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

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The act of changing the zoning will have no affect on the water quality. Any future projects based on the proposed zoning must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations.

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

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed zone change does not propose the installation of any groundwater wells, and would not directly withdraw any groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions in the study area or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of subsequent projects. Therefore, the proposed zone change would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

In December of 2007, the City of Pasadena adopted a finding that a projected water shortage existed within the City, and adopted Water Shortage Plan I pursuant to Pasadena Municipal Code 13.10.040. Unless the finding and Plan are withdrawn, all future projects that make use of the additional density allowed for by this zone change will need to comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). To ensure compliance, applicants shall submit a water conservation plan limiting the project's water consumption to 90% of its originally anticipated consumption. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans shall comply with the approved water conservation plan. Through this reduction of its water supply needs, the project's incremental effect to a cumulative water supply impact is reduced to less than cumulatively considerable.

During drought conditions, future projects must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) the projects shall only consume 90% of expected consumption.

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? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

WHY? By changing the zoning in the study area, drainage patterns will not be changed, streams will not be altered, and erosion rates will not increase because the new zone on itself does not propose construction of units or square footage. How future projects will affect erosion, drainage, and stream courses will be reviewed at the time a specific development is proposed. For future projects, the drainage of surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. Applicants shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

d. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek; the study area is not located near either stream. Therefore this zone change and subsequent projects making use of the zone change provisions will not alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

e. *Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Changing the zoning from one type of residential zoning to another will not, by itself, increase runoff. Future projects constructed because of this ordinance could increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces onsite. However 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 number of projects this zone change is expected to allow.

Similarly, these future projects 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, futures projects 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? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The zone change will not by itself degrade water quality. For future projects that come as a result of this zone change, runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. Future projects will most likely connect to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems. The environmental review of future projects proposed under the new zoning and land use designations will assess any impacts on groundwater quality.

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, the proposed zoning overlay and future development 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 zone change and associated subsequent development 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 enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community. The project does not include the construction of nor will allow the construction of any project that would physically divide the community. The project proposes to modify residential density, which will have no dividing effect.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The zone change is consistent with the City's General Plan. Policy 15.2 states that the City should, "Increase the total number of market rate and affordable housing units within the City."

The proposed zone change would allow for a density increase of 15% in addition to the density bonus provided by the State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915). The State Law states that the granting of a density bonus shall not be interpreted in and of itself to require a general plan amendment. Therefore the density designated for this area by the City's Land Use Diagram (0-16 dwelling units/net acre) is not in conflict with the proposed density allowed by this zone change (0-24 dwelling units/net acre).

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 study area is not near these areas.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed

Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed zone change and potential, subsequent residential development 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 zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The Noise Chapter of the EIR states that Initial Study determined that the Land Use Element would have a less than significant noise impact with respect to violation of the City's noise ordinance and exposure of persons to groundborne noise. The Initial Study also indicated that no impact would result due to the presence of any airport or private airstrip. Further the EIR found that because noise-sensitive uses and residential development in particular would be located in areas where noise levels are anticipated to exceed 70 dB(A) and the degree to which mitigation could achieve reduction was not known, the impact would be significant.

The EIR for the Land Use Element examined Noise impacts across the City. This environmental initial study focuses on an area of North Los Robles Ave. between E. Mountain St. and Douglas Street. The Noise Contour Maps (Figure 19, page 102 and Figure 20, page 105) of the EIR demonstrate that noise levels in the study area are not anticipated to exceed 65 dba. Therefore, any future units that this zoning map and zoning code amendment may allow would not exceed the City's "normally acceptable" standard.

The discussion of noise impacts on pages 99-114 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at

http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

Future projects making use of this density will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Future projects would be residential and would not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by these projects would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

The construction impacts of future projects would be analyzed in the required CEQA document for each project. The projects may generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, these projects will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (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 generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The study area is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? See response to 14.a. The zone change and possible, subsequent residential projects will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. Future projects would not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing

zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The Noise Chapter of the EIR states that Initial Study determined that the Land Use Element would have a less than significant noise impact with respect to violation of the City's noise ordinance and exposure of persons to groundborne noise. The Initial Study also indicated that no impact would result due to the presence of any airport or private airstrip. Further the EIR found that because noise-sensitive uses and residential development in particular would be located in areas where noise levels are anticipated to exceed 70 dB(A) and the degree to which mitigation could achieve reduction was not known, the impact would be significant.

