

1.1 OVERVIEW

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter, a commercial development proposed on a 16.29-acre parcel located at the northwestern section of the City of Ontario in San Bernardino County. The project site is located two blocks (approximately ¼ mile) south of the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10), west of Mountain Avenue and north of Fifth Street. The site is currently developed with several commercial buildings, including those previously occupied by Target, Toys R Us, and Food 4 Less stores. Target and Food 4 Less shared the western most building and Toys R Us occupied a freestanding building on the southeastern portion of the site. A Hollywood Video store is currently operating in a freestanding building located at the northeastern corner of the site and an abandoned kiosk (formerly Jack's Key Service) is located just south of the Hollywood Video store. The project site does not include a 0.52-acre parcel occupied by a 76 gas station at the northwestern corner of Mountain Avenue and Fifth Street.

The proposed development would include the demolition of two vacant commercial buildings and the kiosk; removal of the on-site paved parking areas and signage; and construction of an approximately 190,803-square-foot building on the western portion of the site. Parking for the new building would be provided on the eastern portion. The proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would be open 24 hours per day and would include a general merchandise store, a grocery, the sale of alcoholic beverages, banking services, a game arcade, and an outside garden center. Infrastructure and street improvements would accompany the project. The existing Hollywood Video store and parking area to the east of the video store would remain.

The proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter is considered a "project", as defined by Section 21065 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with Section 15051 of the CEQA Guidelines, the *Lead Agency* is "the public agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole". The City of Ontario has the primary responsibility for the review and approval of the proposed project. Thus, the City is serving as the Lead Agency and is responsible for the environmental review and clearance of the project, pursuant to Section 15040 of the CEQA Guidelines.

This EIR is subsequent to the Mountain Village Specific Plan Supplemental EIR (1998) which evaluated environmental impacts associated with the adoption of the Mountain Village Specific Plan.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE SUBSEQUENT EIR

1.2.1 *Previous Environmental Review*

The building formerly shared by Target/Food 4 Less was constructed in 1964; the former Toys R Us building was constructed in 1970. No records of the original construction date of the key kiosk were found, but it was expanded in 1973 and again in 1978. The existing buildings and the kiosk were constructed before approval of Amendment No. 1 to the Ontario Redevelopment Project No. 2. The site was included in the "Added Area" as defined in Amendment No. 1. An EIR was prepared for Amendment No. 1 and certified in 1994 (State Clearinghouse - SCH No. 94-072-064). An Addendum to the 1994 EIR for Amendment No. 1 was adopted in 1996 to update the information in the EIR as part of the discretionary

review process for a redevelopment project proposed at Sixth Street and Mountain Avenue. The Hollywood Video store was constructed on the site in 1997 and is currently operating.

In 1998, the project site was included in the planning area for the Mountain Village Specific Plan, and a Supplemental EIR was prepared and certified as part of the Specific Plan adoption discretionary review process. The EIR was supplemental to the 1994 EIR prepared for Amendment No. 1 to the Ontario Redevelopment Project No. 2. In the Specific Plan, development of an additional anchor store and small retail shops on the project site was planned, as was the extension of Hawthorne Street through a portion of the site and development of a “Main Street” pedestrian area. Target, Food 4 Less, Toys R Us and Jack’s Key Service were operating at the site when the Specific Plan was adopted.

In 2004, Wal-Mart submitted application materials to the City of Ontario for construction of a proposed Supercenter. In response to this application, an Initial Study was prepared in December 2004. The Initial Study led to the preparation of an Addendum to the Mountain Village Specific Plan Supplemental EIR. However, new information regarding the project prompted the City to reconsider the CEQA review process and postpone decisions on the project until new and more detailed environmental analysis could be performed. An updated Initial Study was prepared in October 2006, to meet that mandate.

