

**CITY OF PASADENA
DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
CHAMBERS BUILDING, 2ND FLOOR
117 EAST COLORADO BOULEVARD
PASADENA, CA 91105-1918**

FINAL

INITIAL STUDY

Introduction

The Master Plan for the Eaton Wash Park was developed and approved by the City in 1991. The City Council approved the Master Plan for Eaton Wash Park in concept on August 9, 1999; and the City Council approved in concept a revision to the Eaton Wash Master Plan on June 28, 2004. In December, 2004 the City Council formally adopted the Master Plan to expand and redesign the park to include the adjacent Southern California Edison (SCE) property and adopted a corresponding Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). The City is now considering developing an Ice Rink in the southern portion of the Eaton Wash Park Master Plan Area, south of the core Eaton Wash Park facilities.

In accordance with CEQA and the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this analysis is a Subsequent Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration that builds on the analysis contained in the Eaton Wash Master Plan IS/MND adopted in December 2004. This Subsequent IS/MND evaluates the impacts of the Ice Rink on the project-level since it is geographically separate from the remaining Eaton Wash Park facilities. However, this Subsequent IS/MND also discusses the cumulative impacts of the proposed Ice Rink together with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects including build-out of the balance of the Eaton Wash Master Plan. This document along with the Eaton Wash Master Plan IS/MND adopted on December 20, 2004, the associated "Master Application Form," Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), and supporting data constitute the complete Initial Study for the subject Project. These documents are available for review as part of the project file at the City of Pasadena, Hale Building, 175 North Garfield Avenue Pasadena, CA 91109-7215 on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m, and from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon on Fridays.

This Subsequent IS/MND combined with the aforementioned documents provide the assessment for a determination whether the Project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The City of Pasadena circulated an IS/MND for the proposed Ice Rink project on February 22, 2005. However, due to the availability of additional project details and comments received from interested parties, the City has revised the project's Initial Study and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and is recirculating the document for public review in accordance with Section 15073.5 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. **Project Title:** Pasadena Ice Rink Facility
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Pasadena, Planning and Development Department
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Brian M. Yanuaria, Assistant Planner (626) 744-4660
4. **Project Location:** The Project site is located east of the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel in East Pasadena, south of Orange Grove Boulevard, and north of Foothill Boulevard in Pasadena, California. The project site lies in the southern portion of the Eaton Wash Park Master Plan area.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Pasadena, Parks and Natural Resources, 117 East Colorado Boulevard Pasadena, California 91105
6. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space (OS)
7. **Zoning:** Open Space (OS)
8. **Description of the Project:** The Project site is approximately 3.13 acres and is currently vacant land. The project involves the construction of an approximately 65,000 square-foot, one-story "state of the art" commercial recreational Ice Rink Facility and required surface parking with approximately 143 spaces. The Facility would contain two (2) indoor National Hockey League-sized ice rinks with about 400 and 100 seats respectively. Other amenities include a food preparation area, offices, skate rental, locker rooms, restrooms with showers, lobby/waiting area, a small retail shop and a small eating area.

Access to the on-site parking is via an existing driveway on Foothill Boulevard (which currently serves the Pasadena City College Community (PCC) Education Center located southeast of the Project site) and an access roadway through the existing PCC parking areas and SCE-owned property east of the Project site. The project also provides two (2) gated emergency access entrances. The first connects the north side of the Ice Rink facility to the parking corridor/drive lane included in the Eaton Wash Park Master Plan. This parking corridor/drive lane will connect to Orange Grove Boulevard and will be developed as part of Eaton Wash Park prior to occupancy of the Ice Rink. The second gated emergency access will be via the Alameda Street City right-of-way, which crosses the SCE easement from the Ice Rink site to Avocado Lane. This right-of-way will be improved as part of the project, but will be gated for emergency access only. Gating will be controlled by the Pasadena Fire and Police Departments.

As part of this project, the City will install a traffic signal at the intersection of PCC's access road and Foothill Boulevard. This traffic signal installation is a project identified in the City's adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP includes other traffic signal installation projects along Foothill Boulevard, which would not be undertaken as part of this project. However, if and when other traffic signals are installed along Foothill Boulevard, they will be coordinated and synchronized with the proposed signal at the PCC access road.

