

**CITY OF PASADENA
PLANNING DIVISION
HALE BUILDING
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91109-7215**

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this analysis, the associated "Master Application Form," and/or Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and supporting data constitute the Initial Study for the subject project. This Initial Study provides the assessment for a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Polytechnic School Master Development Plan
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena Department of Planning & Development
175 N. Garfield Avenue, Pasadena CA 91109
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Robert Ávila
(626) 744-6706
4. Project Location: The project site is an approximately 15-acre campus located at 1030 East California Boulevard, Pasadena. The campus is bounded by California Boulevard to the north, Wilson Avenue to the east, Arden Road to the south, and Catalina Avenue to the west.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Polytechnic School
1030 East California Boulevard, Pasadena
Debbie Reed, Director
6. General Plan Designation: Institutional
7. Zoning Designation: PS (Public & Semi-Public District)
8. Description of the Project: This Master Development Plan presents a ten-year planning framework and development entitlement for Polytechnic School in Pasadena, California. The 2004-2010 Master Development Plan or Master Plan is a framework for future development of the school covering upgrades to the Poly campus through enhancement of the educational program and construction of additional administrative, educational, and storage space. The purposes of a master development plan are to reduce processing time and uncertainty in the development process and to ensure an orderly and thorough review of development plans, resulting in more compatible and desirable developments. The Master Plan is proposing

building envelopes of new building area for the North and South Campuses and athletic fields (20,000 square feet each campus; 10,000 square feet for the fields) not to exceed 45,000 square feet of net new construction over the ten-year term of the plan. Also included in the scope of the Master Plan are tenant improvements to the interiors of existing buildings, the construction of a swimming pool, and a subterranean, two-level parking structure southwest of the intersection of California Boulevard and Wilson Avenue. Specific building projects would be designed and rendered over the life of the Master Plan as funding becomes available.

The Master Development Plan as proposed by the applicant would be implemented through four phases over a ten-year period.

Phase 1 consists of development of the proposed new swimming pool (Figure 17), including its surrounding fencing and landscaping. This is expected to occur during years 1 through 3 of this plan. Figures from the Master Development Plan are attached at the end of the Initial Study.

Phase 2 consists of demolition or removal of structures and development of various new structures, renovations of existing structures, Garland lot improvements, and landscaping and fencing improvements. This development is expected to occur during years 2 through 10 of this plan.

Phase 3 consists of development of a new 250-space subterranean parking structure located at the southwest corner of California Boulevard and Wilson Avenue. This is expected to occur during years 2 through 10 of this plan.

Phase 4 consists of street improvements to Wilson Avenue and Catalina Street as described in the City mandated Street Improvements section. This is expected to occur during years 2 through year 10 of this plan, but only after completion of Phase 3 (new underground parking structure). Because construction of the Wilson Avenue and Catalina Street improvements would disrupt existing parking capacity on those streets, Phase 4 cannot occur until substantial completion of Phase 3. Except for that limitation, no phase is dependent on any other phase, and development may occur in any order and at any times during the periods set forth above.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The Polytechnic campus is located along the southern frontage of California Boulevard in south central Pasadena, two blocks east of South Lake Avenue. The surrounding land uses include:

- North: Uses to the north include multi-family residential to the northwest, and institutional (Caltech) to the north and northeast.
- East: The land use to the east is the campus of California Institute of Technology (Caltech).
- South: The land use to the south is single-family residential.
- West: The land use to the west is single-family residential.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: The Master Plan for the Polytechnic School must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation, Design Commission, and Planning

Commissions before being presented to the City Council for adoption. The Historic Preservation Commission would review and make findings on any potential impacts to historic resources. The Design Commission would review and evaluate potential aesthetic impacts of building design, landscaping and site plan layout. The Planning Commission would review and make findings on the land use issues that may arise from implementation of the Master Development Plan. The City Council would consider the recommendations of the reviewing commissions, the environmental documentation, public comment, and staff recommendation prior rendering a decision.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Geology & Soils		Population & Housing
	Agricultural Resources		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality		Hydrology & Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use and Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities & Service Systems
	Energy		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project DOES NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	✓
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment. Analysis in the Initial Study shows that one or more impact areas will have a "Potentially Significant Impact" An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that were not analyzed in a previously approved EIR or Negative Declaration for the project at hand.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: November 15, 2004
 Department requiring checklist: Planning & Development
 Planner assigned: Robert Ávila

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (Explanations of all answers are required):

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

WHY? This area contains structures ranging from one to two stories in height and mature trees that obstruct the northerly views of the San Gabriel Mountains. Adjacent properties also have mature trees and landscaping that obstruct views to the north. The Pasadena Municipal Code states that properties of the Public/Semi-Public Zone District would be subject to the development standards of the most restrictive abutting base district. Consequently, the development standards of the Residential Single-Family (RS) District apply if not addressed in the Master Development Plan. For example, new construction on the North and South Campuses would not be permitted to exceed a maximum height of 36 feet at the ridge beam of a two-story building, which is the maximum height allowed under the adjacent RS-4 zoning district. The Master Development Plan proposes a maximum height of 35 feet for new construction on the North and South Campus. Since the project is not located in an area that offers views of the mountains to the north, and the Master Plan's proposed height limits are less than the currently allowable height limits, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan would have no impact to scenic vistas.

b. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan does not impact an Official State Scenic Highway, Los Angeles County Recommended Scenic Highway or unofficial City Designated Scenic Corridor. The project site does not incorporate properties within or adjacent to a state scenic highway. No adverse effects to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

c. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan does not provide specific building and landscape designs at this time. Rather, the proposed Master Development Plan is establishing building envelopes where new development would occur. At each building phase, the Director of Planning would review new construction projects under 25,000 square feet to evaluate consistency with the proposed Master Development Plan, the Protected Tree Survey and the approved site plan. For new construction over 25,000 square feet, the Planning Director would also review the project phase. However, the Design Commission may request to review project phases over 25,000 square feet consistent with the Thresholds of Design Review, Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.92.

Additional development of the Polytechnic campus may result in the removal of some trees recognized as having significant aesthetic value and potentially impact others. To analyze the potential aesthetic impacts of the proposed Master Development Plan, the applicant has prepared a tree survey to document protected native and specimen trees on the project site indicating which trees may be impacted by full implementation of the proposed Master Development Plan. The project would be required to comply with the Tree Protection Ordinance, including maintenance of the existing tree canopy on campus. Compliance with the Tree Protection Ordinance would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. See section 6(e) for discussion on Tree Protection.

d. *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

WHY? The project would not have a significant impact on light and glare because it would be required to comply with the statutory performance standards regulating glare and outdoor lighting as stipulated in Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.64. Currently, the project site is not a significant source of light or glare. The majority of buildings on the site are used during daytime hours only. Nighttime lighting sources are limited to path, landscape and security lighting. Height and direction of any new outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to requirements of the Zoning Code. The Public Works Department is requiring that a maximum of 34 post-top streetlights be installed to bring street lighting up to existing design standards. Due to design that incorporates shields to direct illumination down, these lights are not sources of glare and are an aide to public safety. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project.

a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

WHY? The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. There would be no project impact.

b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than retail plant nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and conditionally in the CL (Limited Commercial) and IG (Industrial) OS (Open Space) Zoning Districts. There would be no project impact.

c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

WHY? There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. There would be no project impact.

5. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

a. *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

WHY? The Master Development Plan proposes adding 45,000 square feet of building area to the Polytechnic campus in increments over a ten-year period. The amount of additional square footage is nominal in the context of new construction projected for the city as a whole or region. The Master Development Plan would not conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan. Furthermore, the project must comply with the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act and the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and Southern California Association of Governments. The AQMP contains measures to meet federal and

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

state requirements. The City of Pasadena is also part of the West San Gabriel Valley Planning Council, which adopted the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b. *Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

WHY? The proposed Master Plan has the potential to generate air pollutants in the short-term from construction and in the long-term from operation and vehicle trips. Daily construction related regional emissions for the proposed project are described in the *Air Quality Analysis for Polytechnic School Master Development Plan 2004-2014, September 2004*. The construction related daily emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance thresholds. The emissions from construction related activities are not considered to result in a significant adverse short-term regional air quality impact because the levels of these emissions during construction of the proposed project would be below the SCAQMD air pollutant significance thresholds.

