

5. Environmental Analysis

5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) examines the potential socioeconomic effects of the Ontario Ranch Business Park Specific Plan project (proposed project), including changes in population, employment generation, and demand for housing. This section evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional housing and jobs policies of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the adopted General Plan for the City of Ontario, with a particular emphasis on jobs-housing relationships in the City and County.

5.12.1 Environmental Setting

5.12.1.1 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

State and regional laws, regulations, plans, or guidelines that are potentially applicable to the propose project are summarized below.

State

Planning and Zoning Law

California planning and zoning law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan for future growth (California Government Code Section 65300). This plan must include a housing element that identifies housing needs for all economic segments and provides opportunities for housing development to meet that need. At the state level, the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) estimates the relative share of California's projected population growth in each county based on California Department of Finance (DOF) population projections and historical growth trends. These figures are compiled by HCD in a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for each region of California. The RHNA is a tool used for SCAG and its member local governments in planning for growth. The RHNA quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction. Communities then plan, consider, and decide how they will address this need through the process of completing the Housing Elements of their General Plans. The RHNA does not necessarily encourage or promote growth but allows communities to prepare for growth in a way that enhances quality of life and mobility; improves access to jobs, transportation, and housing; and in a way that would not adversely impact the environment.

State law recognizes the vital role that local governments play in the supply and affordability of housing. To that end, California Government Code requires that the housing element achieve legislative goals to:

- Identify adequate sites to facilitate and encourage the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for households of all economic levels, including persons with disabilities.
- Remove, as legally feasible and appropriate, governmental constraints to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons of all incomes, including those with disabilities.
- Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of low and moderate income households.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

- Conserve and improve the condition of housing and neighborhoods, including existing affordable housing. Promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability.
- Preserve for lower income households the publicly assisted multifamily housing developments in each community.

California housing element laws (California Government Code Sections 65580–65589) require that each city and county identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs within its jurisdiction and prepare goals, policies, and programs to further the development, improvement, and preservation of housing for all economic segments of the community commensurate with local housing needs.

Housing Accountability Act (SB 330)

Senate Bill 330 – Housing Accountability Act (Govt. Code § 65589.5 et seq.) (SB 330) was passed by the California Legislature, signed by the Governor and became effective on January 1, 2020. The bill is the result of the Legislature’s extensive findings regarding the California “housing supply crisis” with “housing demand far outstripping supply.” In 2018, California ranked 49th out of 50 states in housing units per capita. As stated in SB 330, the Legislature further found that:

[T]he housing crisis has particularly exacerbated the need for affordable homes at prices below market rates... The housing crisis harms families across California and has resulted in all of the following... including increased poverty and homelessness, crowded and unsafe housing in urban areas, forced housing in greenfields at the urban-rural interface with longer commute times and a higher exposure to fire hazard...as well as increase greenhouse gas emissions... the housing crises is severely impacting the state’s economy and also harms the environment.

As part of the newly enacted SB 330, Government Code section 65589.5(a)(1) provides:

The lack of housing, including emergency shelters, is a critical problem that threatens the economic, environmental, and social quality of life in California. California housing has become the most expensive in the nation. The excessive cost of the state’s housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing, increase the cost of land for housing, and require that high fees and exactions be paid by producers of housing. Among the consequences of those actions are discrimination against low-income and minority households, lack of housing to support employment growth, imbalance in jobs and housing, reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting and air quality deterioration... Many local governments do not give adequate attention to the economic, environmental and social costs of decisions that result in disapproval of housing development projects, reduction in the density of housing projects, and excessive standards for housing development projects.

SB 330 amends Govt. Code Sections 65589.5, adds Govt. Code Sections 65940, 65943 and 65950, and repeals and readopts Sections 65906.5, 65913.10 and 65941.1. To summarize, no city may disapprove a residential housing development project for low- to moderate-income households (as defined therein) unless it makes a finding that the housing development project “would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households...” such as where the housing development project is proposed on land “which does not have adequate water or wastewater facilities to serve the project.” (Govt. Code § 65589.5(d)(2), (4)).

