

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to indicate the impacts of a project alternative whereby the proposed surface parking area would be eliminated. Under this alternative, the proposed surface parking lot would be eliminated from the project description and the existing land use consisting of a single-family residence would remain.

The proposed surface parking lot would occupy *Parcel 009*. As indicated above, this parcel is currently occupied by single-family residences, a detached garage, and a storage building. The parcel’s address is 12202 Chosen Street. Under the proposed project, these existing improvements would be demolished to accommodate the new 37 space surface parking lot.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

City staff, as part of their preliminary review of the Initial Study prepared for the project, requested a separate assessment of those environmental impacts that would occur in the absence of the proposed surface parking lot. This analysis focused on the *difference* in the environmental impacts of the proposed project that was evaluated in the Initial Study with the potential impacts of an alternative project scenario where the proposed surface parking area proposed for Parcel 9 were to be eliminated. The differences in the potential impacts are summarized below and on the following pages.

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
1. Aesthetics			
<i>A. Would the project affect a scenic vista?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The existing residence is dilapidated and the building would remain in its current state indefinitely. No scenic vistas are present in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, the impacts of the Proposed Project and the “No Surface Parking Alternative” would be similar.	×	
<i>B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. No scenic resources are located on-site or in the vicinity of the project site. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
1. Aesthetics (continued)			
<i>C. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day- or night-time views in the area?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in the existing residential unit remaining on the site indefinitely. No new lighting would be installed as is proposed for the under the proposed project. As a result, the impacts would be less for the No Surface Parking Alternative.		×
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
<i>A. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to farmland resources. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	
<i>B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. Neither alternative would involve any conflicts with agricultural uses and/or zoning. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	
<i>B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or zoned timberland production (as defined by Government Code § 51104[g])?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	
<i>C. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	
<i>D. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, may result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	×	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
3. Air Quality			
<i>A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. Neither project scenario would impact the applicable air quality management plan (AQMP). There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✗	
<i>B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study overall. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The elimination of the surface parking lot would result in fewer construction-related emissions compared to that anticipated for the proposed project.		✗
<i>C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study since the proposed project's emissions are below the SCAQMD's thresholds. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The elimination of the surface parking lot would result in fewer construction-related emissions compared to that anticipated for the proposed project.		✗
<i>D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking lot would result in fewer construction-related emissions compared to that anticipated for the proposed project. In addition, operational emissions from vehicles using the surface parking lot would be eliminated if the surface parking lot was not constructed.		✗
<i>E. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? No reduction in impact.</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✗	
4. Biological Resources			
<i>A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✗	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
4. Biological Resources (continued)			
<i>B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study since no sensitive habitat or riparian areas would be affected. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✘	
<i>C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✘	
<i>D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✘	
<i>E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in fewer impacts related to the removal of trees. No tree removal impacts would occur within Parcel 9 if the surface parking project element was eliminated.		✘
<i>F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✘	
5. Cultural Resources			
<i>A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue. The impacts of the Proposed Project and the No Surface Parking Alternative would be similar.	✘	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
5. Cultural Resources (continued)			
<i>B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The area of potential impact would be less compared to the proposed project.	✘	
<i>C. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or unique geologic feature?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>D. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
6. GEOLOGY			
<i>A. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault (as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault), ground-shaking, liquefaction, or landslides?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>B. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>C. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including location on a geologic unit or a soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
6. GEOLOGY (CONTINUED)			
<i>D. Would the project result in or expose people to potential impacts, including location on expansive soil, as defined in Uniform Building Code (2012) creating substantial risks to life or property?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>E. Would the project result in or expose people to potential impacts, including soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
<i>A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gasses?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
<i>A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. The demolition of the existing residential unit will result in fewer impacts related to potential lead paint and asbestos. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, or result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (CONTINUED)			
<i>C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>D. Would the project be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>E. Would the project be located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild lands fire, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
9. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY			
<i>A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in less impervious surfaces compared to the proposed surface parking lot. The drainage characteristics within Parcel 9 would remain unchanged.		✘