As part of the discussion in the October 2006 Initial Study, previous environmental analyses were reviewed to determine if potential impacts associated with the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter or a project of similar scope were adequately addressed, and if there was relevant information and/or mitigation measures in either document that would assist in addressing and/or mitigating impacts associated with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. While development concepts for the site would be similar to what was analyzed in previous environmental documents, the EIRs evaluated larger projects (a Redevelopment Plan amendment and a Specific Plan) and did not focus specifically on the project site). Further, the documents evaluated projects with different scopes than what is proposed. The 1994 EIR evaluated redevelopment of the project site and other blighted parcels within the Added Area. Baseline conditions included the commercial buildings occupied by Target and Ralph’s/Food 4 Less and Toys R Us. It was assumed these existing buildings on-site would be demolished and the site would be redeveloped with the maximum allowable floor area ratio (e.g., FAR 0.40).

The 1998 Mountain Village Specific Plan Supplemental EIR addressed increased commercial development within the Specific Plan area to achieve build-out. Rather than assuming that the existing buildings within the Specific Plan area would be demolished, the Supplemental EIR analyzed impacts associated with the incremental development intensity and density increase over existing developments at the site and within the rest of the Specific Plan area. Baseline conditions were the same as evaluated in the 1994 EIR; with the exception of the Hollywood Video store which was constructed in 1997.

The proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would replace previous commercial uses on the site. Impacts would be generally similar to those generated by the Target and Ralph’s/Food 4 Less and Toys R Us stores before they closed in 2002, 2003, and 2002, respectively. The difference in impacts from the previous land uses and the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter would represent changes in anticipated impacts from what was discussed in the previous EIRs. However, because the buildings at the project site have not been in use for three to four years, current baseline conditions are different from what was evaluated in previous environmental documents. Thus, it would be inappropriate to evaluate impacts associated with the proposed project assuming 1994 and 1998 baseline conditions. Thus, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, preparation of a Subsequent EIR is the preferred CEQA review process identified by the City of Ontario (Lead Agency) for the proposed project. A Notice of Preparation (NOP)

of an EIR was circulated on October 23, 2006 to solicit comments from other agencies and the public on the scope and content of the Subsequent EIR. The NOP was also published in the local newspaper to inform the public and provide opportunities for comments and input.

For the purpose of analysis in this document, baseline conditions are defined as those occurring on-site at the time the Notice of Preparation was distributed in October 2006. Impacts are based on project-related changes to baseline conditions. However, because this Subsequent EIR tiers off the 1998 Mountain Village Specific Plan Supplemental EIR, which was supplemental to the Ontario Redevelopment Plan No. 2 Amendment No. 1 EIR, a summary of the analyses prepared for each environmental issue area in the previous EIRs is provided in Section 4 of this document. Where information in the previous documents is relevant to discussions therein, it is incorporated into the environmental impact analysis. Mitigation measures in the previous EIR documents that are applicable to the project and that would reduce project-specific impacts to below a level of significance are also identified.

While this EIR has been prepared with consultant support, the analysis and findings in this document have been independently reviewed by the City and reflect the City's conclusions, as required by Section 15084 of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.2.2 Authority and Intended Uses of the Subsequent EIR

The City of Ontario Planning Department authorized the preparation of the 2004 and 2006 Initial Studies to review the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter and to determine if previously-prepared EIRs may be used for the project. Based on the preliminary analysis, the City has determined that a Subsequent EIR must be prepared to address potentially significant adverse impacts to the following environmental issue areas:

- ◆ Aesthetics
- ◆ Air Quality
- ◆ Biological Resources
- ◆ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ◆ Land Use and Planning
- ◆ Noise
- ◆ Population and Housing
- ◆ Public Services
- ◆ Transportation and Traffic
- ◆ Utilities and Service Systems
- ◆ Socio-Economic Conditions

Less than significant impacts or no impacts are expected to the following environmental issues:

- ◆ Agricultural Resources
- ◆ Cultural Resources
- ◆ Geology and Soils
- ◆ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ◆ Mineral Resources
- ◆ Recreation

The purpose of this Subsequent EIR is to inform the City, trustee and responsible agencies, decision-makers, and the general public of the environmental effects anticipated with the proposed development of the project site with a Wal-Mart Supercenter. This EIR is an informational document prepared pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines and the City of Ontario's procedures for implementing CEQA. The EIR provides decision-makers, public agencies, and the public in general with detailed information about the potential significant adverse environmental impacts that may occur with the proposed project. The EIR also identifies mitigation measures that would be effective in reducing or avoiding any identified significant adverse impacts. In addition, feasible alternatives to the proposed project are discussed and their potential environmental impacts are compared to that of the proposal, to provide a basis for consideration by decision-makers.

