

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

According to the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map (Pasadena Quadrangle) and the Seismic Safety(Plate 2-2) slope instability (Pate 2-4) of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project is not in an area with slope instability. In addition, the Seismic Hazard map does not show this project to be in an area where there is geologic evidence of past landslides.

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. The project must adhere to all regulations of the Building Department. There will no significant risks related to expansive soil.

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 project will be required to connect to the existing sewer system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

**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 structures 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.

<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	------------------

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?** The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste, although the site is within one-quarter mile of an existing school. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

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). The site was formerly used as a tennis court, which is not a land use associated with hazardous materials. The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist on site.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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?** As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

**11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Los Angeles County and 85 incorporated Cities therein, including the City of Pasadena, obtained an MS4 (Permit # 01-182) from the Los Angeles RWQCB, most recently in 2001. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Pasadena has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP.

The project consists of developing 35 single family residences. None of the proposed uses are point source generators of water pollutants, and thus, no quantifiable water quality standards apply to the project. As an urban development, the proposed project would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. As discussed, these pollutants are permitted by the County-wide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations...Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project would not install any groundwater wells, and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions at the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, the project could indirectly withdraw groundwater. However, the proposed water usage would be negligible in comparison to the overall water service provided by the Department of Water and Power. This minor amount of water use would not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies. Under normal operation the project will use approximately 9100 gallons of water per day.

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

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 project site does not contain any discernable streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Although development of the site will involve grading, it will not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area.

Significant  
Impact

Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Significant  
Impact

No Impact

The project site is presently developed with tennis courts and a surface parking lot that covers 100% of the site with impermeable surface. The proposed single family residential project will cover approximately 95% of the site. Therefore, development of the site will not significantly reduce the amount of area covered by impervious surfaces. The applicant is required to develop a Standard Urban storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) in compliance with the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations. The SUSMP requirements will be submitted for the review and approval of the Building Division and both the Public Works and Transportation Departments, before issuance of a building permit. This plan requires that the peak post-development storm-water runoff discharge rates do not exceed the estimated pre-development rate.

The drainage of surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant is required to submit a site drainage plan to the Building Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval. This required approval ensures that the proposed drainage plan is appropriately designed and that the proposed runoff does not exceed the capacity of the City's storm drain system. The proposed drainage of the site would not channel runoff on exposed soil, would not direct flows over unvegetated soils, and would not otherwise increase the erosion or siltation potential of the site or any downstream areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts from changes to drainage patterns. Further, due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

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?** As discussed, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernible drainage course. The proposed minor changes to the site's drainage patterns are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP Ordinance. This ordinance requires post-development peak storm water run-off rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water run-off rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process.

Since the project does not involve alteration of a discernible watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates are required to not exceed pre-development rates, the proposed project does not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that would result in flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause flooding and would have no associated impacts.

If the proposed on-site drainage improvements drain to the driveways of the proposed homes, the applicant shall construct a side opening culvert inlet in the curbing just upstream of the driveway. This poured in place concrete culvert shall discharge to the street at an approved angle. Calculations shall be submitted showing that the street has the capacity to safely carry the flow of water from the site.

The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek, the project is not located near either stream. The project will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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?** As stated in 11c. above, the site was previously developed with a tennis court and parking lot which includes almost entirely impervious surfaces. In contrast, the proposed development of 35 single family residences effectively increases the amount of porous surfaces due to the proposed landscaping. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development. Further, the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement measures 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?** As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

The project, however, also has the potential to generate short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The County-wide MS4 permit requires construction sites to implement BMPs to reduce the potential for construction-induced water pollutant impacts. These BMPs include methods to prevent contaminated construction site stormwater from entering the drainage system and preventing construction-induced contaminants from entering the drainage system. The MS4 identifies the following minimum requirements for construction sites in Los Angeles County:

1. Sediments generated on the project site shall be retained using adequate Treatment Control or Structural BMPs;
2. Construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be retained at the project site to avoid discharge to streets, drainage facilities, receiving waters, or adjacent properties by wind or runoff;
3. Non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity shall be contained at the project site; and
4. Erosion from slopes and channels shall be controlled by implementing an effective combination of BMPs (as approved in Regional Board Resolution No. 99-03), such as the limiting of grading scheduled during the wet season; inspecting graded areas during rain events; planting and maintenance of vegetation on slopes; and covering erosion susceptible slopes.