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required for a major nonresidential development of more than 25,000 square feet and to establish a Commercial Recreational (Indoor) use in an Open Space Zoning District. The CUP will evaluate all development issues such as height, setbacks, and parking to ensure the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding area. As a condition of approval to the CUP for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and the Project's operator shall be required to seek additional parking options and submit parking management and traffic control plans for major events, such as a sold out performance and a hockey tournament, anticipated to occur once or twice a year during the weekend. Review of these plans will ensure that no potential significant impacts occur in the neighboring communities. The potential for additional parking spaces for the Project may be available through a shared-parking agreement with existing parking facilities or in a new parking area to be constructed on Southern California Edison (SCE)-owned property east of the Project site. If the Ice Rink facility design is revised to include additional parking on the SCE easement, the City will revisit this Initial Study to determine if further CEQA documentation is required.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Project site is located on City-owned property within the Eaton Wash area in the northeasterly quadrant of the City of Pasadena. The site is comprised of dedicated parkland located in a developed residential area, just northwest of Alameda Street. Land uses adjacent to the site include the proposed Eaton Wash Park and Off-Leash Dog Park along Orange Grove Boulevard to the north; SCE-owned property and single-family residential to the east; City-owned

vacant property, T.M. Goodrich Power Substation, PCC Education Center along Foothill Boulevard to the south; Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel, settling basins of Eaton Wash, and single-family residential to the west. City-owned property to the north and south of the Project site and the SCE-owned property to the east have been historically used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery.

The City Council approved a Master Plan for Eaton Wash Park on January 9, 1995 and the Council approved a revision of the Master Plan on June 28, 2004 that expanded and redesigned the park to include the SCE property. There are two smaller parks for passive recreation in the vicinity of the site. A nursery and a Christmas tree farm are located on the SCE property north of Orange Grove Boulevard. Commercial buildings align Foothill Boulevard and the 210 Freeway runs northwest to southeast over the Boulevard.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Discretionary actions from the City of Pasadena for the Project include the following:

- A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a major nonresidential development of more than 25,000 square feet;
- A CUP to establish a Commercial Recreational (Indoor) use in an Open Space Zoning District;
- Management Agreement with the Facility operator and management, Pasadena Ice Skating Center, LLC, and
-
- A License Agreement with SCE to locate an access roadway on SCE-owned land.
- Amendment to the Eaton Wash Master Plan to include an Ice Rink Facility
- Potential Minor CUP for Shared Parking Agreement?

The Project will be reviewed by the following City bodies:

- Pasadena City Council
- Pasadena Community Development Commission (CDC)
- Pasadena Design Commission (Design Review)
- Pasadena Parks & Recreation Commission
- Pasadena Zoning Hearing Officer
- Pasadena Transportation Advisory Committee
- Urban Forestry Advisory Committee
- Others as necessary

The Project will be reviewed by the following agencies:

- Southern California Edison Company (approval for a possible Lease Agreement with SCE for the use of their property)
- California Public Utilities Commission
- Others as necessary

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.

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, significant impacts have been identified. However, identified impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance through the imposition of mitigation measures. With these mitigation measures, the level of impacts will be reduced to insignificance.

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.	X
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 of Environmental Administrator

Date

Prepared by Brian M. Yanuaria
Assistant Planner
Planning & Development Department

Date

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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: April 4, 2005

Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development Department

Planner assigned: Brian M. Yanuaria, Assistant Planner

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? The project site is in a developed residential area, which has distant views of the mountains. This area contains structures and mature trees ranging from 1 to 2 ½ stories in height. The proposed Project does not substantially impact any scenic vista as defined in the 1994 final EIR for the Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City of Pasadena General Plan.

The design of this Project, including its relation to scenic vistas or views, will be reviewed by the Design Commission. Although the project would not significantly impact a scenic vista, this regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project. Further, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required for the Project. The CUP will evaluate all development issues such as height, setbacks, and parking to ensure the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding area. The project would have no impacts to a scenic vista.

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

WHY? The Project does not substantially impact an Official State Scenic Highway, L.A. County Recommended Scenic Highway, or unofficial City Designated Scenic corridor. The proposed project would not result in the destruction of any landmark eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcropping or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value.

The Project site does not contain any onsite trees. Directly to the west of the Project site, there are approximately 28 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance" as detailed in the table listed below under response 6e.

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

No trees are proposed for removal. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

These reviews will also encourage landscaping that is aesthetically pleasing, well maintained, compliments the overall design of the site, and compatible with the site and surrounding area.

