

ATTACHMENT P:

**Findings for Certifying the EIR for the YWCA/Kimpton
Hotel Project**

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA
CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH NO.
2015031023) FOR THE YWCA/KIMPTON HOTEL PROJECT,
AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the YWCA/Kimpton Hotel Project (the “project”) proposes the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the existing 40,570-square-foot YWCA building located at 78 N. Marengo Avenue and the addition of an approximately 87,342-square-foot, three-to-six-story building adjacent to the existing YWCA building on the project site, which together would become a an approximately 127,912- square-foot Kimpton Hotel on land totaling 1.93 acres. The YWCA building would be connected to the new building solely by a bridge at the third floor of the new construction to the rooftop of the north wing of the YWCA building. The project would consist of approximately 179 guestrooms and suites, approximately 1,989 square feet of meeting facilities, approximately 5,630 square feet of ballroom space, approximately 1,197 square feet of hospitality parlors, and an approximately 2,350 square-foot, 140-seat restaurant. The height, floor area ratio, and setbacks meet the development standards for the CD-2 zoning district. The project would require a Surplus Property declaration and exemption from competitive sale requirement, including a determination that real property of the City is not needed for the purpose for which it was acquired or for any other public purpose and to allow the City to enter into a long-term lease with the developer most suited to successfully rehabilitating the YWCA building rather than to the highest bidder. The project would require a Conditional Use Permit to allow construction of a non-residential project over 25,000 square feet in size ('Major Project'), to allow a 'Lodging - Hotels, Motels' use, and to allow the sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages for on-site consumption. The project would require a Minor Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a non-residential project over 15,000 square feet in size within the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Area, shared parking, and reduced parking. The project would require variances to allow the ground floor of the hotel building to be nine feet high where the minimum required ground floor height is 15 feet; and to allow one loading space where six loading spaces are required and to modify the required design of the loading space as required in the Zoning Code; and

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

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the City prepared an Initial Environmental Study (the “Initial Study”) for the project (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR). The Initial Study concluded that there was substantial evidence that the project might have a significant environmental

impact on the following resource areas: (1) Cultural Resources, (2) Energy, (3) Land Use and Planning, (4) Noise and Vibration, and (5) Transportation and Traffic; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064 and 15081, and based upon the information in the Initial Study, the City ordered the preparation of an environmental impact report (“EIR”) for the project. On March 5, 2015, the City prepared and sent a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR and a copy of the Initial Study to responsible, trustee, and other interested agencies and persons in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(a) and 15375; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the City solicited comments from potential responsible and trustee agencies for a 30-day period, from March 5, 2015 to April 6, 2015, requesting details about the scope and content of the environmental information related to the responsible agency’s area of statutory responsibility that should be studied in the EIR, as well as the significant environmental issues, reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that the responsible agency would have analyzed in the Draft EIR. Two public scoping meetings were held on March 19, 2015 and March 25, 2015 to determine the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR. Comments received during the scoping period are contained in Appendix A of the Draft 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. 2015031023) on February 5, 2016 through mailing to all property owners within 500 feet of the Project. The NOA also gave notice of public meetings on March 1, March 8, and March 9, 2016 at which comments on the Draft EIR would be 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 Street, 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 60-day public comment period, from February 5, 2016 to April 5, 2016. During the comment period, the City held three duly noticed public meetings before the Historic Preservation Commission, Design Commission, and Planning Commission on March 1, March 8, and March 9, 2016, respectively, at which the public was given the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, during the aforementioned public comment periods 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 CEQA 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 June 8, 2016, in accordance with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. The written responses to comments were also made available for a 35-day period of public review before the commencement of the public hearings regarding the certification of the Final EIR. After reviewing the responses to comments and the revisions to the Draft EIR, the City concludes that the information and issues raised by the comments and the responses thereto did not constitute new information requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (the "Final EIR" or "EIR") is comprised of: the Draft EIR including clarifications, revisions, and corrections thereto; and the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR set forth in the Final EIR dated June 2016; and

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the Project on July 13, 2016 to consider making a recommendation to the City Council regarding (1) certification of the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (2) a declaration of surplus property and exemption from the competitive sale requirement, (3) approval of Conditional Use Permits, Minor Conditional Use Permits, and variances for the project; and (4) approval of the location, setbacks, and general massing of the project presented in the Alternative 2A design study with a maximum of 185 rooms consistent with Alternative 2A as studied in the Final EIR for the project, with specified conditions of approval;

WHEREAS, at the public hearing on July 13, 2016, the Planning Commission, in concurrence with City staff's recommendation, considered the proposed project and ultimately recommended to the City Council conditions of approval for the Alternative 2A design study, including maximizing the setback from Garfield Avenue, provided such setbacks would not sacrifice the integrity of the project design, and requiring that the courtyard be made accessible to the public during the daytime, and also recommended certification of the Final EIR;

WHEREAS, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the project on August 15, 2016; 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 project 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 at 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101 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 project, 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 project, (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 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 project 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 project 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: (1) Aesthetics, (2) Agricultural Resources, (3) Air Quality, (4) Biological Resources, (5) Cultural Resources-Paleontological Resources, (6) Greenhouse Gases, (7) Geology and Soils, (8) Hazards and Hazardous Materials, (9) Hydrology and Water Quality, (10) Mineral Resources, (11) Population and Housing, (12) Public Services, (13) Recreation, and (14) Utilities and Service Systems (see Initial Study, Appendix A of the Draft EIR).

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

The City Council finds that the proposed project will have no impact or a less than significant impact without mitigation on a number of environmental topics. 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. Environmental topics determined to be less than significant without mitigation are listed below. For each topic, the discussion begins with a delineation of the potential impacts evaluated in the EIR, as specifically related to that topic, along with page citations as to where in the EIR the relevant discussion is found, and is followed by an explanation of the substantial evidence in support of the EIR conclusion that a significant impact would not occur.

a. ENERGY

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Draft EIR, p. 3.2-9)
- Would the project use energy resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Draft EIR, p. 3.2-12)
- Would the project require or result in the construction of new energy facilities (electricity, natural gas, propane) or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Draft EIR, p. 3.2-12)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

As noted above and explained below, the EIR analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to energy. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

Construction of the proposed project would consume energy from off-road construction equipment and on-road vehicular travel from vendor trucks, haul trucks, and construction employee commuting. Additionally, electricity would be required to deliver water to the project site for dust control. A total of 60,055 gallons of diesel fuel, 16,097 gallons of gasoline fuel, and 2,093 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity would be consumed during construction. However, construction activities would be temporary and would cease at the end of construction; therefore, there would be no long-term energy impacts associated with construction activities. The adopted energy conservation plans do not specifically discuss energy uses from construction activities. For this reason, and because the amount of fuel and electricity used during construction would be minor, impacts from construction would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.2-9 through 3.2-10)

