

groundborne vibrations will be reduced a less than significant level (Class II). After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Reference. EIR Section 4.3.2, Impact HR-4, Pages 4.3-19 through 4.3-21; Section 8.2, General Response 3(C). (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis), Page 8-21; Final EIR Appendix A, Revised Historical Resources Report.

- **Transportation/Parking**

Threshold T-2: Would the Project incrementally increase operational traffic at street segments based upon the Criteria listed in EIR Table 4.4-7?

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would reduce Impact T-2 to a less than significant level.

T-2 Street Segment Mitigation. The Proposed Project shall contribute funds to the City of Pasadena's Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program, and complete a Transportation Demand Management Plan in accordance with the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance requirements (Municipal Code § 17.46.290 and §10.64). The approved TDM Plan may include the following items:

1. Private vanpool operation;
2. Transit and vanpool fare subsidies;
3. Pay parking for employees;
4. Provision of subscription bus services;
5. Alternative work hours;
6. Capital improvements for transit services;
7. Reduction of parking fees for carpools and vanpools;
8. Bikeway linkages to established bicycle routes;
9. Provision of an on-site employee transportation coordinator.

Rationale for Finding. The daily traffic volumes resulting from the addition of net trips generated by the Proposed Project with Scenario 2 to the existing daily traffic counts are shown in Table 4.4-13. As shown in Table 4.4-13, due to the proposed project with Scenario 2, the Euclid Avenue roadway segment between Walnut Street and Union Street has an ADT increase of 4.5%.

As discussed on Draft EIR page 4.4-37 the Transportation Demand Management Plan will be implemented in compliance with Pasadena Municipal Code Sections 17.46.290 and 10.64. The Proposed Project must comply with all City Regulations, including 17.46.320 which requires bicycle parking facilities. The Proposed Project must also comply with 17.46.290(B)(1) and (B)(2) which require “[a] minimum of 10 percent of employee parking spaces shall be reserved for and designated as preferential parking for carpool and vanpool vehicles...” Furthermore, consistent with the City’s municipal code, a finalized TDM will be prepared which will incorporate additional measures as conditions of approval, as described in the May 17, 2010 DOT “Traffic Impact Study” letter (Draft EIR Appendix D). Implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure T-2 will ensure compliance with the City’s Trip Reduction Ordinance which requires a Transportation Demand Management Plan for the Project, and will require contribution to the Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program, further ensuring coordination of traffic mitigation efforts. Therefore, impacts related to the project increase in Average Daily Trips (“ADT”) will be reduced a less than significant level (Class II).

While Alternative 7 Impact T-2 would be slightly reduced in comparison to the Proposed Project (see DEIR Table 4.4-13), this reduction would not reduce Impact T-2 to less than significant without mitigation (i.e. Class III). The significance criteria for Impact T-2 are provided in Table 4.4-7 [ADT growth of 2.5% - 4.9%]). As shown, in Table 4.4-13, the Proposed Project scenario 2, would result in a 4.5% increase in ADT growth, which is above the 2.5% significance threshold. Like the Proposed Project, impacts to street segments would be potentially significant (Impact T-2), and mitigation measure T-2 would be required for Alternative 7. Similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of mitigation would reduce Impact T-2 to street segments to a level that is significant-but-mitigable Class II. After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Reference. EIR Section 4.4.2, Impact T-2, Pages 4.4-35 through 4.4-37; FEIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C). (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis), Page 8-22; FEIR Section 8.2, Response to Comment D16.2.

Threshold T-6: Would the Project result substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses (impediments to free circulation in the subterranean garage)?

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would reduce Impact T-6 to a less than significant level.

- T-6(a) Ramp Alignment.** For Scenario 1, Senior Residential, and Scenario 2, Youth Recreation, the drive ramp shall be aligned with the parking aisle or otherwise designed to ensure safe passage and that queuing shall not impede circulation, subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation.
- T-6(b) Parking Reconfiguration.** For Scenario 2, Youth Recreation, the parking spaces shall be reconfigured to ensure unimpeded passage subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation. Additional off-site parking may be provided in accordance with standard City policies regarding shared parking, subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation.

Rationale for Finding. Under Proposed Scenario 2, a set of tandem parking spaces located in the north-west portion of the parking garage in front of the emergency generator could potentially constrain circulation. These spaces reduce the drive aisle dimension to less than the required width for two-way traffic. Also, since the generator doors open outwards, the remaining lane would be completely blocked when doors are opened. These are potential safety concerns. Mitigation Measure T-6(b) is required. This is a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.

Under Proposed Scenario 2, the site plans indicate that the driveway ramp would not be aligned with the parking aisle immediately adjacent to and serving the ramp, resulting in a 'jog' that creates congestion. Further, vehicles entering the subterranean garage by traveling down the ramp would be facing parking spaces and a column that would potentially result in impeded circulation. Mitigation Measure T-6(a) would be required to move or realign the ramp to match the parking aisle, so that all the different movements occurring at the bottom of the ramp are simplified and the congestion relieved. Impacts under Alternative 7 would be the same as the Proposed Project Scenario 2. This would be a significant but mitigable impact (Class II). After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Reference. EIR Section 4.4.2, Impact T-6, Pages 4.4-50 through 4.4-51; FEIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-22 (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis).

- **Water Supply**

Thresholds W-1 *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);*

Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;

Fail to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or if new or expanding entitlements are needed.

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would reduce Impact T-6 to a less than significant level.

W-1 **Water Efficiency.** In accordance with LEED NC prerequisites, the applicant shall employ strategies that in aggregate use 20% less water than the water use baseline calculated for the building (not including irrigation) after meeting the Energy Policy Act of 1992 fixture performance requirements. Calculations are based on estimated occupant usage and shall include only the following fixtures (as applicable to the building): water closets, urinals, lavatory faucets, showers and kitchen sinks.

Rationale for Finding. The Proposed Project would result in a net increase in demand of 6.2 AFY under Scenario 2 Youth Recreation. These estimates represent standard water consumption rates absent water conservation techniques. There are, however, a number of applicable water conservation measures described in Section 4.5.1 of the EIR that would be applicable to the Proposed Project and Alternative 7. Both MWD and

the City include conservation as a portion of the future strategy to ensure that water supplies are maximized, while consumer demand is minimized. Future supplies are adequate to meet demands through a 20-year planning horizon with implementation of conservation and groundwater recharge programs both locally and regionally. Alternative 7 would have the same impacts as Proposed Project Scenario 2 and would therefore have a Class II, significant but mitigable impact. Implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure W-1 will require the project to employ strategies to use 20% less water than normal baseline useage, and would ensure the Project is consistent with the City's goal of increasing water conservation by 20% by 2020. Therefore, impacts to water service will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Reference. EIR Section 4.5, Impact W-1, pp. 4.5-10 through 4.5-11.