The proposed site has not been designated as an historic resource or has structures that have been designated as historic resources. The proposed project would not impact nearby sites or structures, which are historic resources. The project is not part of a landmark district.

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

WHY? The design of this project will be reviewed for approval by the Design Commission, which advises the City Council on proposed public buildings and park plans. The Zoning Hearing Officer will review the site plan, landscape plan, and proposed use prior to the issuance of any building permits. The proposed ice rink will be designed by professional architects, with the goal of creating a visually pleasing structure. The Design Commission will review the project to ensure that the design, colors, and finish materials of the project comply with adopted design guidelines and achieve compatibility with the surrounding area. This regulatory design-review procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project. Therefore, although the project would change the aesthetics of the site, the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings. Approval of the proposed Project would not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impacts.

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

WHY? The Project will not have a significant impact on light and glare because it will be required to comply with the performance standards in the Zoning Code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. The height and direction of any outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to the Zoning Code requirements. The project is in an older, developed residential and commercial urban area with streetlights in place. PCC parking areas located southeast of the Project site include outdoor lighting. These lights are not sources of glare and are an aide to public safety.

Exterior and interior lights and reflective building materials from the Project's building, parking area and access roadway may be potential sources of light and glare. Use of reflective materials shall conform to Zoning Code requirements and to evaluations of exterior cladding and materials through the City's design review process.

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

These standards limit reflective glass to no more than 20 percent of any building surface visible from a street. Any outdoor security lighting shall be indirect or diffused or shall be directed away from or shielded from residential districts within 100 feet of the Project. Outdoor security lighting may not result in an illumination level exceeding 1-foot candle in nearby residential districts. Since a CUP is required for the Project to ensure the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding area, no significant impact is expected to occur.

The proposed Project is surrounded by the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel to the west, the proposed Eaton Wash Park to the north, and the SCE-owned property to the east. The proposed Project will cast shadows on adjacent sites. However, no significant impact is expected to occur since this shadow pattern will not affect the adjacent uses within the area. The design of this project, including its finish, colors, and materials, will be reviewed for approval through the Design Review process.

4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 residential area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. It has commercial recreation, park, natural and open space. 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.

- 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), IG (Industrial) and OS (Open Space) Zoning Districts.

- 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.

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

5. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:

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

WHY? 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 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.

The Project will result in the construction of an Ice Rink Facility of approximately 65,000 square feet in size. This growth is within that allowed by the Land Use Element of the City’s adopted General Plan, and thus, within the projections used to create the AQMP. The Project would not impact the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act or the AQMP.

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

WHY? Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high.

Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. However, the Project itself does meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) land use threshold for significant air emissions, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Project does not involve substantial grading, demolition, or other construction practices that are typically associated with significant air pollution. In addition, the project-generated air pollutants would be reduced by the required compliance with existing regulations including the City’s Trip Reduction Ordinance, City approval of the construction travel routes (as part of the construction plan), and SCAQMD rules 403 and 1113 regarding the control of fugitive dust emissions, and architectural coatings.

However, the Project is in the preliminary design stage, and the Project’s construction details have not been determined, some of which (i.e. grading techniques) may affect the amount of air pollution generated by the Project. As such, to ensure that the proposed Project would not generate significant air pollutants, a mitigation measure has been included that will require the City to complete an Air Quality Study for the Project prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Project’s Air Quality Study will quantify the construction and operational air pollutants generated by the Project using the “URBEMIS 2002 Air Emissions From Land Development” model (URBEMIS model) or equivalent air quality model approved by the City of Pasadena. In addition, if the project’s Air Quality Study reveals any potential project exceedances of the SCAQMD’s numerical thresholds

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

of significance, the City shall incorporate air pollution reduction techniques into the project that reduce the project-generated air pollutants to below the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance.

The project is also subject to review by several departments such as Building, Public Works, Transportation and Zoning. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards and any potential negative impacts caused by the proposed Project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

Further, the Project is subject to the Trip Reduction Ordinance for nonresidential development projects, which exceed 25,000 square feet of gross floor area. The requirements of the Ordinance will lower the emissions from vehicles by reducing the expected number of vehicle trips per day generated by the Project. Under this Ordinance, the City will be required to prepare and submit a Transportation System Management (TSM) Plan showing how the trips will be reduced. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Department, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Project would generate a net increase of 60 vehicle trips (27 inbound and 33 outbound) during the weekday PM peak commuter hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a net increase of 630 weekday daily trip ends (approximately 315 inbound and 315 outbound).