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
9. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY (CONTINUED)			
<i>B. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in such a way that would cause a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of a pre-existing nearby well would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in less impervious surfaces compared to the proposed surface parking lot. The drainage characteristics within Parcel 9 would remain unchanged.	✘	
<i>D. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>E. Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in less impervious surfaces compared to the proposed surface parking lot. The drainage characteristics within Parcel 9 would remain unchanged.		
<i>F. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain.	✘	
<i>G. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
9. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY (CONTINUED)			
<i>H. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>I. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding as a result of dam or levee failure?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>J. Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
10. LAND USE			
<i>A. Would the project physically divide or disrupt an established community or otherwise result in an incompatible land use?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the existing single-family residence would remain. Under the No Surface Parking Lot Alternative, no General Plan Amendment or Zone Change would be required.		✘
<i>B. Would the project conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to, a general plan, proposed project, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the existing single-family residence would remain. Under the No Surface Parking Lot Alternative, no General Plan Amendment or Zone Change would be required.		✘
<i>C. Will the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
11. MINERAL RESOURCES			
<i>A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
<i>B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, proposed project or other land use plan?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
12. NOISE			
<i>A. Would the project result in exposure of persons to, or the generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
<i>B. Would the project result in exposure of people to, or the generation of, excessive ground-borne noise levels?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. No excessive ground borne noise impacts would occur under either development scenario.	✗	
<i>C. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the existing single-family residence would remain. Under the No Surface Parking Lot Alternative, no traffic would use Chosen Street or Maxson Road to access the proposed surface parking lot.		✗
<i>D. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would result in less construction-related noise impacts since no demolition or construction activities would occur on Parcel 9.		✗
<i>E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
<i>F. Within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
13. POPULATION & HOUSING			
<i>A. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
<i>B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the existing single-family residence would remain. The existing housing unit would not be demolished to accommodate the proposed surface parking lot.		✗
<i>C. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the existing single-family residence would remain. The existing housing unit would not be demolished to accommodate the proposed surface parking lot.		✗
14. PUBLIC SERVICES			
<i>A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives relative to fire protection services?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	
<i>B. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives relative to police protection?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✗	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
<i>C. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives relative to school services?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>D. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives relative to other governmental services?</i>	The proposed project's implementation is not expected to have any impact on existing governmental services other than those identified in the preceding sections. As a result, no impacts associated with the proposed project's implementation are anticipated.	×	
15. RECREATION IMPACTS			
<i>A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>B. Would the project affect existing recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
16. TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION			
<i>A. Would the project cause a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would mean that the potential traffic impacts related to the use of the surface parking lot would not occur. The surface parking area is anticipated to result in 74 daily trips with 37 trips during the morning and evening peak hours. This traffic would use Chosen Street and Maxson Road to access the proposed surface parking lot. This incremental traffic on the streets would be eliminated.		×

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
<i>B. Would the project result in a conflict with an applicable congestions management program, including but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in the location that results in substantial safety risks?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>D. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>F. Would the project result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
17. UTILITIES			
<i>A. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	
<i>B. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	✘	

NO SURFACE PARKING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO
 CITY OF EL MONTE • MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY
 LAWRENCE EQUIPMENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT • EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

Proposed Project and Alternative Project Impact Comparison Matrix (continued)			
Environmental Issue	Discussion of Impact	Impacts are Same	Impact is Less
<i>C. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>D. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>E. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>F. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>G. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>H. Would the project result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations in power or natural gas facilities?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	
<i>I. Would the project result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations in communications systems?</i>	The elimination of the surface parking area on Parcel 9 would not alter the conclusions of the Initial Study. In terms of Parcel 9, the existing single-family residence would remain. There would not be any lessening of impacts with respect to this issue.	×	