Operation of the proposed project would consume electricity for lighting, hotel kitchen and laundry equipment, HVAC equipment, commercial and in-room appliances, water supply and delivery, and other commercial operations; natural gas consumption for space heating, cooking, and laundry dryers; and transportation fuel consumption from motor vehicles driving to and from the site. The total amount of electricity and natural gas consumed during operation of the proposed project would be 1,190,915 kWh/year and 3,483,431 thousand British Thermal Units (kBtu)/year, respectively. This represents a permanent increase in electricity and natural gas consumption; however, this increase would be less than the Business as Usual (BAU) scenario. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's General Plan Energy Element because electricity demand would be reduced by at least 10 percent when compared to the BAU scenario. Furthermore, the building would be built in compliance with the CALGreen ordinance, including reducing water consumption by at least 20 percent when compared to BAU. The project would also meet the intent of LEED Silver standards, as required by the City's Green Building Ordinance. By meeting these requirements, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted energy conservation plan and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.2-10 through 3.2-12)

The proposed project would provide a variety of travel mode choices to project employees and guests. A public transit stop is located one block west of the proposed project site. In addition, the project is within walking distance of amenities such as shopping and restaurants. As a result, the project would result in a lower increase in the consumption of transportation-related fuels than might otherwise occur. Because energy efficiency standards would be incorporated into the project design and total building-related energy consumption would be reduced when compared to the BAU scenario, energy would not be used in a wasteful and inefficient manner, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.2-12)

Although operation of the proposed project would increase electricity and natural gas consumption, usage would be reduced compared to the BAU scenario and would not require new or expanded energy facilities. As a result, impacts associated with the need for new or expanded energy facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.2-12 through 3.2-13)

Cumulative Impacts

The potential for future growth within the City to result in impacts to energy consumption (i.e., cumulative impacts) was recently evaluated in the Pasadena General Plan Initial Study. As the proposed project is consistent with the site's General Plan designation and zoning, the analysis of energy impacts in the General Plan Initial Study is representative of cumulative impacts associated with the project. As identified in the General Plan Initial Study, energy usage associated with buildout of the General Plan, which represents the cumulative condition, would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.2-13 through 3.2-15)

Buildout of the proposed project and additional forecasted growth in the City, including the 67 cumulative projects, would increase demand for transportation fuels. Although there would be a cumulative increase in the consumption of petroleum-based fuels, because future supplies would be adequate to meet projected demand, cumulative impacts relating to transportation fuels would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.2-15)

b. LAND USE AND PLANNING

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Draft EIR, p. 3.3-24)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

As noted above and explained below, the EIR analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to land use and planning. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project as proposed would be consistent with the overall intent of the land use plans that govern development in the project area. The proposed project would be consistent with the overall goals of the General Plan's Guiding Principles, Land Use Element, and Green Space, Recreation and Parks Element, and would not preclude the attainment of the primary intent of the General Plan or the Green Space, Recreation and Parks Master Plan. Similarly, the project would be consistent with the ultimate vision of the Central District Specific Plan (CDSP) to provide a diverse civic center with convenient access by alternative modes of travel and would not preclude the attainment of the primary intent of the CDSP. The proposed project would be consistent with goals relating to sustainable development and preservation of historic resources. A number of important features that contribute to the urban landscape in the Downtown area would be maintained or enhanced. In particular, the proposed project would respect the Holly Street and Garfield Avenue promenades, the Robinson Memorial, and Centennial Plaza, and would maintain the majority of the project site's street trees. The landscaping and trees that would be removed with implementation of the proposed project would not impede the implementation of the General Plan or CDSP with respect to landscape resources in the Downtown and Civic Center areas. In summary, the proposed project would not conflict with the Guiding Principles of the General Plan nor with any City objectives or planning concepts adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, impacts of the project relative to City plan consistency would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.3-24 through 3.3-38)

Members of the public submitted particular comments regarding land use and planning impacts, to which adequate responses were provided in the Final EIR. In particular, Topical Responses were provided related to various historical iterations of planning efforts in the City, including the evolution of the Bennett Plan and its relevance to the proposed project. Without diminishing its importance as a lasting vision for the Civic Center, a detailed analysis of historical documents and City records evidences the fact that the Bennett Plan is not an adopted regulatory plan that governs development in the City. (Final EIR, TR-GEN-2, pp. 3-4 through 3-8, 3-243; see also Final EIR Appendix B – Bennett Plan Materials) Consistency with land use plan policies regarding open space were also adequately addressed in responses to comments, wherein it was made plain that the landscaped areas along Garfield Avenue and Holly Street are not open spaces nor specially protected by any land use plans or policies. (Final EIR, pp. 3-46, 3-50, 3-146 through 3-148; see also Appendix F)

Cumulative Impacts

The related cumulative projects located within the Civic Center/Midtown Sub-District are infill projects that would be, or are being, constructed in highly developed areas. The sites for these related projects contain very little to no existing landscaped area and, therefore, would not result in significant impacts to downtown open space. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a

significant cumulative loss of open space in the downtown area or of landscaped areas, mature trees, and tree lawns in the Civic Center core. Impacts to land use policies pertaining to open space and landscaping would be less than significant. Moreover, as none of the projects are located along Garfield Avenue, there would be no cumulative impacts to Garfield Avenue as a civic promenade. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.3-38 through 3.3-39)

c. NOISE AND VIBRATION

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-15)
- Would the project cause result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-17)
- Would the project expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-20)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

As noted above and explained below, the EIR analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to the noise impact listed above. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels during construction from typical construction activities, including diesel engines of construction equipment and activities such as pile driving, blasting, and jackhammering. No pile driving or blasting would occur during construction of the proposed project. Nearby receptors would be exposed to occasional high noise levels associated with the operation of heavy equipment during construction, including air compressors, cement and mortar mixers, cranes, forklifts, generator sets, graders, pavers, paving equipment, rollers, rough terrain forklifts, rubber tired dozers, skid steer loaders, tractors/loaders/backhoes, and welders. Construction activities would be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturday, as required by the Pasadena Municipal Code. Noise generated from construction equipment

assumed to be used during project construction would not exceed 85 dBA Lmax at 100 feet. In addition to on-site activities, construction activities could include the import or export of excavated soils and other materials using large diesel trucks. Construction-related trucks would generate a noise level of 70 dBA at a distance of 100 feet, which is below the City's construction noise limit of 85 dBA at 100 feet. Therefore, noise impacts during construction would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-15 through 3.4-17)

