

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? 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, implementation of the Plan 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? ()

X

WHY? The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the Plan 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? ()

X

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan does not include new recommendations for placement of any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets.

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.

- g. 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? ()

X

WHY? The proposed Pedestrian Plan would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the Plan would have no associated impacts. Future development projects that may be subject to the policies of the Plan are too speculative to evaluate at this time. However, there no improvements in the Plan that would expose people to fire risks and future projects will continue to be required to comply with CEQA and all applicable safety standards of the Fire Department and Building Department.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

X

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 proposed Plan would not impact water quality standards, nor affect groundwater supplies. The proposed Plan is intended to improve the pedestrian environment of the City and will not be responsible for direct development impacts. However, subsequent development projects that may be subject to the requirements or policies of the Plan would be required to comply with CEQA and the development impact standards put forth in the City's General Plan and all Clean Water Act Requirements, including the National Pollutant discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Therefore, the project will have no 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)?* ()

X

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? See response 11 a.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY? The proposed Plan will not have any impact on any 100-year flood hazard area, tsunami, drainage patterns, erosion, or runoff of Stormwater Management systems. As mentioned previously, the proposed Plan will not be responsible for direct development impacts. However, subsequent development projects required to implement pedestrian improvements would be required to comply with the standards put forth in the City's General Plan and all Clean Water Act Requirements, including the National Pollutant discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and SUSMP requirements. Furthermore, the proposed Pedestrian Plan would not change any hydrology or water quality-related codes, laws, permits, or regulations. Therefore, the project will have no related impacts

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 11 c.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See responses 11 a and 11 c.

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

X

WHY?

See response 11 a and 11 c.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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? ()

X

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan does not include the construction of new housing. Therefore, the Plan would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the Plan would have no related impacts. See response 11 a.

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

X

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

Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan does not include the construction of new structures. Therefore, the Plan would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the Plan would have no related impacts. See response 11 a.

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? ()

X

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 P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. See response 11 a.

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

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

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

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

12. **LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community. The City proposes to create a comprehensive document that will combine preexisting pedestrian policies and apply them to certain development projects Citywide. The Plan relies on existing pedestrian promoting goals, objectives and policies that are found in several documents such as the General Plan and Specific Plans. A goal is to create compatibility with pedestrians and future uses within the community. No established community would be disrupted or physically divided due to the proposed Plan, and therefore, no impact would occur.

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

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

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan is consistent with the 2004 General Plan Land Use Element, the 2005 General Plan Mobility Element, as well as several other City adopted plans, policies, and programs. The Pedestrian Plan is a compilation of strategies, goals, and objectives included in the 2004 General Plan Land Use and Mobility Elements that strive to enhance safety and create a City where people can circulate without a car. See also response 12 a.

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

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

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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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? ()*

X

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. Implementation of the Plan does not encourage construction of any projects 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? ()*

X

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? ()*

X

WHY? Implementation of the Plan itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Plan implementation does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by Plan-related projects would be typical urban environment noise associated with people walking or maintenance of the facilities. The exact noise impacts of future projects is not known and too speculative at this time to evaluate, however future projects subject to the plan would be required to comply with CEQA and all existing noise regulations. 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.

Implementation of the Plan may result in projects that would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, these projects will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

(Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). If required, a traffic and parking plan for construction will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project and subsequent projects subject to the plan would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

X

WHY? Implementation of the Plan will not result in the construction of any new projects located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration. See also response 14 a.

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

X

WHY? See response to 14.a. The project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise 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?* ()

X

WHY? See response 14 a. Implementation of the Plan may encourage projects that would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the Plan-related 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). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). If required, a traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ()

X

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

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

X

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)? ()

X

WHY? The proposed Plan would not induce substantial population growth in the City, either directly or indirectly, nor would any of the policies cause displacement of existing homes or people. The proposed project is a plan to improve the pedestrian environment of the City and does not include any development activities at this time. The proposed Plan would not alter the City's population projections and many of the policies are currently found in the City's General Plan. Therefore, the project would have no impacts to population and housing

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

X

WHY? See response 15 a.

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? ()

X

WHY? See response 15 a.

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? ()

X

WHY? The proposed project will not directly increase the need for fire protection services. However, any future development that may be subject to policies in the plan would be subject to development fees, which are established to compensate for growth. Since, the proposed Plan involves no new construction and would have no immediate impact on fire protection services, and future development would remain subject to development fees, the project would have no significant impacts to fire services.

b. Libraries? ()

X

WHY? The proposed project would not directly increase the number of persons using public libraries. Future development projects will continue to be subject to applicable impact fees, which are established to compensate for residential growth. The Plan is designed to improve the pedestrian environment and does not propose any new development or promote growth that would result in an increased demand for library services.

c. Parks? ()

X

WHY? The proposed project would not directly increase the number of persons using public parks. Future development projects will continue to be subject to applicable park impact fees, which are established to compensate for residential growth. The Plan is designed to improve the pedestrian environment and does not propose any new development or promote growth that would result in an increased demand for park services.