The EIR for the Land Use Element examined Noise impacts across the City. This environmental initial study focuses on an area of North Los Robles Ave. between E. Mountain St. and Douglas Street. The Noise Contour Maps (Figure 19, page 102 and Figure 20, page 105) of the EIR demonstrate that noise levels in the study area are not anticipated to exceed 65 dba. Therefore, any future units that this zoning map and zoning code amendment may allow would not exceed the City's "normally acceptable" standard.

The discussion of noise impacts on pages 99-114 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

The proposed zone change will not by itself create an increase in ambient noise. Future residential projects making use of this zone may generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, these projects will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). Construction related traffic plans are 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 would 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 future projects would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels.

e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ( )*

Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

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 zone change 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 zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

According to the 2000 Census the average household size in Pasadena is 2.51 persons per household. Given this figure, the existing units house approximately 248 people. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow approximately 384 people. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 427 people (a net increase of approximately 178 people over the existing built environment). The 2004 Land Use Element proposed housing densities that would allow for 158,213 people. The Element proposed, and the accompanying EIR analyzed the impacts of a residential density of up to 32 units/acre in this study area. Using the same assumptions above, this would have resulted in a population of approximately 557 people (a net increase of 308 people over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The EIR found that over the 10 year time period in the Land Use Element the population would increase by 12%, which is an average growth rate of 1.1% per year. This is marginally higher than the 11% for the San Gabriel Valley. The Land Use Element proposed to continue existing development patterns and to maintain the existing rate of growth, which was a less than significant impact.

The discussion of population and housing impacts on pages 91-97 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed zone change by itself would not displace housing. This zone change will presumably result in the construction of additional housing units – approximately 71 – a percentage of which will be affordable. There for this zone change would likely increase – not decrease – the number of housing units.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The proposed zone change by itself would not displace housing. This zone change will presumably result in the construction of additional housing units – approximately 71 – a percentage of which will be affordable. There for this zone change would likely increase – not decrease – the number of housing units. As noted in 15 a, the number of people added to the area would not constitute a substantial number.

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

a. *Fire Protection? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed

zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The EIR for the Land Use Element found that new will not result in the need to construct new fire stations or police facilities. Thus, the impact would be less than significant. However, mitigation measures were recommended to provide for monitoring of the incremental increase in demand for emergency service over time. Mitigation measures are found on page 178.

The discussion of public services and recreation impacts on pages 173-190 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

b. *Libraries? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The study area is located .5 miles from the nearest branch library. 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 study area is located within .3 miles of the nearest park, (Washington Park). 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.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged in accordance with City Ordinance #6252. The park mitigation fee is $19,743 per residential unit. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks. The park impact fee for affordable housing units is $756/unit.

d. *Police Protection? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

WHY? The proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The EIR for the Land Use Element found that new will not result in the need to construct new fire stations or police facilities. Thus, the impact would be less than significant. However, mitigation measures were recommended to provide for monitoring of the incremental increase in demand for emergency service over time. Mitigation measures are found on page 178.

The discussion of public services and recreation impacts on pages 173-190 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at
http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

e. *Schools? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools.

f. *Other public facilities? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155

housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The discussion of public services and recreation impacts on pages 173-190 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at
http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

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 zone change would not by itself increase the use of area parks. Future residential projects that make use of zone change would be located .3 miles from the nearest park (Washington Park). The proposed zone change could produce approximately 40 net-new units and therefore would likely increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks. However, in accordance with Ordinance #6252, the City collects a park impact fee for each residential unit constructed and on each residential addition over 400 sq. ft. in size. These fees are used to fund land acquisition and capital improvements. This zone change and future residential projects would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

b. *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The zone change does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed zone change does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