In addition, the legislation adds Chapter 12 to Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (Section 66300 et seq.) that applies to “affected cities,” which are identified as cities in urbanized areas as determined by the most recent census. In accordance with SB 330, the Department of Community Development and Housing (“HCD”) has prepared a list of affected cities and has determined that Ontario is an “affected city.” Therefore, pursuant to Government Code section 66300(b)(1)(A) and (b):

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any other law except as provided in subdivision (i), with respect to land where housing is an allowable use, an \ affected city shall not enact a development policy, standard, or condition that would have any of the following effects:

(A) Changing the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018...”

except when approved by HCD or when the following exception is set out in Govt. Code § 66300(i)(1) applies:

(i) (1) This section does not prohibit an affected county or an affected city from changing a land use designation or zoning ordinance to a less intensive use if the city or county concurrently changes the development standards, policies, and conditions applicable to other parcels within the jurisdiction to ensure that there is no net loss in residential capacity.

As explained in the Chapter 3 of the DEIR, the proposed project would eliminate the low-moderate density housing designation, thereby theoretically eliminating 159 units (as determined by the City’s density determinations to be 8.5 dwelling units per acre [du/ac.]).

Exceptions to SB 330

As explained below, both exceptions are met for this proposed project:

1. **Lack of water and sewer facilities.** The proposed project site does not have sufficient water or wastewater facilities to serve a residential project. As explained in Section 3.4.1.2, of the DEIR, at present there is no water or sewer infrastructure that could serve residential units because the land has been used for agricultural purposes with water provided by on-site wells and sewer provided by septic systems. Currently there are no City potable water mains or City potable water infrastructure in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area and significant water improvements are required to serve the project (see Figures 3-7a and 3-7b of the DEIR). The proposed sizing and alignment of potable water lines will follow the most current approved City of Ontario Water Master Plan. The proposed project will be conditioned to provide such facilities at the level required for industrial uses, as opposed to residential uses. In contrast, the City’s requirements for water and sewer services to residences are set out in the City of Ontario’s Urban Water Management Plan, Water Master Plan, and Sewer Master Plan. The nearest water line is approximately three

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

miles to the east from the site, and the nearest sewer line is one mile to the south. Additionally, there are no sewer mains located within the vicinity of the Specific Plan area; therefore, the Specific Plan includes a network of new public sewer mains (see Figure 3-9 of the DEIR), consistent with the City of Ontario's Sewer Master Plan.

The total estimated cost of the proposed water and sewer infrastructure is \$13.1 million and \$9.4 million, respectively (Murow 2020; Appendix N of this DEIR). The estimated construction costs of all infrastructure for the proposed project, including water, recycled water, sewer, storm drain, roadways, dry utilities, and street signals totals upwards of \$46.5 million (Murow 2020; Appendix N). Design, City development impact fees, and permitting costs would add another approximately \$15 million, resulting in a total of approximately \$61.6 million (Murow 2020; Appendix N). This cost would be financially infeasible for the 159 units presently allowed under the current residential General Plan designation and therefore the cost of such improvements would make residential development on the site financially infeasible (see Govt. Code § 66589.5(d)(2) cited above). Community Facilities Districts (CFDs), authorized pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (Govt. Code § 53311 et seq.), are often used to fund major infrastructure requirements for development to occur; however, the City has a minimum threshold of 175 dwelling units to create a CFD. Even if the City waived the required 175-unit threshold and allowed the formation of a new CFD, the new CFD would only be able to generate around \$4 million or \$26,000 per unit in proceeds at 4 percent interest rate for a residential project.¹ Although constructing the above-mentioned infrastructure would generate fee credits to offset the City development impact fee obligations, the fee credits and CFD proceeds would still not sufficiently cover the required infrastructure cost.

2. **No net loss.** Although the project would remove the authorization for 159 low-moderate residential units at a density of 8.5 dwelling units per acre, the provisions of Section 66300(i)(1) are met here that there is no net loss of residential capacity.

Pursuant to the approved Housing Element of the Policy Plan (General Plan), the City maintains an Available Land Inventory which includes residential units available for development as of right.