The existing ambient noise level at the project site is estimated at 60 dBA. The project would contribute operational (post-construction) noise to the existing environment through (1) the addition of traffic on local streets, (2) on-site stationary sources, and (3) on-site outdoor activities. The increase in project-related traffic volumes on surrounding streets would vary, depending on which parking garage is used for valet parking. A doubling of average daily traffic on adjacent streets would result in a 3 dBA increase in noise levels, which would be barely perceptible to the human ear. Traffic would need to be increased at least three times for increased noise to exceed the City's threshold of 5 dBA. The greatest increase in traffic on surrounding roads would occur on Garfield Avenue, where traffic would increase by 81 percent with use of the Holly Street Garage or the Ramona Garage. This would result in an increase in existing noise levels of less than 3 dBA. Therefore, impacts from increased traffic volumes would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-17 through 3.4-18)

Operational noise sources associated with the proposed project would include mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC units and swimming pool pumps); landscape maintenance equipment; and outdoor activities in the patio and swimming pool areas. Mechanical equipment would comply with the City Noise Ordinance. Noise from landscape maintenance equipment would be similar to noise currently generated by the same activities on the project site and would not result in a substantial increase in noise above existing noise levels. Noise from the pool area and outdoor patio area would not exceed significance thresholds for noise, and would comply with the City Noise Ordinance. Therefore, noise impacts from mechanical equipment, landscape maintenance equipment, and outdoor activities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-18 through 3.4-20)

The building design would comply with the California Building Standards Code, which requires the interior noise level for hotel guest rooms to be 45 dBA CNEL or less. With adherence to the code, noise impacts to hotel guest rooms would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-20 through 3.4-21)

The proposed project would be located in the CD-2 zoning district. The primary purpose of CD-2 is to be the governmental center of the City by supporting civic, cultural, and public service institutions. Governmental functions, such as City Hall, the Post Office, the Pasadena Police Department, and the Court House, are located near the proposed project. Unusual noises, such as

police sirens and protests at City Hall, could occasionally occur near the project site; however, these types of noise events would not be of the frequency or magnitude to result in a CNEL exceeding 70 dBA, the upper limit of the Normally Acceptable noise exposure category. Therefore, impacts to future occupants, users and employees of the hotel would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-21)The proposed project would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance, the California Building Standards Code, and the City's Noise Element land use compatibility criteria. For these reasons, the proposed project would not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of any established state or local standards and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-21)

Cumulative Impacts

Growth in the study area from future development projects in the vicinity has the potential to increase ambient noise levels. There are only three planned projects within 1,000 feet of the proposed project site. The Union Street Condominiums Project is located at 254 East Union Street, approximately 50 feet from the project site; the planned redevelopment of the former Macy's building at Paseo Colorado is located at 260-386 East Colorado Boulevard, approximately 550 feet from the project site; and the expansion of All Saint's Church is located at 132 North Euclid, approximately 650 northeast of the project site. There are no sensitive noise receptors located between the proposed project site and these three planned developments. As a result, the proposed project, in combination with these and other development projects in the City, does not have the potential to result in a significant cumulative temporary or permanent noise impacts. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-26 through 3.4-27)

d. Transportation and Traffic

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-16)
- Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-18)
- Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to level

of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-19)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

As noted above and explained below, the EIR analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to the transportation and traffic impacts listed above. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The City recently adopted TIA Guidelines that promote an integrated and multimodal transportation system within the City through public transit services, parking strategies, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian components that are connected with the larger transportation system. The TIA Guidelines require analysis of metrics that evaluate vehicular travel, access to bicycle and transit facilities, and pedestrian accessibility. The project would not have any significant impacts relating to any of these modes of travel. As a result, the project would not conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Moreover, the project would not decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Impacts relating to the circulation system would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-16 through 3.5-18) Further explanation regarding the inapplicability of auto delay as a proper threshold was further provided in response to comments. (Final EIR, pp. 3-91, through 3-92, 3-149)

The proposed project's parking needs will be met at offsite parking garages in the immediate area. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-16 through 3.5-17) Comments regarding the speculative nature of the actual parking were adequately addressed, with clarification provided that the offsite parking must receive a valet permit, must be within a maximum of 1,500 feet of the project site, and that all of the garages analyzed meet that requirement. (Final EIR, pp. 3-72, 3-92)

The nearest CMP arterial monitoring intersection to the project site is at the intersection of Arroyo Parkway at California Boulevard (CMP No. 119). Based on the incremental project trip generation estimates and trip distribution analysis, the project is not expected to add 50 or more new trips per hour to this CMP monitoring intersection. The nearest CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations to the project site are I-210 west of SR-134/Interstate 710 (I-710) and SR-134 west of San Rafael Avenue. Based on the incremental project trip generation

estimates, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to add 150 or more new trips per peak hour to these locations in either direction. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the adopted Congestion Management Program; impacts to CMP arterial monitoring intersections and mainline freeway monitoring locations would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-19)

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative transportation impacts within the City were recently evaluated in the Pasadena General Plan Draft EIR (City of Pasadena 2015). As the proposed project is consistent with the site's General Plan designation and zoning, the analysis of transportation impacts in the General Plan Draft EIR is representative of cumulative impacts associated with the project. The analysis considered impacts associated with the five transportation performance measures identified in the TIA Guidelines, namely VMT per Capita, VT per Capita, proximity and quality of the bicycle network, proximity and quality of the transit network, and pedestrian accessibility. The analysis found that transportation impacts associated with all five performance measures would be less than significant. The proposed project would be consistent with land use designations associated with the project site that were evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, project-related impacts were considered in the cumulative analysis conducted for the Pasadena General Plan Draft EIR. Cumulative impacts associated with all transportation modes would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-20 through 3.5-21)

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 that will reduce the following potentially significant environmental impacts to below a level of significance. For each environmental topic within this category, the discussion below begins with a delineation of the potential impacts evaluated in the EIR, as specifically related to that topic, along with page citations as to where in the EIR the relevant discussion is found, and is followed by presentation of the mitigation measure(s) identified in the EIR for that topic, and then provides an explanation of the substantial evidence in support of the EIR conclusion that the impact would be reduced to a level less than significant within implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

e. CULTURAL RESOURCES

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? (Draft EIR, p. 3.1-20)

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? (Draft EIR, p. 3.1-26)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

MM-CULTURAL-1: Compliance with Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The applicant will engage a historic preservation consultant that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to oversee the design development for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Design development will also be guided by the 2011 Pasadena YWCA Rehabilitation Study prepared for the City of Pasadena by Architectural Resources Group. The historic preservation consultant will conduct on-site construction monitoring throughout the construction phase. The historic preservation consultant will submit monthly written progress memoranda confirming Standards compliance and a final report prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City. (Draft EIR, P. 3.1-25)