In addition, projects with a construction site of one acre or greater are subject to additional stormwater pollution requirements during construction. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) maintains a statewide NPDES permit for all construction activities within California that result in one (1) or more acres of land disturbance. This permit is known as the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit or the State's General NPDES Permit. Since the proposed project involves greater than one (1) acre of land disturbance, the project is required to submit to the SWRCB a Notice of Intent

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

(NOI) to comply with the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. This NOI must include a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that outlines the BMPs that will be incorporated during construction. These BMPs will minimize construction-induced water pollutants by controlling erosion and sediment, establishing waste handling/disposal requirements, and providing non-storm water management procedures.

Complying with the both the MS4's construction site requirements and the State's General Construction Permit, as well as implementing an SWPPP will ensure that construction of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** 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. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

- 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?** 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. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

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

**WHY?** The 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?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar uses. The Planned Development has been designed as single-family, detached homes and will be compatible with other development in the area. There are no features proposed that would divide an existing community. No adverse impact will result.

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?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The project is consistent with the General Plan land-use designation, as shown in the 2004 adopted Land Use Element, but not with the existing zoning designation. Further, these designations are not consistent with each other. The proposed Zone Change in combination with the existing General Plan designation (as explained below) will remove this inconsistency. The Zone Change must be effective prior to the issuance of any building permits.

The project is a Zone Change and Subdivision to construct 35 single family residences. The applicant is requesting a zone change from the RS- 1 Zoning District to a Planned Development. The General Plan designation for the project site is Medium Density Residential (0 – 16 dwelling units per acre). Multi-family housing such as apartments, townhouses and condominiums are the types of uses typically constructed on lots designated for this density. The proposed density is 7.3 units per acre. Therefore the proposal to build 35 dwelling units at this location is consistent with the General Plan designation.

The Land Use Element of the General Plan identifies general criteria for the former Rose Avenue Tennis Court site in order to achieve consistency between the General Plan and the Zoning Code. Specifically, the section states that “this site could be developed with the same density as the adjacent Rose Court development (PD-17) to the north and east (12.9 units per acre). In addition, the same standards such as detached single family housing fronting Rose Avenue, would be made apart of the development standards.” The project as presented, is consistent with the prescribed density parameters for the site in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

The following General Plan policies are applicable to the project:

**Policy 5.5 Architectural and Design Excellence:** The City shall actively promote architectural and design excellence in buildings, open space and urban design and discourage poor quality development.



<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

*The project will go through the Design Review process to ensure that the architectural design of the homes and their materials and colors are visually harmonious with the surrounding development. This process will augment the Planned Development review which will also ensure architectural and design excellence, as well as the provision of open space.*

**Objective 7 – Residential Neighborhoods:** Preserve the character and scale of Pasadena’s established residential neighborhoods.

*The proposed project should take into consideration the scale and massing of the existing residential development, particularly building setbacks, rooflines, and landscaping. The design should relate to and support the characteristics of the existing fabric of the site’s surroundings as well as the larger environment of which it is a part.*

The proposed project will develop the site within the density envisioned in the General Plan and will create consistency between the Zoning and General Plan designations. The project is compatible with the surrounding area and will therefore have no significant impacts.

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

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

**WHY?** 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? ( )*

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

**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? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The City’s 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. 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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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?** The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will 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). 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.

The project would also not expose persons to excessive noise. The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. According to Figure 2 of the City's Noise Element (2002) the project site lies outside the 60 dBA noise contours. This level of noise is within the "Clearly Acceptable" range for the proposed land use, as shown in Figure 1 of the City's Noise Element (2002). Therefore, the project would not expose future residents of the proposed homes to noise levels in excess of standards.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

- 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 project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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 project proposes to construct 35 dwelling units, which is more intense than the current zoning designation permits (5 units are permitted under the RS-1 designation). However, 35 dwelling units is a less intensive than the General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential (0 – 16 du/ac)

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

would permit . The project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. The project will result in the potential net gain of 35 units. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will be the responsibility of the applicant. Since the project is in conformance with the existing General Plan land-use designations this gain will not be significant. Further, the project will change the zone to a Planned Development (PD) designation to establish consistency between the Zoning and General Plan designations.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** This project conforms to the 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002, therefore this housing gain is within the housing forecast in this element. It is also within the range of housing forecast for Pasadena contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** No persons currently reside on the project site and the project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts.