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

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 study area is located along North Los Robles Avenue between Douglas Street and Mountain Street and is supported by a roadway network consisting of Adena Street, Jackson Street, Eldora Street and Washington Boulevard. Of these roadways, North Los Robles Avenue is a Principal Arterial Mobility/Multimodal Corridors and Washington Boulevard is a de-emphasized street, as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

The proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The EIR for the Land Use Element found that future although the goals and policies in the 2004 Land Use and Mobility Elements encourage transit-oriented development and stress non-automotive modes of travel, increased population resulting from development in Pasadena, combined with regional growth and its associated contribution to increased traffic volumes on the local road network, will result in an increase in vehicle trips citywide. Furthermore, it found that a significant impact would result at SR-134/San Rafael Avenue in both directions and eastbound I-210/Rosemead Boulevard. All other CMP impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are found on pages 87-88. The traffic impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The EIR for the Land Use Element reviewed the impacts on traffic at a citywide level. The project being analyzed in this environmental initial study is along North Los Robles Avenue between East Mountain Street and Douglas Street. The study area does not include and is not in relative proximity to SR-134/San Rafael Avenue or the eastbound I-210/Rosemead Boulevard. The project being analyzed would lessen the traffic impacts already analyzed in the Land Use Element EIR. Further, the "project" being analyzed is a zone change and zone text amendment and does not propose any specific construction project. Analysis relating

to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

The discussion of transportation and traffic impacts on pages 63-89 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at
http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

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 proposed zone change and zoning map amendment would allow an additional 15% density bonus over the 35% density bonus allowed by State Government Code Section 68915. The study area for this zoning map and code amendment currently contains approximately 100 dwelling units. The existing zoning in combination with the State's density bonus law would allow a maximum of approximately 155 housing units. The proposed amendments could allow up to approximately 170 units (a net increase of approximately 71 units over the existing built environment).

The State's density bonus law (State Government Code Section 68915) allows a 35% density bonus for projects that provide affordable housing. This bonus amounts to a 22 unit/acre density. The proposed zoning map and code amendments would allow an additional 15% density bonus for projects in the study area as long as the added units are provided at affordable levels. This added bonus amounts to a 24 unit/acre density.

The 2004 Land Use Element designated this study area Medium-High Density Residential (32 dwelling units/net acre). The environmental impact report for the Land Use Element (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099) evaluated the environmental effects of a density higher than that proposed by this zoning map and code amendment. The proposed amendments will decrease the density from the previous analyzed levels and thus lessen the impacts already analyzed.

The EIR for the Land Use Element found that future development pursuant will result in population growth. Although the goals and policies in the 2004 Land Use and Mobility Elements encourage transit-oriented development and stress non-automotive modes of travel, increased population resulting from development in Pasadena, combined with regional growth and its associated contribution to increased traffic volumes on the local road network, will result in an increase in vehicle trips citywide. Furthermore, if found that a significant impact would result at SR-134/San Rafael Avenue in both directions and eastbound I-210/Rosemead Boulevard. All other CMP impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation measures are found on pages 87-88. The traffic impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The discussion of transportation and traffic impacts on pages 63-89 of the Land Use Element EIR is incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150 and 15168(d), and is concurrently available for review at the Permit Center, located at 175 N. Garfield Ave., and on the City's website at
http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

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? ( )*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The study area 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)? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure or feature and therefore would not create a hazard or incompatible use. A typical residential structure, which would be allowed by this zone change, would not normally create hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. All projects using this density bonus would be required to be reviewed for compliance with CEQA and would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department and the Transportation Department. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure or feature and therefore would not create a situation where inadequate emergency access is provided. A typical residential structure, which would be allowed by this zone change, would normally provide adequate emergency access. All projects using this density bonus would be required to be reviewed for compliance with the CEQA and would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department and the Transportation Department.