- **Biological Resources**

Threshold 6.d. Would the Project Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would ensure Impact 6.d is less than significant.

MM BIO 1: Construction of the project shall comply with the provisions of the Federal Migratory Bird Act and disturbance or removal of existing vegetation shall take place outside of the breeding bird season of March 1 to August 31 to avoid take of migratory birds (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If the project cannot avoid the breeding season, nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to demolition or removal of trees. Active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for Raptors). No work shall occur within the buffer zone until all young have fledged the nest as confirmed by the site biologist, which will not likely occur until the end of the breeding season. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

Rationale for Finding. The Proposed Project is located in a developed urban area and does not involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will the Proposed Project result in a barrier to migration or movement. However, the Proposed Project site contains a number of mature trees that are part of the site's landscaping. The Proposed Project will require the removal of 44 non-protected trees. While the site is located in a developed urban area, given the number and size of trees proposed for removal, a mitigation measure (MM BIO 1) is included that requires the applicant to comply with the Federal Migratory Bird Act. Implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure MM BIO-1 will restrict vegetation removal and disturbance during breeding bird season to avoid disturbance; if vegetation removal cannot avoid breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct nest surveys and active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for raptors). Compliance with applicable State and Federal law pertaining to protection of birds shall be documented. This analysis is the same for Alternative 7. With adherence to the mitigation measure, Alternative 7 will not interfere with the movement of any migratory wildlife species or with migratory wildlife corridors. Therefore, impacts to breeding birds will be less than significant.

Reference. Draft EIR Section 5.4; Draft EIR Appendix A, Pages 10 - 11; FEIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-12 (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis).

- **Archeological Resources**

Threshold 7.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would ensure Impact 7.b is less than significant.

MM CR 1: If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archeologists examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site archaeologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage archaeological resources.

Rationale for Finding. There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the Proposed Project site. In addition, the site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. The site was previously used for lodging, residential, office and commercial

purposes and was entirely developed with associated structures and facilities. However, the Proposed Project involves grading into previously undisturbed soils and the site itself has not been surveyed for archeological resources. Thus, construction of the Proposed Project could encounter previously undiscovered archeological resources. In the unlikely event that archeological resources are encountered during grading or construction of the Proposed Project, implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure MM CR-1 will require all project grading and construction efforts to halt until an archeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. This analysis is the same for Alternative 7. Therefore, impacts to archeological resources will be less than significant.

Reference. Draft EIR Section 5.4; Draft EIR Appendix A, Page 12; FEIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-12 (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis).

- **Paleontological Resources**

Threshold 7.c. ***Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would ensure Impact 7.c is less than significant.

MM CR 2: If paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until a paleontologist meeting the satisfaction of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County identifies the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site paleontologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage paleontological resources.

Rationale for Finding. The Proposed Project site lies on the valley floor in an urbanized portion of the City of Pasadena. This portion of the City does not contain any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to contain paleontological resources. However, the Proposed Project does propose excavation of undisturbed soils for a subterranean level. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are encountered, implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure MM CR-2 will halt all construction activities in the vicinity of the find until a qualified paleontologist identifies the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction activities will not resume until the site paleontologist states in

writing that proposed construction activities will not significantly damage paleontological resources. This analysis is the same for Alternative 7. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant.

Reference. Draft EIR Section 5.4; Draft EIR Appendix A, Page 12; FEIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-12 (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis).

- **Utilities**

Threshold 19.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?

Finding. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which avoid and substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. Specifically, the follow mitigation measures would ensure Impact 19.e is less than significant

MM UTILITIES – 1: The applicant shall either correct the sewer deficiency on Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue, a length of 456 feet, and in Los Robles Avenue between Marengo Avenue and 315 feet north of Marengo Avenue or pay their share of a fee that the City will use to correct the deficiency.

Rationale for Finding. The Proposed Project would generate approximately 4,134 gallons of wastewater per day under Scenario 2 youth recreation. This analysis would be the same or slightly reduced for Alternative 7 given the reduced square footage. Wastewater generation rates for the Proposed Project are based on information provided by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District which represents a conservative assumption and does not take into account local regulations and programs (i.e., green building code requirements, LEED certification, LACSD rebates based on reductions in wastewater generation, etc.).

The City's sewer system has adequate capacity to accommodate current demands, and the majority of the system has adequate surplus capacity to accommodate anticipated buildout (City of Pasadena General Plan EIR, 2004). Pasadena is expected to generate approximately 24.2 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater in 2015, an increase of 4.28 million gpd (18 percent) over 2000 conditions. The City's wastewater is treated at the Whittier Narrows, Los Coyotes and the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plants. These plants provide primary, secondary and tertiary treatment. No existing

deficiencies have been identified in the County Sanitation Districts' collection or treatment facilities serving Pasadena. County Sanitation Districts indicated the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant has a design capacity of 15 mgd and that the plant currently processes an average flow of 4.7 mgd. The District also indicated the Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 mgd and processes an average flow of 24.8 mgd. The design capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by SCAG. All expansions of the Districts' facilities must be sized and serviced in a manner that is consistent with SCAG regional growth forecasts.

However, two sewer capacity deficiencies exist downstream from the proposed development; in Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue, a length of 456 feet; and in Los Robles Avenue between Marengo Avenue and 315 feet north of Marengo Avenue. The Public Works Department has stated that the applicant must either correct the deficiency on Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue or pay their share of a fee that the City will use to correct the deficiency. Implementation of the measures outlined in mitigation measure MM UTILITIES-1 will ensure that these sewer capacity deficiencies are corrected. As discussed in Response to Comment D4.9, fees charged by the Districts are distinct from, and would be required in addition to any funds the applicant would pay to the City to fund the applicant's fair share of cost to correct the sewer deficiency discussed in Response D4.8. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Reference. Draft Section 5.4; Draft EIR Appendix A, Page 33; Final EIR Section 8.1; Final EIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-12 (Alternative 7 Impact Analysis); Final EIR, Section 8.2, Response D4.3, Responses D4.7, D4.8 and D4.9.