The Notice of Preparation for this project issued on May 24, 2019. During preparation of this environmental document, on December 17, 2019, the City Council approved an Amendment to the Meredith International Centre Specific Plan (File No. PSPA19-002) to establish a Mixed-Use Overlay district on 22.39 acres of land within a portion of Planning Area 2 (Urban Commercial) land use district, located at the southeast corner of Vineyard Avenue and Inland Empire Boulevard. The Meredith International Centre Specific Plan is listed in the Available Land Inventory contained in Table A-3 (Available Land by Planning Area) of the Housing Element Technical Report Appendix. The Specific Plan allowed 800 dwelling units at a density of 37 dwelling units per acre, which have all been constructed. The Specific Plan amendment approved in December 2019 provides for an additional 925 residential units at a density of 41 dwelling units per acre, which will add 925 units to the Available Land Inventory Table. The Addendum to the Meredith International Centre Specific Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Report

¹ Assumes approximately 8 units/acre density, 1,800 – 2,200 SF and approximately \$400,000 sales price.

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

(SCH# 2014051020) certified by the City Council on April 7, 2015, approved on December 17, 2019, supports that change in the Specific Plan that results in 975 additional residential units within the City.

On January 28, 2020, the Planning Commission approved a revision to the Policy Plan (General Plan) land use table (see General Plan Table LU-03) showing this change. 159 of these 975 units will directly offset the units that are permitted on the project site under the current General Plan designation.

Regional

Southern California Association of Governments

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is a council of governments representing Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties. SCAG is the federally recognized metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for this region, which encompasses over 38,000 square miles. It serves as a forum for addressing regional issues concerning transportation, the economy, community development, and the environment. SCAG develops, refines and maintains SCAG's regional and small area socio-economic forecasting/allocation models. SCAG is also the regional clearinghouse for projects requiring environmental documentation under federal and state law. In this role, SCAG reviews proposed development and infrastructure projects to analyze their impacts on regional planning programs. As the southern California region's metropolitan planning organization, SCAG cooperates with the South Coast Air Quality Management District, the California Department of Transportation, and other agencies in preparing regional planning documents. The socio-economic estimates and projections are used for federal and state mandated long-range planning efforts such as the Regional Transportation Plan /Sustainable Communities Strategy, the Air Quality Management Plan, the Federal Transportation Improvement Program, and the RHNA.

Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

On April 7, 2016, SCAG adopted the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which places a greater emphasis than ever on sustainability and integrated planning. The 2016–2040 RTP/SCS vision encompasses a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. The 2016 RTP/SCS includes a strong commitment to reduce emissions from transportation sources to comply with Senate Bill 375, improve public health, and meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. This long-range plan, required by the state of California and the federal government, is updated by SCAG every four years as demographic, economic, and policy circumstances change. The 2016 RTP/SCS is a living, evolving blueprint for the region's future (SCAG 2016).

5.12.1.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Population

Citywide and Countywide Population

Table 5.12-1 exhibits the population growth trends in the City of Ontario as well as in the County of San Bernardino, collected by the Department of Finance (DOF 2019). According to the data, population has

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

steadily increased in both the City of Ontario and the County of San Bernardino from 2010 to 2019 with the largest percentage increase for the City of Ontario being from 2018 to 2019, at 2.31 percent. The largest percentage increase for the County of San Bernardino was from 2010 to 2011 at 1.14 percent.

Table 5.12-1 Population Trends in the City of Ontario and County of San Bernardino

Year	City of Ontario		County of San Bernardino	
	Population	Percent Change	Population	Percent Change
2010	163,924	N/A	2,035,210	N/A
2011	165,740	1.11%	2,058,416	1.14%
2012	167,072	0.80%	2,076,145	0.86%
2013	168,037	0.58%	2,090,945	0.71%
2014	168,382	0.21%	2,104,088	0.63%
2015	169,858	0.88%	2,123,562	0.93%
2016	170,268	0.24%	2,136,242	0.6%
2017	172,168	1.12%	2,156,115	0.93%
2018	174,244	1.21%	2,171,517	0.71%
2019	178,268	2.31%	2,192,203	0.95%

Source: DOF 2019.

