

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

available. If the sewer is at a higher elevation than the project, the sewage is to be pumped up to the sewer.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

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

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

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

WHY? The project does not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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).

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

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <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.

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? ()

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

WHY? The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

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

WHY? The project is located within an urban area and will not change the logistical nature of the area. The applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review to ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes 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 Fire Marshall maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Marshall is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency.

The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is not within any of these dam inundation areas.

There are no areas in the City designated as eligible for flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA).

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

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate 4-2, Wildfire Hazard Map, the project site is in an area of very high fire hazard. The project site is within a Hillside Development Overlay District, which requires

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

that an approved landscape plan must conform to the required types of vegetation allowed by the Fire Department and the roofing materials must also be approved by the Fire Department.

The project site currently has two routes of access out of the hillside area—San Rafael Avenue and Glen Oaks Boulevard. The Fire Department reviewed the original subdivision design, and the modified design which provides a different access point for the proposed Lot B. The Fire Department has no objections to the project, and they will review all plans prior to the issuance of a building permit for any new construction.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City’s Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations. New development in the Hillside Overlay District is required to submit a plan for implementing Best Management Practices.

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

The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water.

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 will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer provided by the Public Works Department. Therefore, there will be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters. Moreover, there is no known aquifer condition in the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the project.

Under normal operation, with future development on the site of two single-family units, the project will use approximately 660 gallons of water per day. The source of some of the water from the Pasadena Water and Power Department is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin.

During drought conditions, the project 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

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

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? Based on the preliminary plans submitted as part of the Predevelopment Plan Review (PPR) the future development of the site would cover approximately 17% of the site as compared to the present use, which occupies 24% of the site. The General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Tentative Map do not propose any new construction. The future conversion of the lab to a single-family residential use envisions removal of approximately 22,736 square feet of asphalt parking surface installed for the institutional use of the laboratory. Therefore, storm and other water runoff will decrease for Lot A. New construction for the proposed Lot B, is subject to the review and approval of a Hillside Development Permit (HDP). The Zoning Code limits lot coverage to 35% and the amount of impermeable surfaces will be reviewed with the site plan and landscape plans submitted with the HDP.

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. The applicant shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there will be less than significant impacts 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? The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek, the project is not located near either stream. The General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Tentative Map do not propose any new construction. However, the future conversion of the lab to single-family residential use envisions removal large areas of asphalt parking surface (approximately 22,736 square feet) installed for the institutional use of the laboratory on Lot A, and a new single-family residence on the proposed Lot B. The project 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? ()

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

WHY? The project site is adequately served by existing stormwater drainage systems. Any future residential development of the project site will require the review and approval of a Hillside Development Permit. During the HDP process the Public Works Department will review the application to ensure there are no significant impacts related to runoff and drainage.

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

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

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

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

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

WHY? The entire City of Pasadena is in Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Community Number 065050. In Zone D, the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations. See responses to 9 Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides and b soil erosion and the response to 11i below.

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

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

There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. An on-site drainage system will convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

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

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community. The project would create two residentially zoned parcels, which would be consistent with the general plan and zoning designations of adjacent parcels and the surrounding neighborhood.

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

WHY? The proposed project involves four actions. The first action is a General Plan Amendment to change the existing Institutional general plan designation to Low Density Residential (0-6 du/net acre). The second action is a Zoning Map Amendment to change the existing zoning from PS (Public/Semi-Public District) to RS-2 HD (Single-family Residential/ 2 du/net acre/Hillside Overlay District). The third action is a proposed subdivision to split the existing 129,718 square foot parcel into two lots. The fourth and final action is a variance request for Parcels A and B, to allow these lots to be created with less than the required width of 100 feet (a lot width of approximately 55 feet is proposed). Parcel A would measure approximately 104,108 square feet and Parcel B would measure approximately 25,610 square feet. The new residentially zoned parcels would eventually be developed with single-family residences.