1.5.3 Findings on Significant Environmental Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less than Significant Level (Class I)

Based on the issue area assessment in the Final EIR, the City Council hereby finds that the Project (Alternative 7) will not have significant unavoidable impacts.

The Proposed Project identified a significant unavoidable impact to historic resources associated with relocating the Maryland Hotel Wall, i.e., demolition and reconstruction of Wall in a different location (Impact HR-2). However, the Project (Alternative 7) will not relocate the Wall. As discussed in Section 1.5.1, above, Impact HR-2 will be less than significant and the mitigation measures identified for this impact under the Proposed Project (HR-2(a), HR-2(b), and HR-3) will not be required.

Reference. Final EIR Section 8.2, General Response 3(C), Page 8-21; Final EIR Section 8.3 ("Revised Section 4.3"), Page 8-298.

I.5 Findings on Project Alternatives

I.5.1 Alternatives Screened Out from Detailed Consideration in the EIR

The City Council finds that all of the alternatives eliminated from further consideration in the Draft EIR are infeasible, would not meet the project objectives and /or would not reduce or avoid any of the significant effects of the Proposed Project or Alternative 7, for the reasons detailed in Section 6.7 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, and summarized here. CEQA only requires a project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15041, 15126.4(a)(3), and 15126.6(b).) The City has incorporated mitigation measures and Alternative 7 into the Proposed Project that reduces and avoids all impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, Findings for the other Alternatives are not required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3). Nevertheless, additional grounds for infeasibility of the Alternatives have been provided here.

Specifically, the off-site alternatives would not meet the Main Project Objectives A, B, or C. An off-site alternative would not “provide new spaces and update and reconfigure existing space...of All Saints Church”, nor would an offsite alternative “[o]rganize new buildings and spaces...that maximize the functionality of the site...and integrate the new and existing parts of the campus visually and functionally, all in a manner that expresses the religious and community serving mission of All Saints Church”, nor would such an alternative “Create an inspiring and sensitive design that expresses through architecture respect for the historical foundations of All Saints Church seen its historically significant existing campus while embodying its relevance to the future in contemporary architectural styles that relate to the old in massing, material and adjacencies.” An off-site alternative would further not meet supporting objectives 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. In addition, it is not feasible for the applicant to exchange the proposed site for another site without financial losses. The City also seeks to promote development in existing dense locations, such as the project site, to avoid sprawl. This policy determination is also grounds for finding such an alternative infeasible. (See *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957.)

I.5.2 Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR

The FEIR analyzed seven alternatives to the Proposed Project (Alternatives 1 through 7), including a “No Project” alternative (Alternative 1). These Alternatives are described in Revised/Recirculated Section 6.0 and in Final EIR Section 8.2, General Response 3, and are summarized below. CEQA only requires a project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15041, 15126.4(a)(3), and 15126.6(b).) The City has incorporated mitigation measures and Alternative 7 into the Proposed Project that reduces and avoids all impacts to a less than significant level.

The City has adopted Alternative 7, which, like Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because it reduced Impact HR-2 to a less than significant level. Therefore, Findings for the other Alternatives are not required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3). Nevertheless, additional grounds for infeasibility of the Alternatives have been provided here.

- **Alternative 1 – No Project.**

As described in detail in Section 6.1 of the Revised/Recirculated Alternatives Section of the EIR, Alternative 1 assumes that the Proposed Project would not be developed and that existing improvements on the project site would remain. Scott Hall, the existing commercial building, the trailer and two surface parking lots would remain rather than being demolished to accommodate four new buildings. In addition, the Maryland Hotel Wall would remain as it is now, bordering the Children's play yard for the day care center.

Finding/Rationale: The City Council finds that this alternative is infeasible for specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other reasons and rejects this alternative. Specifically, Alternative 1 would fail to meet any of the main project objectives.

First, Alternative 1 would not alter the existing Church facilities and so would not provide new spaces or update and reconfigure existing spaces to serve the spiritual needs of All Saints Church and allow for the expansion of religious and community serving programs and activities of All Saints Church.

Second, Alternative 1 would not replace the existing facilities with new buildings and spaces with massing, voids, shapes and adjacencies that maximize the functionality of the site and integrate the new and existing parts of the campus visually and functionally, all in a manner that expresses the religious and community serving mission of All Saints Church.

Third, Alternative 1 would not achieve the new architectural expression that would create an inspiring and sensitive design that respects the historical foundations of All Saints Church seen in its historically significant existing campus while embodying its relevance to the future in contemporary architectural styles that relate to the old in massing, materials and adjacencies.

Further, Alternative 1 would not meet the supporting objectives. Alternative 1 would not provide separate buildings specifically designed for particular uses, nor locate those buildings in the most appropriate places for their size and nature of use. Alternative 1 would not allow for the integration of sacred shapes and spaces into the architecture and grounds; would not create a large "outdoor room" for religious and community uses by orienting buildings to create a protected courtyard using the historic church buildings as a "fourth wall" to serve as a welcoming, yet private, space suitable for uses such as worship, weddings, funerals, counseling, grieving and contemplative prayer. Alternative

1 would not develop the courtyard as single unified space serving as a central community gathering place with access from all new buildings and unbroken visual connection between new buildings. Alternative 1 would not maximize the use and attractiveness of the site by developing below grade parking; would not plan for and build new community uses directly accessible from Euclid Avenue; would not enhance the pedestrian experience within the Civic Center by providing new, well landscaped streetscapes and points of entry to the church campus; would not contribute quality architecture to the rich and diverse pattern of architectural styles in Pasadena in compliance with Central District Specific Plan and applicable historic resources regulations; would not construct buildings with an environmentally sustainable design which will minimize depletion of natural resources and qualify for a LEED rating.

Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not provide the benefits of the Project and would be worse from Aesthetics and Land Use and Planning perspectives, and is therefore considered environmentally infeasible (See Recirculated Draft EIR Table 6-2). As discussed in Response D15.6, the Project would offer improvements in comparison to the existing physical conditions on site in regard to consistency with the massing of the surrounding structures. The Proposed Project site currently includes a surface parking structure, and several one story structures which do not match the size, massing, and scale of the surrounding structures as well as Alternative 7 (See DEIR Section 2.3, Figure 4.1-2 Photos A, B, and C, and DEIR Appendix D, Photo 2).