MM-CULTURAL-2: Protection of Archaeological Resources

If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until an archaeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists 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. (Draft EIR, P. 3.1-26)

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

The proposed project would rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the Pasadena YWCA, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributor to the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District, is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources as a contributor to the District, and is a designated historic monument by the City of Pasadena. The proposed project would rehabilitate the first floor of the existing YWCA building to include the hotel lobby, registration area, and restaurant. The existing Pasadena YWCA

gymnasium and swimming pool spaces would become hotel ballrooms. The second and third floors of the existing YWCA building would be rehabilitated into 13 guestrooms and suites, hotel meeting rooms, and support spaces, and the roof level would be converted to an outdoor, rooftop pool area. The existing basement would provide for kitchen storage, general storage, mechanical rooms and administrative function space. Without mitigation, rehabilitation of the existing Pasadena YWCA building has the potential to alter or remove character-defining features that are important in conveying the historic significance of the property. With implementation of MM-CULTURAL-1, the proposed project would have no substantial adverse impacts to historic resources because the Pasadena YWCA building and the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District would retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance and remain eligible for listing in the National Register and/or the California Register and as a City of Pasadena historic monument. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation, impacts to the Pasadena YWCA building will be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.1-20 through 3.1-26 and Final EIR, pp. 3-8 through 3-18)

The proposed project would construct a six-story building adjacent to the YWCA building on land currently used for surface parking and as a public landscape area. The significance and integrity of the YWCA building would remain intact and the building would retain its eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributor to the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District, its listing in the California Register of Historical Resources as a contributor to the District, and its status as a City of Pasadena historic monument. The YWCA building would also remain eligible for individual listing in the National Register and California Register. The impact of the new building on the historic significance of the YWCA building would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.1-20 through 3.1-21 and Final EIR, pp. 3-13 through 3-18)

New construction would be within the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District boundaries and within the vicinity of several buildings that are district contributors. However, the proposed project would have no impact on the vast majority of the contributing resources and character-defining features of the Historic District. In addition, the proposed project's alterations to the YWCA building (a contributing resource), alterations to spatial relationships in the District, and removal of a portion of landscaped area (a character-defining feature) would not reduce the integrity of the District or of any historic resources such that the historic significance of these resources would be threatened. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project to the historic significance and integrity of the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District and eligibility for listing of resources within the District would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.1-21 through 3.1-23 and Final EIR, pp. 3-8 through 3-18)

There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site, and the site was previously graded and disturbed to support the existing development. In addition, the project site has been subject to extensive ground disturbance due to previous development of the site and surrounding

areas. The proposed project would require minimal excavation; nevertheless there is a potential that construction of the project could encounter previously undiscovered archeological resources. With implementation of MM-CULTURAL-2, impacts on archaeological resources would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 3.1-26)

Numerous public comments regarding cultural resources were received and adequately responded to in the Final EIR. Particularly detailed analyses in five topical responses demonstrate that the proposed project's potential cultural resources impacts were adequately analyzed, not only by expert consultants but also by the City's own highly qualified expert staff. (Final EIR, pp. 3-8 through 3-20; see also curriculum vitae at Final EIR, Appendix C) In particular, the Historical Resources Technical Report correctly identified all contributing buildings and important features of the District, including important Beaux-Arts planning and design aspects of the District. While a number of alterations in the District have taken place since its listing in 1980, most of the new construction took place on vacant areas and surface parking lots. The proposed project would remove vacant landscaped areas but would not constitute a "significant adverse change" to the District and the District would retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance. (Final EIR, pp. 3-9 to 3-13) Likewise, the new construction would be compatible with and sufficiently subordinate to existing historic resources such as the YWCA building, City Hall, and the District. (Final EIR, pp. 3-13 through 3-15) While the valet drop off in front of the YWCA along Marengo would remove an original landscape feature, the alteration would not result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. (Final EIR, pp. 3-16 through 3-17) Finally, Robinson Memorial, which is not an historical resource under CEQA despite its importance as a memorial object commemorating the brothers' legacy, would continue to be experienced and understood by the public as it has been since its dedication in 1997 and completion in 2002 without impact from the proposed project. (Final EIR, pp. 3-18 through 3-20)

Cumulative Impacts

With implementation of MM-CULTURAL-1, the proposed project would have no substantial adverse impacts to historic resources. With mitigation, the Pasadena YWCA building and the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District would retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance and remain eligible for listing in the National Register and the California Register, and as a City of Pasadena historic monument. Moreover, the YWCA Kimpton Hotel project would not have an adverse impact on the Civic Center Financial District or on the Loweman Building. As a result, the proposed project, in combination with the Union Street Condominiums Project, would not have a cumulative impact on the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District, the Civic Center Financial District, or the Loweman Building. Further, the project's contribution to the potential citywide significant cumulative impact to historic resources would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.1-26 through 3.1-27)

No archaeological resources are expected to be found on the project site and, should this occur, MM-CULTURAL-2 would ensure that no significant impacts would result. Therefore, the project's contribution to the potential significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.1-27)

f. NOISE AND VIBRATION

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project expose persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-22)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

MM-NOISE-1: Consult with Structural Engineer and Project Historical Architect

Prior to approval of grading plans and/or prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the Applicant shall retain a team to include a Professional Structural Engineer with experience in structural vibration analysis and monitoring for historic buildings and a Project Historical Architect (PHA) to perform the following tasks:

- Review the project plans for demolition and construction;
- Survey the project site and the existing YWCA building, including geological testing, if required; and
- Prepare and submit a report to the Director of Planning and Community Development to include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - Any survey information obtained from the survey identified above;
 - Any modifications to the estimated vibration level limits based on building conditions, soil conditions, and planned demolition and construction methods to ensure that vibration levels would remain below the potential for damage to the existing YWCA building;
 - Specific measures to be taken during construction to ensure the vibration level limits identified by the Professional Structural Engineer (or 0.12 ppv in/sec in lieu of such specified limits) are not exceeded, including modeling calculations that demonstrate the vibration levels following implementation of the identified measures; and
 - A monitoring plan to be implemented during demolition and construction that includes post-construction and post-demolition surveys of the existing YWCA building and documentation

demonstrating that the measures identified in the report have been implemented.