Citywide and Countywide SCAG Projections

SCAG's regional forecast population, housing and employment projections for 2012 and 2040 for the City of Ontario and the County of San Bernardino are shown in Table 5.12-2. According to SCAG and TOP, significant growth is anticipated to occur within the City of Ontario as well as San Bernardino County in the next two decades. Additionally, SCAG forecasts that the number of housing in the City of Ontario will increase by 30,200 units between 2012 and 2040, a 67 percent increase. As shown in the table, SCAG also forecasts that the number of jobs in the City of Ontario will increase by 72,100 between 2012 and 2040, also a 70 percent increase (SCAG 2016).

Table 5.12-2 SCAG Projections – City of Ontario and County of San Bernardino

	2012	2040	Project Change 2012-2040	Percent Change 2012-2040
Adopted County of San Bernardino				
Population	2,068,000	2,731,300	663,300	32%
Housing	615,300	854,300	239,300	39%
Employment	659,500	1,028,100	368,600	56%
Adopted City of Ontario Forecast				
Population	166,300	258,600	92,300	56%
Housing	45,100	75,300	30,200	67%
Employment	103,300	175,400	72,100	70%

Source: SCAG 2016

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

Housing

Citywide and Countywide Housing

As shown in Table 5.12-3, DOF estimates that there are currently approximately 50,654 housing units in the City of Ontario (DOF 2019). Characteristics of occupied and vacant housing units in the City of Ontario and San Bernardino County, as reported by the DOF, are also shown in Table 5.12-3.

Table 5.12-3 Housing Units – City of Ontario and San Bernardino County

	City of Ontario	San Bernardino County
By Unit Type¹		
Single-Family Detached	30,089	514,630
Single-Family Attached	3,114	25,078
Two to Four	5,086	46,242
Five Plus	10,190	93,873
Mobile Homes	2,175	43,960
Total	50,654	723,783
Average Household Size	3.76	3.38
Vacancy Rate	6.8%	11.9%

Sources:
¹ DOF 2019.

Employment

Citywide Employment

As shown in Table 5.12-4, there were 119,057 jobs in Ontario from July 2017 to July 2018 as provided by the City of Ontario’s “Regional Intelligence Report”. The numbers of jobs in the City per industrial sector are shown in Table 5.12-5 with the most amount of jobs at 16.22 percent occurring in the “Professional Business” industrial sector.

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 5.12-4 Employment by Industrial Sector – City of Ontario (2017)

Industrial Sector	Jobs in the City of Ontario	
	Jobs	Percent of Total Jobs
Professional Business	19,310	16.22%
Transport/Warehouse	18,119	15.22%
Retail Trade	14,684	12.33%
Manufacturing	13,861	11.64%
Wholesale Trade	12,876	10.81%
Education/Health	9,777	8.21%
Leisure and Hospitality	8,518	7.15%
Government	6,335	5.32%
NR/Construction	5,631	4.72%
Financial Activities	3,982	3.34%
Other Services	3,833	3.22%
Information	2,130	1.79%
Total	119,057	100%

Source: California Employment Development Department (EDD). 2019.

Jobs-Housing Balance

The jobs-housing ratio is a general measure of the total number of jobs and housing units in a defined geographic area, without regard to economic constraints or individual preferences. The balance of jobs and housing in an area—in terms of the total number of jobs and housing units as well as the type of jobs versus the price of housing—has implications for mobility, air quality, and the distribution of tax revenues. The jobs/housing ratio is one indicator of a project’s effect on growth and quality of life in the project area. SCAG applies the jobs-housing ratio at the regional and subregional levels to analyze the fit between jobs, housing, and infrastructure. A major focus of SCAG’s regional planning efforts has been to improve this balance. SCAG defines the jobs-housing balance as follows:

Jobs and housing are in balance when an area has enough employment opportunities for most of the people who live there and enough housing opportunities for most of the people who work there. The region as a whole is, by definition, balanced. . . . Job-rich subregions have ratios greater than the regional average; housing-rich subregions have ratios lower than the regional average.

