

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 Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. 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.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are 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. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking.

Additionally, seismic improvements to the Stadium, required as part of the new lease agreement, have been completed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, including the University of California Seismic Policy.

- 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 maps, Pasadena Quadrangle released March 25, 1999, the project site is located in an area of historic liquefaction or where local geological, geotechnical or groundwater conditions indicate a potential for liquefaction to occur. According to this same map, the project site is not located in an area subject to earthquake-induced landslides. The 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan on Plate 1-3 does not show the project site to be located in an area subject to either liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides.

The site is relatively flat, and in conjunction with existing City Municipal Code and Building Code regulations that would control any slope instability, no impact would occur.

Due to these codes and inspections there would be no increased exposure to seismic ground failure including liquefaction, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- 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 within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

WHY? Construction of the project would result in a total of 83,920 cubic yards of material being exported. The project would involve the rehabilitation of several sections of the existing Rose Bowl facility. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities would not create unstable earth conditions.

The displacement of soil through cut and fill would be controlled by Appendix Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, and therefore, there would be a less than significant impact. The applicant would obtain approval for disposal of any exported cut earth material at an appropriate landfill/disposal site.

Water erosion during construction would be minimized by covering any exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. This plan would be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or Design Review Commission staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind and/or water erosion. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations would be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site.

The proposed project would have an erosion and sediment transport control plan completed as part of the applicant's grading plan. The grading plan must be approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permit.

- 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. As shown on Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The proposed project is not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not likely cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, will ensure the project will not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils.

- 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. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. Since the proposed project would be located on previously developed land and construction activities would include compaction of soils at the

project site, the expansion potential of soils at the project site would be further reduced, thereby ensuring a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures would be required.

- 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? ()*

WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and located in an urbanized area which includes adequate sewer structure. Therefore, no need exists for the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems onsite. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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 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 the structure and landscaping. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

- 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? ()*

WHY? The project does not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material.

- 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? As mentioned above, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

- 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 located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA). No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

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. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? The construction and operation of the proposed project would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. 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 will 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 Pasadena Fire Department maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Department 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.

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? ()

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate 4-2 (Wildfire Hazard Map), the project site is in an area of low fire hazard. However, the proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and is located in an urbanized area. Therefore, there would be no increase in the potential risk involving wildland fires. As a result, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and, in any event, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations.

There are no bodies of water near the project site, the surface waters of which would receive any increased discharge from the project. However, if there is water runoff from the site, this runoff may be discharged via Los Angeles County Flood Control Channels into the San Pedro Bay.

The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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 proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and would continue to rely on 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 by the proposed project from the ground waters in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Moreover, there is no known aquifer condition under the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the project.

The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in water consumption due to the increase in square footage of the locker room facilities. As mentioned above, UCLA would only use the facility 16 days per year (6 games, 6 pre-game practice days and 4 practice days). Other patrons of the Rose Bowl would use the locker rooms during the year an estimated 10 to 15 days. No increase in the intensity of use of the Rose Bowl would occur following project implementation. The source of some of the water from the Pasadena Water and Power Department is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. During drought conditions, the project would have to comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code), pursuant to its actual consumptions would have to be reduced to 90% of expected consumption. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and includes the replacement of the existing locker room facilities with new locker room facilities. Impermeable surfaces at the project site may increase incrementally. Storm and other water runoff could therefore slightly increase.

Increased paving or building footprint would reduce water percolating into the soil to replenish the water table and would increase storm and irrigation water flowing into storm drain facilities. The drainage of surface water from the project would be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. The applicant would submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. With implementation of the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan, there would be no significant impact from surface runoff. No mitigation measures would be required.

