

**ATTACHMENT C
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**CITY OF PASADENA
PLANNING DIVISION
HALE BUILDING
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101-1704**

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this analysis, the associated "Master Application Form," and/or Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and supporting data constitute the Initial Study for the subject project. This Initial Study provides the assessment for a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Zoning Code Amendments – Hillside Overlay Districts (2006)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: David Sinclair
Associate Planner
(626) 744-6766
4. Project Location: The proposed Zoning Code Amendments will apply to all Hillside Overlay Districts (HD, HDSR, and HD1).
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
7. Zoning: RS-1-HD, RS-2-HD, RS-4-HD, RS-6-HD, RS-6-HDSR, RS-4-HD1, and RS-6-HD1
8. Description of the Project: These Zoning Code amendments to the Hillside District Ordinance include the following changes: 1) guidelines (i.e. lots not in Pasadena, lots in neighborhood separated by physical barrier) for defining the 'neighborhood' when utilizing the Neighborhood Compatibility calculation; 2) guidelines (i.e. relative lot size, low lot average slope) for allowing floor area in excess of that allowed by the Neighborhood Compatibility calculation; 3) clarification of the slope reduction formula; 4) replacing all references to "50 percent slope" with "2:1 slope"; and 5) confirming the applicability of the Hillside Development findings for projects in the HD-1 overlay district.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Varied
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required. The proposed amendments are City-wide, and will change the regulations in various parts of the Zoning Code. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Approval by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Geology and Soils		Population and Housing
	Agricultural Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality		Hydrology and Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use and Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities and Service Systems
	Energy		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	X
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment., but at least effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Prepared By/Date _____

Reviewed By/Date _____

Printed Name _____

Printed Name _____

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____

Adoption attested to by: _____
 Printed name/Signature Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) 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 20 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.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant

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

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: May 24, 2006
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development
 Case Manager: David Sinclair

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (explanations of all answers are required):

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

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance. The existing protection of scenic vistas will not be altered in any way. Therefore, the proposed amendments would have no negative impacts on scenic vistas.

b. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not change the height and mass restrictions established in the Hillside Overlay District section of the City's Zoning Code. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

c. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?* ()

WHY? See response 3 a.

d. *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not change the height and mass restrictions established in the Hillside Overlay District section of the City's Zoning Code, and would not change any of the City's lighting and building materials standards. Therefore, the proposed amendments would have no negative impacts as a result of light or glare.

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

4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. It has commercial recreation, park, natural and open space. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

- b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the CO (Office Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), OS (Open Space) and PS (Public-Semi Public) Zoning Districts. The proposed Zoning Code Amendments will only affect properties in the Hillside Overlay District which are entirely residentially zoned.

- c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ()*

WHY? There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

5. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a. *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality

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

Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2003 AQMP, adopted on August 1, 2003. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMD.

In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth.

The proposed amendments are primarily guidelines and clarifications that do not have the potential to promote growth since they are small changes to the Zoning Code. These amendments do not increase the height, density, FAR or other development standards that would lead to greater intensity of development than is currently allowed by the Zoning Code. These amendments would not interfere with the City's ability to implement the air quality plans.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments are for the most part minor, and do not result in the approval of a specific project that would violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not result in an increase in criteria pollutants as the amendments are minor and do not result in changes in the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ()

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not result in exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the amendments are minor in nature and do not result in changes in the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

e. *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. The Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and will not result in objectionable odors. New projects will be reviewed in accordance with the City's Zoning Code and will be required to meet the performance standards for odors contained in 17.40.090.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. While they apply to Hillside District zoned areas of the City, there is no new development or changes to development standards that would affect sensitive species. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would not change the way future projects subject to the Hillside Overlay District are reviewed for potential impacts to sensitive species and would not change the applicability of sensitive species regulations.

b. *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ()

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. While they apply to Hillside District zoned areas of the City, there is no new development or changes to development standards. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would not change the way future projects subject to the Hillside Overlay District are reviewed for potential impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, and would not change the applicability of regulations that protect such resources.