Ideally, job-housing balance would . . . assure not only a numerical match of jobs and housing but also an economic match in type of jobs and housing.

Jobs-housing goals and ratios are advisory only. No ideal jobs-housing ratio is adopted in state, regional, or city policies. However, SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs-housing ratio is 1.36; communities with more than 1.36 jobs per dwelling unit are considered jobs-rich; those with fewer than 1.36 are housing-rich. A job-housing imbalance can indicate potential air quality and traffic problems associated with commuting.

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

As shown in Table 5.12-5, the jobs-housing balance in the City of Ontario is forecast to increase slightly between 2012 and 2040, from 2.29 to 2.33. The City of Ontario is shown to have a disproportionate number of employment opportunities to housing. This suggests that a large number of Ontario workers commute to the City. According to SCAG projections, the City is expected to remain jobs-rich. The size, location in the City, and noise and safety zones surrounding the City of Ontario provide a physical barrier for the development of land uses such as housing, and therefore encourage placement of compatible land uses such as retail, office, industrial, warehousing, and airport service-related uses. Consequently, and as stated above, the City of Ontario is inherently jobs-rich (City of Ontario 2009).

Furthermore, as shown in Table 5.12-5, the County of San Bernardino is below the proposed balanced ratio of 1.36. It is expected to increase from 2012 to 2040 to 1.20 which would still be considered housing-rich. Therefore, it is likely that residents within the subregion will supply the majority of the workforce, thereby reducing the influx of individuals migrating to southwest San Bernardino County and the Ontario area. Additional employment to the area is expected to create a better balance between housing and jobs within the San Bernardino County subregion.

Table 5.12-5 Jobs-Housing Balance

Jurisdiction	Year	Employment	Households	Jobs-Housing Ratio
City of Ontario	2012	103,300	45,100	2.29
	2040	175,400	75,300	2.33
County of San Bernardino	2012	659,500	615,300	1.07
	2040	1,028,100	854,300	1.20

Source: SCAG 2016.

5.12.2 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

- P-1 Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- P-2 Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The Initial Study, included as Appendix A, substantiates that impacts associated with the following thresholds would be less than significant:

- Threshold P-2

This impact will not be addressed in the following analysis.

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

5.12.3 Plans, Policies, and Programs

There are no plans, policies, or programs applicable to the project related to population and housing impacts.

5.12.4 Environmental Impacts

5.12.4.1 METHODOLOGY

The proposed project's demographics are examined in the context of existing and projected population for the San Bernardino County region in addition to the City of Ontario and considers consistency with The Ontario Plan (TOP) and the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Information on population, housing, and employment for the planning area is available from several sources including:

- **US Census.** The official United States Census is described in Article I, Section 2, of the US Constitution. It calls for an actual enumeration of the people every 10 years, to be used for apportionment among the states of seats in the House of Representatives. The Census Bureau publishes population and household data gathered in the decennial census. This information provides a record of historical growth rates in Bloomington and San Bernardino County.
- **California Department of Finance.** The Department of Finance (DOF) prepares and administers California's annual budget. Other duties include estimating population demographics and enrollment projections. DOF's "Table E-5: City/County Population and Housing Estimates" reports on population and housing estimates for the state, counties, and cities, January 2011 to 2015, benchmarked to base year 2010.
- **Southern California Association of Governments.** Policies and programs adopted by SCAG to achieve regional objectives are expressed in its 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

The potential impacts of the proposed project were evaluated relative to the demographic condition, jobs/housing balance and socioeconomic profiles. The proposed project would be considered consistent with TOP and the 2016 RTP/SCS if it is compatible with the general intent of such plans and would not preclude attainment of primary goals of such plans.

5.12.4.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for which the Initial Study disclosed potentially significant impacts. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

Impact 5.12-1: The proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in population growth in the project area. [Threshold P-1]

Impact Analysis: The proposed project would not introduce new population or housing to the project site. Development would include business park and industrial uses, it would result in jobs for residents in the area. Table 3-1, *Maximum Specific Plan Buildout*, provides the maximum allowable gross building area for each Planning

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

Area based on its allowable floor area ratio, resulting in a combined maximum building square footage of 1,905,027 square feet of business park and industrial uses.