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? ( )*

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not create a need for additional parking. Future projects proposed under this ordinance could receive waivers from the zoning code standards set in place in order to ensure that adequate parking is provided by a residential structure. These projects would require review by the CEQA and their environmental affect could be mitigated at the time at which a definite proposal is submitted. Further analysis at this point in time would be speculative.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The proposed zone change which would allow for the construction of additional units. The study area is centered along North Los Robles Avenue, a multi-modal corridor. The Mobility Element calls for new multifamily residential development to be placed along key transit corridors in Policy 1.1. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not change wastewater levels. Future projects proposed under this zone change 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. These residential projects would not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, these projects would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

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

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not cause a change in wastewater levels. Future projects proposed under this zone change would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. In December of 2007, the City of Pasadena adopted a finding that a projected water shortage existed within the City, and adopted Water Shortage Plan I pursuant to Pasadena Municipal Code 13.10.040. Unless the finding and Plan are withdrawn prior to construction of these units, future projects must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). To ensure compliance, the future applicant submits a water conservation plan limiting the project's water consumption to 90% of its originally anticipated consumption. This plan is submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans must comply with the approved water conservation plan. Through this reduction of its water supply needs, the incremental effect to a cumulative water supply impact is reduced to less than cumulatively considerable.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not cause a change in stormwater drainage. Future projects proposed under this zone change would cause an increase in storm water drainage. These future projects would not require the construction of new storm water

drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The study area is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. Future projects would likely only involve minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and would not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels. Future projects must be reviewed by the CEQA and comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance and Public Works requirements.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The adequacy of the 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 zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not cause a change in water usage. Future projects proposed under this zone change would require additional water resources, and analysis relating to how individual projects will impact water supply will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review. During periods of drought, future projects will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which reduces monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. Also see response to 11 b.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not cause a change wastewater treatment. Future projects proposed under this zone change would increase the demand for 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 proposed zone change would not directly create any structure and therefore would not cause a change in landfill usage. Future projects proposed under this zone change would increase the demand for landfill use. 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. Future projects would be located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. These projects will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, these projects would cause no impacts to landfill capacity.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. Future projects that make use of the added density provided by this ordinance would be 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, these projects would be required to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, these future projects would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

The analysis in the following document was referred to in this environmental initial study:

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2004 Land Use and Mobility Elements, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2003031099)

This document is available for review at the 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 8:00-12:00 p.m. every Friday and on the City's website at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/gpeir.asp.

The following effects within this checklist were adequately addressed by the aforementioned EIR:

Air Quality:	No impact to the air quality plan or the creation of objectionable odors was found. A significant, unavoidable impact in regard to PM10 emissions was found. Mitigation measures were approved – see pages 128-129.
Cultural Resources:	Impacts identified were less than significant; therefore no mitigation was required.
Noise:	The degree to which such mitigation measures will achieve noise/land use compatibility could not be measured. Thus, impacts were deemed significant and unavoidable on an individual project basis.
Population and Housing	Impacts identified were less than significant. Mitigation measures in the form of policies and objectives within the Land Use Element further reduced the impacts of the growth proposed.
Public Services	Impacts to water, wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste facilities were less than significant. Mitigation measures were developed to even further reduce impacts on solid waste see page 202-3. Impacts to police and fire services were less than significant.
Transportation and Traffic	The impacts identified were significant and unavoidable. See page 87-88 for a list of mitigation measures

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The proposed zone change will not have any direct impacts on the physical environment. Future projects may make use of the added density allowed for by this zone change. As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the potential, future projects are unlikely to have substantial impacts to aesthetic or air quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the future projects are unlikely to have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the future projects would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the future projects would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the future projects would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

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

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ( )*

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The proposed zone change will not have any direct impacts on the physical environment. Future projects may make use of the added density allowed for by this zone change. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

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

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? *(Check responses to 5 Air Quality, 9 Geology and Soils, 10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 11 Hydrology and Water Quality, 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 proposed zone change will not have any direct impacts on the physical environment. Future projects may make use of the added density allowed for by this zone change. As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, future proposed projects would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Although residents of these future projects 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 these projects would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. Analysis relating to how this general rule will directly impact individual projects will be analyzed at the time of the project-level CEQA review.

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

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

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

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