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 proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of 35 single family residential dwelling units, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities. Furthermore, the project applicant is required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to fire service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

The proposed site is located in a low wildlife hazard area according to the Wildlife Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the Technical Appendix of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The closest fire station to the site is Station 32 located at 2424 East Villa Street, approximately 2.5 miles from the project site. Station 32 has an engine company with 4 personnel, a ladder truck with 4

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

personnel, a rescue ambulance with 2 fire fighter paramedics, and a heavy rescue vehicle especially equipped for technical rescues, structural collapses, etc.

The project will incorporate all required safety and security features, including fire sprinklers, alarm systems, and adequate access for emergency vehicles. Therefore impacts to Fire Service will be less than significant.

b. Libraries? ( )

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

**WHY?** The project is located is approximately 1.5 miles from the nearest branch library, Hastings Library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ( )

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

**WHY?** The project is located within 1,000 feet of the nearest park, Victory Park. According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged under the Quimby Act. On December 6, 2004, the City modified their Quimby Act ordinance (Ordinance #6252) to increase the park mitigation fees. Under the first year of the modified ordinance, the park mitigation fee will be \$10,977 per residential unit; after December 6, 2005 the park mitigation fee will be \$19,743 per residential unit. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks.

The proposed single family residential project includes private yards for its residents in an effort to be consistent with the residential single family standards. The project is not expected to create a significantly increased demand for neighborhood of regional parks or other recreational facilities. Any impact would therefore be less than significant.

d. Police Protection? ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of 35 dwelling units, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Police facilities. Furthermore, the project applicant is required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to police service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. Schools? ( )

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools. For this residential project, the development impact fee of \$2.24 per square foot will be collected. This fee helps pay for the cost of new children enrolling in the school district as a result of the development.

d. *Other public facilities?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes, and development fees this impact is not significant.

**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?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The project is located 1000 feet from the nearest park, Victory Park. The proposed project is expected to generate 88 residents, and thus, could possibly increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks. However, in accordance with Ordinance #6252, the City collects a park impact fee for each residential unit constructed and on each residential addition over 400 sq. ft. in size. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

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?* (no)

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

**WHY?** The project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

**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)?* ( )

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**WHY?** The project is located along 1000 Rose Avenue and is supported by a roadway network consisting of Altadena Drive, Washington Boulevard, Woodlyn Road, Whitefied Road, Cooley Place, and Orange Grove Boulevard. Of these roadways, Altadena Drive and Orange Grove Boulevard are Multimodal Corridors as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

A traffic study was prepared for the project in July 2005 by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates. This traffic study is included as Appendix B of this Initial Study. The proposed project may increase vehicular traffic during the weekday morning and evening peak hours. The project would add approximately 335 vehicle trip ends a day to traffic of which approximately 25 trips are expected to occur during the morning peak hour and approximately 35 trips during the evening peak hour. According to the Department of Transportation Guidelines for intersection significant impacts, this increase will not be significant since it will not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at nearby intersections.

In addition to intersection impact analysis, the project traffic impacts were also assessed along five street segments. The project is expected to have a minimal effect on Altadena Drive and Sierra Madre Boulevard with increases in daily traffic volumes of one percent or less. Along Woodlyn Road (west of Washington Boulevard) daily traffic volumes are expected to grow by 4.3% due to the proposed project. The project is expected to add approximately 232 daily trips along Cooley Place, representing a 10.5% increase. Under the City's street segment thresholds, the growth would require appropriate measures to mitigate this impact. The project would increase the daily two-way volumes along Rose Avenue by approximately 232 daily trips (24.8% growth). The projected growth along this segment of Rose Avenue would also require mitigation under the City's thresholds.

**Required Mitigation**

Improvements identified in the Traffic Improvement Program Consolidation Report for 1000 Rose Avenue and Pasadena High School Traffic Improvements, dated July 2006 (attached) <sup>1</sup>, will mitigate the traffic increase by shifting existing school related traffic generated by student loading activities from Rose Avenue to Sierra Madre Boulevard.

With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, the project's potential to increase traffic would not be a significant impact in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- 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 identified in the latest edition of the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), the nearest CMP intersection is located at Rosemead Boulevard and Foothill Boulevard. The proposed project at 1000 Rose Avenue will not exceed the County's thresholds of significance at this intersection or any other CMP facility.

- 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? ( )*

---

<sup>1</sup> On June 5, 2006, the City Council and the Pasadena Unified School District approved in concept the Rose Avenue and Pasadena High School improvements referenced in the attached Traffic Improvement Program Consolidation Report, dated July, 2006, in association with the July 2005 Traffic Study prepared by Meyer Mohaddes. The City of Pasadena and the Pasadena Unified School District will be jointly undertaking the cost and implementation of the improvements.

