

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA  
CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE LINCOLN  
AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND A  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

**WHEREAS**, adoption of the Lincoln Avenue Specific Plan (the “Plan”) could result in the gradual conversion of existing industrial and auto-related land uses to a neighborhood-serving district. Buildout of the Plan would allow for an additional approximately 500,000 square feet of commercial/office/retail uses and approximately 91 additional residential units. Mixed-use opportunities (commercial/residential) would also be introduced along the Lincoln Avenue corridor. Approval of the Plan also requires a General Plan amendment and a zone change amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Pasadena is the lead agency for the Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA,” Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 *et seq.*), the State CEQA Guidelines (the “Guidelines,” 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 *et seq.*), and the City’s local environmental policy guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, to analyze the potential environmental effects of the Plan, the City prepared an Initial Study that concluded that there was substantial evidence that the Plan might have a significant environmental impact on the following resource areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and

Housing, Public Services, Recreation (addressed in Parks section of Public Services), Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems; and

**WHEREAS**, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of an environmental impact report (“EIR”) on April 25, 2012 (see Appendix A to the EIR), and sent the NOP and a copy of the Initial Study to responsible, trustee, and other interested agencies and persons in accordance with Guidelines Sections 15082(a) and 15375. Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15082, the City solicited input on the contents of the EIR from potential responsible and trustee agencies for a 30-day period, which extended from April 25, 2012 to May 25, 2012, and sought details about the scope and content of the EIR related to the responsible agency’s area of statutory responsibility, as well as the significant environmental issues, reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that the responsible agency would have analyzed in the EIR. Two EIR scoping meetings were held as follows: 1) May 9, 2012 during a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, and 2) May 24, 2012 at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Northwest Commission. Comments received during the public review period are contained in Appendix B to the EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092, the City provided a public Notice of Completion and Availability (“NOA”) of the Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2011091041) on March 19, 2013 through mailing to all property owners within 500 feet of the Plan. The NOA also gave notice of a public meeting on April 10, 2013 at which comments on the Draft EIR were taken. Copies of the Draft EIR

were also placed at the City's Planning and Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, at the Central Library at 285 East Walnut, and on the City's website; and

**WHEREAS**, the Draft EIR was circulated, together with technical appendices, to the public and other interested persons for a 45-day public comment period, from March 21, 2013, through May 6, 2013. During the comment period, the City held one duly noticed public meeting before the Planning Commission on April 10, 2013 at which the public was given the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, during the public comment period the City received written and oral comments on the Draft EIR, and consulted with all responsible and trustee agencies, and other regulatory agencies pursuant to Guidelines Section 15086; and

**WHEREAS**, the City subsequently prepared written responses to all written comments received on the Draft EIR and made revisions to the Draft EIR, as appropriate, in response to those comments. The City distributed written responses to comments on the Draft EIR on August 29, 2013 in accordance with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and Guidelines Section 15088, and were posted on the City's website that same date. The written responses to comments were also made available at least ten days prior to the commencement of the public hearing regarding the certification of the Draft EIR. After reviewing the responses to comments and the revisions to the Draft EIR, the City Council concludes that the information and

issues raised by the comments and the responses thereto did not constitute new information requiring further recirculation of the Draft EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, the Final Environmental Impact Report (the “Final EIR” or “EIR”) is comprised of: the Draft EIR; the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR set forth in the Final EIR dated August 2013; technical appendices; and

**WHEREAS**, as required by the Zoning Code, the Planning Commission must provide a recommendation, with appropriate findings, to the City Council. On August 14, 2013, the Planning Commission considered the EIR and Plan, and recommended certification of the EIR, adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adoption of the Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council, the body with decision-making authority over the Plan, held a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the Plan on October 21, 2013; and

**WHEREAS**, the findings made in this resolution are based upon the information and evidence set forth in the Final EIR and upon other substantial evidence that has been presented at all public meetings regarding the Plan and in the record of the proceedings. The documents, staff reports, technical studies, appendices, plans, specifications, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this resolution is based are on file and available for public examination during normal business hours in the Planning & Community Development Department and with the

Director of Planning & Community Development, who serves as the custodian of these records; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council finds that agencies and interested members of the public have been afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the Final EIR and that the comment process has fulfilled all requirements of State and local law; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council, as the decision-making body for the lead agency with regard to this Plan, has independently reviewed and considered the contents of the Final EIR and all documents and testimony in the record of proceedings prior to deciding whether to certify the Final EIR; and

**WHEREAS**, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA  
RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

**I. RESOLUTION REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR**

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the City Council certifies that: (1) it has reviewed and considered the Final EIR prior to approving the Plan, (2) the Final EIR is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the City's local environmental guidelines, and (3) the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency. The City Council certifies the Final EIR based on the findings and conclusions herein.

The City Council finds that the additional information provided in the staff report, in the comments (and any responses thereto) received after circulation of the Draft EIR, in the evidence presented in written and oral testimony presented at public meetings, and otherwise in the administrative record, does not constitute new information requiring further recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA. None of the information presented to the City Council after circulation of the Draft EIR has deprived the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial environmental impact of the Plan or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative that the City has declined to implement.

## **II. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ANALYZED IN THE EIR**

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Plan were found to be less than significant in the Initial Study, did not require the imposition of mitigation measures, and therefore did not require study in the EIR: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, and Mineral Resources (see Initial Study; EIR, p. 2-2).

## **III. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITHOUT MITIGATION**

The City Council finds that the Plan will have a less than significant impact or no impact without mitigation on a number of environmental topics listed below. For some of these topics, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements is assumed, as discussed in the EIR, which would ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

**a. Aesthetics**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

5.1-1 The Plan would alter the visual appearance of the Lincoln Avenue Corridor. (EIR, p. 5.1-7.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation -- NONE**

**iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**iv. Supporting Explanation**

Along Lincoln Avenue, underutilized commercial and auto-oriented uses would gradually transition to neighborhood-serving retail and office with new housing options within a mixed-use district, and thereby create a vibrant “main street” with enhanced pedestrian experiences. (EIR, p. 5.1-7.) New development and redevelopment along the corridor would be consistent with the City’s General Plan and City’s “Design Standards and Guidelines for Neighborhood Commercial & Multi-family Districts.” The Plan promotes these goals by incorporating development standards and design guidelines to create improvements that are compatible with the existing scale, orientation, and character of the best qualities of the existing environment. New development and redevelopment would enhance the pedestrian environment and improve the identity of the area through construction of curb extensions, crosswalks,

and additional canopy trees. Along Lincoln Avenue, new architecture, additions, and repair projects would feature entries, porches, landscaped terraces, courtyards, and arcades. Pedestrian improvements would improve accessibility and safety throughout the Plan and provide better east–west connectivity. (EIR, Figure 5.1-4.) Traffic-calming measures would include curb extensions, crosswalks, landscaped parkways, and medians. In the vicinity of Lincoln Avenue and Washington Boulevard, the Plan envisions a new neighborhood center with sheltering arcades and trellises adjacent to the sidewalks. (EIR, Figure 5.1-5.) The massing and scale of new structures would be compatible with existing architecture, and new development would not exceed 36 feet. The design standards and guidelines incorporate setbacks, building placement, building design, and landscape buffers to create a fluid transition between uses. (EIR, p. 5.1-8.) Design goals have been specifically created for the Plan, and future development, rehabilitations, and alterations within the Plan area must follow the Design Standards outlined in the Plan. With the above, the Plan area would experience a change in character, from one- to two-story box retail, light industrial yards, and residential land uses transitioning to more neighborhood serving retail and mixed-use space and features meant to attract pedestrians (existing residential areas would remain generally unchanged). (Id. at p. 5.1-15.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** Cumulative aesthetics impacts would occur if the Plan impacts would be compounded by impacts of other projects in the vicinity. No significant project-specific impacts to the appearance of the Plan area have been identified.



Future development projects in the surrounding area would be required to complete individual environmental reviews, and the City would analyze their compliance with the City's Design Guidelines as well as their compatibility with the Plan before granting approval. The Plan's incremental effect to cumulative aesthetic impacts is not cumulatively considerable. (EIR, p. 5.1-16.)

**b. Energy**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

- 5.3-1 Development of the Plan would not conflict with an adopted Energy Conservation Plan. (EIR, p. 5.3-5.)
- 5.3-2 Development of the Plan would not cause inefficient and wasteful use of nonrenewable resources. (EIR, p. 5.3-6.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation – NONE**

**iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**iv. Supporting Explanation**

Construction undertaken in accordance with the Plan must comply with the City's Green Building Standards Code (PMC Section 14.04.504), the City's Green Action Plan, and the open space and conservation element of the General Plan, which would reduce energy consumption compared to the existing buildings on site. All new buildings must achieve at least a 15 percent increase in energy efficiency compared to the 2008

Building and Energy Efficiency Standards. Those buildings that will be subject to the mandatory Tier 1 or Tier 2 CALGreen standards could result in a 15 to 30 percent increase in building energy efficiency compared to the 2008 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards (PMC Section 14.04.540). In addition, nonresidential projects over 25,000 square feet are required to comply with prerequisite and elective measures to achieve an equivalent 40 to 50 Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) points. As a result, development of the Plan will not conflict with an adopted Energy Conservation Plan. (EIR, pp. 5.3-5 to 5.3-6.)

Development of the Plan would increase the use of energy in Pasadena, and Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) has stated that there is sufficient supply to serve the Plan area. (EIR, p. 5.3-6.) Within the Plan boundary, the corresponding electricity demand would increase and affect the energy distribution infrastructure. The increased electricity demand would comprise approximately 0.01 percent of the annual consumption, and will not adversely affect the PWP's supply capacity. (Ibid.) New or modified facilities such as transformers, switchboards, conductors, and underground conduits may be necessary, and will be provided by PWP. With necessary infrastructure improvements, PWP has the capacity to supply electricity to meet the demand for electricity projected for the Plan and the Plan will not create a significant impact with respect to electricity facilities and services. (Ibid.)

With regard to natural gas, Southern California Gas Co. has indicated that sufficient natural gas facilities and supply to service the Plan. Although implementation

of the Plan would create additional demands on natural gas supplies and distribution infrastructure, the increased demands are projected to be within the service capabilities of SCGC provided necessary improvements are made in coordination with SCGC. (EIR, pp. 5.3-7 to 5.3-8.) Finally, new development and redevelopment must comply with the requirements of the City's Green Building Standards, which result in a 15 to 30 percent increase in building energy efficiency compared to the 2008 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards. As a result, development of the project would not cause inefficient and wasteful use of nonrenewable resources. (Id. at p. 5.3-8.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** The implementation of the Plan in combination with other projects in the surrounding area may cause cumulative impacts to energy use. However, all current and future projects are required to comply with the City's Green Building Standards Code, which results in a reduction in energy consumption. Future cumulative development will be required to meet more stringent energy conservation measures. Buildings that are constructed in accordance with the 2013 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards are 25 percent (residential) to 30 percent (non-residential) more energy efficient than the 2008 Standards as a result of better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features that reduce energy consumption in home and businesses. The Plan, therefore, in combination with surrounding would not cause significant cumulative impacts related to energy use or conservation plans. (Id. at p. 5.3-8.)

**c. Land Use and Planning**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

5.7-1: Project implementation would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation. (EIR, p. 5.7-6.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation -- NONE**

**iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**iv. Supporting Explanation**

The Plan amends various elements within the adopted General Plan to reflect the land use changes and change in proposed zoning designations arising from the Plan, and to ensure internal consistency within the General Plan. Specifically, the Plan includes a General Plan amendment to update the land use map to: 1) include the boundaries of the Lincoln Avenue Specific Plan, and 2) change the land use designations to “specific plan.” The Plan is consistent with the vision and guidance provided in the General Plan. The consistency of the proposed project with objectives and policies established in the General Plan are outlined in Table 5.7-2 of the EIR, and as shown therein, is consistent with the goals, objectives, strategies, and policies outlined in the existing General Plan, and would not result in significant impacts related to General Plan consistency. (EIR, pp. 5.7-6 to 5.7-9.) With regard to the Zoning Code,

the Plan includes land use designations that determine uses and design characteristics that would be allowed along the Lincoln Avenue corridor. The land use designations outlined in the Plan are based on existing regulations in the City's Zoning Code, but have been modified to achieve the Plan's objectives. A zoning ordinance amendment is required to allow the change and land uses. (EIR, p. 5.7-9.) In general, the type of development permitted by the zoning designations included in the Plan does not represent a substantial deviation from the type of development allowed under the corridor's existing zoning. The new zoning designations simply modify some portions of the existing development standards as necessary to achieve the development objectives identified for the corridor. With approval of the proposed zone change, all components of the Plan would be consistent with the revised Zoning Ordinance. (EIR, p. 5.7-10.)

The Plan's consistency with the advisory and voluntary goals and policies of SCAG's 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan is analyzed in Table 5.7-3 of the EIR, and the Plan is consistent with the advisory and voluntary RCP policies. (EIR, pp. 5.7-10 to 5.7-19.) Likewise, the Plan is consistent with the applicable 2012 RTP/SCS goals as set forth in the EIR. (Id. at pp. 5.7-19 to 5.7-21.) Accordingly, there are no potentially significant land use impacts.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The Plan involves amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan. These changes to local land use regulations and policies are specific to the Plan area, and their effects will not be magnified by new development elsewhere in

Pasadena. While implementation of other planned projects in the City will result in new dwelling units and nonresidential development in the City, these projects are located primarily in the Central District and will not affect the Plan's compatibility with its surroundings or its consistency with local land use regulations or policies. The cumulative population and economic growth resulting from the Plan in combination with buildout of the General Plan is a desired and intended impact of the policies outlined in the General Plan and 2012–2035 RTP. Accordingly, there are no potentially significant cumulative impacts. (EIR, p. 5.7-21.)

**d. Population and Housing**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

5.9-1: The proposed project would directly result in population growth in the project area. (EIR, p. 5.9-9.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation -- NONE**

**iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**iv. Supporting Explanation**

The project-related population increase of 315 persons would be well within the SCAG forecast of population increase in the City of Pasadena of 9,979 persons over the 2008–2020 period. As a result, there would not be a substantial impact on proposed

housing and population. Likewise, the Plan-related employment increase would be well within the SCAG forecast of employment increase of 7,265 jobs in the City of Pasadena over the 2008–2020 period. As a result, there would not be a substantial impact on employment-generating land uses. Finally, Plan buildout would result in shifting the jobs-housing ratio in the City of Pasadena to slightly more jobs rich than without specific plan buildout: from 2.18 to 2.19 in 2020, and from 2.23 to 2.25 in 2035. While Plan buildout would intensify an already jobs-rich jobs-housing ratio in the City of Pasadena, the impact on jobs-housing balance would be minimal and would not result in a substantial adverse impact. (EIR, pp. 5.9-9 to 5.9-11.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** The estimated job generation and population increase resulting from the Plan in combination with related projects are 2,205 jobs and 4,993 persons, which are well within SCAG forecasts for the City of Pasadena for increases over the 2008–2020 period. Therefore, increases in population and employment resulting from cumulative projects would not result in significant impacts. (EIR, p. 5.9-11.)

**e. Public Services**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

5.10-3: Project implementation does not propose new parks but would generate approximately 315 additional residents, increasing the service needs for local parks. (EIR, p. 5.10-7.)

5.10-4: The proposed project would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the Pasadena Police Department service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for police protection facilities and personnel. (EIR, p. 5.10-9.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation -- NONE**

### **iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

### **iv. Supporting Explanation**

The Plan does not include proposed parks and would not result in the expansion of existing facilities. Payment of park impact fees pursuant to the City's Residential Impact Fee Ordinance, by projects approved within the Plan area is expected to reduce impacts of specific plan implementation on park facilities to less than significant levels. (EIR, p. 5.10-7.) PPD officials have indicated that the increase in demands on law enforcement services resulting from Plan implementation would not be significant when compared to the current demand levels based on the nature and character of the proposed development, therefore law enforcement personnel will be able to respond in a timely manner to emergency calls in the affected area and impacts are less than significant. Likewise, PPD would review and approve any new development plans to ensure that adequate facilities and personnel are provided to allow the PPD to serve the needs of all City residents. Therefore, no significant impacts related to police services are anticipated. (EIR, p. 5.10-9.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** Recreational needs of future residents of the specific plan area, in conjunction with cumulative development in accordance with the adopted General Plan, would add to citywide and regional demand for parks and recreational facilities.



However, new development in the City of Pasadena is required to comply with the City's Residential Impact Fee requirements, which correlates funding for parks and recreation with population growth. Therefore, no significant impacts related to recreational opportunities are anticipated. (EIR, p. 5.10-8.) Police service needs of future residents of the Plan area, in conjunction with cumulative development, would add to citywide and regional demand for police services. Additional personnel and associated equipment would be provided through the continued implementation of the PFD's Five Year Strategic Plan and the annual budget review process. Therefore, despite the increased need for police services in the City, no significant cumulative impacts related to police services are anticipated. (EIR, p. 5.10-9.)

#### **IV. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The City Council finds that mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR which will reduce the following potentially significant environmental impacts to below a level of significance.

##### **a. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

##### **i. Potential Significant Impacts**

- 5.5-1 Project grading and construction activities, involving the demolition of existing buildings, could disturb known or potential hazardous materials onsite, such as Asbestos-containing material or lead-based paint.
- 5.5-2: Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

5.5-3 There is the potential for exposure to construction personnel or the public to hazardous substances with new development on properties that are listed on government databases.

**ii. Proposed Mitigation -- NONE**

5-1 Before issuance of a grading permit for any new development within the specific plan area, the project applicant shall conduct an asbestos survey if the project involves the demolition or renovation of structures constructed prior to 1978. If ACM is present, the removal, transport, and disposal of the ACM shall be conducted in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1403.

5-2 Before issuance of a grading permit for any new development within the Specific Plan area, the project applicant shall determine whether lead-based paint is present for projects involving the demolition or renovation of structures constructed prior to 1978. A LBP survey shall be conducted for any painted surfaces, and the removal, transport, and disposal of LBP shall be undertaken in accordance with California Health & Safety Code Sections 17920.10 and 105255.

5-3 Prior to issuance of grading permits for new development within the Specific Plan area, the applicant shall review the most current records available for the subject site and adjacent properties to determine if they are listed on federal and/or state databases as having potential or historic contamination. The applicant shall complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to identify environmental conditions and determine whether contamination is present. The Phase I ESA shall be prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer and in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E 1527.05, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. If the Phase I ESA determines the need for additional sampling and testing, a Phase II ESA shall be completed. Should contamination be found at significant levels, the applicant shall complete site remediation in accordance with state and local agency requirements (DTSC, RWQCB, Pasadena Fire Department, etc.). A report documenting the completion, results, and any follow-up (remediation on the recommendations, if any, shall be provided to the Building Official and the Pasadena Fire Department Hazardous Material Specialist prior to the issuance of grading permits within the project area.

### **iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Plan alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

### **iv. Supporting Explanation**

New industrial land uses would be allowed with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) but would be restricted to proposed zoning district LASP-CG2, which includes part of the Plan east of Lincoln Avenue. Otherwise, industrial uses within the Plan area would be prohibited. Permitted land uses within the remainder of the Plan area will consist of residential and neighborhood-serving commercial and public uses, and would only use limited quantities of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes. With the current limited use of hazardous materials and limited generation of hazardous waste within the Plan area, and compliance with all applicable codes and regulations, there would be no adverse impacts to new residential or commercial receptors and no adverse impacts to existing facilities related to hazardous materials or waste. Grading and construction activities and the demolition of existing buildings could disturb known or potential hazardous materials onsite, such as asbestos-containing materials (“ACM”) and lead based paint (“LBP”). Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, which specifies

procedures for abatement, containment, and disposal of ACM, would be required if ACM is present. Demolition activities require LBP to be contained, as per California Health and Safety Code Sections 17920.10 and 105255. Compliance with these regulations will render hazards associated with ACM and LBP less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.5-11 and 5.5-12.) Further, grading and excavation activities associated with project development within the Plan area could result in the exposure of construction personnel and the public to hazardous substances in the soil if future development occurs on one of the sites identified in the EIR. Although it is not anticipated, the potential exposure of construction personnel or the public to remnant hazardous substances within the Plan area would be a potentially significant impact. (EIR, p. 5.5-13.)

These impacts are reduced to below a level of significance with the implementation of mitigation measures 5-1 through 5-3. These measures ensure that ACM and LBP in existing buildings are discovered and properly removed, and that potential hazardous materials in soils are investigated and remediated prior to disturbance, so that workers and residents are not exposed thereto. (EIR, pp. 5.5-14 and 5.5-15.)

Finally, restricted industrial uses would be limited to zoning district LASP-CG2, which includes part of the Plan area east of Lincoln Avenue. Otherwise, new industrial land uses would be prohibited within the Plan. All projects associated with buildout of the Plan would be required to comply with existing hazardous materials regulations,

which are codified in Titles 17, 19, and 27 of the CCR and Chapter 6.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, as administered by the Pasadena Fire Department. In addition, commercial and industrial land uses that use, store, handle, or transport hazardous materials in quantities above threshold levels are required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, which includes an inventory of hazardous materials stored onsite, an emergency response plan, and procedures to be used in the event of a release of a hazardous material. All future projects within the Plan area will be required to complete applicable environmental review processes and to conform with environmental regulations related to new construction and hazardous materials storage, use, and transport. (EIR, pp. 5.5-12 and 5.5-13.) Since the Plan calls for a reduction in industrial land use, there will be a reduced risk of upset or accidental releases. Therefore, the Plan will result in less than significant impacts related to the upset and/or accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. (Id. at p. 5.5-13.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** Development within the boundaries of the Plan has the potential to result in a cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. However, the Plan focuses on redevelopment with retail/commercial and residential land uses and a reduction in industrial land uses. Therefore, there should be a reduced impact from hazardous materials. Hazardous material usage in excess of threshold quantities would require compliance with the Hazardous Materials Business Plan administered by the Pasadena Fire Department. Compliance with existing federal, state, and local

hazardous materials regulations and a reduction in industrial land use within the specific plan area would result in a less than significant cumulative impact. (EIR, p. 5.5-13.)

## **b. Hydrology and Water Quality**

### **i. Potential Significant Impacts**

- 5.6-1: Implementation of the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. (EIR, p. 5.6-11.)
- 5.6-2: Implementation of the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or result in substantial erosion. (Ibid.)
- 5.6-3: Projects developed pursuant to the Specific Plan would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface water flows into drainage systems within the watershed. (Ibid.)
- 5.6-4: Construction of the projects developed pursuant to the Specific Plan could result in short-term increases in pollutant concentrations from the site. (EIR, p. 5.6-12.)
- 5.6-5: Operation of projects developed pursuant to the Specific Plan could result in long-term increases in pollutant concentrations from the site. (EIR, p. 5.6-15.)

### **ii. Proposed Mitigation**

- 6-1 Notice of Intent (NOI). Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for construction sites with a disturbed area of one or more acres, the project applicant shall provide the City Engineer with evidence that a NOI has been filed with the State Water Resources Control Board. Such evidence shall consist of a copy of the NOI stamped by the State Water Resources Control Board or Regional Water Quality Control Board, or a letter from either agency stating that the NOI has been filed.
- 6-2 Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Prior to the issuance of grading permits for construction sites with a disturbed area of one or more acres, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP that will:
  - Require implementation of best management practices (BMPs) designed with a goal of preventing a net increase in sediment load in stormwater discharges relative to preconstruction levels;
  - Prohibit during the construction period, discharges of stormwater or non-storm water at levels which would cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality standards contained in the Basin Plan;
  - Discuss in detail the BMPs planned for the project related to control of sediment and erosion, non-sediment pollutants, and potential pollutants in non-storm water discharges;

- Describe post-construction BMPs for the project;
  - Explain the maintenance program for the project's BMPs;
  - During construction, require reporting of violations to the Regional Board; and
  - List the parties responsible for SWPPP implementation and BMP maintenance during and after grading. The project proponent shall implement the SWPPP and will modify the SWPPP as directed by the Storm Water Permit.
- 6-3 Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Project-specific WQMPs/SUSMPs must be submitted to the City for approval as part of project submittal packet for projects that meet the SUSMP thresholds. A conceptual WQMP shall be reviewed and approved prior to any entitlement approval. A Final WQMP shall be submitted for review prior to issuance of any building permit approved by the Building Department. The WQMP shall identify the best management practices (BMPs) that will be used on the site to control predictable pollutant runoff. More specifically, the WQMP shall:
- Describe the routine and special post-construction BMPs to be used at the proposed development site (including both structural and non-structural measures);
  - Describe responsibility for the initial implementation and longterm maintenance of the BMPs;
  - Provide narrative with the graphic materials as necessary to specify the locations of the structural BMPs;
  - Certify that the project applicant will seek to have the WQMP carried out by all future successors or assigns to the property.

### **iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Plan alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

#### **iv. Supporting Explanation**

The Plan will not increase the amount of impervious surfaces as buildout occurs because the area is already fully developed. Instead, imperviousness would likely decrease due to the requirements for water quality BMPs. As a result, the Plan will not have a substantial impact on groundwater recharge. (EIR, p. 5.6-11.) Likewise, the Plan does not propose additional groundwater wells and would not affect any existing wells. Growth under the Plan has been accounted for in the City's Urban Water Management Plan and there are adequate supplies available to serve the Plan area. (Ibid.) Implementation of the Plan will not change stormwater receiving water bodies and would not require improvements to the channel. Instead, peak flows are expected to slightly decrease with incorporation of water quality BMPs. Implementation of the Plan would not result in erosion or siltation on- or offsite and impacts are considered less than significant. (Ibid.)

During implementation of the Plan, clearing, grading, excavation, and construction activities related to individual development projects could impact water quality through sheet erosion of exposed soils and subsequent deposition of particles and pollutants in drainage areas. Construction materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints also presents a risk to surface water quality due to an increased potential for nonvisible pollutants entering the storm drain system. Construction impacts due to implementation of the specific plan would be minimized through compliance with the Construction General Permit required by the SWRCB. Soil-disturbing activities caused



by the development of projects pursuant to the specific plan larger than one acre would require the implementation of a SWPPP and construction BMPs specified in the SWPPP. Submittal of the Construction General Permit to SWRCB and implementation of the SWPPP and its associated BMPs throughout the construction phase of the future projects within the specific plan would address anticipated and expected pollutants of concern as a result of construction activities. Construction under the Plan would comply with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, and construction impacts on pollutant concentrations in storm water are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 5.6-12 to 5.6-14.) Mitigation measures 6-1 and 6-2 require the filing of a Notice of Intent (to comply with the General Construction Permit) with the SWRCB for projects that are one acre or larger prior to the commencement of construction activities, and the development and implementation of a SWPPP which must include BMPs, respectively. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2, Impact 5.6-4 would be less than significant. (Id. at p. 5.6-21.)

The operational phase of future site specific projects could result in long-term impacts to the quality of stormwater and urban runoff, subsequently impacting downstream receiving waters. The long-term operation of the future projects within the specific plan will require the implementation of post-construction or operational BMPs to the extent practicable to mitigate and abate pollutants. New projects built under the Plan would involve use of pesticides, fertilizers, and paints and could generate trash and debris. Operation and parking of motor vehicles onsite is expected to generate oils,

greases, and metals. Implementation of the Plan has the potential to result in significant impacts to water quality. Future projects in the Plan area less than one acre in size would be required to implement BMPs in compliance with the City's adopted Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SUSMP report and plans would outline approved post-construction BMPs, including site-design and source and treatment-control BMPs selected for the project to reduce pollutants in post-development runoff. (EIR, pp. 5.6-15 to 5.6-17.) Mitigation measure 6-3 requires incorporation of site design, source control, and treatment control BMPs in accordance with the WQMP/SUSMP, to ensure that runoff water is treated prior to exiting the sites. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-3, Impact 5.6-5 would be less than significant. (Id. at p. 5.6-21.)

**Cumulative Impacts.** The areas over which cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality are assessed are the Arroyo Seco Watershed for surface water and drainage impacts and the Raymond Groundwater Basin for groundwater impacts. Other projects in the Arroyo Seco Watershed could increase the amount of impervious area in the Watershed and could thus lead to increased rates and volumes of runoff. Projects developed under the Plan must comply with the regulatory requirements discussed above and in Mitigation Measures 6-1 through 6-3, and no significant cumulative impact would occur. Water supply impacts would also be less than cumulatively significant, as Pasadena Water and Power must plan for water consumption in line with the Raymond

Basin Judgment so as to be consistent with long-term stability of underground water resources. (EIR, pp. 5.6-17 and 5.6-18.)

**c. Utilities and Service Systems**

**i. Potential Significant Impacts**

- 5.12-1: The Lincoln Avenue Specific Plan would increase water use in the City by 102,065 GPD (115 AFY) placing additional demand on water supply.
- 5.12-3: Existing facilities would be able to accommodate Project generated solid waste. (EIR, p. 5.12-19.)

**ii. Proposed Mitigation**

- 12-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for future site specific development, the project applicant shall prepare a water study and identify the sizing and location of backbone facilities necessary to service the proposed project, in accordance with City standards and submit the plan to the City's Public Works Department for review and approval. Design of the facilities that serve the project shall be sufficient to meet the projected service demands of the proposed project.
- 12-2 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for future site specific development, the project applicant shall prepare a sewer study and identify the sizing and location of backbone facilities necessary to service the proposed project, in accordance with City standards and submit the plan to the City's Public Works Department for review and approval. Design of the facilities that serve the project shall be sufficient to meet the projected service demands of the proposed project.

**iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Plan which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.