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

d. *Police Protection?* ()

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

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan may improve safety and result in a decrease in pedestrian-related collisions. The Plan is designed to improve the pedestrian environment and does not propose any new development or promote growth that would result in an increased demand for police services. Therefore, the Plan would not significantly impact police protection.

e. *Schools?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed project would not directly increase the population of the City. Future development projects will continue to be subject to applicable school impact fees, which are established to compensate for residential growth. The Plan is designed to improve the pedestrian environment and does not propose any new development or promote growth that would result in an increased demand on the school system. Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan would not significantly impact schools.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

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

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

17. RECREATION.

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?* ()

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

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan is not expected to generate new residents. Therefore, the Plan itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.. Future development projects will continue to be subject to applicable park impact fees, which are established to compensate for residential growth. The Plan is designed to improve the pedestrian environment and does not propose any new development or promote growth that would result in an increased demand for park services.

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? ()

X

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the Plan 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)? ()

X

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan will not result in an increase in existing load and capacity of the street system or at any CMP designated facility or monitoring station. The Plan is intended to encourage walking as an alternative mode of transportation, therefore, the Plan may result in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips, the volume of capacity ratio on roads, and/or congestion at intersections.

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

X

WHY? See response 18 b.

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? ()

X

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

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

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

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

WHY? The Pedestrian Plan does not include any physical development that will be hazardous to traffic circulation. Future projects that may be subject to the Plan will be evaluated by the Transportation Department to ensure that no new hazards are created. A goal of the plan is to create a more pedestrian friendly environment, and there are no objectives or policies of the plan that would result in dangerous design features. Subsequent development projects (although too speculative at this time to evaluate) will continue to be required to comply with CEQA, the Mobility Element of the City's General Plan, and all adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting safe, effective transportation. Therefore, the project would have no associated impacts.

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

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

WHY? See response 18 d. The Plan itself does not involve the elimination of a through-route or involve the narrowing of a roadway. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

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

WHY? See response 18 d. Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan would neither increase the demand for parking nor eliminate any existing parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to parking.

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

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

WHY? Objective 3.2.2 of the City's 2004 Mobility Element is to "Encourage Non-Auto Travel". In accordance with the policies set by this objective, the Pedestrian Plan encourages the development of pedestrian facilities and amenities to increase walking as an alternative mode of transportation. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts as a result of the Plan.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

X

WHY? Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan would not generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. The Pedestrian Plan does not include any development at this time. Therefore, the project would not result in the construction of new water facilities, expansion of existing facilities, affect drainage patterns, water treatment services, and furthermore, no impacts to the City's landfill capacity would occur. Any subsequent development which would implement Plan policies would be required to comply with the City's General Plan and the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and all applicable utility purveyors. Compliance with these requirements would ensure all federal, state and local statutes and imposed regulations are met. Therefore, no impacts to utilities or service systems would occur.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY? See response 19 a.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY? See response 19 a. Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 11, implementation of the Plan may involve only minor changes in drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

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

X

WHY? See response 19 a. The proposed implementation of the Pedestrian Plan consists of policies and guidelines related to the planning and construction of pedestrian facilities, and would not increase the demand for water. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient water supplies, and would cause no related impacts.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

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? ()*

X

WHY? See response 19 a. The proposed implementation of the Pedestrian Plan consists of policies and guidelines related to the planning and construction of pedestrian facilities, and would not increase the demand for wastewater service. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

X

WHY? See response 19 a. Implementation of the Plan will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the Plan would cause no impacts under this topic.

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

X

WHY? See response 19 a. Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan consists of policies and guidelines related to the planning and construction of pedestrian facilities, and would not generate any solid waste. Therefore, the Plan would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

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

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).

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. (Identify and state where they are available for review.) No program EIR, tiering, or other process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects: Not applicable.
- 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? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetic or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

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

- b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable*

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project? ()

X

WHY? Implementation of the policies set forth in the Pedestrian Plan does not have any impacts whose incremental effects are cumulatively considerable. The Plan gathers together a list of preexisting pedestrian oriented development policies with which future development will have to comply, and does not propose any physical development. Therefore, the proposed Plan does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

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

X

WHY? As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although residents would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

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

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 |