1.2.3 Agencies Having Jurisdiction

State law requires that all EIRs be reviewed by trustee and responsible agencies. A 'Trustee Agency' is defined in Section 15386 of the CEQA Guidelines as "a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project, which are held in trust for the people of the State of California." Per Section 15381 of the CEQA Guidelines, "the term 'Responsible Agency' includes all public agencies, other than the Lead Agency, which have discretionary approval power over the project."

The City of Ontario is acting as the Lead Agency for the project. The Subsequent EIR would be used by the Ontario Planning Commission in considering the approval of the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board is considered a Responsible Agency for the project.

While the project site is located within the Project Area for Redevelopment Project No. 2, the proposed project does not require any approval, funding, or permit from the Ontario Redevelopment Agency.

Other agencies may review or use the EIR in considering permits needed for the proposed project. These agencies may use the EIR for evaluating the impacts of the project on public service levels during the processing of development and building permits; in conjunction with changes in services that may occur with redevelopment of the site; and to assist agencies in planning for future facility expansions and service level upgrades. They include:

- ◆ California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
- ◆ California Department of Transportation
- ◆ Chaffey Community College District
- ◆ Chaffey Joint Union High School
- ◆ Inland Empire Utilities Agency
- ◆ Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- ◆ Omnitrans Bus Company
- ◆ Ontario Fire Department
- ◆ Ontario Montclair School District
- ◆ Ontario Police Department
- ◆ Ontario Public Works Department
- ◆ Ontario Utilities Department
- ◆ San Bernardino Associated Governments
- ◆ San Bernardino County Fire Department

- ◆ San Bernardino County Waste Management Department
- ◆ South Coast Air Quality Management District
- ◆ Southern California Association of Governments
- ◆ Southern California Edison Company
- ◆ Southern California Gas Company
- ◆ Time Warner Communication
- ◆ Verizon
- ◆ West Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District

1.2.4 Notice of Preparation and Public Scoping

The City of Ontario has determined that a Subsequent EIR is required for the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter. Based on this determination, the City complied with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines by issuing a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft EIR. The NOP was distributed on October 23, 2006, and published in the Daily Bulletin (a newspaper of general circulation in the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Claremont, Diamond Bar, Fontana, Jurupa Valley, La Verne, Montclair, Norco, Ontario, Pomona, Rancho Cucamonga, Rialto, San Dimas, and Upland [Daily Bulletin Publisher's Info – accessed 3/9/2007]) on October 26, 2006. The NOP indicated that a Subsequent EIR would be prepared for the proposed project, and the City was seeking public comments on issues to be addressed in the EIR. The NOP is provided in Appendix A. Appendix A also contains the Initial Study and the list of agencies and individuals that received a copy of the NOP. The NOP review/comment period extended for 30 days after receipt of the NOP and ended on November 23, 2006. Consequently, the responses to the NOP were used to refine the focus and scope of issues addressed in the Draft EIR. The responses received on the NOP are summarized in the Executive Summary, and the actual letters are included in Appendix B of this EIR.

A community meeting was held at the Anthony Munoz Community Center (located at 1240 West Fourth Street in the City of Ontario) on November 28, 2004, beginning at 6:30 PM. The meeting provided information on the proposed Wal-Mart project and solicited resident input into the proposal.