Potential local impacts from operations are also anticipated to be below the thresholds of significance because of the relatively small magnitude of project-generated trips over existing levels. Parking which is currently dispersed around the perimeter of the Polytechnic campus would be consolidated to a two-level subterranean garage. Enrollment would not increase as a result of implementation of the Master Development Plan.

The applicant would be required to follow the statutory requirements of PMC Title 14-Building and Construction, as to the mitigation of fugitive dust and dirt offensive to the neighborhood for each building phase, including the construction of the subterranean parking garage.

c. *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

WHY? As presented in the *Air Quality Analysis for Polytechnic School Master Development Plan 2004-2014, September 2004*, the proposed project would result in development that is below the SCAQMD thresholds for construction and operational phase activities. These significance thresholds are designed to identify those projects that may result in significant levels of air pollution and to assist the region in attaining the applicable California and national ambient air quality standards. Because the project would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, the project is not considered by the SCAQMD to result in significant levels of emissions and these emissions are not cumulatively considerable or cumulatively significant. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

d. *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

WHY? Sensitive land uses adjacent to the proposed project include residences located west and south of the project site, and the Caltech campus located to the east. The project site itself is an educational facility and considered a sensitive use. However, none of the site's surrounding land uses generate toxic air pollutants. In addition, the project site is not in the vicinity of congested intersection or otherwise in the vicinity of a carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot. Therefore, sensitive receptors onsite would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Similarly, the proposed use of the campus would not generate any toxic air pollutants and would not cause any CO hotspots. The project entails the eventual construction of a two-level subterranean parking garage to consolidate parking on surface lots and around the perimeter of the school campus. The project would not result increase student enrollment, nor would there be substantial numbers of vehicle trips be generated above existing levels. As such, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial amounts of pollutant concentrations. Both construction-related and operational activities are below the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, due to the lack of generators, there would be no impact.

e. *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

WHY? During the construction phase, paving on portions of the site would entail the application of asphalt that would produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites. However, most paving activities would be internal to the site. Any odors could be a temporary source of nuisance to residents located adjacent to the project site but would be limited to activities occurring directly on or adjacent to Wilson Avenue or during the repair/resurfacing of the Garland parking lot on the South Campus. The temporary odors would not be considered a significant environmental impact. Educational facilities are not permanent noxious land uses considered to be the source of substantial odors. There would be no project impact.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *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?*

WHY? The project is in a developed urban area. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site. There would be no project impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

b. *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? No sensitive natural plant communities, such as wetlands, oak woodland, and habitat conservation planning areas, are found on the site. There would be no project impact.

c. *Have a substantial adverse effect of 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?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? *The proposed project is located in an urbanized area. No wetland habitat as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is present on the site. There would be no project impact.*

d. *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? *The proposed project is located in a highly urbanized area bounded by single-family residential or institutional development on all sides. The site does not serve as, nor is it a component of, a wildlife dispersion corridor. There would be no project impact.*

e. *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The site contains 47 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". There are approximately 35 trees potentially impacted by the proposed footprint of new development on the Polytechnic campus, as indicated in the list below. Three of these trees meet the criteria for protection, while the remainder of trees either do not meet the criteria for protection or are not listed as protected species. The Existing Tree Survey submitted with the Master Plan application, Figure 4, would be used to evaluate compliance with the approved Master Development Plan as development progresses over time. The Figure 4 specimen tree list would be used for future project reference unless the project description or parameters change (i.e., the Master Development Plan is amended). Any trees affected by the project scope of work that do not meet the criteria for protection at the time of approval are exempt from the Tree Protection Ordinance (and

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Tree Removal Permit requirement), even if such trees should grow to specimen size with time, unless the project scope or description changes. The Tree Protection Ordinance requires that the tree canopy of the project site be maintained or enhanced after full implementation of the Master Development Plan. Incorporation of Mitigation Bio-1, which requires campus development to adhere to the Tree Protection Ordinance, would ensure that potentially significant impacts from excessive tree removal would be reduced to a less than significant level.

TREE NO.	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	TRUNK DIAMETER	CANOPY DIAMETER	DEVELOPMENT AREA	PROTECTED
NC-001	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	27'	X	
NC-002	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	13"	23'	X	
NC-003	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	13"	25'	X	
NC-004	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	12"	25'	X	
NC-005	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	17"	36'	X	
NC-006	Redwood	Sequoia sempervirens	9"	12'	X	
NC-008	Purple Leaf Plum	Prunus cerasifera	5"	9'	X	
NC-009	Purple Leaf Plum	Prunus cerasifera	5"	8'	X	
NC-010	Purple Leaf Plum	Prunus cerasifera	5"	5'	X	
NC-011	Purple Leaf Plum	Prunus cerasifera	5"	8'	X	
NC-012	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	8"	18'	X	
NC-013	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	8"	18'	X	
NC-015	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	8"; 8"	15'	X	
NC-016	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	7"	12'	X	
NC-017	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	8"; 8"; 8"	20'	X	
NC-018	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"; 12"	30'	X	
NC-019	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	25'	X	
NC-020	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	25'	X	
NC-021	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	30'	X	
NC-022	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	30'	X	
NC-023	Redwood	Sequoia sempervirens	6"	12'	X	
NC-024	Holly	Ilex sp.	6"	8'	X	
NC-025	Holly	Ilex sp.	6"	8'	X	
NC-026	Holly	Ilex sp.	6"	8'	X	
NC-027	Holly	Ilex sp.	6"	8'	X	
NC-028	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	12"	38'	X	
NC-029	Evergreen Elm	Ulmus parvifolia	15"	50'	X	
NC-030	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	12"	38'	X	
NC-031	Jacaranda	Jacaranda mimosifolia	6"	20'	X	
NC-032	Carob	Ceratonia siliqua	16"; 18"; 20"	45'	X	
NC-033	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	8"	18'	X	X
NC-034	European White Birch	Betula pendula	5"	10'	X	
NC-035	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	25'	X	
NC-036	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	25'	X	
NC-037	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	7"	25'	X	
NC-038	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	25'	X	
NC-039	Red Ironbark	Eucalyptus sideroxylon	6"	18'	X	
NC-041	Purple Leaf Plum	Prunus cerasifera	5"	12'	X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
NC-042	Fern Pine	Podocarpus gracilior	28'	48'		X
NC-044	Carob	Ceratonia siliqua	18'	35'	X	
NC-045	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	18'	30'	X	X
NC-047	Bailey Acacia	Acacia baileyana	33'	35'	X	X
TREE NO.	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	TRUNK DIAMETER	CANOPY DIAMETER	DEVELOPMENT AREA	PROTECTED
NC-051	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"	25'		X
NC-062	Deodar Cedar	Cedrus deodara	24"	40'	X	
NC-063	Evergreen Elm	Ulmus parvifolia	20"	40'	X	
NC-064	Evergreen Elm	Ulmus parvifolia	16"	40"	X	
NC-065	Brush Cherry	Syzygium paniculata	14"	24'		X
NC-072	Bailey Acacia	Acacia baileyana	16"-multi	38"		X
NC-074	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	6"-multi	35'	X	
NC-075	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	8"-multi	30'	X	
NC-085	Southern Live Oak	Quercus Virginiana	12"	28		X
NC-096	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	20"	30'		X
NC-097	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	16"	20'		X
NC-101	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	24"	35'		X
NC-103	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	20"	20'		X
NC-107	Guadalupe Fan Palm	Brahea endulis	N/A	12' BT		X
NC-122	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	30'	X	
NC-123	Indian Laurel Fig	Ficus nitida	15"	30'	X	
SC-001	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	20"	30'		X
SC-011	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	28"	40'		X
SC-019	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	30"	30'		X
SC-022	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	14"	25'		X
SC-023	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"	25'		X
SC-025	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	12"	40'		X
SC-026	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	12"	35'		X
SC-030	Aleppo Pine	Pinus halepensis	30"	60'		X
SC-031	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	16"	40'		X
SC-032	Engelmann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	30"	60'		X
SC-033	Southern Live Oak	Quercus Virginiana	12"	40'		X
SC-045	Fern Pine	Podocarpus gracilior	24"	45'		X
SC-048	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	20"	30'		X
SC-048	Jacaranda	Jacaranda mimosifolia	14"	40		X
SC-049	Jacaranda	Jacaranda mimosifolia	16"	60'		X
SC-050	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	30"	30'		X
SC-051	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	48"	35'		X
SC-052	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	44"	35'		X
SC-054	Fern Pine	Podocarpus gracilior	20"; 24"	50'		X
SC-055	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	12"	25'	X	
SC-056	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	12"	25	X	
SC-057	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	24"	25'	X	
SC-058	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	24"	25'	X	
SC-059	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	24"	25'	X	
SC-060	Weeping Bottlebrush	Callistemon viminalis	4"	15'	X	
SC-061	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	15'	X	
SC-062	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	20'	X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
SC-063	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	6"	18'	X	
SC-064	Canary Island Date Palm	Phoenix canariensis	N/A	25' BT	X	
SC-065	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"	20'	X	X
SC-066	Carrotwood	Cupaniopsis anacardioides	3"-multi	10'	X	
SC-067	Evergreen Elm	Ulmus parvifolia	6'	22'	X	
SC-068	Fern Fine	Podocarpus gracilior	14"	25'	X	
SC-069	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
SC-070	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
TREE NO.	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	TRUNK DIAMETER	CANOPY DIAMETER	DEVELOPMENT AREA	PROTECTED
SC-071	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
SC-072	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
SC-073	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
SC-074	Brazilian Pepper	Schinus terebinthefolius	6"	15'	X	
SC-075	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	36"	45'		X
SC-077	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	30"	50'		X
SC-079	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	30"	60'		X
SC-080	Coast Live Oak	Quercus agrifolia	48"	70'		X
SC-081	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	17"	25'	X	
SC-082	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	17"	25'	X	
SC-083	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	17"	25'	X	
SC-084	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	17"	25'	X	
SC-085	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	17"	25'	X	
SC-086	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	16"	35'	X	
SC-087	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	16"	35'	X	
SC-088	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	16"	35'	X	
SC-091	Englemann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	30"	50'		X
SC-092	Englemann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	28"	55'		X
SC-097	Englemann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	20"	35'		X
SC-098	Canary Island Pine	Pinus canariensis	30"	20'	X	
SC-099	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"	20'	X	
SC-108	Englemann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	6"	15'	X	
SC-109	Englemann Oak	Quercus engelmannii	20"	32'		X
SC-110	Pine	Pinus sp.	24"	48'	X	
SC-111	Victorian Box	Pittosporum undulatum	12"-multi	25'		X
SC-114	Jacaranda	Jacaranda mimosifolia	12"-multi	30'		X

