

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? As discussed, the project would not involve in any changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernable drainage course. No development is proposed onsite. In accordance with the Caltech Master Plan, the existing single-family residence onsite will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. As provided in the Master Plan, the use of a single-family residence to academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence will not alter the site's drainage patterns and are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. This ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process.

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

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

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? ()

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

WHY? No development is proposed onsite. The proposed project would not increase runoff nor increase impermeable surfaces onsite. However, as discussed above in Sections 11.c. and 11.d., compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 11.a. and 11.c., the project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()

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

WHY? As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality. No development is proposed onsite. The existing single-family onsite will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence.

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? ()

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

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

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

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 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.

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

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

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community? ()

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

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

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar development on all sides, and the project consists of an infill development within a highly urbanized area. No adverse impact will result.

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

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

WHY? The project is not consistent with either the General Plan Land Use designation or zoning designation as shown in the 2004 Land Use Element. The subject site, 505 S. Wilson Avenue, is within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area. The current General Plan Land Use designation is Medium-High Density Residential (0-32 dwelling units/net acre) with the corresponding zoning designation of RM-32 (Multi-family Residential District, 32 dwelling units/net acre). The action being undertaken, General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, is to clarify the underlying land use policy and zoning of the property that was recently acquired by Caltech, and that, although within the 1989 Caltech Master Plan boundary, was exempted from the Master Plan because the property was not owned by Caltech at that time. The 1988 Final EIR for the Caltech Master Plan analyzed the entire campus and the properties (nine properties) not owned by Caltech at that time. Since the adoption of the Master Plan, only one property remains that is not owned by the Institution within the Master Plan boundary area, 391 S. Wilson Avenue.

With the recent acquisition of the property by the Institution, the Master Plan needs to be modified to reflect the ownership by Caltech; thus, a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for the property. Under the process of approval of the Master Plan, remaining Caltech properties within the campus boundaries which are not zoned PS will be rezoned to the PS district.

The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change is consistent with Objective 24 – Existing Institutions, Policy 24.2 – Land Use Opportunities, and Policy 24.4 – Support Planning, of the General Plan Land Use Element. Objective 24 provides for long-term opportunities for growth of existing cultural, scientific, corporate entertainment and education institutions in balance with their surrounding. Policy 24.2 provides for land use opportunities to develop regionally significant cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment, and educational uses. Policy 24.4 supports specific plans, master plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.

The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change must be approved and effective prior to any building permits being issued for the property to be used as academic or administrative office.

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

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

WHY? Currently, there 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.

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?* ()

WHY? No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas are Eaton Wash, which, was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. The project is not near these areas.

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

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?* ()

WHY? The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. No development is proposed onsite. The existing single-family residence onsite will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities from tenant improvement of the single-family house to academic or administrative office. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore,

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

adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

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

WHY? The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration. The proposed project is approximately 1.5 miles from the Gold Line light rail tracks. This light rail system has been designed to limit excessive ground-borne vibration to surrounding land uses, and no significant vibration levels are experienced outside of the railway's right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed project will not be significantly impacted by ground-borne vibration or noise.

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

WHY? 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. See also response to 14.a.

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

WHY? No development is proposed onsite. The project would not generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However if there are tenant improvements to the single-family residence to academic or administrative office, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels.

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? ()

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

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

WHY? There are no private-use airports or airstrips within or near the City of Pasadena.

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project involves a General Plan Amendment from Medium-High Density Residential (0-32 dwelling units/net acre) to Institutional and a Zone Change from RM-32 (Multi-family Residential District, 32 dwelling units/net acre) to PS (Public and Semi-Public) for the property at 505 S. Wilson Avenue within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area. The project is not consistent with the land use designations for the site; thus a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change was required (see also Section 12 of this document). In accordance with the Master Plan provisions, property not owned by Caltech, but within the Master Plan boundaries, will be retained, and its development will continue to be regulated by, its current zoning. A zone change to PS zoning must be obtained for properties within the Master Plan boundaries as they are acquired by Caltech; thus a General Plan Amendment and zone change was required for the recent purchase of this property by Caltech.