The project would be in substantial compliance with both the RS-2-HD zoning designation and the low-density residential General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element. The applicant has revised the parcel map to address community concerns presented at the neighborhood meeting of October 11, 2005, to limit ingress and egress from the redeveloped site to one point on San Rafael Avenue. Under the previous lot configuration, the access point to the new Lot B was from the northwest corner of the lot onto San Rafael Avenue. This has now been revised with one access point from San Rafael Avenue. The proposed revision results in the need for a variance in the RS-2-HD development standards from the required lot width of 100 feet. The proposed Lots A and B would have a width of approximately 55 to 65 feet when measured at a distance of 25 feet perpendicular from the street frontage. Both proposed lots would still exceed the required minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet. Although the reduced lot width would conflict with the minimum width required per the Zoning Code, the square footage would exceed the minimum requirements. In single-family residential areas, the size of homes is directly related to the size of the lot, therefore the resulting home may be smaller under the revised plan. The home

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

must still comply with all requirements of the RS2-HD district, and would be compatible with the General Plan designation.

Future improvements would be limited to the development intensities identified in the General Plan as Low Density Residential. The proposed Tentative Parcel Map requests approval for a maximum of two lots for single-family development. This is below the maximum allowable density in the RS-2-HD zone and consistent with the proposed General Plan designation.

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

WHY? There are no Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in Pasadena.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ()*

WHY? The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City's General Plan states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel and stone Eaton Wash, and Devils Gate Reservoir. The project is not near these areas.

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

WHY? The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13 a) of this document.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

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

WHY? The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Noise generated by future construction activities may have a short-term impact and noise from air conditioning and heating systems may increase the existing level of ambient noise after construction. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. Any future construction and development 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).

The impact from construction noise will be short-term and limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday in or within 500 feet of a residential area) in accordance with City regulations. A construction related traffic plan would be 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 by the Public Works and Transportation Departments and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits.

Projects must comply with the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A). According to the Noise Restrictions Ordinance the allowed ambient noise level is 50 dBA during the day (6a.m.-11 p.m.) and 40 dBA at night (11 p.m. to 6 a.m.).

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 1, Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use, of this element this residential project would be located in an area of identical land use, compatible with a normally acceptable ambient noise range of 50-60 dBA. Land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive include but are not limited to: residences, hotels, single room occupancy buildings, group care and convalescent homes, schools, churches, libraries, performance halls, parks and hospitals.

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

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

WHY? The project is not located near any light rail tracks or freeways.

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

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The project will not permanently increase ambient noise levels

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <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? See response 14 a. The project will not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

- 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 within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank.

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

WHY? The project is not within the vicinity of the Police Heliport or the Fire Camp in the Arroyo Seco.

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ()

WHY? The project is in a developed area where the major infrastructure is already in place. The project will result in the potential net gain of two housing units. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure are already established (water, power and sewer services). Since the project is within the intensity standards under the General Plan and zoning land-use designations for the proposed land use change, this gain will not be significant.

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

WHY? The project does not involve the demolition of any housing units. The proposed project would result in the net gain of two housing units.

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 in the contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people.

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

a. Fire Protection? ()

WHY? The project site is located in a very high wildfire hazard area according to the Wildfire Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project is located one mile from the nearest fire station located at 50 Avenue 64. However, the effect on fire service is not significant, since this change is within the Fire Department's scope of responsibility. The Fire Department reviewed the application and has no objections to the proposed project.

b. Libraries? ()

WHY? The project is located 1.15 miles from the nearest branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System. The future addition of two single-family units will not significantly affect library service.

c. Parks? ()

WHY? The project is located within 1.5 miles of the nearest park, Arroyo Seco. According to Parks and Natural Resources staff, the City as a whole had 1.6 acres of parkland per 1000 residents in May 2002. The state standard in the Quimby Act is 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged under the Quimby Act. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks.

d. Police Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed site is in an area which has reported low crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The project may slightly increase the need for police protection. However, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

e. Schools? ()

WHY? The 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.

f. Other public facilities? ()

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and development fees will lower this impact to a level that 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? The project is located 1.5 miles from the nearest park, Arroyo Seco. A residential impact fee is collected by the City's Building Official on each residential unit constructed and on each addition over 400 sq. ft. in size. This fee is to improve recreational and park facilities near the project mitigating all project impact on parks. Future development resulting from the project may generate nine residents who may use neighborhood and regional parks. This increase will be served through the impact fees collected.