The Project is expected to generate a net increase of 192 vehicle trips (147 inbound and 45 outbound) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a maximum net increase of 868 weekend daily trip ends assuming a sold out performance and a hockey tournament (approximately 434 inbound and 434 outbound). This condition is only anticipated to occur once or twice a year during a weekend.

According to the Transportation Department, this increase will not be significant based on the fact it will not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at nearby local intersections. Because there are no significant traffic impacts, the traffic study finds that no traffic mitigation measures are required at any of the study intersections.

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS: According to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 9-1 Project emissions during construction will not exceed the district threshold for construction emissions. As discussed, the project's mitigation measures require the City to quantify the air pollutants generated by the project using an air quality model. This mitigation measure further requires the quantified project-induced pollutants to be compared to the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance. If any potential project exceedances of the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance are revealed, the City shall incorporate air pollution reduction techniques into the project that reduce the project-generated air pollutants to below the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance.

MOBILE EMISSIONS: Using the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 9-7 for Estimating Mobile, Energy and PM10 Emissions, the Project's mobile emissions will not exceed the district's threshold for air emissions. As discussed, the project's mitigation measures requires the City to quantify the air pollutants generated by the project using an air quality model. This mitigation measure further requires the quantified project-induced pollutants to be compared to the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance. If any potential project exceedances of the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance are revealed, the City shall incorporate air pollution reduction techniques into the project that reduce the project-generated air pollutants to below the SCAQMD's numerical thresholds of significance.

Mitigation Measure

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

Mitigation Measure 5-1, as shown in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), is hereby incorporated into the project.

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? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). This basin is a non-attainment area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) and fine particulates matter (PM₁₀). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in NO₂ or PM₁₀ will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures. This Project does not meet the size threshold in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook's screening table 6-2 for potential significant operational emissions or table 6-3 for potential significant quarterly construction emissions.

According to the City of Pasadena listing of Projects of Community-wide Significance, dated January 1, 2004, there are three (3) Projects of community-wide significance within 1/2 mile of the proposed Project. Those Projects include the Sierra Madre Villa Tech Campus with 350,000 square feet of research & development office space and 2,000 parking spaces; SMV/BRE Residential with 188 residential units; and Madre Villa Estates with 28 single-family residential subdivision. This Project will not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in NO₂ and/or PM₁₀ during construction and/or operation.

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

WHY? According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the Project will not generate any significant toxic air emissions. Residential uses are considered sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, according to Figure 5-1 in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Project's location is within close proximity to single-family residential neighborhoods, PCC and Eaton Wash Park. The Project itself will not significantly raise existing levels of pollutants. A Commercial Recreation facility (such as the proposed indoor ice rink) is not a use that will generate significant pollutants.

While no impacts are identified, two Mitigation Measures have been added to ensure proper maintenance of construction equipment, and monitoring to ensure the Project is in compliance with SCAQMD rule 403 and 1113 regarding the control of fugitive dust emissions, and architectural coatings.

The use of hazardous refrigerants may cause emissions to occur. Because the specific refrigerant chemical has not been selected and the system has not yet been designed, specific engineering and technical solutions cannot be detailed. However, mitigation measures, as identified in Section 10b of this document, have been established through the adoption of specific, risk- and science-based thresholds. Through compliance with existing local, regional, state and federal regulations, routine emissions are limited to insignificant levels. While in an emergency situation the potential for larger releases may exist, the criteria of the mitigation measures identified in Section 10b limit the impact of these releases to an insignificant level either through engineering design requirements or the substitution of less hazardous materials (see 10b).

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

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 5-2, as shown in the attached MMRP, is hereby incorporated into the project.

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

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

WHY? This type of use is not shown on the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints."