Mitigation Bio-1: The applicant shall submit a Tree Protection Plan and a Landscape Plan to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of building permits for each building phase that indicates the extent of vegetation removal for site preparation and development, and the location and species of individual trees of 4-inch caliper or more at 4.5 feet above grade. Maximum effort should be exercised to retain existing trees on site. For trees to be removed, efforts shall be made when feasible to transplant them on site. Approved tree removals shall be consistent with the findings stipulated in Pasadena Municipal Code 8.52.075. If street tree vacancies exist in the area of the building phase, the applicant would be required to plant and maintain, for a period of three years, the officially designated street trees per the City approved Master Street Tree Plan on the subject frontages and install an irrigation system for those

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

trees. Locations would be finalized in the field by the Department of Public Works. Any trees affected by the project scope of work that do not meet the definition for protection at the time of the Master Development Plan approval are exempt from the Tree Protection Ordinance (and Tree Removal Permit requirement) should said trees grow to specimen size with time, unless the project scope or description changes or the Master Development Plan is amended.

The Tree Survey submitted with the MASTER PLAN application, Exhibit 16 and Tree Survey Inventory would be used to evaluate compliance with the approved Master Development Plan as development progresses over time. The Specimen Tree List dated June 2, 2003, would be used for future project reference unless the project description or parameters change (Master Development Plan is amended).

f. *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

WHY? No such plans apply to the project site. See items IV (a-d) above. There would be no project impact.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?*

WHY? The Master Development Plan proposes to relocate three buildings from the North Campus and demolish eight other campus structures. The buildings proposed for relocation are the Pre-Kindergarten (Bldg. #3), Classrooms (Bldg. #19), and Classrooms (Bldg. #20). These three structures are attributed to important Pasadena architects, as outlined below. The structures were surveyed for eligibility for designation as a landmark of the City of Pasadena or the National Register of Historic Places.

The criteria for designation as a landmark of the City of Pasadena are:

- The property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the city's history of the city.
- The property is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in the history of the city.
- The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a locally significant historic resource property type, architectural style, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder who is locally significant, or that possesses high artistic values that are locally significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

- It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important locally in prehistory or history.

Properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are those districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology and culture.

Over the life of the Master Development Plan, new construction is proposed in developed areas where structures already exist. Development in these areas would result in the demolition or relocation of classroom buildings and offices on the North and South Campuses. Three of the structures proposed for relocation – Buildings # 3, 19, and 20 – date from the early 20th century.

The proposed relocation of three buildings on the North Campus (Buildings #. 3, 19, 20) is acceptable because the original setting of the buildings has been substantially altered. The buildings are crowded amid new construction, and some have also been altered. Covered arcades obscure the facades of most of the campus buildings. In some cases, original windows have been covered over where the roof of the arcade meets the wall plane of the various campus buildings. Compared to the main courtyard-building complex on the campus, the three structures proposed for relocation are of secondary significance. Whereas the main courtyard-building complex on campus was designed as a cloister with the arcades integrated into the design as well as the utilization of clerestory windows for better interior light levels, these subject structures do not reflect the same consideration for shelter or light, nor do they demonstrate an attempt to integrate them visually or through site planning into the main campus courtyard. Nevertheless, the above structures should be given special consideration in the planning process in recognition of the designing architects. Potential historic resource impacts caused by alterations to the above structures would be reduced to a less than significant level with relocation and rehabilitation in accordance with Mitigation Cultural-1.

The other buildings identified below (Buildings # 4, 5, 11, 13, 16, 21, 26, and 27) lack sufficient architectural merit and historical associations or have been substantially altered to not be eligible for listing as a National Register or City landmark. Because these structures do not qualify for designation, their proposed demolition is not a significant impact to historic/cultural resources.

Buildings Proposed for Relocation			
BLDG. #	BLDG. Name	Architect/Contractor	Date
3	Pre-Kindergarten	Gordon Kaufman	1933
19	Classrooms	Myron Hunt	1928
20	Classrooms	Roland Coate	1928
Buildings Proposed for Demolition			
4	Pre-Kindergarten	Eggers, Wilkman & Whittle	1966
5	Classrooms	Norwood & DeLonge	1952
11	Stork Administration	Kistner, Wright & Wright	1970
13	Flagler Learning Center	Kistner, Wright & Wright	1970
16	Library	Norwood & DeLonge	1952
21	Maintenance	Thomas J. Thompson	1984
26	Senior Room	Unknown	Unknown
27	Hixon Classrooms	Smith, Powell & Morgridge	1959

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

Mitigation Cultural-1: For relocation/significant exterior alteration of all buildings on the campus designed by Gordon Kaufmann, Hunt & Grey, or Roland Coate (including buildings nos. 3, 19, 20): If any of these buildings are relocated, the applicant shall file a Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval by the staff of Historic Preservation Commission. The applicant shall demonstrate that the exterior of the buildings would be restored and rehabilitated in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. A historic preservation consultant or architect experienced in historic preservation (and whose credentials comply with the professional requirements of the National Park Service for contract personnel) shall participate in all aspects of the planning and design involved with relocation of these buildings. Minor exterior alterations to these buildings are exempt from design review.

b. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

WHY? The likelihood of encountering archaeological resources is considered low since these resources are usually discovered under several layers of soil which would not be affected by development of the project. The project site has been actively used and fully developed as a private school facility or a number of single-family residences for nearly 100 years. Most of the proposed development would occur in areas that previously have been developed with building pads. Nevertheless, standard language incorporated into the contracts of the civil engineers would still be required to alert construction crews to any potential, however low, of encountering unrecorded resources. In the event that archaeological resources were encountered during grading, Mitigation Cultural-2 requires work in the immediate area of the find to be halted and a qualified archaeologist contacted to determine the significance of the find and develop appropriate follow-up measures. This would ensure that any unearthed resources would be protected. There would be no significant project impact.