A scoping meeting for the project was held on November 20, 2006, at the Ontario Convention Center from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM. Public agencies and residents of the project area were invited to the scoping meeting. The meeting provided a brief overview of the project, the environmental review process, and the environmental issues that would be analyzed in the EIR. Comments on the environmental analysis to be included in the EIR were solicited from the public during the meeting. The issues that were raised included the project's potential impacts related to increased traffic and accidents, air quality, noise, crime and public safety, stormwater pollutants, parking availability, trash, shopping carts, pedestrian-friendly streets and sidewalks, compatibility with adjacent land uses, alternative uses and alternative sites, on-site security and police services, use of the police substation on Sixth Street, 24-hour operations, crime and criminal elements, economic impacts, hazards, diesel delivery trucks, and impacts on nearby residents, churches, schools, and parks. Comments presented at the scoping meeting and submitted to the City are included in Appendix B.

1.2.5 Availability of the Draft Subsequent EIR

After completion of the Draft Subsequent EIR, a Notice of Completion was published in the Daily Bulletin on June 25, 2007 and mailed out to inform the public and interested and affected agencies that the Draft Subsequent EIR was available for review and comment. In addition, the Draft Subsequent EIR was

distributed directly to affected public agencies and to interested individuals and organizations for review and comment. The Draft Subsequent EIR and all related technical studies have been made available for review and copying at the City of Ontario Planning Department at the following address:

City of Ontario
Planning Department
303 East B Street
Ontario, California 91764
Richard Ayala, Project Manager
(909) 395-2421

The Draft Subsequent EIR and Appendices to the Draft Subsequent EIR are also available for review at the following locations:

Ontario Main Library
215 East "C" Street
Ontario, CA 91764
(909) 395-2004
Hours: Monday – Thursday = 10 AM to 9 PM
Friday – Saturday = 10 AM to 6 PM
Sunday = 1 PM to 4 PM

City of Ontario
City Clerk
303 East B Street
Ontario, California 91764
Hours: Monday – Thursday = 7:30 AM - 5:30 PM
Friday = 8 AM – 5 PM

Agencies, organizations, and individuals have been invited to comment on the information presented in the Draft Subsequent EIR during a 45-day public review period, from June 25 to August 8, 2007. Specifically, comments addressing the scope and adequacy of the environmental analysis contained in the Subsequent EIR were solicited. Respondents were also asked to provide or identify additional environmental information which is germane to the project and the project site, but which they feel may not have been addressed in the analysis.

Following the public review period, responses to all substantive comments ~~were~~^{will be} prepared and compiled into the Final Subsequent EIR. Point-by-point responses ~~were prepared~~^{will be provided} for each comment found in the letters and the responses ~~were prepared~~^{sent} ~~to agencies and~~^{provided to} individuals that provided the comments. The comments and responses have also been compiled into Section 11.0, Response to Comments, of this Subsequent EIR. In addition, revisions to the Draft Subsequent EIR, based on the comments and responses, and other changes to the Draft Subsequent EIR are provided as redlines in this Final Subsequent EIR. As such, underlined text are inserts/additions and strikeouts (~~text~~) are deleted text.

The Final Subsequent EIR will then be considered by the Ontario Planning Commission for certification, prior to any discretionary action or decision on the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter.

1.2.6 Incorporation by Reference

As permitted by Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR has referenced the EIR for Amendment No. 1 (SCH No. 94-072-064), the Addendum to the Final EIR for Amendment No. 1, and the Supplemental EIR for the Mountain Village Specific Plan. The EIR, Addendum, Supplemental EIR, and related documents in the City record are available for review at the Ontario Planning Department. Information from the documents, which have been incorporated by reference into this EIR, has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) which follow and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this EIR has been described.

Several technical studies and published reports are also used as references for this EIR. The documents and other sources which have been used in the preparation of this EIR are identified in appropriate sections and listed in Section 11.0, *List of References*. Citations have also been provided at the end of paragraphs or sentences within the appropriate sections to identify the main source of information used in discussing the environmental setting, analysis of impacts, and other issues in this EIR. In accordance with Section 15150(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the locations where the public may obtain and review these referenced documents and other sources used in the preparation of the EIR are also identified.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

The environmental analysis contained in Section 4.0 of this EIR has been developed to address the environmental issues and concerns raised by comments on the NOP. The environmental impact analysis seeks to determine the significance of potential impacts and to develop appropriate mitigation. To facilitate the analysis of each issue, a standard format was developed to analyze each environmental issue thoroughly. This format is presented below, with a brief discussion of the information included within each topic.