- **Alternatives 2 through 6**

Alternative 2 – Retain Maryland Hotel Wall Alternative

Alternative 2 has the same characteristics as the Proposed Project, but retains the Maryland Hotel Wall in place. Building A would be located closer to the Maryland Hotel Wall compared with the Proposed Project, thereby decreasing the space between Building A and the Maryland Hotel wall from 9 feet (for the Proposed Project) to 6 feet (for Alternative 2).

Alternative 3 – Retain the Maryland Hotel Wall and Relocate Building A Alternative

Alternative 3 has the same characteristics as the Proposed Project (including Scenarios 1 and 2), but would relocate Building A approximately 3 feet to the east in order to retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place. The space between Building A and the Maryland Hotel Wall would be the same as for the Proposed Project (9 feet).

Alternative 4 – Retain the Maryland Hotel Wall and Rotate Building A (Combine Buildings A & C) Alternative

Alternative 4 has the same characteristics as the Proposed Project (including Scenarios 1 and 2), but would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place and rotate Building A 90 degrees so that its primary and longest walls face north-south and its shorter walls face east-west. The height and mass of Building A would also be increased as compared to the Proposed Project; Building A would be a minimum of three stories instead of two. This configuration would create a rectangular courtyard on the site. EIR Figure 6-1 shows this conceptual configuration.

Alternative 5 – Relocate/Reconfigure Building A and Retain the Maryland Hotel Wall Alternative

Alternative 5 has the same characteristics as the Proposed Project, but would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place and relocate Building A approximately 80 feet to the north and approximately 50 feet to the east, as compared to the Proposed Project. The distance between Building A and the Rectory would be approximately 140 feet, compared with approximately 60 feet for the Proposed Project. Building A would be reconfigured to be L-shaped with a single-story southern portion and a two-story northern portion (maximum 35 feet in height). The northern portion of the building would be set back from N. Euclid Avenue, creating a courtyard between Building A and Building E. The area behind the Maryland Hotel Wall would be left open and would include a courtyard and a pre-function area for Building A. Building E would be eight stories in height and would include 45 senior residential units in Scenario 1 or a two-story, 13,000 sq. ft. youth recreation building in Scenario 2. Building B would have a maximum height of approximately 55 feet, with 6,700 square feet of floor area. Revised/Recirculated EIR Figure 6-2 shows this conceptual configuration. This alternative would reconfigure the massing of Building A, rearrange the open areas (courtyards) that are interspersed between building elements along the N. Euclid Avenue (western) side of the project site. Revised/Recirculated EIR Figure 6-2 provides dimensional illustrations of Alternative 5. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the overall building area for church-support uses would be the same as the Proposed Project.

Alternative 6 – Relocate Building A and Retain the Maryland Hotel Wall Alternative

Alternative 6 has the same characteristics as the Proposed Project, but would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place and relocate Building A approximately 80 feet farther to the north. This relocation would create a courtyard on the site between Building B and the Maryland Hotel Wall. Revised/Recirculated Figure 6-4 shows this conceptual configuration. It would increase the height but reduce the length of Building A, and move it closer to Building E. It would also locate a pre-function area along the east side of the building. Building A would be three stories in height (55 feet maximum). The area behind the Maryland Hotel Wall would be left open and would include a large courtyard.

Building E would be eight stories in height and would include 45 senior residential units in Scenario 1, or a two-story, 13,000 sq. ft. youth recreation building in Scenario 2. Building B would have a maximum height of approximately 55 feet, with 6,700 square feet of floor area. Revised/Recirculated Figure 6.5 provides dimensional illustrations of Alternative 6.

Finding/Rationale: As discussed in Revised/Recirculated EIR Section 6.8, and Section 8.2, General Response 3 (Alternative 7), Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, and the Project (Alternative 7) are all environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because all would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place, preserving its integrity of workmanship, materials, thus reducing the Proposed Project's only significant, unavoidable impact associated (Impact HR-2) to less than significant, without creating any other additional significant impacts beyond those identified for the Proposed Project.

Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, and the Project (Alternative 7) eliminate the Proposed Project's significant unavoidable impact related to demolition and reconstruction of the Maryland Hotel wall (Impact HR-2). Compared to the Proposed Project: Alternative 2 would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place and reduce the space setback between the wall and the proposed Building A from nine feet to six feet; Alternative 3 would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place, move Building A back three additional feet towards the center of the site, and have a nine-foot space setback from the Maryland Hotel Wall; Alternative 4 would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place, rotate Building A 90 degrees and combine Buildings A and C into one such that a large internal courtyard is created on the east side of the Maryland Hotel Wall; Alternative 5 would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place, reconfigure and relocate Building A approximately 80 feet; Alternative 6 would retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place and relocate Building A approximately 80 feet north. Both Alternatives 5 and 6 would create a large internal courtyard (approximately 140 feet in width) behind the Maryland Hotel Wall.

Furthermore, Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would not fully meet the project objectives and are therefore considered infeasible. As discussed under Alternative 4 (Recirculated Draft EIR Section 6.4.2), Alternative 4 would not fully meet the project objectives. Under this alternative, the functions of Building A (social hall, kitchen, café, offices and conference rooms) and Building C (child daycare center), would be consolidated in one building; thus, separate buildings designed for particular uses would not be provided. The building layout would not provide the semi-enclosed outdoor space needed for Building E nor outdoor play area at the ground level for the proposed day care center. The building placement north of the Maryland Hotel Wall would create a large gap between the existing and new buildings that would increase pedestrian travel times between the new and the existing buildings and would detract from the intended visual and functional integration of the campus. The pre-function area and courtyard would be partially

visible from Euclid Avenue, reducing its privacy and sense of enclosure desired by the applicant for religious ceremonies. The building layout would not provide for a single unifying space (open space axis) which is accessible from all of the new buildings. The building placement and configuration, including the large courtyard behind the Maryland Hotel Wall, would create a void in the street pattern and works against repeating the sequence of building proportions and open spaces of the existing historic cloister.