The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. Thus, the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

The 1988 Final EIR prepared for the Caltech Master Plan, analyzed the retention of all existing residential structures on the west side of Wilson Avenue south of San Pasqual Street for support services for the campus. This will result in the preservation of the six (6) single-family residences and a small apartment building, which have been ranked for potential City Landmark status. As analyzed in the Final EIR, the loss

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

of this single-family residence will not have a significant or adverse effect on the City's population or housing.

The project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. If the structure is used as academic or administrative office, the project will result in the potential loss of one residential unit; however, if the structure is retained as a faculty residence there will be no loss in the housing stock. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will be the responsibility of the applicant.

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

WHY? The project site contains an existing single-family residential dwelling unit. In accordance with the provisions of the Caltech Master Plan and analyzed in the 1988 Final EIR for the Master Plan, the existing houses fronting on Wilson Avenue, within the boundary area of the Master Plan, will be retained on their current sites and used as academic or administrative offices, and/or faculty residences. Caltech is proposing to retain the single-family residence onsite.

As analyzed in the 1988 Final EIR, mitigation measures were imposed that would offset the loss of existing single-family residences. These measures include:

1. The retention of the most significant residences, including those on Hill Avenue, Wilson Avenue south of San Pasqual Street, and Catalina Avenue.
2. Construction of adequate student/faculty housing on campus, including apartment-style graduate student units.
3. Offer to make available for relocation any single-family residences scheduled for demolition.

This project conforms to the 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002, therefore this loss is within the housing forecast in this element. It is also within the range of housing forecast for Pasadena contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will not have a significant or adverse effect on the City's population or housing.

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

WHY? Currently on the project site is an existing single-family residential dwelling unit. In accordance with the provisions of the Master Plan, the existing single-family houses fronting on Wilson Avenue, within the boundary area of the Master Plan, will be retained on their current sites and used as academic or administrative offices, and/or faculty residences. Caltech is proposing to retain the single-family residence onsite. Currently, the single-family residence is being utilized as housing for visiting faculty and post doctorate students.

The proposed project would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts. See also 15.b.

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

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

governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. *Fire Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of General Plan Amendment from Medium-High Density Residential (0-32 dwelling units/net acre) to Institutional and a Zone Change from RM-32 (Multi-family Residential, 32 dwelling units/net acre) to PS (Public and Semi-Public), which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h. of this document for wildfire-related impacts. Currently, Fire Station #34 1360 E. Del Mar Boulevard is located within the immediate vicinity (Caltech Master Plan boundary area) of the proposed project.

b. *Libraries?* ()

WHY? The project is located 1.1 miles from the nearest branch library (Hill Avenue Branch Library, 55 S. Hill Avenue). The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. *Parks?* ()

WHY? The project is located within 0.3 miles of the nearest park, Tournament Park. This park is within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area. According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents.

The proposed project is a non-residential project that would not directly increase the City's population. However, there is a potential for an increase in usage of park space given the new employees and patrons associated with the proposed project. The City collects an impact fee of \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on parks.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change for the property at 505 S. Wilson Avenue within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Police facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services. The proposed

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

project is located within the Caltech Master Plan boundary, which Caltech also provides security service for their campus.

The proposed site is in an area which has reported average crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The project will not 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.