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? ()*

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

WHY? The Project is located in a developed residential area. The Project site is currently vacant. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the Project site. The Project site has been historically used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery. As a part of Eaton Wash, the site once was thriving with vegetation, insect and animal life. Periodic flooding created an alluvial scrub habitat similar to that found in Eaton Canyon to the north of the Project site. The construction of the concrete flood control channel and settling basins in 1941 left the Project site virtually denuded of vegetation. The only notable vegetation associated with the site are trees located directly west of the project area boundary. At this time, no trees are proposed for removal. However, the Project's design has not been finalized. Thus, it cannot be said definitively that the Project would not impact any of these trees. If any trees are impacted, the project must comply with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, which will condition the Project to protect existing trees and vegetation through signage, barriers and trail delineation. Regardless of the Project's potential to have a minor impact on trees, the project would not adversely affect any special status species. In addition, the project may include the reintroduction of native plants to the site that would encourage the return of insect and animal life to the area, similar to that found in other parts of Eaton Canyon and Eaton Wash.

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? There are no State Natural Community Preservation Plans within the City or Federal Habitat Preservation Plans. The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements maps the natural plant communities within the City's boundaries. These communities are primarily in the surrounding hillsides and within the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Canyon Washes. The Project is located near the Eaton Canyon Wash. The Project site is currently vacant and has been historically used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

The Project site is largely denuded of vegetation, and the only notable vegetation associated with the site are trees located directly to the west of the Project site. Any trees located on City-owned property are public trees and are protected by the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. At this time, no trees are proposed for removal. However, the project's design has not been finalized. Thus, it cannot be said definitively that the project would not impact any of these trees. If any trees are impacted, the project must comply with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

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? ()

WHY? The Project is located in a developed residential area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat on or near the Project site.

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? ()

WHY? Though the Project would result in increased human presence at the site, the Project site is located in a developed urban area and will not involve the dispersal of wildlife, nor will it result in a barrier to migration or movement of wildlife species. See response to 15b.

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

WHY? The Project site does not contain any onsite trees. Directly to the west of the Project site, there are approximately 28 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance" as detailed in the table listed below. The tree survey shows native trees such as Quercus agrifolia (Live Oak) present directly to the west of the Project site.

The Project site is largely denuded of vegetation, and the only notable vegetation associated with the site are trees located directly to the west of the Project site. Any trees located on City-owned property are public trees and are protected by the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. At this time, no trees are proposed for removal. However, the project's design has not been finalized. Thus, it cannot be said definitively that the project would

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

not impact any of these trees. If any trees are impacted, the project must comply with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

These reviews will encourage landscaping that is aesthetically pleasing, well maintained, compliments the overall design of the site, and compatible with the site and surrounding area. The plan will include the conservation and protection of the remaining native trees located on the site and new landscaping and trees throughout the Project site. Any negative impacts caused by the proposed destruction of trees will be reduced to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed during this review to preserve recognized aesthetic natural features.

The Project is not in the Hillside Development Overlay District or the Lower Arroyo.

A trees inventory field check for the Eaton Wash Park Master Plan was reviewed and approved by a certified arborist on the Public Works Department staff on July 10, 2003 in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance.

#	Genus & Species (Inventory Reference)	Map	Common Name	Diameter (inches)	To Remain	To be Removed	Protected	Below min. dia.
	Trees							
1	Quercus Agrifolia (T-23)		Coast Live Oak	14	x		x	
2	Quercus Agrifolia (T-24)		Coast Live Oak	18	x		x	
3	Quercus Agrifolia (T-25)		Coast Live Oak	18	x		x	
4	Quercus Agrifolia (T-26)		Coast Live Oak	24	x		x	
5	Quercus Agrifolia (T-27)		Coast Live Oak	20	x		x	
6	Quercus Agrifolia (T-28)		Coast Live Oak	12	x		x	
7	Quercus Agrifolia (T-29)		Coast Live Oak	20	x		x	
8	Quercus Agrifolia (T-30)		Coast Live Oak	16	x		x	
9	Quercus Agrifolia (T-31)		Coast Live Oak	14	x		x	
10	Quercus Agrifolia (T-32)		Coast Live Oak	12	x		x	
11	Quercus Agrifolia (T-33)		Coast Live Oak	10	x		x	
12	Quercus Agrifolia (T-34)		Coast Live Oak	20	x		x	
13	Quercus Agrifolia (T-35)		Coast Live Oak	24	x		x	
14	Quercus Agrifolia (T-36)		Coast Live Oak	10	x		x	
15	Quercus Agrifolia (T-37)		Coast Live Oak	20	x		x	
16	Quercus Agrifolia (T-38)		Coast Live Oak	26	x		x	
17	Quercus Agrifolia (T-39)		Coast Live Oak	24	x		x	
18	Quercus Agrifolia (T-40)		Coast Live Oak	16	x		x	
19	Quercus Agrifolia (T-41)		Coast Live Oak	24	x		x	
20	Quercus Agrifolia (T-42)		Coast Live Oak	12	x		x	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21	Quercus Agrifolia (T-43)	Coast Live Oak	26	x	x
22	Quercus Agrifolia (T-44)	Coast Live Oak	10	x	x
23	Hicoria (T-45)	Pecan Tree	8		
24	Washington Robusta (T-46)	Washington Fan Palm	12		
25	Quercus Agrifolia (T-47)	Coast Live Oak	9	x	x
26	Quercus Agrifolia (T-48)	Coast Live Oak	12	x	x
27	Quercus Agrifolia (T-49)	Coast Live Oak	10	x	x
	Dead Trees				
1	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-3)	Coast Live Oak	12	x	x
2	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-4)	Coast Live Oak	14	x	x
3	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-5)	Coast Live Oak	10	x	x