Examples of measures that may be specified for implementation during demolition or construction include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Prohibition of certain types of construction equipment;
- Requirement for lighter tracked or wheeled equipment;
- Specifying demolition by non-impact methods, such as sawing concrete;
- Phasing operations to avoid simultaneous vibration sources; and
- Installation of vibration measuring devices to guide decision making for subsequent activities. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-24 through 3.4-25)

MM-NOISE-2: Post-Construction Survey and Repairs

At the conclusion of vibration-causing activities, in the unanticipated event of discovery of vibration-caused damage, the Structural Engineer and the PHA shall document any damage to the existing YWCA building and shall recommend necessary repairs. The Applicant shall be responsible for any repairs associated with vibration-caused damage. Repairs shall be undertaken and completed, as required, to conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 68) and any other codes, if applicable, such as the California Historical Building Code (24 CFR Part 8). (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-25)

MM-NOISE-3: Coordination of Scheduled Construction Activities

The City of Pasadena will coordinate with developers of the YWCA Kimpton Hotel Project and the Union Street Condominiums Project to ensure that construction activities that have the potential to generate cumulatively significant vibration, namely excavation and grading/compaction, would be scheduled so as not to occur simultaneously. (Draft EIR, p. 3.4-27)

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

Construction of the proposed project has the potential to generate vibration that would be experienced by nearby structures and their occupants.

Conventional heavy construction equipment, such as large bulldozers, would be used during construction. The proposed project would involve renovation of the historic YWCA building. In addition, construction of the new building would occur immediately adjacent to the YWCA building. If large bulldozers or similar equipment were to operate within 20 feet of the existing YWCA building, the vibration level could exceed the 0.12 ppv in/sec significance threshold for damage. Use of vibratory rollers or similar equipment could exceed the 0.12 ppv in/sec threshold if used at distances of less than 40 feet from the existing YWCA building. Because the exact limits of equipment use, types of equipment to be used, and soil conditions are not known at this time, it is assumed that vibration generated during construction could result in structural damage to the YWCA building. This would be a significant impact without mitigation. There would be no impacts associated with human annoyance because the building would not be occupied during construction. The Loweman Building is located approximately 50 feet south of the proposed project site across Union Street. Due to the distance of this building from the project site, impacts associated with vibration-related structural damage would be less than significant. However, construction activities could potentially exceed the 75 VdB threshold for human annoyance at commercial land uses. This would be a potentially significant impact without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOISE-1 and MM-NOISE-2, vibration-related structural impacts to the YWCA building, and vibration-related human annoyance impacts would be less than significant. Due to the distance of other surrounding buildings from the project site, including City Hall, the first Baptist Church of Pasadena, and Centennial Plaza, vibration impacts to these structures would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-22 through 3.4-26)

In response to particular comments regarding noise and vibration, the Final EIR made necessary minor corrections to vibration impacts at the Loweman Building, resulting in lower impacts than initially reported. (Final EIR, pp. 2-4 through 2-5, 3-148) Noise impacts and the inapplicability of a CEQA analysis on future residents, as well as the applicability of the City's Noise Ordinance, were adequately explained as well. (Final EIR, pp. 3-77 through 3-78, 3-148 through 3-149, 3-173)

Cumulative Impacts

Due to the proximity of the proposed project and the Union Street Condominiums Project to the Loweman Building, and the fact that the two projects could undergo construction during a similar timeframe, it is possible that cumulative vibration impacts associated with construction of the two projects could exceed thresholds of significance for structural damage and/or human annoyance at the Loweman Building. Similarly, as both projects are located in proximity to the YWCA building, cumulative vibration impacts associated with construction of the two projects could exceed thresholds of significance for structural damage at the YWCA building. These cumulative impacts would be

potentially significant without mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOISE-3, potential cumulative vibration impacts on the YWCA building and the Loweman building would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.4-26 through 3.4-27)

g. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses? (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-19)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

MM-TRAFFIC-1: Loading Zone Design

All loading spaces shall be designed and maintained so that the maneuvering, loading, or unloading of vehicles does not require backing movements onto or from any public street. If the applicant is unable to provide an on-site loading zone which does not prevent backing onto or from a public street, or an on-street loading area is unavoidable, the applicant is limited to the following:

- If an on-street commercial loading zone is proposed, the hours of operation for the on-street loading zone shall be limited to 2:00 AM to 5:00 AM every day of the week.
- If proposed, the on-street commercial loading zone along Union Street shall provide and maintain a lane closure throughout the hours of operation.
- Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall provide a traffic control plan to the Department of Transportation for review and approval of the lane closure associated with the on-street commercial loading zone. The plan shall identify measures to direct oncoming traffic onto remaining traffic lanes that would not be blocked by loading activity.
- The above-mentioned traffic management plan shall be prepared by a registered professional engineer in California.
- All lane closures shall be implemented in accordance with the WATCH Manual, 2012 Edition. (Draft EIR, p. 3.5-20)

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project includes a commercial loading/access zone for service vehicles along Union Street. All ingress and egress to the project site would be required to comply with the specifications of the Departments of Public Works and Transportation to ensure that adequate visibility and safety distance are provided at the access points. Based on a review by DOT, it was determined that a standard commercial loading/access zone in this location would be incompatible with existing traffic on Union Street. A standard loading/access zone in this location could involve service vehicles backing into, or backing out from, the loading/access zone onto a public street or, alternatively, stopping in the travel lane. Any of these maneuvers would create unsafe conditions given the travel speeds on Union Street. Thus, without mitigation, the proposed commercial loading has the potential to result in safety hazards associated with this project design feature. With implementation of MM-TRAFFIC-1, safety impacts associated with the proposed loading/access zone would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.5-19 through 3.5-20)

The Final EIR adequately addressed comments regarding the loading zone. The intention is to design the loading zone so that vehicles do not have to back in or out, but if that is not feasible, then MM-TRAFFIC-1 includes restricted hours of operation so that such backing movements are not occurring during busy traffic flows, which will keep any impacts to below significant. (Final EIR, pp. 3-72 through 3-74, 3-91, 3-150)

V. RESOLUTION REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

The City Council declares that the City has considered and rejected as infeasible Alternatives 1, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, 2G, and 3 identified in the Final EIR as set forth herein. CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate the comparative merits of a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of a project, that: (1) would feasibly attain most of the project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts of the project, and (2) may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved. An EIR does not need to address alternatives that are not feasible, and the consideration of alternatives is to be judged against a rule of reason.

The lead agency is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative, but is not required to choose the environmentally superior for approval over the proposed project if the alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., does not avoid or substantially reduce the significant impact(s) that would otherwise occur from the project), does not attain most of the project objectives, or is infeasible due to social, economic, technological or other considerations.