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

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

**WHY?** The project site is 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 in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. Helipads are required on many high-rise buildings for evacuating occupants in case of an emergency. The police heliport is located at the eastern edge of the Arroyo Seco near the City's border with Altadena. This heliport is not open for public use. No impact is expected.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed project has been reviewed by the Public Works and Transportation Departments and it will not create hazardous design features or incompatible uses. No impact is expected.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ( )

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

**WHY?** The ingress and egress for the site have been reviewed by the Fire Department and have been found to be adequate for emergency access. No impact is expected.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ( )

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

**WHY?** Due to the increased intensity of land use, there will be an increased demand for parking. However, the project will comply with the number of parking spaces required by the Zoning Code for single family residences. The project is in compliance with the Code.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation system, including roadways and transit. The proposed project is located near several transit lines and designated bikeways to encourage non-auto travel. The bus routes near the project include: Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System (ARTS) routes 31 and 32; and MTA transit routes 264, and 268, and 487. No impacts will occur.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:



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

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

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

**WHY?** The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

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? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water 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.

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?*

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

**WHY?** The project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 11, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

Further, the project applicant must submit and implement an on-site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department; and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

The project does meet a standard for review of drainage plans for compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) Ordinance. If the project meets a standard for review, drainage plans will be reviewed by the Building Division and the Public Works Department. 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 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. This project will result in an increase of approximately 9100 gallons per day in water consumption. The current use consumes a minimal amount of water per day. The net gain in water consumption would be 9100 gallons of water per day. During periods of drought, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which reduces monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. 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 less than significant impacts.

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?** The proposed project consists of 35 single family residential units, and as a result, would increase the demand for wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service area of the wastewater service purveyor. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyor are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts. The Public Works Department is requiring the developer to participate monetarily (refundable deposit) for its share of a City sewer study and an evaluation of the impact of the development on the City sewer system. The objective of the study is to correct any deficiencies downstream of the development as determined by the new City Master Sewer Plan, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever comes first. If there are no deficiencies downstream that would result from the development, the deposit will be returned. If there are deficiencies, the cost of correcting the deficiencies will be deducted from the refundable deposit.

The proposed development shall connect to the public sewer by a method approved by the department of Public Works. All sewer connections shall be a 6" in diameter vitrified clay pipe with a minimum slope of 2 percent. Based on adherence to all requirements of the Public Works Department, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

**WHY?** The project can 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 is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic

The Solid Waste Division of the Pasadena Public Works Department has an active recycling program to reduce the metal, glass, plastics, newspapers and yard waste for disposal in approved landfills. This program serves single-family residences and some of the smaller multifamily projects.

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

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

**WHY?** In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable solid waste franchise's recycling system, and thus, will meet Pasadena's and California's solid waste diversion regulations. In addition, the project must comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuse storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste

**20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.**

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

- 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.

**21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed 35 unit single family residential project is an in-fill project in a developed urban area. As discussed in Section 3 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts related to Aesthetics. 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.

As discussed in Section 5 (Air Quality) the project does have the potential to generate significant short-term air-quality impacts during construction. In addition, as discussed in Section 18 (Transportation and Traffic), the project has the potential to generate significant impacts. However with adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in these Sections that are based on an Air Quality Study and a Traffic Study that are attached as Appendix B and C to this document the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project could cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality and traffic impacts. As discussed in Section 5 (Air Quality) the project does have the potential to generate significant short-term air-quality impacts during construction. In addition, as discussed in Section 18 (Transportation and Traffic), the project has the potential to generate significant impacts. However with adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in these Sections that are based on an Air Quality Study and a Traffic Study that are attached as Appendix A and B to this document the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**WHY?** The proposed project is compatible with the other residential uses presently found in the area. The proposed use is consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan. Prior to issuance of building permits the project must be reviewed and approved by a number of City departments including Fire, Planning and Development and Public Works. The project must adhere to all applicable code regulations and therefore not have a substantial adverse impact on human beings. Further, as discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

As discussed in Section 3 (Air Quality) the project does have the potential to generate a short-term air-quality impacts during construction. In addition, as discussed in Section 18 (Transportation and Traffic), the project has the potential to generate significant impacts. However with adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in these Sections that are based on an Air Quality Study and a Traffic Study that are attached as Appendix B and C to this document the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation measures the proposed project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.