Mitigation Cultural-2: If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities shall halt until an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Architects examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site archaeologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage archaeological resources.

c. *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

WHY? The likelihood of encountering unique paleontological is also considered low since these resources are usually discovered in deep sedimentary rock formations which would not be affected by development of the project. Nevertheless, standard language incorporated into the contracts of the civil engineers would still be required to alert construction crews to any potential, however low, of encountering buried paleontological resources. If resources were discovered, Mitigation Cultural-3

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

requires work in the immediate area of the find to be halted and a qualified paleontologist contacted to determine the significance of the find and develop appropriate follow-up measures. This would ensure that any unearthed resources would be protected. There are no unique geologic features on the site as it is fully developed and improved with structures, hardscape and landscape, and is located within a developed urban area. There would be no impact.

Mitigation Cultural-3: If paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities shall halt until a qualified paleontologist examines the site, identifies the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site paleontologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage paleontological resources.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies?

WHY? See 4 (b). In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered during construction, all work in the vicinity of the find would be halted and the Los Angeles County Coroner contacted to evaluate the find and administer appropriate follow up measures. There would be no project impact.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan would not directly affect energy use. The project does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan. Furthermore, the project must comply with the statutory energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these standards may include high efficiency HVAC and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation, and double-glazed windows. The overall impact to energy conservation plans after full implementation of the Master Development Plan would be less than significant.

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?

WHY? See 6 (a) above. The impact is considered less than significant.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

a. *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

i. *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?*

WHY? As is true of the southern California region as a whole, the project area is at risk for earthquakes. The northeastern block of the Los Angeles Basin is bordered on the north by the active Sierra Madre Fault and on the south by the active Raymond Fault. The Sierra Madre Fault is located approximately three miles north of the site. No known faults or fault systems traverse the project site. The site does not fall within a Fault Rupture Hazard zone as designated by Los Angeles County Safety Element Maps (1990) or the City of Pasadena Safety Element (2002), nor is it located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone (APSSZ). Consequently, the possibility of surface fault rupture within the project site is considered remote. The impact is considered less than significant.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

WHY? As stated above, the project site is exposed to earthquake risks, albeit no greater than the region as a whole. Major fault systems traversing and affecting the Pasadena area include the San Andreas and Newport Inglewood fault systems. A major earthquake along these regional systems, local faults or as yet unknown faults has the potential to result in ground shaking on-site. New development in California must be constructed in accordance with current seismic engineering standards of the State Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements. A geotechnical report is required to determine the proper footings and materials for all structures on the site, prior to issuance of any grading or building permits. Based on that required investigation, subsurface, seismic stability and foundation design requirements would be identified and specific engineering requirements imposed upon the project to minimize any potential structural or occupancy risks. The project itself would not increase the likelihood of a seismic event. The impact is considered less than significant.

iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction?*

WHY? The project site is not in a designated liquefaction hazard area, as designated in Los Angeles County Safety Element maps (1990) or the City of Pasadena Safety Element (2002). California Division of Mines and Geology Maps (1999) do not show any portion of the project site lying within a liquefaction zone or seismically induced landslide hazards area. Any seismically related impacts

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

would be addressed by engineering requirements imposed upon grading and building permits identified by geotechnical reports prepared for site development. There would be no project impact.

iv. *Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides?*

WHY? The project site is not located within a landslide or mudflow hazard area according to Los Angeles County Safety Element maps (1990) or the City of Pasadena Safety Element (2002), or an area considered prone to seismically induced landsliding (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1999). The site is fully developed in an urbanized area, away from major slopes and hillsides and is not prone to landslides, mudflows, or other slope failures. There would be no project impact.

b. *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

WHY? The project site is fully improved and developed with the Polytechnic campus and related structures and landscaping, with few sources of natural erosion. The campus is relatively flat and features mature landscaping, paved surfaces such as parking and walkways, and ground cover. Excavation would be limited to foundations and footings, or recompaction of existing material. Short-term erosion may occur during the grading phase of construction should there be substantial rainfall. All grading would be subject to the City's grading ordinance, Chapters 29 and 70 of the California Uniform Building Code (UBC) relating to grading and excavation, and other applicable building regulations. Erosion control would be further controlled as mandated by SCAQMD Rule 403 dust preventative measures, and other regulatory requirements as may be imposed by other responsible agencies as conditions of the grading permits. The impact is considered less than significant.

c. *Be located on a geologic unit or 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?*

WHY? The project site is not located within an area of known subsidence associated with fluid withdrawal (groundwater or petroleum), peat oxidation or hydrocompaction and the likelihood of subsidence from these sources is very low. Any construction/excavation that could occur in affected areas would be subject to restrictions imposed by the Department of Public Works as conditions of the respective grading permits. The project would be required to comply with Chapters 29 and 70 of the UBC per the City's grading ordinance that would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

d. *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? According to the City of Pasadena Safety Element (2002), the soils beneath the site consist of Pleistocene Terrace Deposits which are coarse to very coarse grained and are not considered expansive. Nevertheless, due to the presence of expansive soil types in the greater Pasadena area, it may still be possible that expansive soils would be encountered. The project would be required to comply with Chapters 29 and 70 of the UBC per the City's grading ordinance which would further ensure that no significant impacts would occur. As part of that process, a detailed geotechnical report would be required which would determine specific foundation requirements for all structures on the site, prior to issuance of any grading or building permits. This would effectively address any potential impacts that could occur due to expansive soils. The impact is considered less than significant.

e. *Have 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?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The Polytechnic School campus is located in an urbanized area well served by existing public infrastructure, including sewers available for disposal of wastewater associated with the project. Septic tanks and other alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be used or needed. There would be no project impact.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of building maintenance and landscaping. There are no industrial uses proposed for the project site, nor would there be transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials associated with the operation of the private school with grades kindergarten through 12th grade. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials. Hence, there would be no project impact.

b. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

WHY? The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of structures and landscaping. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. There would be no project impact.

c. *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

WHY? No elements of the proposed project would create potential for health hazards, including emissions or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste. There would be no project impact.

d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials 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?*

WHY? The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 nor would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There would be no project impact.

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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There would be no project impact.

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?*

WHY? The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no project impact.

g. *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

WHY? The project site is located within an urban area and would not change the logistical nature of the area. The Master Development Plan would not significantly impact the city's street grid, such as proposing extensive street vacations or redirecting of major arterial routes. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project would not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Fire Marshall maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Marshall is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency. The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is not within any of these dam inundation areas. There are no areas in the City designated as eligible for flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA). There would be no project impact.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate 4-2, Wildfire Hazard Map, the project site is not within a designated wildland and urban fire hazard zone. The project would not represent a significant departure from the current low fire hazard potential associated with the site. There would be no project impact.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or construction permits for this project, the applicant is required to submit a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance. Compliance with these standard programs and requirements would ensure less than significant impacts.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

b. *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

WHY? The project would use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer provided by the Public Works Department. Therefore, there would be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters. Moreover there is no known aquifer condition in the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the project. The project would not affect any of the groundwater recharge spreading grounds, wells or distribution of water of the Water Division of the City's Water and Power Department.

