

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

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The Specific Plan amendment which would allow the new uses would not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances. However, future projects built under the under the amendment, may use or involve small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. Future projects must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances.

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 Specific Plan does not propose any new construction. 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? The Specific Plan Amendment does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste.

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 Specific Plan Amendment which would potentially allow the new uses does not involve specific proposals at this time. Future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed to determine at that time if a specific site is located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA).

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?* ()

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

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 future construction and operation of the new uses which would be potentially allowed within designated districts within the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan area 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? As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the Specific Plan districts which would potentially allow the two new uses are not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the plan area is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the projects would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

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? 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.

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 entire Specific Plan area is not located near any significant body of fresh water. Further, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment that would potentially allow the new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Hydrology or Water Quality. However, since there are currently no plans to develop either of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments, at this time, are too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to city regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for Hydrology and Water quality related 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)? ()

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

WHY? See 11.a.

The proposed Specific Plan Amendment that would potentially allow the new uses in the plan area in and of itself, will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. However, the Specific Plan amendment does not currently involve plans to develop either of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments, are too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to city regulations and CEQA review, and will be analyzed for any impacts to groundwater supplies.

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

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? ()*

By potentially allowing the new uses through the Specific Plan amendment, drainage patterns will not be changed, streams will not be altered, and erosion rates will not increase. How future projects will affect erosion, drainage, and stream courses will be reviewed at the time a specific development is proposed. For future projects, the drainage surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, food control channels, storm drains and catch basins. The applicant shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public works Department prior to issuance of a building permit. 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.

According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena Comprehensive General Plan, most properties in the City are not normally subject to flooding.

d. *WHY? 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 Creek, the project is not (or is) located near either stream. The Specific Plan Amendment will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

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, the Specific Plan area, is adequately served by existing stormwater drainage systems.

The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not result in a significant impact to hydrology or Water Quality. However, since there are currently no plans to develop either of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to city regulations, and will be accordingly analyzed for Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()*

WHY? The Specific Plan Amendment will not degrade water quality. For future projects, runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. Future projects will most likely

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

connect to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems. The environmental review of future projects proposed under the Specific Plan Amendment which allow the new uses will assess any impacts on groundwater quality.

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

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

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? ()

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

WHY? The Specific Plan Amendment will not physically divide an existing community, as the area is surrounded by similar development on all sides. Future projects that may locate within the Plan area, will be reviewed to ensure they are compatible with the surrounding area.

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 Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the new uses (Vehicle Services - Automobile Rental and Retail Sales), would be in the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan area.

Currently, the Specific Plan does not permit the Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental Use in any of the three Specific Plan districts. The Retail Sales Use is not allowed in District 2, although all it is allowed in Districts 1 and 3. Adding these uses to uses already permitted in the respective districts is not in conflict with the current vision of the Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan.

The project is consistent with the General Plan policies of targeting development into Specific Plan areas, and consistent with the following General Plan policies:

Policy 1.6 – Neighborhood Commercial – Encourage the provision of businesses that serve residents within walking distance of homes.

Policy 10.6 – New Businesses – Recruit new businesses to provide retail and other services, and employment and other services, and employment and other opportunities for Pasadena residents and visitors.

The proposed uses will only be allowed in specific sub-areas of the Specific Plan that have been found to be most appropriate. The two new uses will be compatible with other permitted uses in the sub-areas and as noted are consistent with the current vision for the Specific Plan and with the General Plan. The Zoning Code currently permits these uses in the underlying base district; it is the Specific Plan overlay that has prohibited the uses. The amendment will allow the uses upon review and approval of a discretionary permit (e.g. a Conditional Use Permit). Therefore, the proposed amendments will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation.

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? ()

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

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 Specific Plan area 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 amendments 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? The Specific Plan Amendment that would potentially allow both uses does not involve specific project proposals, which would include construction at this time. Further, projects of these types (Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental and Retail Sales) do not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the projects 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. Therefore, the amendments will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise.

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. Projects of these types (Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental and Retail Sales) do not involve installing a

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

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.