As discussed under Alternative 5 (Recirculated Draft EIR Section 6.5.2), Alternative 5 would not fully meet the project objectives. The building layout does not provide the required semi-enclosed outdoor space for Building E (Urban Housing standard for Scenario 1 – 45 senior residential units). Relocating the building 80 feet to the north creates a gap between the existing and new buildings that increases pedestrian travel times between the new and the historic buildings. The building placement and configuration does not integrate the campus nor repeat the sequence of building proportions and open spaces of the existing historic cloister. The pre-function area and courtyard would be visible from N. Euclid Avenue, and would not have sufficient privacy and sense of enclosure for religious ceremonies. The building layout would not create a single unifying space (open space axis) which is accessible from all of the new buildings. The placement of Building A closer to Building C would create a narrow, canyon-like pathway where shadows would be cast on the proposed children's play area. Furthermore the visual and functional connection between the proposed new buildings and existing buildings would be diminished. (See Final EIR, Response to Comment R5.1, R5.2, and R5.9 for further details.)

As discussed under Alternative 6 (Recirculated Draft EIR Section 6.6.2), Alternative 6 would not fully meet the project objectives. Relocating the building an additional 80 feet to the north creates a 140-foot separation with an open courtyard between the existing and new buildings. The building placement creates a significant distance and disconnection between the new and historic buildings which diminishes the use of the campus as an integrated space. The functionality of the campus is also reduced by having the social hall functions on separate floors. The large courtyard creates a void in the street pattern and works against repeating the sequence of building proportions and open spaces of the existing historic cloister. (See Final EIR, Response to Comment R5.14 for further details.)

Because the Project (Alternative 7) will retain the Maryland Hotel Wall in place, preserving its integrity of workmanship, materials, and location, it reduces the Proposed Project's only significant, unavoidable impact to less than significant, without creating any other additional significant impacts beyond those identified for the Proposed Project. Further, as discussed in Section 1.5.2, above, mitigation identified in the EIR and incorporated into the Project (Alternative 7) will reduce all other significant impacts to less than significant.

1.6 Findings on Mitigation Measures and Alternatives Proposed in Comments

Several comments on the Draft EIR suggested additional changes to the Proposed Project. In many instances the commenters provided no evidence that the suggestion would reduce or avoid a significant impact, and would therefore not be considered a mitigation measure or an Alternative under CEQA.

CEQA only requires a project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15041, 15126.4(a)(3), and 15126.6(b).) The City has incorporated mitigation measures and Alternative 7 into the Proposed Project that reduces and avoids all impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, Findings for the other Mitigation Measures are not required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3). Nevertheless, additional grounds for infeasibility of the suggestions in comment letters have been provided.

The City Council adopts and incorporates by reference the responses to comments in the Final EIR as its grounds for rejecting these suggested changes to the Project as infeasible, including but not limited to Responses D1.2, D8.2, D10.12, D10.20, D10.22, D10.23, D10.24, D12.3, D12.4, D15.3, D16.2, D16.6, D17.6, D17.7, D17.10, D17.12, D18.1, D18.2, D20.7, R4.4, R4.5, R4.6, R9.18. For comments which suggested off-site alternative the Findings in Section 1.5.1 of this document are also incorporated by reference here. Particularly, an offsite alternative of using the YWCA building as an alternative to the gym component of the Project is not feasible, as the ownership of the YWCA property is currently in litigation and thus not available for rent. Further, the YWCA building is in a severely dilapidated state, will require significant rehabilitation and restoration, and intensive review under CEQA to ensure that any such work's impact on the historical significance of the YWCA is mitigated to the extent feasible. These factors would also preclude construction of the Project within a reasonable period of time. These legal, practical and financial factors make use of the YWCA for any offsite component of the Project infeasible.

Comments submitted after the close of the comment period, at Design Commission and Planning Commission's meetings held on February 27, 2012 and March 14, 2012 suggested the EIR incorporate an additional Alternative, also referenced as "Alternative 8" or the "Purple Diagram." This alternative does not change the Forum or East Building, but changes the West and North Buildings to be a series of four smaller buildings oriented east to west rather than north-south. The central north-south oriented enclosed pre-function garden area is removed and replaced with three small courtyards open to the street. Staff considered this additional plan from both a CEQA perspective and from a planning perspective. Under CEQA, an additional alternative should only be considered if it potentially provides additional or improved mitigation for significant environmental impact. CEQA requires an analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives which reduce or avoid significant impacts. No evidence has been provided

that this suggested alternative would be environmentally superior to Alternative 7 or to any of the other alternatives analyzed in the EIR.

Since Alternative 7 avoids all potentially significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project, Alternative 8 does not improve upon the potentially significant effects and is therefore not a proper CEQA alternative. Further, CEQA does not require variations on existing alternatives. CEQA presumes that once a reasonable range of alternatives that reduces or mitigates potentially significant effects has been analyzed, decision makers and the public can understand the potential impacts of permutations of alternatives. To require further analysis of each permutation would not provide additional information valuable to the role of CEQA as a disclosure document.

Furthermore, Proposed Alternative 8 is infeasible based upon policy considerations and has the potential to result in additional environmental impacts and is therefore considered environmentally infeasible. Proposed Alternative 8 does not provide an improved site plan or greater consideration of historic preservation. It appears to preclude access to the courtyard behind the Maryland Hotel Wall by siting buildings on either end of the wall. Pedestrians on Euclid Avenue would not perceive that a courtyard is located behind the wall, which would change the rhythm of solids to voids along the streetscape. This alternative would appear less open and therefore lessen the pedestrian experience in comparison to Alternative 7.

In addition, the southernmost of the proposed buildings in Alternative 8 would be much closer to the existing historic Rectory Building than in Alternative 7. Rather than separated by a 120 feet wide courtyard as proposed by Alternative 7, in Alternative 8 a new building appears to be approximately 15 feet from the Rectory Building. This adjacency of a new building to the existing historic church complex may have a negative impact on the historic setting of the church buildings.

Comments submitted by Ms. Nina Chomsky at the March 14, 2012 Planning Commission hearing also suggested an "Alternative 9." No explanation was given as to why this alternative was not proposed much earlier in the process, why it differs in any material way than the alternatives already considered, or why it reduces any environmental effects. This Alternative would not further reduce or avoid a significant impact and is a variation of Alternatives 4, 5, and 6. Further consideration of this alternative would only serve to delay final consideration of the Project. For the reasons discussed above for Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 this alternative is considered infeasible.