During drought conditions, the project must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) the project shall only consume 90% of expected consumption. To ensure compliance with this ordinance, the applicant shall submit a water conservation plan limiting the project's water consumption to 90% of expected consumption. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans must comply with the approved water conservation plan. The impact is considered less than significant.

c. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through 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?*

WHY? Any future changes in drainage of surface water from the project site would be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the city's existing street, flood control channels, storm drains, and catch basins. Any development is pursued within the Polytechnic campus, each individual building or building phase would be required to submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division of Planning and Development and the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant must submit to the Department of Public Works a grading and drainage plan and hydrology study for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The project is also subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or construction permits for this project, the developer is required submit a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance. Through compliance with the existing building regulations and the required submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there would be no impact from surface runoff.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

d. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

WHY? The project site is not adjacent to any river or stream. Any future building or building phases would be required to comply with standard regulations to limit increases in storm water flows. No impact is anticipated.

e. *Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

WHY? The project is not located near any significant body of water. Any future building or building phases would be required to comply with standard regulations to limit increases in storm water flows. Any polluted runoff is expected to be limited to that which normally is found in residential development. Little change in existing levels of runoff and/or polluted runoff is anticipated. Compliance with standard NPDES and SUSMP requirements would further reduce any polluted runoff. The impact is considered less than significant.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

WHY? The project would not substantially degrade water quality during construction or operation. Runoff would be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. The project would be connected to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems so there would be no direct impact on groundwater quality.

g. *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or dam inundation area as shown in the City of Pasadena adopted Safety Element of the General Plan or other flood or inundation delineation map?*

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan does not include proposals for housing. Furthermore, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area. There would be no project impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The entire City of Pasadena is in Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map Community Number 065050. In Zone D the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations. The project site is not located adjacent to any flood channels that are identified as a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no project impact.

i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project is not located in a dam inundation area. There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. An on-site drainage system would convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. The project site is not located in a hillside area subject to mudslides or mudflow events.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The Polytechnic School has operated at its current location at Wilson Avenue and California Boulevard since 1926. Additional proposed development on the existing Polytechnic campus is not a project that would physically divide an existing community. Most new construction would occur on the existing campus areas. No impact is anticipated.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The proposed project is a Master Development Plan for the Polytechnic School. The Master Plan would create a 10-year planning framework and development entitlement that would establish a procedure for reviewing future building phases and ensure orderly growth and thorough city review resulting in more compatible and desirable development.

The General Plan designation for the Polytechnic School site is Institutional. The General Plan designation for 1001 Arden Road, and 984 and 993 Dale Street is Low-Density Residential. The residential properties under Polytechnic School's ownership would remain zoned as residential parcels, as no zoning map or general plan amendments are proposed in conjunction with this Master Plan. Educational institutions are uses identified and planned for in the Zoning Code and General Plan. Therefore, the existing use would be consistent with land use regulations. Land use impacts from the Master Plan provisions would less than significant.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? There are no Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in Pasadena. No impact is anticipated.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City's General Plan states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel and stone Eaton Wash, and Devils Gate Reservoir. The project is not near these areas. No impact is anticipated.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? There are no locally important mineral-resource recovery sites delineated by the City of Pasadena Land Use Element of the Comprehensive General Plan. The 1994 certified final EIR for

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

this element states that there are two areas within Pasadena which contain aggregate for making Portland cement, one in the Arroyo Seco, the other in Eaton Canyon. These areas are zoned for Open Space uses and are not currently being mined. There are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan. The 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology shows no aggregate resources with the City of Pasadena. No impact is anticipated.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

- a. *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

WHY? The proposed project would not result in exposure of persons to or generate significant noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Element of the General Plan or Noise Ordinance. The Polytechnic School is an existing private school facility operating at its current location for nearly 100 years. As the Master Development Plan is implemented over its lifetime, the campus would continue to function in the same manner in which it is currently operated--as a private school. The new classroom and sport facilities proposed under the Master Plan would be situated toward the Wilson Avenue corridor and Caltech campus, away from residential areas. The proposed subterranean parking improvements would also be located along Wilson Avenue away from residential areas. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. The applicant submitted a Noise Analysis that compared existing and projected future noise levels with the proposed swimming pool described in the Master Development Plan. In each instance, the proposed improvements are not expected exceed the thresholds defined under the Noise Ordinance, Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36.030, as demonstrated in the analysis. The Noise Analysis concluded that the Master Development Plan would result in a less than significant impact.

Any improvements to accommodate the proposed growth of the Polytechnic campus may result in short-term construction noise. This type of noise is regulated by the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance, which limits construction from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday within a residential district or within a radius of 500 feet there from. Potential impacts from this construction are considered less than significant. The project would adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). Regulations in the Municipal Code regarding ambient noise levels apply to stationary noise sources. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance does not regulate traffic noise. The project must comply with the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A). Compliance with these standards would ensure that potential impacts are less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Nevertheless, recognizing that the project site is located adjacent to established residential areas, the following Conditions of Approval would be imposed upon the applicant to further protect the neighborhood from noise that may result from the implementation of the proposed Master Development Plan. These conditions are statutory requirements of the Pasadena Municipal Code applicable to new construction projects.

- *Construction and demolition activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm Saturdays. No construction or demolition activity shall be permitted on Sundays.*
- *The Language Arts classrooms shall not be used as a classroom on Sundays, and shall not be used as a classroom after 8:00 pm or before 7:30 am.*

b. *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?*

WHY? The project is not located near any light rail tracks or freeways. Any ground borne noise and/or vibration from construction pursuant to the Master Development Plan is expected to temporary. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c. *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

WHY? According to the Noise Analysis submitted with the development application, the continued operation of the school with the addition of the proposed swimming pool would still be within the Land Use Compatibility Limit for residential uses. Therefore, permanent increases in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.

d. *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

WHY? The activities of construction have the potential to result in periodic increases in ambient noise levels. This type of noise is regulated by the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance, which limits construction from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday within a residential district or within a radius of 500 feet there from. However, construction activities would be temporary. As a Condition of Approval, construction and demolition activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm Saturdays. Therefore, the potential impact would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

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?

WHY? As April 2004 there were no airports or airport land use plans within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

WHY? The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact is anticipated.

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a. 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)?

WHY? The project is in a developed area where major infrastructure is in place. The project is a private kindergarten through 12th grade school with no residential units proposed as part of the Master Development Plan. No impact would result.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

WHY? No residential properties are identified for future development in the proposed Master Development Plan. The Polytechnic School is proposing to maintain the three RS-4 properties included within the boundaries of the Master Development Plan as single-family residential uses. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

WHY? See 14(b). The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people. No impact would result from implementation of the proposed Master Development Plan.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. *Fire Protection?*

WHY? The study area is located in a low wildfire hazard area according to the Wildfire Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the General Plan 2002 Safety Element. The study area is located less than a mile from the nearest fire station. The study area is located within an existing urbanized area, and can be served by existing fire protection facilities. The potential for new development within the study area is minimal. Potential impacts are considered less than significant.

b. *Libraries?*

WHY? The project is located 1/2 mile from the nearest branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System. The subject property of the proposed Master Development Plan is a private kindergarten through 12th grade school with its own library facility.

c. *Parks?*

WHY? The project is located across the street from the nearest park, Tournament Park. The Polytechnic School has its own athletic fields to meet the demand of its students. No impact is anticipated.

d. *Police Protection?*

WHY? The proposed site is in an area which has reported low crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The increased development proposed in the Master Development Plan is expected to be minimal in the context of citywide building intensities. The project would not increase the need for police protection. Potential impacts are considered less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

e. *Schools?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan is for a private kindergarten through 12th grade school.

f. *Other public facilities?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan is not expected to result in substantial demand for public facilities. Potential impacts are considered less than significant.