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 City of Pasadena contains two streams-the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Wash. The project is located adjacent to a channelized portion of the Arroyo Seco stream. As mentioned above, the proposed project would be located within the existing footprint of the Rose Bowl stadium and would not expand in the direction of the channelized stream. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the course of any streams, ravines, or gullies on the site. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The project site is adequately served by existing stormwater drainage systems. Implementation of the proposed project would involve a minor expansion of use, in terms of impermeable surfaces, and would not result in a substantial increase in surface runoff or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed project would include the use of several Best Management Practices (BMPs) or pre- and post-construction water quality controls to manage storm water runoff. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 11.a) and 11.c), the project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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 BMPs. 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. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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? According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the project is located in the Devil's Gate Dam inundation area. However, the proposed project is a continuation of an existing use within an urbanized area and would not involve the placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or dam inundation area. No additional impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts.

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? ()

WHY? According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the project is located in the Devil's Gate Dam inundation area. See response to 10.g.

There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. An onsite drainage system would convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ()

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. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. *Physically divide an existing community?* ()

WHY? The proposed project would not physically divide an existing community. The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and includes the rehabilitation of a portion of an existing facility. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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?* ()

WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and would involve the replacement of a portion of an existing land use with the same type of facility. No change in land use would occur. The project is consistent with both the zoning designation and the General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element. The proposed project would comply with the Zoning Code requirement that a CUP be obtained prior to the start of construction. Conditions imposed during the CUP process would ensure that no impacts to adjacent residential structure and uses would occur as a result of project implementation. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

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?* ()

WHY? No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas are Eaton Wash, which, was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. The project is not near these areas.

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?* ()

WHY? The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed

Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

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?

Construction

The project is a continuation of an existing use and would not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Noise generated by construction activities may have a short-term impact on the existing ambient noise levels. The nearest privately-owned residence is located 613 feet east of the Rose Bowl. 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. In addition to the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance, the proposed project must comply with the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A).

Table 3 summarizes typical noise levels during different construction stages. Table 4 shows typical noise levels produced by equipment commonly used in construction projects. As indicated, equipment involved in construction could potentially generate noise levels ranging from 70 dBA – 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Noise produced by construction equipment would be reduced at a rate of about 6 decibels per doubling of distance. Therefore, at a distance of approximately 100 feet, the proposed project would generate noise levels ranging from 64 dBA – 84 dBA.

The City of Pasadena Municipal Code allows construction to occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Saturday. No work is to be done on Sundays and holidays. Further, the Municipal Code stipulates that construction equipment shall not be permitted to emit noise levels in excess of 85 dBA when measured within a radius of 100 feet from such equipment. The impact from construction noise would be short-term and limited to 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. Monday through Saturday within 500 feet of a residential area in accordance with City regulations. Based on the attenuation of sound over a certain distance and on the projected construction noise levels shown in Tables 3 and 4, the proposed project would not generate construction noise levels in excess of established standards and restrictions, and therefore, would have a less than significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would further reduce this less than significant impact but are not necessary to ensure a less than significant impact.

TABLE 3: TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS

<u>Construction Phase</u>	<u>Noise Level (dBA, Leq^a)</u>
Ground Clearing	84
Excavation	89

Foundations	78
Erection	85
Finishing	89

a Average noise levels correspond to a distance of 50 feet from the noisiest piece of equipment associated with a given phase of construction and 200 feet from the rest of the equipment associated with that phase.

Source: Bolt, Baranek, and Newman, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, 1971.

TABLE 4: NOISE LEVELS FROM CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

<u>Construction Equipment</u>	<u>Noise Level (dBA, Leq at 50 feet)</u>
Dump Truck	88
Portable Air Compressor	81
Concrete Mixer (Truck)	85
Scraper	89
Jack Hammer	88
Dozer	87
Paver	89
Generator	76
Pneumatic Tools	85
Concrete Pump	82
Backhoe	85

Source: Cunniff, *Environmental Noise Pollution*, 1977 and Federal Transit Administration, 1995.

Operation

The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the City's General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. The proposed project would involve the modification of an outdoor spectator sport facility and would not increase the operational ambient noise levels at the Rose Bowl stadium. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated because the proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and includes the replacement of existing facilities with no anticipated expansion of usage. No impact would occur during operation of the proposed project.