The Final EIR identified objectives for the project as follows (see Draft EIR, pp. 2.10 and 2-17):

- Restore and rehabilitate the historic YWCA building into an economically sustainable, long-term use as an integral part of the Civic Center area that will allow the City to recoup its investment in the property within a reasonable amount of time by way of a market-rate ground lease.
- Complement City Hall and the existing Civic Center area by adding a premier four-star hotel with a restaurant and banquet facilities commensurate with the historical integrity of the YWCA building and site and that will allow for public accessibility to the building.
- Enhance the dynamic environment of the Civic Center District while respecting the dominance and monumentality of major civic buildings, the scale and form of existing historic structures, and the architectural context of the surrounding historic district, including the Robinson Memorial.
- Create a vibrant entrance to the City's Civic Center area in an urban context that encourages pedestrian oriented and non-motorized transportation uses and maximizes available existing parking facilities and transit opportunities in close proximity to the site (e.g., the Memorial Park Gold Line Station).
- Increase pedestrian activity, create a pedestrian friendly environment for the public, and create a pleasant walk that connects the Civic Center area to the Mid-Town, Paseo, Playhouse, South Lake, and Old Pasadena Business Districts.
- Create a premier four-star hotel that supports and contributes to the economic vitality of the Civic Center, Mid-Town, Paseo, Playhouse, South Lake, and Old Pasadena Business Districts as well as the convention center and adheres to the intent and the requirements of the City's General Plan and the Central District Specific Plan.

The alternatives analyzed in the EIR represent a reasonable range of alternatives based on the applicable provisions of the CEQA Guidelines.

a. Alternatives Considered But Rejected

The City Council finds that all of the alternatives eliminated from further consideration in the Final EIR are infeasible, would not meet the basic project objectives, and/or would not reduce or avoid any of the significant effects of the proposed project for the following reasons.

Construction of the Project on an alternate site was dismissed as infeasible because consideration of an alternative site would not fulfill the basic objective of rehabilitating the historic YWCA building as an integral part of the Civic Center area.

The Minimum Development Standards Compliant Alternative was considered infeasible because the alternative would be expected to have greater impacts than the proposed project. This alternative would have a larger building footprint (i.e., smaller setbacks) than the proposed project. In addition, parking would be provided onsite in a new, subterranean parking garage. The larger footprint of the new building would remove more landscape area than the proposed project. The new parking garage would require additional construction, including substantial excavation that would have potential air quality and greenhouse gas impacts as well as increased construction-related noise and vibration impacts relative to the proposed project.

The Rehabilitation Only Alternative would involve rehabilitation of the YWCA building with no adjacent new construction. The use of the building would be assumed to be a community-based organization similar to the original use of the building as a YWCA. This alternative was dismissed as infeasible because there appears to be no market for a private developer to rehabilitate the existing YWCA building for reuse as a community center type use, nor is there a need for such a facility. During the solicitation process for redevelopment of the YWCA building, the City did not receive any proposals to use the existing YWCA building as a community center. Although the existing YWCA building and infrastructure are suitable for a community center type use, given that the site has remained largely vacant for the past 18 years, and no proposals were received that would reuse the site in this manner, there appears to be no market for such a use at the site. Moreover, the City's planning documents do not identify a need for such a community facility. Finally, this alternative would not return to the City the substantial investment it undertook to save the structure from demolition by neglect.

b. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Pursuant to Guidelines Section 15126.6, the EIR discussed a No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative assumes no development of the proposed project site. The YWCA building would remain vacant. It is assumed that the City would allocate funding to conduct minimal maintenance on the building; the amount of funding that would be allocated is not known at this time. The parking lot would continue to operate for public parking and the landscaped area would remain the same as the existing condition.

Under implementation of Alternative 1 some environmental impacts would be similar to the proposed project, some environmental effects would be reduced, and others would be increased. Impacts to energy would be less than

significant under the No Project Alternative, similar to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 4-5) Impacts to noise and vibration and to transportation and traffic would be reduced as compared to the proposed project; however, as discussed in Sections 3.4 and 3.5, respectively, of the Draft EIR, all potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, including these impacts, can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures. (Draft EIR, p. 4-6)

Implementation of the No Project Alternative could result in new potentially significant and unavoidable impacts related to cultural resources, which would not occur with the proposed project. Specifically, under this alternative, there would be no rehabilitation of the YWCA building and the building would remain unused. Over time, without adequate maintenance, the condition of the building would continue to deteriorate, which could affect the historic significance of the building if historic features are altered or damaged through deterioration. Continued deterioration of historic features could eventually reduce the historic integrity of the building and adversely affect the building's eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, and as a Pasadena Historic Monument. Depending on the level of funding allocated by the City to arrest such deterioration, this could be a potentially significant impact to historic resources under the No Project Alternative. If insufficient funding were allocated to allow for adequate maintenance to reduce deterioration of the building, demolition by neglect could occur, which would be a significant impact.

In comparison, potentially significant impacts from rehabilitation of the YWCA building under the proposed project would be mitigated to level that is less than significant. Deterioration of the YWCA building under the No Project Alternative could also result in potential impacts to the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District. The YWCA building is a contributing building to the Civic Center Historic District and the continued deterioration and possible loss of the YWCA building could result in an adverse change to the Historic District. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-4 through 4-5) In addition, the No Project Alternative would not support the intent of the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, which is to focus new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas in existing main streets, downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in an improved jobs-housing balance and more opportunity for transit-oriented development. The No Project Alternative would not contribute to housing or job growth in Pasadena. Moreover, the No Project Alternative would not advance key principles of the City's General Plan. (Draft EIR, p. 4-5)

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed project, such as restoring and rehabilitating the historic YWCA building into an economically sustainable use that will allow the City to recoup its investment in the property; complementing City Hall and the

Civic Center area by adding a premier four-star hotel that will allow for public accessibility to the building; enhancing the environment of the Civic Center District while respecting major civic buildings, existing historic structures, and the architectural context of the surrounding district; creating a vibrant entrance to the Civic Center area in a context that encourages pedestrian oriented and non-motorized transportation use and maximizes available parking facilities and transit opportunities; increasing pedestrian activity and connections to surrounding districts; and supporting the economic vitality of the area while adhering to the intent and requirements of the General Plan and Central District Specific Plan.