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? As of February 2005, there were no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There were also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The Project is located in a developed residential area adjacent to the concrete-lined portion of Eaton Wash. The closest natural habitats to the Project site are the coastal sage scrub, chaparral and riparian communities that exist approximately one mile upstream from the site, in the natural-bottom portions of Eaton Canyon and Eaton Wash to the north. See also response to 6.b.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? ()

WHY? The Project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and there are no known buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site having a significant historic value to the City which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered by the Project.

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

WHY? There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the Project site. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the Project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

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

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

WHY? There are no records of any significant paleontological resources in the City of Pasadena. Therefore, there are no known paleontological resources that will be affected by the Project. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the Project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

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

WHY? There are no known human remains on the site. If any remains are encountered during Project implementation, the Los Angeles County Coroner will be contacted. If there are remains determined to be Native American, the Gabrieleño/Tongva Tribal Council will be contacted at (626) 286-1632 or by e-mail at <http://www.tongva.com/>.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. *Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ()*

WHY? 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. Further the Project will comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows on new construction.

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

Why? (Oil-based products) The proposed Project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources. Construction of the Project will result in a short-term insignificant consumption of oil-based energy products. However, the additional amount of resources used will not cause a significant reduction in available supplies. Consumption of gasoline by project-generated vehicles will be reduced by adherence to the Trip Reduction Ordinance to a level that is not significant.

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

(Energy) The long-term impact from increased energy use by this Project is not significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. Occupation of the Project will result in an insignificant increase in the consumption of natural gas. This consumption will be lessened by adherence to the performance standards of California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code Title 24.

As a condition of approval for the Project prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building plans for review and approval to the Building Division, Water and Power Department, Public Works, Fire, Zoning and Transportation. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards and there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project and any potential increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards. The energy conservation measures will be prepared by the City and shown on the building plan. Installation of energy-saving features will be inspected by a City Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If found during the course of project review, the City is responsible for any improvements to the existing infrastructure.

(Water) As a condition of approval for the Project, the City must submit plans to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval through the City's Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) to determine if the existing infrastructure can serve the Project. If it is found that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City is responsible for providing infrastructure upgrades for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permits. Consumption of water and energy resources generated by the proposed Project will adhere to local and state regulations to a level that is not significant. In addition, any potential negative impact will be mitigated during drought periods by the City adhering to the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which restricts water consumption to 90% of expected consumption during each billing period. Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a building permit for the Project.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the Project:

- 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ()*

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena's General Plan, the San Andreas Fault is a "master" active fault and controls seismic hazard in Southern California. This fault is located approximately 21 miles north of Pasadena.

The County of Los Angeles and the City of Pasadena are both affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Pasadena is in four USGS Quadrants, the Los Angeles, and the Mt. Wilson quadrants were mapped for earthquake fault zones under the Alquist-Priolo Act in 1977. The Pasadena and Condor Peak USGS Quadrangles have not yet been mapped per the Alquist-Priolo Act.

A geotechnical investigation and a seismic hazard evaluation were prepared for the Project (dated September 1, 2003) by Leighton Consulting, Inc. The closest major active faults that could affect the Project site include

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

the Sierra Madre (0.8 miles north of Project site), and the Raymond (1.3 miles south of Project site). The San Andreas Fault is the largest active fault in California and is approximately 26 miles northeast of the Project site. The 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan considers the Sierra Madre Fault to be in a Fault Hazard Management Zone and the Raymond Fault to be in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Within the southwest of the City, the Eagle Rock Fault is considered potentially active.