1.3.1 Environmental Setting

This introductory section describes the existing environmental conditions related to each issue analyzed in the EIR. In accordance with Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines, both the existing local and regional settings are discussed as they exist prior to implementation of the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter and when the NOP was circulated for public review (October 23, 2006). This section provides the baseline conditions with which environmental changes created by the proposed project would be compared and analyzed.

While this is a Subsequent EIR, the environmental setting under each issue area discusses the current conditions at the site and the project area, and serves to update the baseline conditions that existed when the EIR for Amendment No. 1 and the Supplemental EIR for the Mountain Village Specific Plan were prepared.

1.3.2 Threshold of Significance

Section 15126.2 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR “identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project”. “Effects” and “impacts” mean the same under CEQA and are used interchangeably within this EIR. A “significant effect” or “significant impact” on the environment means “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project” (Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines).

In determining whether an impact is “significant”, Section 15064.7 of the CEQA Guidelines encourages each public agency to develop and publish thresholds of significance to use in determining the significance of an environmental impact. These thresholds may consist of identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level criteria, of which non-compliance would mean the effect or impact would be determined to be significant and compliance with the thresholds would mean the effect normally would be determined to be less than significant.

The City of Ontario has not adopted thresholds of significance. Thus, the significance criteria used in the analysis in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR are derived from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, City policies and standards and thresholds adopted by other public agencies with jurisdiction over select environmental issues are used as thresholds of significance. Also, accepted technical and scientific data are used in other instances to determine if an impact would be considered significant. An effort has been made to avoid overly subjective significance criteria, which are not based on specific CEQA policies, and to use generally accepted thresholds upon which significance can be determined. These significance criteria are identified under each environmental issue area and have been applied in analyzing the potential effects of the proposed project.

1.3.3 Environmental Impacts

The analysis of environmental impacts presented in the EIR identifies specific project-related direct and indirect, short term and long term, and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter.

As described above, the significance criteria provide the basis for distinguishing between impacts which are determined to be significant (i.e., impact exceeds the threshold of significance) and those which are considered less than significant. The existing environmental setting (i.e., existing conditions) at the time of NOP publication is used as the basis for documenting the nature and extent of changes to the environment or the environmental impacts anticipated to result from project implementation.

In assessing the impacts of the proposed project and the various CEQA alternatives, the City has conducted the following analysis:

"Potential effects" of the project are identified. Initially, these potential effects are identified on a cursory level. No determination is made that they truly are "significant", "adverse", or "substantial". This process merely identifies issues of concern and impacts which, on a cursory level, may seem possible or may occur with the proposed project. "Potential effects" include those which have been identified in the preliminary analysis for the project, as well as those raised by the public, the City, and other public agencies during the NOP review process.

With respect to each potential effect, further analysis has been conducted in the EIR to determine if, in fact:

- ◆ The project causes the identified "effect"; and
- ◆ The effect produces a substantial, or potentially substantial change in the physical conditions within the area affected by the project (i.e., "significant"); and
- ◆ The changed conditions are "adverse".

Where the investigation of a potential effect concludes that the effect is too speculative or subjective for evaluation, that conclusion is noted and the discussion of that effect is ended.

Where the investigation demonstrates that a potential effect does or may (without undue speculation) occur, but is beneficial, that conclusion is noted. Where the investigation demonstrates that a potential effect is not significant or not adverse, that conclusion is noted.

Where the impact analysis demonstrates that a potential effect does or may (without undue speculation) occur and is found to have a substantial or potentially substantial **and** adverse impact on existing physical conditions within the area affected by the project, that conclusion is noted.