Employment Growth

Construction

The construction phase of the development would generate temporary employment opportunities, including short-term design, engineering, and construction jobs. Construction related jobs would not result in a significant population increase because they would be filled by workers in the region. Therefore, temporary construction-related jobs would not result in a substantial increase in population in the area, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The projected number of employees that would result from the implementation of the Specific Plan was calculated based on the land use projection assumptions in the TOP EIR, Appendix J. As shown in Table 5.12-6, the project site has the potential to generate 2,064 employees.

Table 5.12-6 Project Generated Employment

Building	Warehouse (sf)	Total Building (sf)	Employees/1,000 sf	Total Employees
Business Park	Non-Office (50%)	228,952	0.650	149
	Office (50%)	228,952	2.860	655
Industrial	Non-Office (90%)	1,302,411	0.650	847
	Office (10%)	144,712	2.860	414
Total	-	1,905,027	-	2,064

Source: General Plan EIR Appendix J, Land Use Modeling Methodology.

It should be noted that the “VMT Assessment” conducted by Urban Crossroads projected a total of 1,950 employees which was used to determine the service population for purposes of calculating vehicle miles traveled per service population. Note that both the figure for 2,064 employees and 1,950 employees would result in the same SCAG 2040 plus proposed project jobs-housing ratio projection for both the City of Ontario and the County of San Bernardino (refer to Tables 5.12-6 and 5.12-7). In order to provide a conservative analysis for purposes of analyzing the project’s employment growth, it is assumed that the project would generate 2,064 employees.

The forecast increase in project employment is well within SCAG’s forecast employment increase for the City of Ontario of 72,100 and the forecast employment increase for the County of San Bernardino of 368,600 by 2040 (see Table 5.12-2, *SCAG Projections – City of Ontario and County of San Bernardino County*). Additionally, the Transport/Warehouse industrial sector constitutes 15.22 percent of the jobs in the City of Ontario, second highest to the Professional Business sector. The implementation of the proposed project would contribute to

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

job growth in this already prosperous industrial sector. Therefore, project-related employment growth impacts are not anticipated to be significant.

Population Growth

Implementation of the proposed project would increase jobs in the City of Ontario, which would have the potential to increase the demand for housing in the area. As stated, the proposed increase in 1,905,027 square feet of business park and industrial uses has the potential to result in 2,064 jobs. The San Bernardino Council of Governments (SBCOG) region is housing rich. According to SCAG RTP/SCS, “the land use pattern also encourages improvement in the jobs-housing balance by accommodating 1.1 million more jobs by 2020 and about 2.4 million more jobs by 2040.” The project would produce more jobs and therefore would support the improvements designated by SCAG in pursuit of an improved jobs housing-balance for the County of San Bernardino. Because the region is housing-rich, it is expected that jobs at the project site would be drawn from the regional labor force.

However, even if the project increase in employees added equivalent population to the project site, growth of 2,064 residents would be well within the growth projections assumed for the City and the region, specifically, 92,300 by 2040 in the City of Ontario and 663,300 by 2040 in the County of San Bernardino (see Table 5.12-2, *SCAG Projections – City of Ontario and County of San Bernardino County*). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.

Jobs-Housing Balance

As stated, the San Bernardino Council of Governments (SBCOG) region is housing rich. According to SCAG RTP/SCS, “the land use pattern also encourages improvement in the jobs-housing balance by accommodating 1.1 million more jobs by 2020 and about 2.4 million more jobs by 2040.” The project would produce more jobs and therefore would support the improvements designated by SCAG in pursuit of an improved jobs housing-balance for the County of San Bernardino.

Project impacts on the jobs-housing balance are estimated by comparing employment and household buildout statistics of the proposed project to that of SCAG’s 2040 projections.