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 contains no recreational facilities.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

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

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 project is located on a street that is not identified as a Principal Mobility Corridor or a deemphasized street in the 2003 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

The proposed development is within the applicable intensity standards allowed by both the General Plan land use and the zoning designations. Therefore, it is within the range of development planned for by the City. According to Table A9-5A-1 of the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (or the Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1998 "Trip Generation" 6th edition) future development resulting from the project is likely to have an average daily trip (ADT) generation of 9.55 trips for each dwelling unit.

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

WHY? The regional Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or the local City sets the Level of Service Threshold (LOS). The adopted 2002 Congestion Management Program prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Agency lists LOS E as acceptable for the highway and road system. The CMP defines the 2002 Highway and Roadway System in Exhibit 2-3. The project does not impact this roadway system. Thresholds from the 1995 CMP are 50 peak hour trips added to a freeway on or off ramp or 150 trips added to a mainline freeway or ramp monitoring location. The proposed project and future development of two units is below the threshold of significance.

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.

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the Transportation Department and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project site or in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project would not alter the existing street grid. Furthermore, consultation with the Pasadena Police Department confirmed that the data for reported automobile accidents in the one-year between October 15 2004 through November 1, 2005 reported on the street segment of San Rafael between the 134 Freeway and Glen Oaks Boulevard was considered to be low. The Police Department does not classify this street segment as one with a higher than average number of reported accidents.

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

The applicant revised the subdivision design as a response to neighborhood concerns regarding the safety of the area, and the opposition to an access point for the lot on San Rafael Avenue. In response, the proposed Lot B, will take access from Glen Oaks Boulevard. The proposed project will not change the street grid at its location. The project and resulting access must be reviewed by the Transportation and Fire Departments. This will ensure the safest design for the neighborhood.

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

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Transportation Department and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity (vehicle or bicycle)?* ()

WHY? Due to the decreased intensity of land use, there will not be an increased demand for parking. However, through the Hillside Development Permit future construction of two units would be conditioned to comply with the number of parking spaces required by the Zoning Code. According to the Zoning Code, the project requires two parking spaces for each residential unit, and guest parking. The parcels resulting from the subdivision are adequate in size to accommodate the off street parking requirements of the zoning code.

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

WHY? The future net addition of two residential units would not result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation system. No building plans are attached to this application.

The project is not near a principal mobility corridor or de-emphasized street according to the 2004 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual projects are subject

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

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

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

WHY? The project 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 and water treatment facilities. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line.

- 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 stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. The project development will not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system.

Furthermore, the project must have an on-site drainage plan approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any on-site improvements needed to provide drainage or to connect the project with the existing City drainage system are the responsibility of the applicant.

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 be reviewed by the Building Division of the Planning and Development Department by 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?* ()

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

WHY? According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project (and future development of two units) from existing entitlements and resources. 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 does not propose any new construction. The potential future development of two residences would result in an increase of approximately 660 gallons per day in water consumption. The current use consumes approximately 1,943 gallons of water per day. The net reduction in water consumption would be 1,282 gallons of water per day. Furthermore, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance during periods of drought, thereby reducing monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. The impact will be reduced to a level that is not significant. Further, the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department has reviewed this project and the potential for two new homes, and determined that the City can serve it.

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

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

WHY? See responses to 19 a. and b.

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

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 as of 2005 has a 20-year capacity, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was repermited in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and 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. 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?* ()

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

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.

20. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 18 at the end of the checklist.

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

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? ()*

WHY? The proposed project involves four actions. The first action is a General Plan Amendment to change the existing Institutional general plan designation to Low Density Residential (0-6 du/net acre). The second action is a Zoning Map Amendment to change the existing zoning from PS (Public/Semi-Public District) to RS-2 HD (Single-family Residential/ 2 du/net acre/Hillside Overlay District). The third action is a proposed subdivision to split the existing 129,718 square foot parcel into two lots. Parcel A would measure approximately 104,108 square feet, and Parcel B would measure approximately 25,610 square feet. The fourth and final action is a variance request for Parcel A and B, to allow these lots to be created with less than the required width of 100 feet. The new residentially zoned parcels would eventually be developed with single-family residences—Lot A would entail adaptive reuse of the existing historic structures as a residence. All four actions will be reviewed concurrently by the City of Pasadena.