16. RECREATION.

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?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The project is located across the street from the nearest park, Tournament Park. The Polytechnic School has its own athletic fields to meet the demand of its students. Adding the swimming pool to the Polytechnic campus reduces the demand for swimming facilities at public schools, in this case, Blair High School. No impact is anticipated.

b. *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? Athletic fields already exist on the Polytechnic campus and are not proposed for expansion. The project would add a swimming pool to the Polytechnic campus reducing the need to expand public recreational facilities. No impact is anticipated.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a. *Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

WHY? The proposed Master Development Plan would not generate a substantial number of additional vehicle trips after full implementation. Enrollment would remain capped of 861 students. The Master Development Plan proposes to reorganize the existing parking demand from public streets to a two-level, subterranean parking structure accessed from Wilson Avenue at California Boulevard. The traffic analysis for the revised project prepared by Kaku Associates and dated October 2004 indicates that impacts would be less than significant. The Transportation Department of the City has reviewed the traffic analysis and concurs with the findings stated in the report.

b. *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? Under the proposed Master Development Plan, the Polytechnic School is proposing to construct a new swimming pool and up to 45,000 square feet of new development on site. The maximum student enrollment would not increase under this proposal. At full enrollment and staffing levels, the proposed Master Plan would add a net total of 15 additional trips to the morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes. Analysis of projected cumulative plus project conditions indicates that, using the City of Pasadena's criteria for determining significance of impact, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact at the eight intersections analyzed in the project traffic study.

c. *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

d. *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? To improve pedestrian safety and circulation around the Polytechnic Campus, the City of Pasadena would require street and infrastructure improvements to be implemented during the lifetime of the Master Plan as a condition of approval. The improvements would include the widening sidewalks, replacing missing street trees, corner rounding, and replacing curbs and gutters along Catalina, Cornell and Wilson where necessary.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

The project has been evaluated by the Transportation Department to consider the impact on circulation resulting from implementation of the Master Development Plan. The design of the street improvements, including expanded sidewalks, rounded corners and narrowed street widths, are designed to improve pedestrian safety and handicapped accessibility. Its design has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. Furthermore, the existing trip generation would not increase substantially and the roadway grid is not being altered with street closures. No impact is anticipated.

e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the Transportation Department to consider the impact on circulation resulting from implementation of the Master Development Plan. The design of the street improvements, including expanded sidewalks, rounded corners and narrowed street widths, are designed to improve pedestrian/vehicular safety and accessibility for disabled persons. The design is not expected to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project site or in the vicinity of the project. Furthermore, the existing trip generation would not increase substantially. No street closures are being proposed. The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Transportation Department and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project must comply with the statutory requirements of the Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Furthermore, the interior of the campus would be evaluated for access by emergency vehicles in accordance with the applicable life/safety development standards during the plan check process. As stated above, the project would not substantially alter the City's roadway network in the vicinity of the project. No impact is anticipated.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

WHY? Currently, there are 166 on-site parking spaces and 110 on-street parking spaces available to the school through a preferential permit-parking district program. The Master Development Plan proposes to increase the number of on-site parking spaces available to Polytechnic staff, students and visitors. The Master Development Plan proposes to build a 250 space, two-level subterranean parking garage on the North Campus where classrooms and visitor parking are currently situated. Furthermore, street improvements to increase pedestrian safety and accessibility are anticipated to remove 73 on-street parking spaces. After street improvements, Polytechnic School may continue the "fee-based" preferential permit parking program for up to 37 preferential on-street parking spaces.

Future parking demand for the Master Plan is forecasted to increase by 15 spaces (12 additional faculty members and 3 for maximum student enrollment) to a projected peak demand of 206 spaces, which includes both on-site and on-street parking. In addition, the 62 spaces displaced by the proposed street improvements along Wilson and Catalina Avenues and Cornell Road would be included in future parking demand projections. The proposed changes in the campus parking system

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

would result in an on-site parking supply of 403 spaces. This increased on-campus parking supply would be sufficient to accommodate the project peak demand of 206 spaces even if the permit parking spaces were no longer available to the school.

Future parking demand for the Master Plan is forecasted to increase by 15 spaces (12 additional faculty members and 3 for maximum student enrollment) to a projected peak demand of 206 spaces, which includes both on-site and on-street parking. In addition, the 62 spaces displaced by the proposed street improvements along Wilson and Catalina Avenues and Cornell Road would be included in future parking demand projections. The proposed changes in the campus parking system would result in an on-site parking supply of 403 spaces. This increased on-campus parking supply would be sufficient to accommodate the project peak demand of 206 spaces even if the permit parking spaces were no longer available to the school.

Parking for events held during normal school hours is met through vacancies in the five on-site lots and on street parking, and supplemented with 50 athletic field parking spaces. Parking for events held after normal school hours, including evenings and weekends, is met by vacancies in the five on-site lots and on-street parking. After construction of the parking garage, the on campus parking supply would be sufficient to accommodate the school's peak parking demand and it would be able to accommodate the parking demand of many of the on-campus special events, without the use of on-street parking thus reducing the impacts on the adjacent neighborhood.

g. *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

WHY? ~~The proposed Master Development Plan is not expected to affect alternative transportation plans or policies.~~ Polytechnic School has a current Transportation Demand Management Plan and is in compliance with the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance. In accordance with the Ordinance, the Plan includes a number of measures to encourage users to utilize alternative modes of transportation. The School conducts and submits an Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR) report annually. Under the proposed Master Development Plan the School will continue to be subject to the City's Ordinance, including the annual AVR report. No impact is anticipated.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a. *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

WHY? The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Implementation of the Master Development Plan would increase the total building area of the school campus. However, growth anticipated is consistent with the anticipated growth identified in the General Plan, which is in compliance with the Polytechnic School

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

SCAG population growth estimates for Pasadena. The number of faculty and students would not increase significantly beyond existing numbers. Student enrollment is capped at 861 students, while Polytechnic staff could grow by an additional 15 members. Therefore, wastewater generation per person would remain approximately at its current level, and not exceed the treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b. *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 effects?*

WHY? The project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities. Growth anticipated is consistent with the anticipated growth identified in the General Plan, which is in compliance with the SCAG population growth estimates for Pasadena. The project is located in a developed urban area where a sewer system is already in place. The enrollment of Polytechnic School would not increase as a result of the Master Development Plan. Total enrollment would remain at the current cap of 861 students. Water usage for school uses is calculated on a per student basis. Current wastewater generation is 8,250 gallons per day and would remain at approximately the same rate since enrollment would not increase. Therefore, adopting the proposed Master Development Plan would not cause a significant increase over existing levels of water usage or generation of wastewater.

c. *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?*

WHY? The project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. The project development would not result in the need for new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system. Furthermore, the project must have an on-site drainage plan approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any on-site improvements needed to provide or to connect the project with the existing City drainage system are the responsibility of the applicant. The project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or construction permits for this project, the applicant would be required to submit a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance.

d. *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

WHY? The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term, reliable water supply. Water usage is calculated on a per student basis. Since the enrollment at the Polytechnic School would maintain the current enrollment cap of 861 students after full implementation of the Master Development Plan, the project would maintain the current usage level of approximately 11,000 gallons of water, per workday in water consumption. However, the new construction of each phase of the Master Development Plan would be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance during periods of drought, thereby reducing monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. Furthermore, the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department has reviewed the project and can serve it. As such, existing water supplies are sufficient to serve the proposed Master Plan, and the impact to water supply would not be significant.

- e. *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project would not result in the need for new sewer or septic tank systems, nor would it create a substantial increase in demand for existing systems. Growth anticipated is consistent with the anticipated growth identified in the General Plan, which is in compliance with the SCAG population growth estimates for Pasadena. The project is located in a developed urban area where a sewer system is already in place. The project would generate 13,000 gallons of sewage per day. The project can be connected to the City sewer system without significant impact.