As shown in Table 5.12-7, at buildout of the proposed project the jobs-housing ratio for the City of Ontario is estimated to be 2.36, similar to and only marginally different than SCAG projections for the City in 2040 of 2.33 (see Table 5.12-5, *Jobs-Housing Balance*). Buildout of the Specific Plan would result in an estimated jobs-housing ratio of 1.21 for the County of San Bernardino, again only marginally different than SCAG projections for the County of 1.20. Therefore, no significant impact related to jobs-housing balance is anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed project.

5. Environmental Analysis POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 5.12-7 Projected Jobs-Housing Balance

Year	Employment	Households	Jobs-Housing Ratio
City of Ontario			
2012	103,300	45,100	2.29
SCAG 2040 Projection	175,400	75,300	2.33
Net increase due to proposed project	2,064	N/A	Not applicable ¹
SCAG 2040 Projection + Proposed Project	177,464	75,300	2.36
County of San Bernardino			
2012	659,500	615,300	1.07
SCAG 2040 Projection	1,028,100	854,300	1.20
Net increase due to the proposed project	2,064	N/A	Not Applicable
SCAG 2040 Projection + Proposed Project	1,030,164	854,300	1.21

Source: SCAG 2016.

¹ Jobs-housing ratios are identified for regions and subregions and are not applicable to an area as small as the Ontario Ranch Specific Plan.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant impact.

5.12.5 Cumulative Impacts

The area considered for cumulative impacts is the County of San Bernardino. Impacts are analyzed using General Plan projections in SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast. Development of the proposed project in conjunction with the related cumulative project list in Table 4-3, *Related Approved and Pending Projects*, in Chapter 4 of this DEIR, would not result in cumulative citywide population and/or housing impacts, as business park projects would further improve the jobs-housing balance in the region. This would encourage alignment with objectives set by SCAG's RTP/SCS as it would increase job opportunity in an area that is predominantly residential. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals set forth in TOP by providing long-term employment opportunities associated with the buildout of the Business Park and Industrial uses on site. Related projects would be reviewed by the City, and development would be required to be consistent with adopted state and city development standards, regulations, plans, and policies to minimize the effect of the increase in population on physical impacts on the environment. Additionally, the indirect effect of project employment on housing and population growth in the City has been anticipated in TOP, and therefore in regional housing and population forecasts. As such, the project would not contribute to cumulatively adverse growth impacts. Upon approval, the proposed project would improve the jobs-housing balance in the County of San Bernardino which is notably considered a housing-rich area. Therefore, the proposed project combined with related projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to population and housing as no substantial new unplanned growth would occur.

5.12.6 Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval, Impact 5.12-1 would be less than significant.

5. Environmental Analysis

POPULATION AND HOUSING

5.12.7 Mitigation Measures

No significant project-level or cumulative impacts to population and housing were identified and no mitigation measures are necessary.

5.12.8 Level of Significance After Mitigation

No mitigation measures are required and impacts would remain less than significant.

5.12.9 References

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2018, May. Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011–2018, with 2010 Census Benchmark.

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>.

California Employment Development Department (EDD). 2019. Labor Force and Unemployment Rate for Cities and Census Designated Areas. <https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/labor-force-and-unemployment-for-cities-and-census-areas.html#CCD>.

_____. 2017. Unemployment Rates (Labor Force).

<https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/dataanalysis/labForceReport.asp?menuchoice=LABFORCE>.

Murow Development Consultants (Murow). 2020, January 22. Infrastructure Estimate.

Ontario, City of. 2018. Regional Intelligence Report.

https://www.ontariothinksbusiness.com/sites/default/files/rir_final_oct1_2018.pdf.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016, April. 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

<http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS.pdf>.

US Census Bureau. 2018a. Total Population. American FactFinder search PEPANNRES.

<https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>.

_____. 2018b. General Housing Characteristics. American FactFinder search QT-H1

<https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>.

_____. 2018c, December 6. 2013–2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: Selected Economic Characteristics. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/news/data-releases/2017/release.html>.

Weltz, Jerry. 2003. Jobs-Housing Balance. Planning Advisory Service Report Number 516. American Planning Association.