





**City of Pasadena  
Planning Division  
175 N. Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, California 91101-1704**

## **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

**PROJECT TITLE:** Open Space and Conservation Element

**PROJECT APPLICANT:** City of Pasadena

**PROJECT CONTACT PERSON:** Laura F. Dahl, Senior Planner

**ADDRESS:** 175 N. Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101

**TELEPHONE:** (626) 744-4009

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Citywide  
City of Pasadena  
County of Los Angeles  
State of California

---

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The Open Space & Conservation Element provides a blueprint for natural open space management and conservation. The Open Space and Conservation Element establishes policies that focus on the protection and enhancement of open space and natural resources to ensure a high quality living environment in Pasadena. The Element includes an inventory of existing open space areas, information about Pasadena's existing open spaces and sustainability programs and agencies that the City partners with in order to protect and enhance natural open space. The Element also reviews existing documents related to conservation. The Element includes a series of implementation measures to achieve goals and objectives in three areas: Open Space; Wildlife, Native Plants and the Urban Forest; Environmental Quality, Conservation & Sustainable Use Practices

More specifically, with regard to open space, the Element contains goals and policies to manage open space areas, including undeveloped lands and outdoor recreation areas. With regard to conservation, the Element contain goals and policies to protect and maintain natural resources such as water, soils, wildlife, and minerals, and prevent wasteful resource exploitation, degradation, and destruction, and also addresses air quality to address reducing pollutant levels through stationary source, mobile source, transportation and land use control, and energy conservation measures. This Element also replaces the 1983 Energy Element. Policies and implementation measures in the Energy Integrated Resource Plan of 2010 are reflected in this Element.

---

FINDING

On the basis of the initial study on file in the Current Planning Office:

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

The proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, however there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program on file in the Planning Division Office were adopted to reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

---

Completed by: Laura F. Dahl  
Title: Senior Planner  
Date: October 26, 2011

Determination Approved: Jennifer Paige-Saeki  
Title: Senior Planner  
Date: October 26, 2011

---

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: October 6 – 26, 2011  
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT:  Yes  No  
INITIAL STUDY REVISED:  Yes  No

nd-mnd.doc

**CITY OF PASADENA**  
**175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE**  
**PASADENA, CA 91101-1704**

---

**INITIAL STUDY**

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

**SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. **Project Title:** Open Space & Conservation Element of the General Plan
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Pasadena  
Planning Department  
Planning Division  
175 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Laura Dahl  
voice: (626) 744-6767  
fax: (626) 396-8514  
email: [Ldahl@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:Ldahl@cityofpasadena.net)
4. **Project Location:** Citywide
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Pasadena  
Planning Department  
Planning Division  
175 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101
6. **General Plan Designation:** N/A
7. **Zoning:** N/A
8. **Description of the Project:** The Open Space & Conservation Element provides a blueprint for natural open space management and resource conservation. The Open Space and Conservation Element establishes policies that focus on the protection and enhancement of open space and natural resources to ensure a high quality living environment in Pasadena. The Element includes an inventory of existing open space areas, information about Pasadena's existing open spaces and sustainability programs and agencies that the City partners with in order to protect and enhance natural open space. The Element also reviews existing documents related to conservation. The Element includes a series of implementation measures to achieve goals and objectives in three areas:

- Open Space
- Wildlife, Native Plants and the Urban Forest
- Environmental Quality, Conservation & Sustainable Use Practices

More specifically, with regard to open space, the Element contains goals and policies to manage open space areas, including undeveloped lands and outdoor recreation areas. With regard to conservation, the Element contains goals and policies to protect and maintain natural resources such as water, soils, wildlife, and minerals, and prevent wasteful resource exploitation, degradation, and destruction, and also addresses air quality to address reducing pollutant levels through stationary source, mobile source, transportation and land use control, and energy conservation measures. This Element also replaces the 1983 Energy Element. Policies and implementation measures in the Energy Integrated Resource Plan of 2009 are reflected in this Element.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The project is Pasadena's Open Space & Conservation Element and is applicable to the entire City. Land uses in and adjacent to the City include residential, commercial, commercial recreation, industrial, institutional, and open space. Nearby jurisdictions include La Cañada-Flintridge, Glendale, Los Angeles, San Marino, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, unincorporated Los Angeles County, and the Angeles National Forest.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

- City of Pasadena City Council – adoption of Open Space & Conservation Element
- City of Pasadena Planning Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission, and Environmental Advisory Commission – recommendation to City Council regarding adoption of Open Space & Conservation Element

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Prepared By/Date  
Laura Fitch Dahl  
 Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Reviewed By/Date  
Jennifer Paige-Saeki  
 Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: \_\_\_\_\_

Adoption attested to by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Printed name/Signature                      Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
  - 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
  - 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
  - 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 21, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
  - 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063( c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 21 at the end of the checklist.
    - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
  - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
  - 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
    - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant
-

## SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

**1. BACKGROUND.**

Date checklist submitted: September 14, 2011  
 Department requiring checklist: Planning Department  
 Case Manager: Laura F. Dahl

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

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

**3. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project is the adoption of the *Open Space & Conservation Element (the Element)*, which is a plan level document which is part of the General Plan and has a goal of protecting viewsheds. No specific physical improvements, policies or other components of the Element that might affect scenic vistas are proposed. Therefore, no adverse impacts on scenic vistas are expected.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City.

The project is the adoption of the *Open Space & Conservation Element*, which has been developed to support the continued protection of native and specimen trees on public and private property. The Element includes policies and objectives that encourage the protection of trees as an open space and conservation resource and support the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. There are no proposed changes to the provisions of the Tree Protection Ordinance and there are no specific physical improvements or other components that might adversely affect trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway and there will be no related impacts.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The Element identifies goals, policies, and implementation measures to provide for the protection and enhancement of open space and natural resources to ensure a high quality living environment in Pasadena. In this regard, the element is expected to be beneficial to the visual quality of the City and no adverse impacts will result.



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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. The Element includes policies to support limiting non-essential outdoor lighting to protect migrating birds. No physical improvements or other components that might create light and glare are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

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

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

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

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. Commercial Growing Area/Grounds is permitted in the CG (General Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the RS (Residential Single-Family), and RM (Residential Multi-Family) districts. The use is also permitted within certain specific plan areas. There will be no related impacts.

- c. *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))?*

**WHY?** There is no timberland or Timberland Production zone in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land, timberland or Timberland Production areas. There will be no related impacts.

- d. *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?*

**WHY?** There is no forest land in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion or loss of forest land. The *Open Space & Conservation Element* supports partnering with land managers in nearby communities to identify and protect trail connections with adjacent forests. Therefore, the proposed project furthers the protections of such natural resources and would not result in the conversion or loss of forest land.

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

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

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

Would the project:

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

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

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source pollutants; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP, adopted on June 1, 2007. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the five percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

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

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

The proposed project is the City's *Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan*. The Element is supportive of the City's efforts to improve air quality. No physical improvements or other components that might conflict with the air quality plan are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high. However, the project is the City's *Open Space and Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that might result in adverse air quality impacts are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is an airshed that regularly exceeds ambient air quality standards (AAQS) – i.e., a non-attainment area. The SCAB is designated a non-attainment area for respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). The SCAB is currently designated an attainment area for the remaining criteria pollutants, which include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>).

As described in Section 5.b, the proposed project does not contain any components that will exceed the SCAQMD's Thresholds for Significance. The SCQAMD established these thresholds in consideration of cumulative air pollution in the SCAB. Thus, projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds do not significantly contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Since the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that might expose sensitive receptors to pollutants are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that create objectionable odors are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

**6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element* and supports creating and restoring areas of the city that support native wildlife and resources. The plan supports identification and protection of wildlife corridors and policies for neighborhoods adjacent to wildlife areas to minimize negative impacts on wildlife. No physical improvements or other components that might have an adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The project, which is the City's *Open Space and Conservation Element*, does not propose to change or revise the City's identified natural communities and contains policies to continue to restore and protect these existing open spaces. The project will not adversely affect natural habitat areas, and thus no impact will occur.

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

**WHY?** Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season. The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements which will adversely impact federally protected wetlands are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. The Element emphasizes protecting wildlife linkages. No physical improvements or other components that might negatively interfere with the movement of native or migratory wildlife species are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's Open Space & Conservation Element. The Element is supportive of the city's existing tree protection ordinance and proposes no changes to the ordinance. No physical improvements or other components that might conflict with local policies protecting biological resources are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** Currently, there 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. The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. The Element addresses habitat conservation in the City by conserving open space and habitat linkages and there will be no related impacts.

7. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that might directly or indirectly destroy a paleontological resource or site are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that disturb any human remains are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

a. *Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?* ( )

**WHY?** The project is the *Open Space and Conservation Element*. The Element contains energy policies addressing increased conservation, efficiency and sustainability. It supports Pasadena's adopted energy standards and energy conservation plans. The Element encourages energy conservation and therefore may result in beneficial impacts in this topic area. No significant impacts will occur.

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

**Why?** No specific physical improvements that might use non-renewable resources are proposed as part of the *Open Space & Conservation Element*. The document is supportive of policies in the Energy & Water Integrated Resource Plans (IRP) and no significant impacts will occur.

Over the past several years, Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) has been impacted by several factors that have restricted local and regional water supply. PWP's groundwater rights in the Raymond Basin have been curtailed in order to mitigate groundwater depletion experienced over the last half century. With respect to imported supplies, a decade-long drought has reduced the ability to replenish regional groundwater supplies; drought conditions in the American southwest have reduced deliveries of water from the Colorado River, and legal and environmental issues have resulted in reduced water deliveries through the State Water Project. As a result, the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) has implemented its Water Supply Allocation Plan, which requires PWP to reduce its total water consumption by approximately 10% effective July 1, 2009. MWD will charge significant penalties if PWP's total water use exceeds this allocation.

In September 2008, Council directed PWP to develop a Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan (CWCP) with a variety of approaches and recommendations for achieving 10%, 20% and 30% reductions in water consumption as well as an analysis of the financial impacts on the Water Fund if those conservation targets were achieved. On April 13, 2009, Council voted to approve the CWCP presented by PWP and to replace the Water Shortage Procedure Ordinance with a new Water Waste Prohibition and Water Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10). As a long term goal, the CWCP presupposes an initial target of reducing per-capita potable water consumption 10% by 2015 and 20% by 2020.

The new Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10) became effective on July 4, 2009 and established thirteen permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. In addition, statewide water demand reduction requirements began in 2009, as a result of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan from April 30, 2009 ("20x2020"), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program.

**9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

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

i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other*

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ( )

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena's General Plan, the San Andreas Fault is a "master" active fault and controls seismic hazard in Southern California. This fault is located approximately 21 miles north of Pasadena.

The County of Los Angeles and the City of Pasadena are both affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Pasadena is in four USGS Quadrants, the Los Angeles, and the Mt. Wilson quadrants were mapped for earthquake fault zones under the Alquist-Priolo Act in 1977. The Pasadena and Condor Peak USGS Quadrangles have not yet been mapped per the Alquist-Priolo Act.

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This fault is located primarily south of City limits, however, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the following three additional zones of potential fault rupture in the City:

- The Eagle Rock Fault Hazard Management Zone, which traverses the southwestern portion of the City;
- The Sierra Madre Fault Hazard Management Zone, which includes the Tujunga Fault, the North Sawpit Fault, and the South Branch of the San Gabriel Fault. This Fault Zone is primarily north of the City, and only the very northeast portion of the City and portions of the Upper Arroyo lie within the mapped fault zone.
- A Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, which appears to join a continuation of the Sycamore Canyon Fault. This fault area traverses the northern portion of the City as is identified as a Fault Hazard Management Zone for Critical Facilities Only.

The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects are proposed. No impact will occur.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?* ( )

**WHY?** See 9.a.i. Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The project is the City's *Open Space & Conservation Element*. No physical improvements or other components that expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects are proposed and there will be no related impacts.

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

**WHY?**