1.3.4 Previous Analysis

As noted, the environmental setting when the NOP was circulated for public review on October 2006 is used as the baseline for determining changes in the environment that would occur with the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. However, the project site is located within the Project Area for Ontario Redevelopment Project No. 2 and in the planning area for the Mountain Village Specific Plan. An EIR was prepared for Amendment No. 1 to the Ontario Redevelopment Project No. 2 (SCH No. 94-072-064), and a Supplemental EIR was prepared for the Mountain Village Specific Plan. The previous EIRs identified potential impacts associated with implementation of the amended Redevelopment Plan and the Specific Plan, respectively, along with mitigation measures necessary to reduce the potentially significant adverse impacts of these plans. The proposed project would be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan and the Specific Plan; thus, the impacts of the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter have been generally addressed in previous documentation. Thus, as part of the analysis in this Subsequent EIR, it is necessary to determine which impacts of the proposed project were previously analyzed and which mitigation measures would be applicable to the project. This discussion is provided under each environmental issue area addressed in this EIR.

As clarification, the baseline conditions which are used to determine the impacts of the project are identified as current (October 2006 or later) conditions (i.e., vacant commercial buildings and the Hollywood Video store). However, under this section, the analysis for each environmental issue in the previous EIRs utilized baseline conditions in 1994 and 1997 when the commercial buildings on the site were in use (Target, Food 4 Less, Toys R Us, and Jack's Key Service in use, without Hollywood Video store). Thus, the discussion under this subsection assumes that on-site conditions are the same as when the previous EIRs were prepared. This comparison is made primarily to thoroughly document new environmental impacts that were not identified in the previous EIRs and discuss applicable mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the level of impact associated with the proposed project.

For each environmental issue area, a summary of the impacts discussed in the Supplemental EIR for the Mountain Village Specific Plan are summarized and project impacts are compared to those identified in the previous Supplemental EIR. Whether impacts are similar or different is so noted. Where the significant adverse impacts are similar, applicable mitigation measures in the previous EIR are identified for incorporation or implementation by the project.

In addition, a summary of the impacts discussed in the 1994 EIR for Amendment No. 1 is provided. Project impacts are then compared to the impacts identified in the previous EIR. Again, where the significant adverse impacts are similar, applicable mitigation measures in the previous EIR are identified for incorporation or implementation by the project.

When a General Plan policy is identified in the EIR for Amendment No. 1 as a way to reduce potential impacts, project compliance with the policy is analyzed and the standard condition that implements this

policy identified. Where mitigation measures are identified in the previous EIR, project features that serve to comply with the measures are called out or the measure is noted as an additional mitigation that the project would implement.

1.3.5 Standard Conditions and Mitigation Measures

When impacts are determined to be significant and adverse, a discussion of standard conditions and mitigation measures is provided, which includes the following:

- ◆ Existing City, County, State and Federal regulations that would reduce potential impacts are identified;
- ◆ Mitigation measures which would avoid or minimize the significant effects and/or reduce them to less than significant levels;
- ◆ Additional mitigation measures in the previous EIRs, which are applicable to the project,
- ◆ Where feasible mitigation measures are not identified which can reduce the significant effects to less than significant levels, the significant effect would be identified as one which would result in "significant unavoidable adverse impacts".

1.3.6 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

A discussion of the preliminary analysis in the Initial Study for the project and the findings of environmental analysis in this Subsequent EIR are provided, along with a comparison of the findings.

Unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those effects that either cannot be mitigated or remain significant after mitigation. The level of significance of the identified impacts after mitigation is identified in this section of the EIR.