- f. *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Growth anticipated in the General Plan EIR indicated that an increase of approximately 37,000 tons per year of solid waste by the year 2010 for the entire City is considered a potentially significant impact. However, no mitigation measures were recommended because the City has already taken the appropriate steps to meet its obligations regarding solid waste plan and policies. Since the City's growth projects are consistent with SCAG's regional forecasts, the City complies with the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Management Plan, which is also based on SCAG's regional growth forecasts.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. This project would not result in the need for a new or any substantial alteration to the existing system of

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

solid waste disposal. Furthermore, the City has an active solid waste recycling program and an adopted Solid Source Reduction and Recycling Plan.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. For each development phase of the Master Development Plan, the applicant would coordinate and provide the following plans to the Recycling Coordinator of the Department of Public Works for approval prior to the request for final inspection:

1. Construction & Demolition Recycling and Waste Assessment Plan – Submit plan prior to issuance of the grading permit. A list of Construction and Demolition Recyclers in Los Angeles County can be obtained from the Recycling Coordinator.
2. Monthly reports must be submitted throughout the duration of the project.
3. Summary Report with documentation must be submitted prior to final inspection.

The applicant would also be required to advertise the availability of salvage materials. Furthermore, city code requires that the project be subject to the use of deconstruction techniques.

19. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

20. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

WHY? There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site. As mitigation for tree removal as a result of future campus development, the applicant is required to replace trees to create canopy coverage equal to or greater than currently exists. Projects impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a level of insignificance. See attached Mitigation Plan for details.

For those historic resources identified as works by significant architects, relocation and significant alteration would adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. A historic preservation consultant or architect experienced in historic preservation (and whose credentials comply with the professional requirements of the National Park Service for contract personnel) would participate in all aspects of the planning and design involved with relocation of these buildings. Minor exterior alterations to these buildings are exempt from design review. Projects impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a level of insignificance. See attached Mitigation Plan for details.

Future development sought under the Master Development Plan would not alter existing site drainage, alter the course of a stream or river, or create substantial runoff that would affect wildlife or plant communities.

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project?*

WHY? The proposed Master Development would not create cumulatively considerable impacts. The net increase in traffic is far below the threshold for cumulative air quality concerns to be relevant. Construction dust concerns would be addressed by statutory compliance with the Uniform Building Code and the City of Pasadena’s Building and Zoning Codes. Analysis of the proposed swimming pool and parking lot demonstrates that neither would result in a cumulative noise impact. Analysis of projected cumulative plus project traffic conditions indicates that, using the City of Pasadena’s criteria for determining significance of impact, the proposed project would not have any significant impacts at the analyzed street intersections identified in the Traffic Study.

c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

**Potentially
Significant
Impact**

**Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated**

**Less Than
Significant
Impact**

No Impact

WHY? The project would not have significant effects for geological resources, water, flooding, hazards, public services and utilities and service systems. The proposed project is not introducing a new use into the community in which it operates. The project would not use or change the use of significant amounts of services; therefore, there would not be a significant impact on human beings.

U://My Documents/Wordfile/envrnmentalforms/IS2003draft answersRobertJC.doc 8.01.03

Significant
Impact

Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
2	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Maps- the official Los Angeles and Mt. Wilson, quadrant maps were released in 1977.
3	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
4	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
5	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
6	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
7	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 1994
8	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
9	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
10	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
11	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
12	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
13	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
14	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
15	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
16	Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
17	Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
8	Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002.
19	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
20	State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
21	Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations in Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
22	Transportation, Housing, and Child Care Survey: A Report Describing the Results and Findings of a Survey of Employees in the City of Pasadena, Child Care Planning Associates for the City of Pasadena, April 11, 1990
23	Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
24	West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
25	Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code
26	Traffic and Parking Study for the Pasadena Polytechnic School Master Plan Update, Kaku Associates, November 2003.
27	Noise Study for the Polytechnic School New Swimming Pool and Faculty Parking Lot, Cotton/Bridges/Associates, March 2004.

CITY OF PASADENA

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

APPLICANT: Polytechnic School

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 1030 East California Boulevard, Pasadena

REVIEW PERIOD: December 16, 2005 — January 18, 2005

PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2004-00428

DESCRIPTION: This Master Development Plan presents a ten-year planning framework and development entitlement for Polytechnic School in Pasadena, California. The 2004-2010 Master Development Plan or Master Plan is a framework for future development of the school covering upgrades to the Poly campus through enhancement of the educational program and construction of additional administrative, educational, and storage space. The purposes of a master development plan are to reduce processing time and uncertainty in the development process and to ensure an orderly and thorough review of development plans, resulting in more compatible and desirable developments. The Master Plan is proposing building envelopes of new building area for the North and South Campuses and athletic fields (20,000 square feet each campus; 10,000 square feet for the fields) not to exceed 45,000 square feet of net new construction over the ten-year term of the plan. Also included in the scope of the Master Plan are tenant improvements to the interiors of existing buildings, the construction of a swimming pool, and a subterranean, two-level parking structure southwest of the intersection of California Boulevard and Wilson Avenue. Specific building projects would be designed and rendered over the life of the Master Plan as funding becomes available.

The Master Development Plan would be implemented through four phases over a ten-year period.

Phase 1 consists of development of the proposed new swimming pool (Figure 17), including its surrounding fencing and landscaping. This is expected to occur during years 1 through 3 of this plan. Figures from the Master Development Plan are attached at the end of the Initial Study.

Phase 2 consists of demolition or removal of structures and development of various new structures, renovations of existing structures, Garland lot improvements, and landscaping and fencing improvements. This development is expected to occur during years 2 through 10 of this plan.

Phase 3 consists of development of a new 250-space subterranean parking structure located at the southwest corner of California Boulevard and Wilson Avenue. This is expected to occur during years 2 through 10 of this plan.

Phase 4 consists of street improvements to Wilson Avenue and Catalina Street as described in the City mandated Street Improvements section. This is expected to occur during years 2 through year 10 of this plan, but only after completion of Phase 3 (new underground parking structure). Because construction of the Wilson Avenue and Catalina Street improvements would disrupt existing parking capacity on those streets, Phase 4 cannot occur until substantial completion of Phase 3.

Except for that limitation, no phase is dependent on any other phase, and development may occur in any order and at any times during the periods set forth above.

ON THE BASIS OF THE INITIAL STUDY FOR THE PROJECT AND THE INCLUSION OF THE FOLLOWING MITIGATION MEASURES INTO THE PROJECT DESIGN, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE A POTENTIAL FOR A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT UPON THE ENVIRONMENT. A COPY OF SAID INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATION MEASURES IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE PASADENA PUBLIC LIBRARY, 285 EAST WALNUT, AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADMINISTRATOR, PASADENA CITY HALL, 100 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE, ROOM 311.

THIS MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM BECOMES PART OF THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT DESCRIBED ABOVE. THE FOLLOWING MITIGATION MEASURES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE PROJECT APPLICANT/OWNER:

1. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Regarding item 6(e) and the project's potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the Tree Protection Ordinance:

Impact: The project site contains over 287 trees, most of which do not meet the minimum size to attain protected status. A total of 35 trees have been identified as being potentially impacted by new development proposed for the North and South Campuses. Of this, at least 13 trees would be removed through continued development of the school campus. Compliance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance requires submission of a landscape plan to demonstrate creation of tree canopy coverage of equal to or greater than the protected tree being removed. Other trees will be removed as a result of development.

However, the majority of these trees are located within the interior of the campus and do not contribute to the visual character of the neighborhood.

Mitigation Measure: Mitigation Bio-1: The applicant shall submit a *Tree Protection and Landscape Plan* to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of building permits for each building phase that indicates the extent of vegetation removal for site preparation and development, and the location and species of individual trees of 4-inch caliper or more at 4.5 feet above grade. Maximum effort should be exercised to retain existing trees on site. For trees to be removed, efforts shall be made when feasible to transplant them on site. Approved tree removals shall be consistent with the findings stipulated in Pasadena Municipal Code 8.52.075. If street tree vacancies exist, the applicant will be required to plant and maintain, for a period of three years, the officially designated street trees per the City approved Master Street Tree Plan on the subject frontages and install an irrigation system for those trees. Locations will be finalized in the field by the Department of Public Works. Any trees affected by the project scope of work that do not meet the definition for protection at the time of the Master Development Plan approval are exempt from the Tree Protection Ordinance (and Tree Removal Permit requirement) should said trees grow to specimen size with time, unless the project scope or description changes or the Master Development Plan is amended.