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

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

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

17. RECREATION.

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

WHY? The proposed project is a non-residential project that would not directly increase the City's population. However, there is a potential for an increase in usage of park space given the new employees and patrons associated with the proposed project. The City collects a park impact fee for non-residential projects. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

The project is located within 0.3 miles of the nearest park, Tournament Park. This park is located south of the Caltech campus and is within the campus Master Plan boundary area.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts. However, the proposed project is within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area that provides recreational facilities, i.e. tennis courts, gymnasium, and athletic field, for its students, faculty, employees, and residents of the surrounding neighborhood.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a. *Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? ()*

WHY? The project is located along Wilson Avenue and is supported by a roadway network consisting of California and Del Mar Boulevards, and Hill Avenue. Of these roadways, Del Mar Boulevard is a Principal Mobility/Multimodal Corridors and California Boulevard is a de-emphasized street, as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed project and determined that no additional traffic analysis is required. This decision is in part based on the fact that the existing street system has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to the traffic load and capacity of the street system.

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

WHY? The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) adopted their most recent Congestion Management Program (CMP) in 2004. This CMP identifies level of service (LOS) E or better as acceptable for the designated CMP highway and road system. The CMP further states, "a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C [volume to capacity ratio] = 0.02), causing LOS F (V/C > 1.00). If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C = 0.02)."

In addition to CMP thresholds, the City's "Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines" August, 2005 states that the following changes in LOS due to a project are considered a significant traffic impact:

Intersection Capacity Analysis (ICU)	
Current ICU	Change due to project
A	0.060
B	0.050
C	0.040
D	0.030
E	0.020

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

F	0.010
---	-------

The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. Thus, due to the size of the project, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, according to Pasadena Department of Transportation, the project would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an establish level of service standard, and would have no related significant impacts.

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?* ()

<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. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

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

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the Pasadena Department of Transportation 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 or in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

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

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

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Pasadena Department of Transportation and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes meet do meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards.

The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

<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? The project consists of a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change for the property at 505 S. Wilson Avenue within the Caltech Master Plan boundary area. As provided in the Master Plan provisions, the existing single-family residence onsite will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would neither increase the demand for parking nor eliminate any existing parking spaces.

In accordance with the Caltech Master Plan, the houses fronting on Wilson Avenue are programmed for a mix of residential and academic uses. To accommodate their need for parking, the Master Plan also calls for development of additional surface lots within the backyards as required to meet demand. Up to 50 parking spaces will be provided behind the houses on Wilson Avenue. Currently, Caltech has a total of 3,269 parking spaces on its campus that meets the demand of its faculty and students; therefore, the project is in compliance with the Master Plan parking strategy, and the project would have no impact to parking.

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the Pasadena Department of Transportation and has been found to be consistent with the City's policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, the project would have no impact to alternative transportation.

Caltech is subject to the requirements of the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance in effect at the time of adoption of the Master Plan, including reserving preferential carpool spaces equivalent to 10% of total employee parking, reserving carpool/vanpool loading areas, and providing commuter matching services, bicycle parking facilities, and a commuter information center with bus schedules, ridesharing promotional materials, etc.

The project is near a principal mobility corridor, Del Mar Boulevard, and a de-emphasized street, California Boulevard according to the 2004 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

The project is located near the following bus routes #267 on Del Mar Boulevard and #177 on Hill Avenue (Montebello Bus Line), and #10 on Del Mar Boulevard (Pasadena ARTS Route) and approximately 1.7 miles from the light rail line station (Metro Gold Line) from Downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena according to the adopted 2004 Mobility Element of the General Plan.

The project does not include provisions for the use of bicycles; however, if the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change are approved for this parcel, the parcel will be subject to the provisions of the Caltech Master Plan, which includes bicycle parking for the campus. Based on the on-campus supply of 3,269 parking spaces, a minimum of 170 bicycle parking spaces shall be provided on the site.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

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

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

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 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.