I.7 Finding on Disagreement Amongst Experts and Recirculation

To the extent the comment letters and correspondence submitted by the public are considered expert opinion, the City Council finds that the assumptions, data, methodology, and analysis included in the FEIR (not including the comment letters) and prepared by the City's Consultants, is supported by substantial evidence and was the

appropriate assumption, data, methodology, and analysis to use to support the impact conclusions reached in the FEIR.

The City further finds that the information submitted and incorporated into the Final EIR and submitted up to the time of certification of the FEIR does not trigger recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

I.8 Custodian of Records

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Project findings are based are located at the Pasadena City Clerk's Office, 100 North Garfield Avenue, Room S228, Pasadena CA 91109. The custodian for these documents is the City Clerk. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(e).

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587
Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party / Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame / Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials
Aesthetics						
Impact AES-3	Mitigation Measure AES-3(a) Glare Minimization. To minimize the amount of glare associated with the glass ceiling of Building B, the exterior glass shall have low reflectivity. Compliance with the intent of minimizing light spillover shall be determined during the design review process. The project contractor shall submit a report to the Planning Director verifying installation of the materials specified.	AES-3(a): Project Applicant shall propose low reflectivity exterior glass for Building B.¹ Design Commission shall review selection of glass, revise as necessary and incorporate selection of low reflectivity exterior glass during Design Review for Building B. Project Contractor shall be responsible for preparation and submittal of the Plan.	AES-3(a): Selection of low reflectivity exterior glass shall occur prior to approval of Final Design Review for Building B. The verification report for installation of low reflectivity exterior glass shall be submitted and reviewed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Building B.	AES-3(a): Design Commission for approval of low reflectivity glass for Building B. Planning Director/Planning Department for receipt and review of Report verifying installation of low reflectivity glass in Building B.		
Impact AES-3	Mitigation Measure AES-3 (b) Light Spillover Minimization To minimize the amount of light spillover that emanates from the site onto surrounding properties and into the night sky, the following measures shall be implemented in the project design. Compliance with the intent of minimizing light spillover shall be	AES-3(b): Project Applicant shall prepare a Lighting Plan which complies with this mitigation	AES-3(b): A Lighting Plan shall be completed prior to approval of Final Design Review. The	AES-3(b): Design Commission for approval of the Lighting Plan. Design and Historic Preservation City Staff for receipt and review of Report verifying		

¹ "Building B" refers to the Forum-Alternative Worship building. See FEIR, Section 8.2, General Response #3.

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
 Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587
 Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials

	<p>determined during the design review process. The project contractor shall submit a report to the Planning Director verifying installation of the materials specified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lighting plan shall be prepared that shows All Saints campus lighting is of a pedestrian scale, highlighting landscape and pedestrian scaled features, and that is downcast, minimizing light spillover to surrounding properties. Maximum horizontal and vertical illuminance shall be 0.05 foot-candle at 15 feet from the site boundary (LEED ND GIB Credit 17: Light Pollution Reduction). Full illumination of the Forum Building (Building B) shall only occur during events and architectural or landscape lighting throughout the All Saints Campus shall be reduced during non-operational hours of the night to save energy and minimize light spillover. Security lighting shall be triggered by sensors to the extent feasible and practicable. 	<p>measure as well as applicable Municipal Code requirements. <u>Design Commission</u> shall review the proposed Lighting Plan, revise as necessary, and incorporate selection during <u>Design Review</u>. <u>Project Contractor</u> shall be responsible for preparation and submittal of the Plan.</p>	<p>verification report for the installation of the Lighting Plan shall be submitted and reviewed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.²</p>	<p>installation of the Lighting Plan.</p>		
Historic Resources						
Impact HR-4³	<p>Mitigation Measure H-4 Construction Vibration Construction Vibration. The applicant shall retain a structural engineer to prepare a detailed construction vibration reduction plan describing the activities to be performed during the demolition and construction phases. The report shall document methodology necessary such that the PPV 0.25 (in/sec) threshold is not exceeded. The PPV 0.25 (in/sec) threshold may be superseded based on structural integrity of</p>	<p><u>Project Applicant</u> shall retain a structural engineer and an onsite conservator (these positions could be fulfilled by a single individual who</p>	<p>The Construction Vibration Reduction Plan shall be completed, and reviewed (and revised if necessary) by</p>	<p>The <u>Planning Director/Planning Department</u> shall review the proposed Vibration Reduction Plan and revise as necessary.</p>		

² To the extent the applicant constructs individual buildings in phases, the verification report(s) can be limited to those portions of the Lighting Plan applicable to the Building for which a Certificate of Occupancy is sought.

³ Mitigation Measures HR-2(a), HR-2(b), and HR-3 are not required under Alternative 7. See FEIR, Section 8.2, General Response #3; see also FEIR, Section 8.3 ("Revised Section 4.3").

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587

Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE	
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date

<p>the most sensitive/most affected historic resource as documented by the structural engineer. The vibration reduction report shall include but not be limited to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment sizes, functions, & duration of activities • Distances to the historic resources from construction activity • Structural integrity of the historic resources • Recommendations for vibration reduction strategies necessary to avoid damaging historic resources, including the Regas House, the Rectory, the Church, the Maryland Hotel Wall, and City Hall. <p>Prior to the start of demolition or construction, the applicant shall retain services of a structural engineer and an on-site conservator (these positions could be fulfilled by a single individual who meets both qualifications) to monitor the demolitions and vibration and submit periodic reports to the Planning Director during the demolition of Scott Hall and the Cupola structure and during the construction of the underground parking garage and Building A. The report shall address the procedures for vibration control. Vibration reduction strategies could be accomplished through the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting the size of equipment within 25 feet of the historical resources • Staging larger equipment further away • Phasing demolition and excavation separately so that earth-moving and ground-impacting operations do not occur within the same time period. <p>During construction activities, the contractor shall implement vibration reduction controls in the plan as</p>	<p>meets both qualifications) to prepare a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan. The Planning Director/Planning Department shall review the proposed Vibration Reduction Plan and revise as necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant's Structural Engineer and On-Site Conservator shall inspect the construction site (including the Regas House, the Rectory, the Church, the Maryland Hotel Wall, and City Hall) and Prepare the Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>the Planning Director/Planning Department prior to issuance of Building permits.</p> <p>The Structural Engineer and the On-Site Conservator shall inspect the construction site as needed (while construction activities are ongoing) and prepare a report for each inspection, addressing the procedures for vibration control (i.e. compliance with the Vibration Reduction Plan ("Plan")), reporting any vibration damage to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
 Case # PLN2007-00587 Tidelmark Case # PLN2007-00587
 Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials

	<p>detailed by the structural engineer. Compliance with the vibration reduction plan will be monitored during construction by the project contractor and a compliance report shall be submitted to the Planning Director.</p>	<p>The Planning Director/Planning Department shall review each Monitoring Report once submitted.</p> <p>The Planning Director/Planning Department shall review the Monitoring Reports prepared by the Structural Engineer and may revise the Vibration Reduction Plan as recommended in the Monitoring Reports.</p>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue _____
 Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 _____
 Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Planner Laura Dahl _____

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials

Transportation / Parking		Conservator and may revise the Vibration Reduction Plan as recommended in the Monitoring Reports.				
Impact T-2	<p><u>Mitigation Measure T-2 Street Segment Mitigation.</u> The proposed project shall contribute funds to the City of Pasadena's Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program, and complete a Transportation Demand Management Plan in accordance with the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance requirements (Municipal Code § 17.46.290 and §10.64). The approved TDM Plan may include the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Private vanpool operation; 2. Transit and vanpool fare subsidies; 3. Pay parking for employees; 4. Provision of subscription bus services; 5. Alternative work hours; 6. Capital improvements for transit services; 7. Reduction of parking fees for carpools and vanpools; 8. Bikeway linkages to established bicycle routes; 9. Provision of an on-site employee transportation coordinator 	<p>(T-2): The Project Applicant shall pay the Traffic Reduction and Transportation Improvement fee as provided in Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 4.19 ("Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program")</p> <p>(T-2): The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit a TDM Plan which complies with Pasadena Municipal Code Sections 17.46.290 and Chapter 10.64 and submit all other materials required by</p>	<p>(T-2): Payment of the Traffic Reduction and Transportation Improvement Fee shall be paid prior to the issuance of any building permit</p> <p>(T-2): The TDM Plan shall be prepared, submitted, revised if necessary, and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit and thereafter shall be reviewed and approved</p>	<p>(T-2) The Director of Transportation shall review (and may direct the Project Applicant to prepare revisions to the TDM Plan if necessary), approve the TDM Plan, and perform the annual review in compliance with Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 10.64.</p>		

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Case # Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		Staff Initials
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	
Impact T-6	Mitigation Measure T-6(a) Ramp Alignment. For Scenario 1, Senior Residential, and Scenario 2, Youth Recreation, the drive ramp shall be aligned with the parking aisle or otherwise designed to ensure safe passage and that queuing shall not impede circulation, subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation.	Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 10.64. (T-2): The Project Applicant shall pay the Traffic Reduction and Transportation Improvement fee as provided in Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 4.19 ("Citywide Traffic Monitoring Program") (T-6(a)): The Project Applicant shall submit plan(s) for the underground parking structure and ramp which fulfill the requirements of T-6(a) and shall construct the underground parking structure and ramp	annually consistent with the requirements of Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 10.64.	(T-6(a)): The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation shall review (and may direct the Project Applicant to prepare revisions to the Plan if necessary), and approve the plan(s) submitted by the Project Applicant for the underground parking structure and ramp prior to the completion of Plan Check.		

⁴ To the extent the applicant constructs individual buildings in phases, the fee can be limited to those portions of the project for which a building permit is sought.

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue _____ Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 _____ Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials

Impact T-6	<p><u>Mitigation Measure T-6 (b) Parking Reconfiguration.</u> For Scenario 2, Youth Recreation, the parking spaces shall be reconfigured to ensure unimpeded passage subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation. Additional off-site parking may be provided in accordance with standard City policies regarding shared parking, subject to review and approval by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation.</p>	<p>consistently with the City approved plans.</p> <p>(T-6(a)): <u>The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation</u> shall review the submitted plan(s) (and may direct the <u>Project Applicant</u> to prepare revisions to the Plan(s) if necessary), and approve the plan(s).</p> <p>(T-6(b)): <u>The Project Applicant</u> shall submit a parking submittal which fulfills the requirements of T-6(b) and shall implement that plan consistently with the City approved plans.</p> <p>(T-6(b)): <u>The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation</u> shall review the</p>	<p>(T-6(b)): The Parking submittal shall be submitted, revised if necessary, and approved prior to the completion of the Plan Check for the Project's Parking Facilities.</p>	<p>(T-6(b)): <u>The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation</u> shall review (and may direct the <u>Project Applicant</u> to prepare revisions to the parking submittal if necessary), and approve the Parking submittal submitted by the Project Applicant for the Parking Facilities.</p>		
------------	---	--	---	---	--	--

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587

Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/ Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials
Water Supply Impact W-1	<p><u>Mitigation Measure W-1 Water Efficiency.</u> In accordance with LEED NC prerequisites, the applicant shall employ strategies that in aggregate use 20% less water than the water use baseline calculated for the building (not including irrigation) after meeting the Energy Policy Act of 1992 fixture performance requirements. Calculations are based on estimated occupant usage and shall include only the following fixtures (as applicable to the building): water closets, urinals, lavatory faucets, showers and kitchen sinks.</p>	<p>submitted plan (and may direct the <u>Project Applicant</u> to prepare revisions to the Plan if necessary), and approve the plan.</p>	<p>Information showing compliance with W-1 shall be submitted prior to issuance of Building Permits and installation of all applicable fixtures and strategies shall be implemented prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy</p>	<p>The City of Pasadena Building and Safety Division shall review (and revise if necessary), and approve the submittal and installation of the fixtures.</p>		

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587
Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE	
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date

Biology					
Threshold 6. d.	<p><u>Mitigation Measure BIO-1.</u> Construction of the project shall comply with the provisions of the Federal Migratory Bird Act and disturbance or removal of existing vegetation shall take place outside of the breeding bird season of March 1 to August 31 to avoid take of migratory birds (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If the project cannot avoid the breeding season, nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to demolition or removal of trees. Active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for Raptors). No work shall occur within the buffer zone until all young have fledged the nest as confirmed by the site biologist, which will not likely occur until the end of the breeding season. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.</p>	<p>submital if necessary).</p> <p><u>The Project Applicant</u> shall comply with the requirements of BIO-1 during disturbance or removal of vegetation.</p> <p>If disturbance or removal of vegetation occurs during Bird Nesting Season from March 1 to August 31, <u>the Project Applicant</u> shall propose a qualified biologist (subject to City approval) to provide nest surveys prior to demolition or removal of trees. <u>The Biologist for the Project Applicant</u> shall identify and provide appropriate buffers for active</p>	<p>Throughout construction the Project shall comply with the requirements of BIO-1.</p> <p>Prior to disturbance or removal of existing vegetation during bird breeding season from March 1 to August 31 a Biologist will be hired.</p>		