The Tree Survey submitted with the MDP application, Exhibit 16 and Tree Survey Inventory will be used to evaluate compliance with the approved Master Development Plan as development progresses over time. The Specimen Tree List dated June 2, 2003, will be used for future project reference unless the project description or parameters change (Master Development Plan is amended to add more property).

2. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Regarding item 7(a) and the project's potential to Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource:

Impact: The Master Development Plan proposes to demolish eight structures on both the North and South Campuses of more recent construction dates. These other structures are classroom buildings with no historic significance.

The Master Development Plan proposes to relocate or significantly alter the exterior of buildings on the campus designed by Gordon Kaufmann, Hunt & Grey, or Roland Coate. The proposed relocation of three buildings on the North Campus (nos. 3, 19, 20) is acceptable because the original setting of the buildings has been substantially altered. The buildings are crowded amid new construction, and some have also been altered. Compared to the main courtyard-building complex on the campus, they are of secondary

significance. Nevertheless, they have sufficient architectural integrity and historic associations with the school for special consideration in the planning process.

Mitigation Measure 1: For relocation/significant exterior alteration of all buildings on the campus designed by Gordon Kaufmann, Hunt & Grey, or Roland Coate (including buildings nos. 3, 19, 20): If any of these buildings are relocated, the applicant shall file a Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval by the staff of Historic Preservation Commission. The applicant shall demonstrate that the exterior of the buildings would be restored and rehabilitated in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. A historic preservation consultant or architect experienced in historic preservation (and whose credentials comply with the professional requirements of the National Park Service for contract personnel) shall participate in all aspects of the planning and design involved with relocation of these buildings. Minor exterior alterations to these buildings are exempt from design review.

Regarding item 7(b) and the project's potential to Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource:

Impact: The likelihood of encountering archaeological resources is considered low since these resources are usually discovered under several layers of soil which would not be affected by development of the project. The project site has been actively used and fully developed as a private school facility or a number of single-family residences for nearly 100 years. Most of the proposed development would occur in areas that previously have been developed with building pads. Nevertheless, standard language incorporated into the contracts of the civil engineers would still be required to alert construction crews to any potential, however low, of encountering unrecorded resources.

Mitigation Cultural-2: If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities shall halt until an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Architects examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site archeologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage archaeological resources.

Regarding item 7(c) and the project's potential to Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource:

Impact: The likelihood of encountering unique paleontological is also considered low since these resources are usually discovered in deep sedimentary rock formations which would not be affected by development of the project. Nevertheless, standard language incorporated into the contracts of the civil engineers would still be required to alert construction crews to any potential, however low, of encountering buried paleontological resources.

Mitigation Cultural-3: If paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities shall halt until a qualified paleontologist examines the site, identifies the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site paleontologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage paleontological resources.

MONITORING PROGRAM COST:

The applicant is required to pay \$1,000.00 mitigation monitoring fee deposit (includes cost of administration and inspections) to the Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator prior to the issuance of building permits. Deposit is subject to additional billing.

I HEREBY AGREE TO PAY THE CITY MONITORING FEES, AND IMPLEMENT THESE MITIGATION MEASURES, AT A MINIMUM, IN THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

APPLICANT

DATE

Mitigatednegdec 8.08.02

FINDINGS OF APPROVAL

Master Plan Findings

Following a careful review of information presented in this report and at the public hearing, the Planning Commission recommends that the Council find that:

1. *The proposed Master Development Plan is allowed within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of this Zoning Code.*

The applicant operates an existing private school in an established PS zone district. The proposed Master Development Plan is an update to a plan previously approved in 1991. The use and development standards established under the Master Development Plan comply with all applicable provisions of the Zoning Code. The development standards are substantially consistent with the RS residential districts to the west, south and southeast.

2. *The location of the proposed Master Development Plan complies with the special purposes of this Zoning Code and the purposes of the applicable zoning district.*

The proposed Master Development Plan affects buildings and land of an existing use in an established PS zone district.

3. *The proposed Master Development Plan is in conformance with the goals, policies, and objectives of the General Plan and the purpose and intent of any applicable specific plan.*

The subject site is designated under the General Plan as Institutional. The existing use defined under the Master Development Plan is a private elementary, middle and high school, which is classified as an institutional use.

The City adopted General Plan Objective 23, which states that the City should provide long-term opportunities for growth of existing cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions in balance with their surroundings. In addition, Policy 23.4 states that the City should support Specific Plans, master plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.

The proposed Master Development Plan establishes a 10-year framework to reduce uncertainty in the development process and ensure orderly and thorough City review of expansion plans.

4. *The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the Master Development Plan would not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed Master Development Plan.*

The proposed Master Development Plan continues the establishment, maintenance and operation of an existing private school. The City has attached conditions of approval to the Master Development Plan to ensure that the continued operation of the Polytechnic School would not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the inhabitants in the surrounding area.

5. *The Master Development Plan, as described and conditionally approved, would not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.*

The Master Development Plan includes provisions to improve public streets and sidewalks, and enhance the environment in the neighborhood for pedestrians, motorists and residents alike.

6. *The subject site is adequate in terms of size, shape, topography, and circumstances and has sufficient access to streets and highways which are adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed Master Development Plan.*

The project site is a land parcel of 13.5 acres with a gradual change in grade, a regular geometric form, and access by arterial streets leading to regional highways. Implementation of the Master Development Plan is not expected to generate significant additional traffic, as enrollment at the school is not increasing. Furthermore, as a condition of approval, the applicant is required to submit to the City and implement an approved trip reduction plan to decrease vehicle trips to and from the project site.

7. *The design, location, operating characteristics, and size of the proposed Master Development Plan would be compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity, in terms of aesthetic values, character, scale, and view protection.*

The proposed Master Development Plan establishes development standards to ensure compatible future development between the existing private elementary, middle and high school and the adjacent institutional campus and surrounding residential neighborhood. The development standards are substantially consistent with the RS residential districts to the west, south and southeast.

Tree Removal Findings

As part of this proposal, the applicant is requesting the removal of four trees that meet the criteria for protection under the Tree Protection Ordinance PMC §8.52 [Tree # NC-033: Engelmann Oak (*Quercus engelmannii*), Tree # NC-045: Victorian Box (*Pittosporum undulatum*), Tree # NC-047: Bailey Acacia (*Acacia baileyana*), and Tree # SC-065: Victorian Box: (*Pittosporum undulatum*)] from the project site. The four trees do not represent landmark examples of their species because they are fairly young and do not exhibit the growth and canopy coverage of the same species elsewhere on the campus. The four trees cited for removal are specimens that are listed as protected on the City's Specimen Tree List and cannot be removed unless one of six applicable findings can be made. The required findings for each tree are listed below.

1. *There would be a substantial hardship to a private property owner in the enjoyment and use of real property if the injury or removal were not permitted.*

Each affected tree is located within the proposed building envelope area of the Master Development Plan. The campus exhibits over 200 mature trees, of which approximately 56 are protected. The Polytechnic School is restricted to building new development in certain locations on campus away from established residential areas toward Wilson Avenue and the center of the existing campus to reduce significant tree removal impacts that would occur in other locations as well as development impacts to the adjacent residential neighborhood. Therefore, the removal of the tree is necessary to allow the property owner a substantial property right to develop the site pursuant to the development standards of the Zoning Code.

2. *The project, as defined in Section 17.12.020, includes a landscape design plan which will result in tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed, within a reasonable time after completion of the project.*

The applicant has not developed specific building plans for each phase of development at this time. Future building phases would be designed as funding becomes available for implementation. Each individual building phase will be required to submit a final *Tree Retention and Landscape Plan* for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any building permits. The applicant shall plant like-kind or other trees on-site that equal the canopy cover of the affected trees. The proposed new trees shall be included in a landscape plan that shows the existing canopy coverage and the proposed canopy coverage as a result of the new trees.