As part of the approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, the following standard condition has been imposed by the Pasadena Department of Public works for the change of use from a single-family to academic or administrative office:

1. A closed circuit television (CCTV) inspection of the house sewer serving the property shall be performed and a CCTV inspection tape submitted to the Department of Public Works for review. The applicant, Caltech, shall correct any defects revealed by the inspection. Defects may include, tuberculation, offset joints, excessive root intrusion, pipe joints that can allow water infiltration, cracks and corrosion or deterioration of the pipe or joint material, damaged or cracked connection to the sewer main, or other defects as determined as determined by the City Engineer. The method of correction of the defects shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer, and may include partial or total replacement of the house sewer, or installation of a structural or non-structural pipe liner. The applicant, Caltech, shall be responsible for all costs required to obtain the CCTV inspection of the existing sewer connection, and if required, to correct the defects.

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 proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change for the property at 505 S. Wilson Avenue, and as a result, would not increase the demand for water and wastewater service. However in accordance with the Caltech Master Plan, the existing single-family residence onsite will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. The use as an academic or administrative office will increase the demand for water and wastewater service.

Per the City's Water and Power Department, this project anticipated water demand is 351 gallons per day (gpd). The use of academic or administrative office anticipated wastewater demand is 501 gallons per day (gpd). The proposed increase to water/wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service areas of the water and wastewater service purveyors. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyors are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. The only water and wastewater improvements required for the project are on-site unit connections to the existing systems, which are subject to connection fees. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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?* ()

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

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

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

No development is proposed onsite. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment and a Zone Change at 505 S. Wilson Avenue, within the Caltech Master Development Plan boundary area. No development is proposed on the project site. Currently, onsite is an existing single-family residential dwelling unit. In accordance with the provisions of the Master Plan, the single-family residence will be retained onsite and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. The proposed project would not increase the demand for water; however, the change in use from a single-family residence to an academic or administrative office would increase the demand for water. The use will result in an increase of approximately 91 gallons per day in water consumption. The current use, single-family residence, consumes approximately 260 gallons of water per day. The net gain in water consumption would be 351 gallons of water per day. However, this impact will be mitigated during drought periods by the applicant adhering the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which restricts water consumption to 90% of expected consumption during each billing period. Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact under this topic.

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?* ()

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

WHY? As discussed in Section 19.b. of this report, the proposed project which consists of General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would not result in an increase demand for wastewater service. The change from a single-family residence to an academic or administrative office may increase the demand for

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

wastewater service; however, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service area of the wastewater service purveyor. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyor are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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 is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

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

The City Council approves non-exclusive franchises to specific solid waste collection firms or haulers to collect waste from non-residential developments, residential estates (20,000 square feet or more) and residential properties of five or more units. These firms are to keep records showing that the firms are reducing the amount of solid waste taken to land fills. These private haulers, as well as the City of Pasadena's Integrated Waste Management utilize the Scholl Canyon Landfill, located in the City of Glendale, north of the 134 Freeway.

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

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

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

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

Earlier Analysis Used. (Identify and state where they are available for review.)

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

In September 1988, the Pasadena City Council adopted a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Caltech Master Plan. This EIR was prepared as a "Program EIR" as defined by CEQA Section 15168. The Program EIR was designed to address the overall effects of a proposed course of action and allow the City and Caltech to take steps to avoid unnecessary adverse environmental effects which could result from the implementation of the Master Plan.

The following document was used for analysis of the project's environmental effects:

- California Institute of Technology (Caltech) Master Development Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), September 1988

This document is available for review at the Hale Building, Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Thursday and from 8:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. every Friday.

As discussed in the 1988 Final EIR and provisions in the Caltech Master Plan, the City shall institute zone change proceedings to establish PS (Public and Semi-Public) zoning districts for those properties within the Master Plan boundaries not currently owned by Caltech, but subsequently acquired by Caltech.

- a) 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.)

Population/Housing: *Displace substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The loss of existing single-family residences (housing units) was discussed and analyzed in the 1988 Final EIR prepared for the Caltech Master Plan. Mitigation measures were imposed that would offset the loss of existing single-family residences. These measures include:

1. The retention of the most significant residences, including those on Hill Avenue, Wilson Avenue south of San Pasqual Street, and Catalina Avenue.
2. Construction of adequate student/faculty housing on campus, including apartment-style graduate student units.
3. Offer to make available for relocation any single-family residences scheduled for demolition.