The proposed project may result in the future removal of up to 18 trees. The potentially impacted trees represent 12% of all trees on the project site. As no specific design plans are attached to this application, permits for individual tree removal are not part of this review. Individual tree removal would be reviewed under the Hillside Development Permit that is required prior to the approving the size, design and location of

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

the new homes. The HDP for a residence in the Hillside Overlay District is subject to the tree retention and removal plan requirements in addition to the City trees and Tree Protection Ordinance. Using the intent of both the Tree Protection Ordinance and the Hillside Development Overlay Ordinance mitigation measures could be developed requiring replacement of trees which the project might remove.

There are two buildings on the project site which are of historic significance. The first is the Charles Richter Laboratory and the ancillary garage structure. The lab and garage were constructed 1925-26 on the property owned and managed by Caltech. They were designed in the Mediterranean Revival Style by renowned local architect Reginald D. Johnson to emulate the appearance of a single-family residential development. The property appears eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places for its association with the development of seismology and key individuals in the field (Charles Richter, Beno Gutenberg, etc.), its construction methods used for the lab building, and its design by Johnson. In addition, the property is eligible for local landmark designation. No specific design plans are attached to this application. Instead, during review of the Hillside Development Permit, parcel specific development impacts to historic resources will be considered.

There is no development project proposed at this time and specific impacts of any future development are too speculative to evaluate at this time. However, the future development of the parcels will be subject to a Hillside Development Permit and review by City staff to ensure there are no impacts as a result of the development.

The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations. New development in the Hillside Overlay District is required to submit a plan for implementing Best Management Practices.

- 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 is within the intensity standards established under the General Plan and Zoning Code. The project would not individually or cumulatively exceed air quality standards set for the southern California region established by the SCAQMD.

The proposed development is within the applicable intensity standards allowed by both the General Plan land use and the zoning designations. Therefore it is within the range of development planned for by the City. According to Table A9-5A-1 of the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (or the Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1998 "Trip Generation" 6th edition) the future development of two units is likely to have an average daily trip (ADT) generation of 9.55 trips for each dwelling unit.

The regional Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or the local City sets the Level of Service Threshold (LOS). The adopted 2002 Congestion Management Program prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Agency lists LOS E as acceptable for the highway and road system. The CMP defines the 2002 Highway and Roadway System in Exhibit 2-3. The project does not impact this roadway system. Thresholds from the 1995 CMP are 50 peak hour trips added to a freeway on or off ramp or 150 trips added to a mainline freeway or ramp monitoring location. The proposed project (and future development) is below the threshold of significance.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? The project site is located approximately two miles from the active Raymond Hill fault and the potential exists for people and property on the project site to be exposed to the hazards of seismic activity. However, any risk will be minimized in that the new structure will be designed and built to meet or exceed the requirements of the California Building Code, Seismic Zone 4. The project itself will not create the potential for earthquakes. Additionally, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area and is not subject to flooding. Further, the site will not be used for the storage of hazardous materials and there is no evidence that the site has previously been used for the underground storage of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

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

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- | # | Document |
|----|--|
| 1 | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 2004 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. |
| 2 | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Maps- the official Los Angeles and Mt. Wilson, quadrant maps were released in 1977. |
| 3 | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993 |
| 4 | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001 |
| 5 | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983 |
| 6 | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002 |
| 7 | Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004 |
| 8 | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002. |
| 9 | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868 |
| 10 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 11 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 12 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 13 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854 |
| 14 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997 |
| 15 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994 |
| 16 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 17 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975 |
| 18 | Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002. |
| 19 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998 |
| 20 | State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology |
| 21 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations n Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837 |
| 22 | Transportation, Housing, and Child Care Survey: A Report Describing the Results and Findings of a Survey of Employees in the City of Pasadena, Child Care Planning Associates for the City of Pasadena, April 11, 1990 |
| 23 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896 |
| 24 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001 |
| 25 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |

U://MyDocuments/wordfile/IS/ISREF.doc7.29.03