Portions of these fault systems are known to be active. The Cucamonga segment of the Sierra Madre fault system is located about 0.8 miles north of Project site. The Raymond fault is located approximately 1.3 miles from the Project site. However, the program FRISKSP suggests that the surface projection of the rupture area may be less than 0.1 miles from the site. There is evidence that at least eight surface-rupturing events have occurred along this fault in the last 36,000 years.

The principal seismic hazard to the site would be ground rupture and ground shaking at the Project site. The Project is not near enough to any fault lines to require a study under the Alquist Priolo Act. No known active or potentially active faults have been mapped across the site. Based on consideration of the current geology framework, the potential for ground rupture is considered low.

The potential exists for people and property to be exposed to the hazards of seismic activity in most of California. This Project will not increase the potential occurrence of earthquakes. The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because the new structure shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and is subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking? ()*

WHY? See 9.a.i.

Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. At a minimum the earthquake-resistant design and materials of new Projects must meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the California Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock. As discussed in Section 9.a.i. of this report the risk of earthquake damage is minimized because the new structure shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and is subject to inspection during construction.

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? According to the State of California Seismic Hazard map (Pasadena, Mt. Wilson or Los Angeles Quadrangle official maps released March 25, 1999), the Project site is in an area subject to either liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides. Further, according to the Slope Instability Map of the 2002 adopted Safety Elements of the General Plan on Plate 1-3, the Project is located in an area of low slope instability.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

There is a possibility that liquefaction could occur in the streambed area of Eaton Canyon Wash. The Official Seismic Hazard Map, Mt. Wilson Quadrangle dated March 25, 1999, shows the area adjacent to the Wash from Del Vina to the south, to Altadena in unincorporated Los Angeles County to the north, to be an area of historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions indicating a potential for permanent ground displacement. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building plans for review and approval to the Building Division, Water and Power Department and the Public Works Division. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards.

The northern portion of the proposed Project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone for potential liquefaction. However, groundwater was not encountered in any of the borings (maximum depth 51.5 feet) conducted by Leighton Consulting, Inc. during their geotechnical investigation. Per the findings of the geotechnical report, the historic high groundwater level for the Project site is more than 100 feet below the surface of the site. The geotechnical report concludes that the potential of liquefaction of this site is low.

The Tujunga stony loam within the Eaton Wash is at least 6 feet deep. It is very porous, in some spots has a high water table, low surface runoff, and the erosion hazard is low due to the Wash's gravelly surface and low topographic relief in its location away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains. As mentioned, ground water at the Project site is expected to be more than 100 feet below surface.

The site is currently vacant and relatively flat. Existing City Municipal Code and Building Code regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact. Due to these codes and inspections there will be no increased exposure to seismic ground failure including liquefaction.

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? According to the 1999 State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Pasadena Quadrangle, and the Seismic Hazards Map and Slope Instability Map (Plates 1-3 and 2-4, respectively, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan), the Project is located where slopes have low slope instability. The Project site is not within a "Landslide Hazard Zone" identified on the Plate P-1: Summary of Hazards Map (I) of the Safety Element of the City's General Plan. According to the same sources, there is not any known historic evidence of landslides on the Project site or adjacent properties. Existing City regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact. In addition, the Seismic Hazard map does not show this Project to be located in an area where there is geologic evidence of past landslides. The Project site topography is generally flat. The potential for earthquake-induced landslide is considered negligible.

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? (Excavating and Grading) A geotechnical investigation and a soil vapor survey were prepared for the Project (dated September 1, 2003) by Leighton Consulting, Inc. Decomposed yard waste, organic materials and the presence of methane gas was found within the Project site, the construction of the Project may result in a cut and fill and an amount of fill to be exported. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions.

Since the Project is in preliminary design phase, the amount of cut and fill and methane control measures has not yet been determined. Methane control measures may include but are not limited to cut and fill, vapor barriers, passive or active venting and methane monitoring. All methane control measures shall be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such measures. These measures may include but are not limited to vapor barriers, passive or active venting and methane monitoring. Earthwork is expected to consist of site excavation and subgrade preparation for support of foundations, slabs, pavement and parking areas, and backfill for utility trenches and retaining wall, if any.