- b) 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. None

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

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

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.

As discussed in Section 7 of this document, **Cultural Resources**, there is an existing single-family residence on the site at 505 S. Wilson Avenue, proposed for a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. The single-family residence was built in 1928 and remodeled in 1938. The house was a single-story structure and became a two-story house in 1937 when a major remodeling was accomplished. The house does retain its 1937 integrity and contributes to the neighborhood as a whole. A Historic Resources Inventory prepared for the Caltech Master Plan in 1986 determined that the single-family residence is of historic significance. The single-family structure is not scheduled for demolition. As analyzed in the 1988 Final EIR, this single-family residence will be retained and used as academic or administrative office, and/or faculty residence. No change to the structure including the exterior of the existing dwelling unit, garage, driveway or landscaping is currently proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and the project would have no related impacts.

Similarly, as discussed Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to 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, floral, 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 when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project? ()*

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

WHY? The proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality, housing, and utility impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, except for cumulative air quality conditions (i.e. the SCAB is a non-attainment basin) and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. As discussed in Section 5.c. of this document, the project's contribution to the cumulative air quality scenario is not considerable.

As discussed in Section 15, **Population and Housing**, a single-family residence on the site may be lost if the structure is converted to an academic or administrative office. However, the 1988 Final EIR prepared for the Caltech Master Plan, analyzed the retention of all existing residential structures for support services within the Master Plan boundary area, south of San Pasqual Street on the west side of Wilson Avenue. This will result in the preservation of six (6) single-family residences and a small apartment building, which have been ranked for potential City Landmark status. Mitigation measures from the 1988 Final EIR were imposed to offset the loss of existing single-family residences. These measures include:

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

1. The retention of the most significant residences, including those on Hill Avenue, Wilson Avenue south of San Pasqual Street, and Catalina Avenue.
2. Construction of adequate student/faculty housing on campus, including apartment-style graduate student units.
3. Offer to make available for relocation any single-family residences scheduled for demolition.

The loss of this single-family residence will not be significant nor would cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Section 19, **Utilities and Service Systems**, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. However, the Pasadena Department of Public Works has imposed the following standard condition for the conversion of the single-family to academic or administrative office:

1. A closed circuit television (CCTV) inspection of the house sewer serving the property shall be performed and a CCTV inspection tape submitted to the Department of Public Works for review. The applicant, Caltech, shall correct any defects revealed by the inspection. Defects may include, tuberculation, offset joints, excessive root intrusion, pipe joints that can allow water infiltration, cracks and corrosion or deterioration of the pipe or joint material, damaged or cracked connection to the sewer main, or other defects as determined as determined by the City Engineer. The method of correction of the defects shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer, and may include partial or total replacement of the house sewer, or installation of a structural or non-structural pipe liner. The applicant, Caltech, shall be responsible for all costs required to obtain the CCTV inspection of the existing sewer connection, and if required, to correct the defects.

Therefore, the proposed project 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? ()

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

Therefore, the proposed project of a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change 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 | California Institute of Technology (Caltech) Amended Master Development Plan, adopted by the Pasadena City Council, August 1999 |
| 3 | California Institute of Technology (Caltech) Master Development Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, September 1988 |
| 4 | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993 |
| 5 | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001 |
| 6 | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983 |
| 7 | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002 |
| 8 | 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 |
| 9 | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002. |
| 10 | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868 |
| 11 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 12 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 13 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 14 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854 |
| 15 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997 |
| 16 | Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended |
| 17 | Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005 |
| 18 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994 |
| 19 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 20 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975 |
| 21 | 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. |
| 22 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998 |
| 23 | 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 |
| 24 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837 |
| 25 | Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005 |
| 26 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896 |
| 27 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001 |
| 28 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |

Attachment 2