To ensure compliance with these standards prior to, and during construction, the following shall be required prior to the issuance of building permits. These items will also be made conditions of approval to the CUP that is required for the project:

- A construction-related noise plan shall be prepared as part of the Construction Staging Plan and must be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the issuance of a grading permit. This plan shall show the location of any construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment would be mitigated by such methods as: temporary noise attenuation barriers; preferential location of equipment; and use of current technology and noise suppression equipment.
- A construction-related traffic plan shall be prepared to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood.

b. *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?* ()

WHY? Operation of the proposed locker room facilities would not expose persons to groundborne vibration or noise levels. Construction activities would utilize the following types of equipment: off-road trucks, tracked loader, tracked tractor, scrapers, wheeled loader, roller, graders, and other miscellaneous pieces. Based on the distance between the areas of major construction and the nearest sensitive receptors, and considering the types of construction that would occur, the adjacent sensitive receptors uses would not be impacted by groundborne noise or vibration.

Further, construction activities would be conducted in such a manner as to minimize any potential vibration and/or subsidence impacts to adjacent and/or overlying components of the Rose Bowl structure. The Rose Bowl structure would be monitored by the structural engineer during construction for any signs of damage. In addition, vibration monitors would be installed during construction activities to assess potential vibration levels throughout the stadium. Should any signs of damage be detected, construction activities would cease immediately, and steps would be taken to restore the damaged area and to prevent further damage. The cause of any incurred damage would be ascertained by the structural engineer and the damage repaired upon concurrence with a qualified historic preservation architect. The construction process would then be modified to ensure no further harm to the structure. Therefore, impacts associated with groundborne noise and vibration as a result of project implementation would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The Noise Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and operation of this use and would not increase ambient noise levels; therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment. (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

- 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? There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport (formerly the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport), which is located more than 10 miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

- 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? There are no private-use airports or airstrips within or near the City of Pasadena.

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 proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and is located in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. The project would involve the modification of an existing use with no anticipated increase in use. The proposed project would not result in a gain or loss of residential population. Since the project is in conformance with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations, the proposed project would have no impact, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The project does not involve the demolition or construction of any additional housing units and would not create or terminate any current employment opportunities at the project site. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people. The proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of an existing locker room facility at an existing commercial recreational facility with no expansion of use. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

16. 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 project site is located in a low wildfire hazard area according to the Wildfire Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project is located approximately 0.5 miles from the nearest fire station. However, the proposed project would not involve an expansion of use, merely the continuation and renovation of an existing use. No increase in the need for emergency fire protection services would occur.

b. *Libraries?* ()

WHY? The project is located 1 mile from the nearest branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System. In addition, the proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of an existing use and would not create additional demand for local libraries. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

c. *Parks?* ()

WHY? The project is located within dedicated parkland and is subject to the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance, Chapter 3.32 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. It is less than one mile from the nearest planned park. The proposed project would not involve an increase in the residential population. Therefore, no park impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The project would not increase the need for police protection since the proposed project would involve the continuation and rehabilitation of an existing facility. Fencing would be installed during construction to reduce potential security issues. However, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

e. *Schools?* ()

WHY? The project would not generate any additional employees or residents as a result of the rehabilitation of the locker room facilities. No impact would occur to the Pasadena Unified School District.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities, including maintenance of the expanded locker room facilities. However, the projected revenue to the City in terms of making the Rose Bowl stadium a more desirable and functional stadium for potential sports events would lower this impact to a level that is not significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

17. 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?* ()

WHY? The project is located within dedicated parkland and is subject to the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance, Chapter 3.32 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. It is also located less than one mile from the nearest planned park, Brookside Park. In addition, the project site is a commercial recreational facility hosting spectator sports and entertainment. The proposed lease and associated rehabilitation and construction would involve the improvement of an existing recreational facility with no expansion of use due to the lease upon completion of construction. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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?* ()

WHY? The proposed project involves the improvement of a commercial recreational facility that is available for certain sporting events. The potential impacts resulting from the modification of the existing recreational facility are detailed in this initial study. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

18. 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)?* ()

WHY? The Rose Bowl is located on Rose Bowl Drive, which is not identified as a Principal Mobility Corridor (or a de-emphasized street) in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use that is allowed by both the General Plan land use and the zoning designations, therefore it is within the range of development planned for by the City.