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

WHY? The Specific Plan amendment that would potentially allow both uses, does not include construction of specific projects at this time. It is anticipated that these future development projects may generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the projects 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).

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 amendments will 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 Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow two new uses (Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental and Retail Sales) in the Plan area will not result in a significant impact to Population and Housing. Any future projects that result from the amendments will be evaluated for future impacts to population and housing.

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

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 amendments do not include construction or demolition. The uses would only be allowed only within commercial zones within the Specific Plan area. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any residents or housing, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The Specific Plan Amendment does not include construction or demolition. The Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental and Retail Sales uses would not call for the displacement of substantial numbers of people. 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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not result have a significant impact on the provision of Fire Services. Since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to city regulations, and will be accordingly analyzed for Fire protection Impacts. Further, the proposed uses are consistent with those currently allowed within the Plan area.

b. *Libraries?* ()

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

WHY? There is no specific project that will be constructed at this time to determine the nearest branch library. However, the City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the amendments would not significantly impact library services.

c. *Parks?* ()

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

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

WHY? Although specific projects associated with the Specific Plan Amendments are not being proposed at this time, these future non-residential projects would not significantly increase the City's population. However, there is a potential for an increase in usage of park space given the new employees and patrons associated with any new projects. The City collects an impact fee of \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on parks.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not result have a significant impact on the provision of Police service. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to city regulations, and will be accordingly analyzed for Police protection impacts.

e. *Schools?* ()

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. There is a school impact fee collected for non-residential development. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on school services.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? Although no specific project or construction is a part of the Specific Plan Amendment to allow the new uses, future development projects 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?* ()

WHY? Although specific projects associated with the Specific Plan Amendments are not being proposed at this time, these future non-residential projects would not significantly increase the City's population. However, there is a potential for an increase in usage of park space given the new employees and patrons associated with the proposed projects. The City collects a park impact fee for non-residential projects. 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.

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

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 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)? ()

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not itself have a significant impact on the number of new trips and traffic. Since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for transportation and traffic impacts.

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

WHY? See Response 18a.

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)? ()

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

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses within designated districts in the Plan area will not itself increase hazards or incompatible uses. Staff recently prepared a land use analysis that verified this condition. Since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future developments will be subject to city regulations, and will be analyzed for transportation and traffic impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not result itself in inadequate emergency access. Since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed new uses, the specific impacts of such future developments are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to review, and 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 Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not result in inadequate parking capacity. Any future development projects will be subject to City regulations, and will be analyzed for parking capacity.

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

WHY? The proposed Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the two new uses in the Plan area will not itself result in conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes. Any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and review, and will be accordingly analyzed for any with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? Although there is no specific project associated with the Specific Plan amendment that would potentially allow the news uses, future projects 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 amendment does not involve the release of unique or

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

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? ()*

WHY? The implementation of the Specific Plan Amendment to potentially allow the new uses will not require or result in the construction of new, or expansion of existing, water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c. *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ()*

WHY? The project 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.

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

WHY? The Specific Plan Amendment does not include a specific project at this time. 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. During periods of drought, any future 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. The City's Water and Power Department would verify with any future project that there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the Specific Plan Amendment would have no impact. .

- 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 19 a. and b.

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

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was repemitted in 2003 for 10 years.

Future projects that would be allowed by the Specific Plan Amendment and under the new uses (Vehicle Services – Automobile Rental and Retail Sales), would be located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area.

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

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. Future projects must 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 complies with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, future projects that may be allowed under the Specific Plan Amendment 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.** (Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, dated November 1, 2001, and the General Plan, dated June 3, 2004).
- 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.

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? ()

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetic or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed Amendment would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the Specific Plan Amendment 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 Specific Plan Amendment will 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 Specific Plan Amendment would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

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.

However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and review, and will be analyzed for any potential impacts.

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 Specific Plan Amendment project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and review, and will be accordingly analyzed for any potential cumulative impacts.

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment will not result in any significant impacts related to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment to allow Vehicle Services-Automobile Rental use and Retail Sales use would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

**Potentially
Significant
Impact**

**Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated**

**Less Than
Significant
Impact**

No Impact

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- | # | Document |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. |
| 2 | 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 |