1.4 SCOPE AND FORMAT OF THE SUBSEQUENT EIR

1.4.1 Scope of Subsequent EIR

As indicated earlier, an NOP was prepared for the proposed project and circulated to all identified affected and interested agencies and parties to solicit their comments on the scope and analysis to be included in the Subsequent EIR for the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter. Based on the comments received in response to the NOP and the preliminary analysis for the project, the City has determined that the Subsequent EIR for the proposed project should address the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation

- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Socio-Economic Impacts
- Cultural Resources

The project was determined to have no impacts on one issue area and this issue would not be analyzed in the Subsequent EIR:

- Agricultural Resources

1.4.2 *Format of Subsequent EIR*

The proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter and the analyses of its potential environmental impacts are presented in this Subsequent EIR through the following sections:

- **Executive Summary.** An overview of the Subsequent EIR, a description of the proposed project and a summary of impacts and mitigation measures are provided in this section. This section includes a summary of each section of the Subsequent EIR and reflects the outline of the entire Subsequent EIR. This section also includes the areas of controversy/issues to be resolved based on comments received on the NOP.
- **Section 1.0: Introduction.** The purpose of the Subsequent EIR and a discussion of the public review process are provided in this section. This section also includes the methodology for the environmental analysis, and the scope and format of the Subsequent EIR.
- **Section 2.0: Environmental Setting.** This section provides a description of the project site and the environment in the vicinity of the project site, as well as a discussion of the existing conditions at the project site. The background and history of the site and the proposed project and applicable plans and policies are also discussed.
- **Section 3.0: Project Description.** This section describes the proposed Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter, including the physical and operational characteristics of the proposed project, as provided by the applicant. The objectives of the project and the discretionary actions needed to approve the project are also identified in this section.
- **Section 4.0: Environmental Analysis.** This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, including the impacts of demolition and construction activities needed to implement the project and the impacts associated with future use and operation of the proposed Wal-Mart Supercenter. The existing environmental setting, thresholds of significance, potential environmental impacts, a comparison of the impact analyses in previous EIRs, standard conditions, recommended mitigation measures, and applicable mitigation measures are discussed in this section. Unavoidable significant adverse impacts after mitigation are also identified.
- **Section 5.0: Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.** This section describes the potentially significant irreversible environmental changes that may be expected to occur with the proposed project, based on the analysis completed in Section

4.0. Unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels after mitigation are also identified.

- **Section 6.0: Cumulative Impacts.** This section describes a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future development projects in the surrounding area, which may potentially contribute to significant cumulative impacts associated with the project. The impacts of these related projects and the Ontario Wal-Mart Supercenter are analyzed in this section of the EIR.
- **Section 7.0: Growth-Inducing Impacts.** This section describes the project's potential for fostering growth in the adjacent areas or in the northwestern section of the City, as associated with the proposed project and the infrastructure improvements proposed as part of the project.
- **Section 8.0: Impacts Found to be Insignificant.** This section provides a summary of the impacts of the project, which were found to be insignificant in the Initial Study. Based on the environmental analysis in the Initial Study and comments on the NOP, the proposed project was determined not to have the potential to cause significant adverse effects on agricultural resources.
- **Section 9.0: Alternatives to the Project.** Projects or development scenarios, which may occur on the site and which would result in a reduction or avoidance of potentially significant impacts, were developed as alternatives to the proposed project and are described in this section. The No Project Alternative and Alternative sites where the proposed development may be feasibly constructed are also discussed. The impacts of these alternatives are evaluated and compared to the impacts of the proposed project.
- **Section 10.0: Mitigation Monitoring Program.** This section contains the mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project and lists the standard conditions and how they are implemented, as well as the recommended mitigation measures and applicable mitigation measures, along with the responsible parties, time frames for implementation, and monitoring parties for each measure.
- **Section 11.0: Response to Comments.** [This section contains the comment letters received during the public review period for the Draft Subsequent EIR and provides point-by-point responses to each comment raised. A list of changes to the Draft Subsequent EIR is also provided, which were made in response to the comments.](#)
- **Section 12.0: List of References.** Reference materials, along with the agencies and individuals contacted and consulted in the course of the EIR's preparation, are listed in this section. Persons and agencies responsible for the preparation of the EIR are also identified.

The EIR also includes appendices that contain the Initial Study, NOP, and NOP mailing list (Appendix A), Responses to the NOP and comments presented at the Scoping Meeting (Appendix B), the technical studies prepared for the proposed project, and letters received from public service agencies (Appendices C to K).