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

c. *Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ()*

WHY? Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are “waters of the United States” and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season.

The proposed project consists of changes to the City’s Hillside Overlay District Zoning code. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would not change the way future projects subject to the Hillside Overlay District are reviewed for potential impacts to resources protected by the Clean Water Act, and would not change the applicability of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

d. *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is a developed urban area and these Zoning Code Amendments do not involve the dispersal of wildlife. The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. While they apply to Hillside District zoned areas of the City, there is no new development or changes to development standards that would impact wildlife or their habitat.

e. *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ()*

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. The amendments will not impact the Tree Protection Ordinance as existing protections for trees will not be altered.

f. *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? ()*

WHY? Currently, there is 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.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? ()

WHY? These amendments will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would not change the way future projects subject to the Hillside Overlay District are reviewed for potential impacts to historical resources, and would not change the applicability of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance or any other regulations protecting historical resources.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ()

WHY? The proposed Code Amendments would have no impact to archaeological resources and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for archaeological resource impacts.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not directly or secondarily destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. Therefore, there are no anticipated impacts to any human remains as a result of these amendments.

8. **ENERGY.** Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments do not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. Projects are required comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

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

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ()

Why? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments are minor and do not result in projects that will encourage the use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ()

WHY? Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not directly or secondarily result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed Zoning Code Amendments are minor in nature and would not affect the applicability of building code requirements. As such, the proposed Zoning Code amendment will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of known fault.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

WHY? See 9.a.i.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. These

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

amendments are not specific to a site, but are Citywide. There are no specific projects associated with the amendments. Any future development projects will continue to be reviewed in accordance with building regulations to ensure there are no seismic related risks.

- iv. *Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides?*
()

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. Projects will be reviewed on a case by case basis to determine that they meet the building code and other requirements that ensure that they are safe. The proposed amendments will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. When an applicant applies to construct any building, the specific impacts on soil erosion will be reviewed. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation therefore there will be no impact.

- c. *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?* ()

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain.

The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. By its nature, the Hillside District Ordinance applies to portions of the City with sloping topography, including some areas that may be subject to landslides and other soils stability constrains. However, the proposed amendments would not change the way future projects are reviewed for potential stability constraints, and would not change the applicability of building code requirements or other regulations that govern construction on potentially unstable soils and geologic units. Therefore, the approval of the proposed amendments would not result in any impacts related to the stability of geologic units or soils.

- d. *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?* ()

<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? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan Pasadena is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would have no expansive soil-related impacts and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for expansive soil-related impacts.

- e. *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific but include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not impact the ability of the City to review a project to determine if the soil is incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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 proposed Zoning Code amendments as described on Page 1 do not change the mechanisms by which the City regulates the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. All new projects would be continued to be reviewed for such impacts.

- 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 proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific and include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazard-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

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

WHY? The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter the way subsequent

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

- 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 proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific thus there cannot be a determination that a project will be located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Any proposed project would be reviewed to determine whether they are on a list of hazardous materials sites. The proposed amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing hazardous material sites.

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

WHY? Pasadena is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

- f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? These amendments would not result in any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, any future applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

- 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? ()*

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor in nature and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are not site specific and do not amend the Zoning Code in such a way to violate any water quality standards. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter any waste discharge requirements, and would not change any water quality-related plans or programs.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific; they include a variety of guidelines and clarifications for the implementation of the Hillside District Ordinance as described on Page 1 of this document. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies. Any project that is the result of these amendments will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power.

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?* ()

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

WHY? Any project that requires a building permit will be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the existing drainage patterns. Future projects are subject to NPDES requirements, including the County-wide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. In accordance with these requirements, the applicant would be required to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP. To comply with the SUSMP, the project must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. Complying with the City's SUSMP and implementing the required BMPs will ensure that the any subsequent development projects would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to drainage patterns.

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?* ()