The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and would involve the modification and improvement of the existing locker room facilities at the Rose Bowl. UCLA home football games have been occurring at the Rose Bowl for 22 years. During construction activities, which would not occur on game days, additional vehicular trips attributed to construction vehicles would occur. However, these trips would be temporary and less than significant. Upon completion of the proposed project, no additional vehicular trips would occur as a direct result of project implementation. Therefore, the proposed project would create a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? As mentioned above, the proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and would involve the modification and improvement of the existing locker room facilities at the existing Rose Bowl stadium. Operation of the proposed project would not increase the number of vehicular trips on local roadways as a direct result of project implementation. Therefore, the project would not exceed any level of service standards for designated roads or highways.

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?* ()

WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the PasDOT and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?* ()

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the PasDOT and found to be adequate/ for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project does not involve the elimination of a through- route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards.

The project must comply with all 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. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?* ()

WHY? The proposed project would not involve an increase in intensity of use of the Rose Bowl facility. Therefore, there would not be an increased demand for parking during operation of the proposed project. The proposed project would require a modest increase in parking usage during non-game days over the eight-month construction period to accommodate construction workers' vehicles. However, the majority of these workers would park immediately adjacent to the project site at temporary laydown areas, leaving the majority of designated parking stalls vacant. A substantial decrease in the number of available parking stalls would not occur as a result of project construction. Thereby, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on parking demand. No mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The proposed project involves the modification of a portion of the existing Rose Bowl facility. Existing alternative transportation opportunities at the Rose Bowl stadium would continue during construction and upon completion of the proposed project. In addition, operation of the proposed project would not involve an increase in the demand for alternative transportation opportunities. Therefore, no conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs would occur. No mitigation measures would be required.

19. 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. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, and individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are not unusual wastes in the project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by Los Angeles County Sanitation District.

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 incrementally increase the amount of wastewater generated at the project site but would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities since the proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of the existing locker room facilities. Based on the increased square footage of the proposed facilities, the proposed locker room facilities would involve a minimal increase in the amount of wastewater generated at the project site. UCLA would only use the facility 16 days per year and would not increase its staffing or team size upon completion of the proposed project. There would be no increase in UCLA's use of the facility over that allowed under the current lease. Other patrons of the Rose Bowl would continue to use the locker rooms during the year an estimated 10 to 15 days. The City's existing infrastructure would be able to accommodate the minimal increase in wastewater without the need for additional facilities. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. This would create a less than significant impact and no mitigation measures would be required.

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? Since the proposed project would involve the continuation of an existing use and since the project site is currently developed, the proposed project would not require the construction of new stormwater 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 majority of the site is paved and the locker room changes would be located within the existing footprint of the Rose Bowl stadium. The project development would not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system.

If changes to the drainage system are necessary, a drainage plan would be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. The project does meet a standard for review of drainage plans for compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) Ordinance.

The City of Pasadena through Ordinance 6837 adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan recommended by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. This ordinance enables the City to be part of the municipal storm sewer permit issued by the Los Angeles Region to the County of Los Angeles. The City Council is committed to adopting any changes made to the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.

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

WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use. As mentioned above, UCLA would continue to use the facility 16 days per year (6 games, 6 pre-game practice days and 4 practice days). Other patrons of the Rose Bowl would continue use the locker rooms during the year an estimated 10 to 15 days. No increase in the intensity of use of the Rose Bowl would occur following project implementation. As a result, the proposed project would result in a minimal increase in water consumption due to the increase in square footage of the locker room facilities. According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures would be required. However, 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. The project 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.