As a condition of approval for the Project and a Mitigation Measure, the City must submit complete building and grading plans that incorporate methane control measures to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. Based on the fact that all applicable regulatory requirements must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by the City's grading ordinance, Appendix Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, other applicable building regulations and standard construction techniques; therefore there will be no impact. The City must have an approved site to receive any exported cut earth.

(Erosion) According to the Final Environmental Impact Report certified for the adoption of the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements, the natural water erosion potential of soils in Pasadena is low, unless these soils are disturbed during the wet season. Both the Ramona and Hanford soils associations, which underlay much of the City, have high permeability, low surface runoff and slight erosion hazard due to the gravelly surface layer and low topographic relief away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains.

Water erosion during construction will be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. Soil erosion after construction will be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. This plan shall be submitted to the Building Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind and/or water erosion. This erosion will be controlled by proper grading techniques as specified in the grading ordinance, a grading plan submitted to the Building Division and Public Works Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit and by city inspections and condition monitoring after the issuance of a building permit.

Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations will be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site. Any project which involves more than 250 cubic yards of cut or fill should have an erosion and sediment transport control plan as part of the City's grading plan. As a condition of approval for the Project and a Mitigation Measure, the City must submit complete building and grading plans (including an erosion and sediment transport control plan and a landscape and irrigation plan) to the Building Official and the Public Works

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

Department for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a building permit. In addition, a construction management plan must be submitted prior to the issuance of any building permit. Based on the fact that all applicable regulatory requirements must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measures 9-1 and 9-2, as shown in the attached MMRP, are hereby incorporated into the project.

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 City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain.

According to Geotechnical Report, any significant settlement in the native soil underlying the fill is not expected. Since the Project site is not considered susceptible to liquefaction or seismically-induced landslides, the potential for lateral spreading and earthquake-induced landslides at the site is considered negligible. The soil is stable enough to support the proposed Project, and the soil when compacted per applicable codes.

For location of the Project in relationship to areas prone to landslides or liquefaction see response to 9A iv.

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? ()*

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the Project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. Based on the material encountered during the geotechnical investigation, the onsite soil has a low expansion potential. As a condition of approval and a Mitigation Measure for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building and grading plans for review and approval to the Building Division and the Public Works Department. All methane mitigation measures shall be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such mitigation measures. These measures may include but are not limited to vapor barriers, passive or active venting and methane monitoring.

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? ()*

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena allows septic tanks to be used for only specified areas in the hillsides per regulations found in Ordinances 3881 and 4170 and codified in Pasadena Municipal Code. The proposed Project is not in any of these specified areas. New construction must be hooked up to a sewer if it is available. If the sewer is at a higher elevation than the Project, the sewage is to be pumped up to the sewer. The proposed project will be required to be connected to the City's sewer system.

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? ()*

WHY? The Project does involve the use and storage of hazardous substances in addition to the amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The proposed Project involves the construction of an Ice Rink Facility containing two ice rinks that will involve the use of refrigerants and/or cooling agents. Since the project is in the planning and design phase, the type of refrigerants/coolants have not yet been determined. Possible refrigerants can range from ammonia, which the U.S. EPA identifies as extremely hazardous, to much less hazardous and more likely chlorofluorohydrocarbons (CFCs), more commonly known as Freons. The use of chemicals is governed by a large variety of regulations, the strictness of which corresponds to the hazard-potential of the chemical. For instance, virtually any refrigerant selected will be subject to Title III of Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986 (40 CFR Part 355), which requires the preparation of emergency response plans, disclosure of toxic inventories, and distribution of materials data safety sheets. Extremely hazardous refrigerants, such as ammonia, would also be subject to the federal Clean Air Act, Section 112(r) - the Federal Accidental Release Prevention Program (aka Risk Management Program). This program requires an intensive engineering review down to the individual component level, a failure modes analysis, and modeling of any potentially significant airborne releases. Each of these Federal statutes has corresponding State legislation, and is ultimately enforced by the Pasadena Fire Department.

As a condition of approval to the CUP, complete building plans must be submitted to Building, Fire, Health and Public Works Departments for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. Review and approval of the plans will ensure that the transportation, storage, use and disposal of refrigerants and/or cooling agents will comply with local, state, EPA, and federal regulations. The Project must adhere to applicable Fire Department regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances.

There is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 10-1, as shown in the attached MMRP, is hereby incorporated into the project.

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? ()*