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587
Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials
		nests as provided in BIO-1. <u>The City of Pasadena Planning Department</u> shall determine whether the biologist proposed by the applicant has the necessary qualifications and will have ultimate approval of the Biologist.	Prior to disturbance or removal of existing vegetation during bird breeding season from March 1 to August 31 the City shall review the qualifications of the proposed Biologist, and approve a qualified Biologist.	<u>The City of Pasadena</u> shall review the survey information.		
		If disturbance occurs during Bird Nesting Season the <u>Project Applicant</u> shall record the survey information gathered by the Biologist, and the protective measures taken.	The survey information shall be provided at the end of the bird nesting season in which the vegetation removal occurred.			
Cultural Resources						

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587

Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		Staff Initials
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	
Threshold 7.b.	<p>Mitigation Measure CR-1. If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archeologists examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site archeologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage archaeological resources.</p>	<p>(CR-1): If the <u>Project Applicant</u> encounters archaeological resources during project construction all work in the vicinity of the archaeological resource shall be halted. The <u>Project Applicant</u> shall then propose and hire an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archeologists (subject to review and approval by the Planning Department).</p> <p>(CR-1): The <u>City of Pasadena</u> shall determine whether the Archeologist proposed by the applicant has the necessary qualifications and will have ultimate approval of the</p>	<p>(CR-1): During grading of the construction site.</p> <p>(CR-1): Upon encountering archaeological resources during grading of the construction site.</p>	<p>(CR-1): The <u>City of Pasadena Planning Department</u> shall determine whether the Archeologist proposed by the applicant has the necessary qualifications and will have ultimate approval of the Archeologist.</p>		

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Case # PLN2007-00587 Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 Planner Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials
		Archaeologist. (CR-1): The Archaeologist shall examine the site, identify the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. The Archaeologist shall also determine when construction activities will no longer significantly damage archaeological resources and submits a statement in writing to the City. (CR-1): The City of Pasadena shall review the statement submitted by the Archaeologist stating that the construction activities will no longer significantly damage archaeological resources.	(CR-1): Prior to re-initiating grading activities in the vicinity of the archaeological resource encountered. (CR-1): Prior to re-initiating grading activities in the vicinity of the archaeological resource encountered.			

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Case # PLN2007-00587 Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE	
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/ Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date

Threshold 7.c.	<p><u>Mitigation Measure CR-2.</u> If paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until a paleontologist meeting the satisfaction of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County identifies the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction shall not resume until the site paleontologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage paleontological resources.</p>	<p>significantly damage archaeological resources.</p> <p>(CR-2): If the <u>Project Applicant</u> encounters paleontological resources during construction all work in the vicinity of the paleontological resource shall be halted. The <u>Project Applicant</u> shall then propose and hire a paleontologist meeting the satisfaction of the Natural History Museum of the Los Angeles County (subject to review and approval by the City).</p> <p>(CR-2): The <u>City of Pasadena</u></p>	<p>(CR-2): During grading of the construction site.</p> <p>(CR-2): The <u>City of Pasadena Planning Department</u> shall determine whether the Paleontologist proposed by the applicant has the necessary qualifications and will have ultimate approval of the Paleontologist.</p>	<p>(CR-2): Prior to re-initiating</p>	
----------------	---	---	---	---------------------------------------	--

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587

Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials

		<p><u>Planning Department</u> shall determine whether the <u>Paleontologist</u> proposed by the applicant has the necessary qualifications and will have ultimate approval of the <u>Paleontologist</u>.</p> <p>(CR-2): The <u>Paleontologist</u> shall identify the paleontological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action which shall be implemented by the <u>Project Applicant</u>. The <u>Paleontologist</u> shall also determine when construction activities will no longer significantly damage paleontological resources and submit a</p>	<p>grading activities in the vicinity of the paleontological resource encountered.</p> <p>(CR-2): Prior to re-initiating grading activities in the vicinity of the paleontological resource encountered.</p>	<p>(CR-2): The City of <u>Pasadena Planning Department</u> shall review the statement submitted by the <u>Paleontologist</u> stating that the construction activities will no longer significantly damage paleontologist resources and may allow construction allow construction activities to resume.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue
Case # _____ Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587
Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE	
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date

		statement in writing to the City. (CR-2): <u>The City of Pasadena</u> Planning Department shall review the statement submitted by the Paleontologist stating that the construction activities will no longer significantly damage paleontologist resources and may allow construction activities to resume.	(CR-2): Prior to re-initiating grading activities in the vicinity of the paleontological resource encountered.		
Utilities	Mitigation Measure Utilities-1. The applicant shall either correct the sewer deficiency on Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue, a length of 456 feet, and in Los Robles Avenue between Marengo Avenue and 315 feet north of Marengo Avenue or pay their	The Project Applicant shall correct the sewer deficiency referenced in Utilities-1 or pay	Prior to issuance of Building Permit.	Pasadena Public Works Department/ Planning Department to monitor whether applicant has elected to correct sewer deficiency	
Threshold 19. c.					

**132 North Euclid Avenue All Saints Church Master Development Plan
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program Matrix**

Project Address: 132 North Euclid Avenue Decision Maker/Effective Date: City Council / April 16, 2012
 Case # PLN2007-00587 Tidemark Case # PLN2007-00587 Planner: Laura Dahl

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Responsible Implementation Party/ Monitor & Reporter	Time Frame/ Monitoring Milestone	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				Responsible to Review Reports (Status/Actions/Notes)	Compliance Date	Staff Initials
	share of a fee that the City will use to correct the deficiency. ⁵	their share of a fee to the City to correct the deficiency.		or pay in-lieu fee.		

⁵ Note-As discussed in Response to Comment D4-9, that fees charged by the County Sanitation District are distinct from, and would be required in addition to any funds the applicant would pay to the City to fund the applicant's fair share of cost to correct the sewer deficiency discussed in Response D4.8.