For CEQA purposes, this alternative is rejected because it would not meet any of the project objectives and it could potentially result in significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources.

c. Alternative 2 – Increased Setback Alternatives

Under the series of alternatives presented under Alternative 2, the project site would also be redeveloped as a hotel, but the new hotel building would be set back farther from Garfield Avenue than the proposed project. There are seven variations for Alternative 2 that vary based on the setback from Garfield Avenue, the number of hotel rooms, the maximum height for the new building and/or whether a portion of the existing YWCA building would be replaced with new construction. For comparison purposes, the proposed project has a setback of 20.25 feet from Garfield Avenue, a new building maximum height of 60 feet, and 179 hotel rooms. Under the proposed project, the 40,570-square-foot YWCA building would be retained, and a new 87,342-square-foot, three-to-six-story building would be constructed on the project site, connected to the existing YWCA building solely by a bridge on the third floor. The total square footage of the hotel would be approximately 127,912 square feet.

i. Alternative 2A – 30/40 Foot Setback

Under Alternative 2A, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would have a varying setback of between 30 and 40 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 60 feet (or six stories, the same as the proposed project), and have a total of approximately 185 rooms. The 30- to 40-foot setback would retain more of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue relative to the proposed project. The square footage of the new building would be greater than the proposed project, at approximately 91,000 square feet. The new building would have a slightly different footprint than the proposed project in order to allow for the additional setback, maintain the same maximum building height and similar number of hotel rooms, and incorporate an open loggia space. To accommodate this, there would be a smaller interior courtyard area than is included under the proposed project and the building would extend to cover the eastern façade of the pool wing of the YWCA building, with articulated physical

separation of portions of this connection to preserve the single existing window on this facade. The new building would also include physical connections to the south-facing courtyard facade of the existing gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA and construction on top of an existing portion of the building that extends south from the pool wing. Other than the interface of the new and existing buildings, the changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2A would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2A would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. Alternative 2A would not result in any new significant impacts not already associated with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2A to cultural resources, energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-8 through 4-16)

For CEQA purposes this alternative cannot be rejected. Alternative 2A would meet all of the project objectives, would better fulfill the objective of respecting the architectural context of the surrounding uses in the Civic Center Historic District, and would better reinforce the vision of the 1925 plan for the Civic Center as prepared by the firm Bennett, Parsons and Frost, as recommended in the Central District Specific Plan. Primary Beaux Arts planning principles include balance and symmetry and Alternative 2A would result in a balanced proportion of space between the west facade of City Hall and the east facade of the proposed Kimpton Hotel building. A line extending from the center of the angled facade of the proposed building facing northeast toward the intersection of Holly Street and North Garfield Avenue would converge with a similar line drawn from the center of the west facade of City Hall in the center of Centennial Plaza. Bennett clearly intended to create this balance surrounding City Hall based on the 1925-1926 plans and, thus, Alternative 2A is clearly consistent with Bennett's Plan for the Civic Center.

ii. Alternative 2B – 70 Foot Setback with No Increased Height and Reduced Room Count

Under Alternative 2B, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 70 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 60 feet (i.e., the same height as the proposed project), and have a total of approximately 143 rooms. The 70-foot setback would preserve much of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same maximum building height as the proposed project, while providing a 70-foot setback, the new building under Alternative 2B would have approximately 36 fewer hotel rooms than the proposed project. The square footage of the new building would be less than the proposed project, at approximately 85,000 square feet. The new building would include physical connections to the south-facing

courtyard facade and east-facing rear facade of the existing gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA, and construction on top of an existing portion of the building that extends south from the pool wing. Other than the interface of the new and existing buildings, the changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2B would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2B would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. Alternative 2B would not result in any new significant impacts not already associated with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2B to cultural resources, energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-16 to 4-24)

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives, although the proposed project would better fulfill the objective of respecting the architectural context of the surrounding uses with respect to the Robinson Memorial. With its reduced operational capacity, Alternative 2B may not fully meet the objective of developing an economically sustainable, long-term use that would allow the City to recoup its investment in the property within a reasonable amount of time, and it would not have the same contribution to the economic vitality of the surrounding area as would the proposed project.

For CEQA purposes this alternative is rejected because it does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would not fulfill the project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project.

iii. Alternative 2C – 70 Foot Setback with Increased Building Height

Under Alternative 2C, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 70 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 90 feet, and have a total of approximately 185 rooms. The 70-foot setback would preserve much of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same number of rooms as the proposed project, while providing a 70-foot setback, the new building under Alternative 2C would be 9 stories. The square footage of the new building would be greater than the proposed project, at approximately 112,000 square feet. The new building would include physical connections to the south-facing courtyard facade and east-facing rear facade of the existing gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA, and construction on top of an existing portion of the building that extends south from the pool wing. Other than the interface of the new and existing buildings, the changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2C would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2C would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2C to energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Cultural resources impacts from the rehabilitation of the Pasadena YWCA building under Alternative 2C would be more severe when compared with those of the proposed project. Even with mitigation to ensure that the rehabilitation would be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the increased height of the new construction associated with this alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources. To accommodate the reduced footprint of the 70-foot setback, the southern volume of the new construction along Union Street would be nine stories high. This is three times the height of the tallest portion of the YWCA building and three stories taller than the office wings of City Hall. Because the new building would be taller than the City Hall office wings and taller than any contributing building in the Civic Center Historic District other than the City Hall dome, it would not be compatible with the Historic District. The overall effect would alter the visual hierarchy within the Historic District, which is an important character-defining feature of the district, and would materially alter the Historic District in an adverse manner. For these reasons, the historic resources impacts of Alternative 2C on the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District would be significant and unavoidable. This would be a new significant impact to cultural resources not already associated with the proposed project.

Alternative 2C would meet many of the project objectives, although the increased building height of 90 feet, taller than the City Hall building wings, would be inconsistent with the objective of respecting the monumentality and dominance of civic buildings. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-24 to 4-34)

For CEQA purposes this alternative is rejected because it does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project.

iv. Alternative 2D – 70 Foot Setback with Construction on Pool Wing

Under Alternative 2D, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 70 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 60 feet (i.e., the same height as the proposed project), and have a total of approximately 185 rooms. The 70-foot setback would preserve much of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same

maximum building height and number of rooms as the proposed project, while providing a 70-foot setback, the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building would be demolished and replaced with additional hotel rooms. The square footage of the new building would be greater than the proposed project, at approximately 119,000 square feet. Other changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2D would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2D would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2D to energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Cultural resources impacts from the rehabilitation of the Pasadena YWCA building under Alternative 2D would be substantially more severe when compared with those of the proposed project. This alternative would demolish the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building, removing over a third of the total building. Although construction on this wing was started while the main YWCA building was under construction, it was designed by Julia Morgan, and is a contributing component to the building's historic monument designation and to its eligibility for listing in the California and National Registers. Removal of this amount of historic fabric would result in a significant impact to the YWCA building and threaten the YWCA building's eligibility for local, state, and national designation as an individual historic resource. Because integrity thresholds are somewhat less for contributors to a historic district, the remaining portion of the YWCA building would remain eligible as a contributing building to the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District. Therefore, demolition of the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building would not result in a significant impact to the Historic District. Nevertheless, the impact to the YWCA building individually would be significant and unavoidable under CEQA. This would be a new significant impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project. Alternative 2D would meet many of the project objectives; however, the demolition of the pool wing would not fulfill objectives pertaining to developing the project site commensurate with the historical integrity of the YWCA building and respecting the scale and form of existing historic structures. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-34 to 4-44)

For CEQA purposes this alternative is rejected because it does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project.