The project does not affect any of the local groundwater recharge spreading grounds.

- 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? ()*

WHY? See responses to 19.a. and 19.b.

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

WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use. The project site would continue to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which as of July 2003 has a 22-year capacity, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was repermited in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and is within the City's refuse collection area. Solid waste generation is directly attributable to intensity of use. Since the proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of an existing use with no expansion of use, the proposed project would not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Any increase in solid waste due to increased square footage of the proposed locker room facilities would be minimal and less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

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

WHY? The project is a continuation of an existing use that complies with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act.

In accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code), the applicant would submit a Construction Waste Management Plan, thereby reducing the potential impact of construction waste materials and ensuring compliance with local statutes and regulations.

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? (Less than Significant)*



WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 6 of this document, the proposed project would have significant Aesthetic and Biology impacts unless mitigated. After implementing the mitigation measures, the impacts will be lessened to a less than significant level (see response 3b for mitigation measures). As discussed in Section 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use and includes the replacement of locker room facilities at an existing commercial recreational facility. Implementation of the proposed project would require the removal of the existing locker room facilities and some minor amounts of vegetation, resulting in changes to the visual characteristics of the project site and potentially minor increases in light and glare. However, these changes in visual characteristics would be consistent with the existing visual character of the Rose Bowl stadium and would represent a less-than-significant impact after the mitigation measures are implemented. The proposed project would not impact any sensitive species or habitats as the site has been historically and repeatedly disturbed. Nor would the proposed project eliminate important examples of California history but, as detailed in item 7.a., minor modifications would be made to an existing historic structure that would not change the historical significance of the structure. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

- 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? (Less than Significant)*



WHY? The proposed project is a continuation of an existing use at the Rose Bowl. No foreseeable cumulative impacts in conjunction with potential local or regional projects would occur as a result of this replacement project other than temporary construction-related impacts. As mentioned above, the new locker room facilities would be utilized in the same manner as the existing facilities are used upon completion of construction activities. No increase in the intensity of use of the Rose Bowl would occur following project implementation. Therefore, no increase in cumulative transportation, air quality, and noise impacts would result. Further, no known projects are currently planned within the vicinity of the proposed project that would contribute to the cumulative impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, the impacts of construction and operations associated with the proposed project in the area would not be cumulatively considerable.

The National Football League (NFL) has expressed an interest in obtaining the right to play professional football games in the Rose Bowl during the term of the UCLA lease. However, the City and NFL have not reached agreement, and may never reach agreement, on terms and conditions under which an NFL team

would play professional football at the Rose Bowl or how the Rose Bowl would be modified to accommodate an NFL team, nor have the RBOC and the City obtained sufficient data to determine whether any such modifications to the Rose Bowl would be technically or economically feasible. Accordingly, the potential use of the Rose bowl by a NFL team and the modifications to the Rose Bowl required for such use are currently uncertain.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less than Significant)

WHY? As previously indicated, the proposed project is located in Southern California, where the potential for exposure to ground shaking is a common hazard. The proposed project would comply with all seismic safety standards for new structures. In addition, all construction activities would follow applicable safety laws to ensure safe working conditions for construction workers. Operational activities would comply with applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements. Hence, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant effects on human beings.

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 | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993 |
| 3 | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001 |
| 4 | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983 |
| 5 | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002 |
| 6 | Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004 |
| 7 | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002. |
| 8 | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868 |
| 9 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 10 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 11 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 12 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854 |
| 13 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997 |
| 14 | Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended |
| 15 | Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005 |
| 16 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994 |
| 17 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 18 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975 |
| 19 | 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. |
| 20 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998 |
| 21 | 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 |
| 22 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837 |
| 23 | Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005 |
| 24 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896 |
| 25 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001 |
| 26 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |