proposed project, as the industrial building would be replaced by more contemporary commercial and residential buildings. Light and glare impacts would reduce as compared to the proposed project.

### Air Quality

The demolition, grading and construction emissions associated with this Alternative would be relatively similar to that of the proposed project. The number of trips would be reduced by approximately 50 percent under this alternative, however, operational impacts on air quality would still remain significant and would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Biological Resources

Under the Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative, the whole site would be disturbed and therefore, impacts to biological resources would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Cultural Resources

Under the Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative, the whole site would be disturbed and therefore, impacts to cultural resources would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Geology and Soils

Similar soil disturbing and grading activities would occur at the project site to accommodate the commercial and residential development. Similar impacts would occur to geology and soils.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, no medical and auto related facilities would be developed. Therefore, potential risks due to bio and chemical related hazards would be reduced. Also, no heliport would be developed under this alternative and impacts due to heliport would also be reduced. This alternative would result in fewer impacts as compared to the proposed project.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

Construction of the mixed-use development would result in changes to existing drainage patterns in the project area. Additionally, the proposed project would generate urban runoff, which would

affect water quality in the area and require retention of stormwater. Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality would be similar to those addressed for the proposed project, as the entire site would be disturbed.

### Noise

The construction activities would generate similar noise impacts. However, operational noise impacts would be less than that of the proposed project. The neighborhood commercial land use would have fewer numbers of loading and unloading activities than the proposed project, and the single-family homes would not generate significant noise levels. However, the single-family residences proposed under this alternative would be close to a freeway and the LA/Ontario International Airport which could expose sensitive receptors to significant noise levels and air quality emissions generated from the freeway traffic and airport operations. Under this alternative, impacts to sensitive receptors may be slightly higher compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be more than that of the proposed project.

### Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing would be more significant when compared to the proposed project. The Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative would result in a direct increase in the number of people and houses.

### Public Services

Development of commercial and residential uses would generate similar needs for public services as that for the proposed project. Similar impacts would occur.

### Traffic and Circulation

Using the trip rates from the Urbemis 2002 air quality model, the Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative is anticipated to generate approximately 5,668 daily vehicle trips when compared to 12,348 daily vehicle trips generated by the proposed project. This alternative would result in a significant reduction (almost 50%) in the number of trips. The impact on level of service at key intersections would also be less. This alternative would result in a fewer impacts on traffic and circulation.

### Public Utilities and Infrastructure

The Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative would require approximately 88 acre-feet per year of water as compared to the water usage of 104 acre-feet per year by the proposed project. Solid waste generation under this alternative would be much lower (1.39 tons per day (tpd)) as compared to the proposed project's solid waste generation of 4.6 tpd. This alternative would have a less impact on public utilities.

### Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Mixed-Use Residential Development Alternative would meet the proposed project's objective of providing a high-quality development within the Specific Plan area. However, this alternative would not provide a cohesive pattern of land uses within the project boundaries which are compatible with the surrounding uses, including the LA/Ontario International Airport. Also, this alternative would fail to meet the City's need for additional medical services.

This alternative would result in fewer impacts pertaining to hazards and traffic. However, this alternative would expose a large number of sensitive receptors to significant noise and air quality impacts. Also, due to its location along a major highway, the site is more suitable for commercial uses. This alternative would not entirely meet the City's goal of establishing a clearly recognizable commercial/medical/office/hotel/business park development that provides an economically viable addition to the City of Ontario. This alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

### **6.4.3 Super Store Costco/Sam's Club Development Alternative**

Under this alternative the project site would be developed with anchor superstores like Sam's Club/Costco and Wal-Mart (approximately 460,000 SF of retail shopping center).

### Aesthetics and Visual Quality

The Super Store Costco/Sam's Club and Wal-Mart Alternative would result in similar impacts to visual quality and light and glare as that of the proposed project. Design guidelines for the superstores and other ancillary retail development would follow appropriate design guidelines as required by the City of Ontario. Both the proposed project and this alternative would significantly change the character of the project site than what currently exists.

### Air Quality

The construction emissions associated with this Alternative would be slightly less than the proposed project. However, this alternative would generate more trips than the proposed project and therefore, would result in more operational impacts. However, operational impacts were determined to be significant for the proposed project as well. Therefore air quality impacts would be considered similar.

### Biological Resources

Under this alternative the entire site would be disturbed, therefore, impacts to biological resources would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Cultural Resources

Under this alternative the entire site would be disturbed, therefore, impacts to biological resources would be similar to that of the proposed project.

### Geology and Soils

Impacts due soil disturbing and grading activities would be similar to that of the proposed project, as the amount of area to be graded would remain the same.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No heliport or any medical facility would be required as a part of the super-store development. Therefore impacts due to heliport operations and biohazards would reduce. Hazards due to routine transportation of hazardous materials would be similar. In general, this alternative would have fewer impacts than the proposed project.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, impacts associated with stormwater runoff, water quality, and groundwater recharge will be the same as the proposed project with similar mitigation to control runoff and to protect water quality.

### Noise

The noise impacts from deliveries to the rest of the development and other surrounding sources would stay the same. However, since this alternative would not include a hospital, impacts to sensitive receptors would reduce.

### Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing would be similar to that of the proposed project, as this alternative would also have indirect impacts on population and housing. However, the number of new jobs created would be less than that of the proposed project.

### Public Services

Development of super-store and ancillary retail uses would generate similar needs for public services as that for the proposed project. Similar impacts would occur.

### Traffic and Circulation

Based on the Urbemis 2002 air quality model, the Super Store Costco/Sam's Club Alternative would generate approximately 15,900 trips. This would be a greater impact than that of the proposed project.

### Public Utilities and Infrastructure

Under this alternative the demand for water usage would be approximately 25 acre-feet per year as compared to a demand of 140 acre-feet per year for the proposed project. The wastewater generated would be approximately 61,000 gpd that would be lower than the proposed project

(88,000 gpd). As compared to 4.6 tpd of solid waste generation from the proposed project, this alternative would generate 3.37 tpd of solid waste. Therefore impacts on utilities would be less.

#### Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Super Store Costco/Sam's Club Alternative would be able to achieve some of the project objectives of providing compatible architectural site designs that will provide a visually attractive entrance into the City of Ontario from I-10 and a high-quality development within the Specific Plan area. This alternative would also achieve the goals to provide a cohesive pattern of land uses within the project boundaries which are compatible with the surrounding uses, including the LA/Ontario International Airport and to provide services to travelers along Interstate 10 and the LA/Ontario International Airport.

The development of super stores would not accomplish the medical needs of the community, as no hospital or medical offices would be built. This alternative would comply with the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and would meet most of the City's objectives. In addition, this alternative would result in similar or more impacts to air quality and traffic as identified for the proposed project. This alternative would be environmentally similar to the proposed project.

#### **6.4.4 Reduced Development Intensity Alternative**

The Reduced Scale Alternative involves eliminating general offices proposed under the Office Planning Area 1 that would decrease the total commercial/retail square footage by approximately 250,000 SF or about 30 percent.

#### Aesthetics and Visual Quality

The Reduced Development Intensity Alternative would reduce the number of structures located on the northern portion of the site (adjacent to the 10 Freeway). The decrease in parking and building pads would result in a slight decrease in the amount of light emitted from the project from both parking lot lighting and lighting generated from the buildings. Elimination of 10-story building would slightly improve views of San Gabriel Mountains.

#### Air Quality

The Reduced Development Intensity alternative would provide an approximately 30 percent reduction in traffic that relates to a similar reduction in long-term emissions of criteria air pollutants resulting from the project. The proposed project exceeds air quality standards for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and ROG. Under this alternative, the 30 percent traffic reduction would not be sufficient to reduce any of the criteria pollutants to less than significant levels. Little or no reduction in short-term (construction) air quality impacts would be afforded by this alternative because the same acreage is being developed as the proposed project.

### Biological Resources

The Reduced Development Intensity Alternative would result in development of the project site and the disruption of existing habitats on the project site. Same amount of area would be disturbed. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would have similar impacts to biological resources compared to the Proposed Project.

### Cultural Resources

Although this Alternative involves eliminating the office building, the expectation is that the same site area would be impacted because the remainder area would be either landscaped or would undergo other improvements. Under this alternative, the impact to cultural resources would be similar to those addressed within the proposed project, as the entire site would be disturbed.

### Geology and Soils

Although this Alternative involves eliminating the office building, similar amount of soil disturbing and grading activities would occur at the project site to accommodate the rest of the development. Similar impacts would occur to geology and soils.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

General offices typically do not use or generate significant amounts of hazardous materials. Therefore, potential risks due to bio and chemical related hazards would be similar. This alternative would result in similar as that of the proposed project.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, impacts associated with stormwater runoff and water quality will be the same as the proposed project with similar mitigation to control runoff and to protect water quality.

### Noise

The noise impacts from deliveries to the rest of the development and other surrounding sources would stay the same. Therefore, the overall noise impacts and mitigation would be similar to the proposed project.

### Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing would be slightly less as this alternative would reduce the number of estimated jobs by approximately 500.

### Public Services

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would still generate similar needs for public services as that for the proposed project. Similar impacts would occur.

### Traffic and Circulation

The Reduce Development Intensity Alternative would involve a decrease in the total amount of commercial square footage and related vehicle trips by approximately 30 percent as compared to the project site. The impact on level of service at key intersections would also be less. This alternative would result in a fewer impacts on traffic and circulation.

### Public Utilities and Infrastructure

Under this alternative the demand amount of wastewater generated utilities would reduce by 30 percent. This alternative would have fewer impacts than that of the proposed project.

### Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Reduced Development Intensity Alternative would be able to meet all of the City's objectives of establishing a clearly recognizable commercial/medical/office/hotel/business park development that provides an economically viable addition to the City of Ontario, maintains a high quality work and client environment, and enhances the quality of life for present and future residents and visitors in the City of Ontario. This alternative would also provide services to travelers along Interstate 10 and the LA/Ontario International Airport (e.g., hotels and restaurants) and fulfill the medical needs of the community by providing a hospital and medical offices.

Since the amount of development would be reduced the direct impact on traffic and public utilities would reduce proportionately. Indirect impact on population and housing would also reduce, as the number of jobs would decrease. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

## **6.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

Table 6-1 shows the impact levels of each of the four alternatives evaluated as compared to those impacts of the proposed project. The alternative that has impact levels similar to or less than the proposed project, and no impact levels greater than the proposed project, is the Reduced Development Intensity Alternative. This alternative also meets all the objectives of the proposed project. It is therefore the "Environmentally Superior Alternative."