v. Alternative 2E – 107 Foot Setback with No Increased Height and Reduced Room Count

Under Alternative 2E, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 107 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 60 feet (i.e., the same height as the proposed project), and have a total of approximately 106 rooms. The 107-foot setback would preserve all of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same maximum building height as the proposed project, while providing a 107-foot setback, the new building under Alternative 2E would have approximately 73 fewer hotel rooms than the proposed project. The square footage of the new building would be less than the proposed project, at approximately 59,000 square feet. The new building would include physical connections to the south-facing courtyard facade of the existing gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA and construction on top of an existing portion of the building that extends south from the pool wing. Other than the interface of the new and existing buildings, changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2E would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2E would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. Alternative 2E would not result in any new significant impacts not already associated with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2E to cultural resources, energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 2E is considered to be environmentally superior to the proposed project. Moreover, this alternative would meet most, but not all, of the project objectives. However, with its substantial reduction in operational capacity, Alternative 2E may not fully meet the objective of developing an economically sustainable, long-term use that would allow the City to recoup its investment in the property within a reasonable amount of time, and it would not have the same contribution to the economic vitality of the surrounding area as would the proposed project. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-44 to 4-52)

The administrative record, particularly the Keyser-Marston peer review of Kimpton's June 2016 financials in Attachment Q to the agenda report prepared for the August 15, 2016 City Council meeting, contains evidence that this alternative is not economically feasible. In summary, the record reflects the following economic points that require rejection of this alternative at 106 rooms and approval of either the proposed project or Alternative 2A at their respective estimated room counts:

- The Julia Morgan Building renovation will cost approximately \$14M - \$16M. Saving this building from demolition by neglect is the linchpin for the project.
- From 2014 to 2016 the total cost estimates for the project increased from \$53.9M to \$69.2M.

- After payment of ground rent to the City, the estimated project financial return for KHP (Kimpton) is estimated to be approximately 6.65% and would be approximately 7.74% without ground rent payment.
- Industry standard range of return for hotels is 9%-11%, accordingly the profit margin for the project is already very thin.
- Throughout, the Southern California hotel market construction costs continue to outpace inflation, as increased competition for contractors and higher quality amenity packages continue to push hotel costs upward.
- Depending on the hotel's performance, there are two proposed possible timeframes under which the City will recoup its initial investment of \$8.3 M from rental payments. In one proposal, the City will be repaid its investment in approximately 12.5 years. Under the second proposal, the City will be repaid its investment in approximately 27.6 years.

For CEQA purposes, this alternative is rejected. This alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would not meet important project objectives that would be met with the proposed project. Most importantly, this alternative is rejected as economically infeasible for the reasons set forth directly above.

vi. Alternative 2F – 107 Foot Setback with Increased Height

Under Alternative 2F, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 107 feet from Garfield Avenue, and it would have a new building maximum height of 120 feet, and a total of approximately 185 rooms. The 107-foot setback would preserve all of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same number of rooms as the proposed project, while providing a 107-foot setback, the new building under Alternative 2F would be 12 stories. The square footage of the new building would be greater than the proposed project, at approximately 100,000 square feet. The new building would include physical connections to the south-facing courtyard facade of the existing gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA and construction on top of an existing portion of the building that extends south from the pool wing. Other than the interface of the new and existing buildings, the changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2F would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2F, would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. As with the proposed project, impacts of Alternative 2F to energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 2F would result in a new significant impact to cultural resources not already associated with the proposed project.

Cultural resources impacts from the rehabilitation of the Pasadena YWCA building under Alternative 2F would be more severe when compared with the proposed project. Even with mitigation to ensure that the rehabilitation would be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the increased height of the new construction associated with this alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources. To accommodate the reduced footprint of the 107-foot setback, the southern volume of the new construction would be twelve stories high. This is four times the height of the tallest portion of the YWCA building and twice the height of the office wings of City Hall. Because the new building would be taller than the City Hall office wings and taller than any contributing or non-contributing building in the Civic Center Historic District other than the City Hall dome, it would not be compatible with the Historic District. The overall effect would alter the visual hierarchy within the Historic District, which is an important character-defining feature of the district, and materially alter the Historic District in an adverse manner. For these reasons, the historic resources impacts of Alternative 2F on the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District would be significant and unavoidable. This would be a new significant impact to cultural resources not already associated with the proposed project.

Alternative 2F would meet many of the project objectives, although the increased building height of 120 feet, taller than the building wings of City Hall, would be inconsistent with the objective of respecting the monumentality and dominance of civic buildings. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-52 to 4-62)

For CEQA purposes this alternative is rejected because it does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project.

vii. Alternative 2G – 107 Foot Setback with Construction on Pool Wing

Under Alternative 2G, the eastern facade of the new hotel building would be set back 107 feet from Garfield Avenue, have a new building maximum height of 60 feet, and have a total of approximately 185 rooms. The 107-foot setback would preserve all of the existing landscaped area along Garfield Avenue. To maintain the same maximum building height and number of rooms as the proposed project, while providing a 107-foot setback, the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building would be demolished and replaced with additional hotel rooms. The square footage of the new building would be larger than the proposed project, at approximately 116,000 square feet. Other changes to the YWCA building under Alternative 2G would be the same as the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have any significant, unmitigable impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2G, would not reduce any significant, unmitigable impacts associated with the proposed project to a level that is less than significant. As with the proposed project, impacts to energy, land use and planning, noise and vibration, and transportation and traffic would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Cultural resources impacts from the rehabilitation of the Pasadena YWCA building under Alternative 2G would be substantially more severe when compared with those of the proposed project. This alternative would demolish the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building, removing over a third of the total building. Although construction on this wing was started while the main YWCA building was under construction, it was designed by Julia Morgan, and is a contributing component to the building's historic monument designation and to its eligibility for listing in the California and National Registers. Removal of this amount of historic fabric would result in a significant impact to the YWCA building and threaten the YWCA building's eligibility for local, state, and national designation as an individual historic resource. Because integrity thresholds are somewhat less for contributors to a historic district, the remaining portion of the YWCA building would remain eligible as a contributing building to the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District. Therefore, demolition of the gymnasium and pool wing of the YWCA building would not result in a significant impact to the Historic District. Nevertheless, the impact to the YWCA building individually would be significant and unavoidable under CEQA. This would be a new significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project.

Alternative 2G would meet many of the project objectives; however, the demolition of the pool wing would not fulfill objectives pertaining to developing the project site commensurate with the historical integrity of the YWCA building and respecting the scale and form of existing historic structures. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-62 to 4-72)

For CEQA purposes this alternative is rejected because it does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources not associated with the proposed project.

d. Alternative 3 – Alternative Land Use

Under Alternative 3, the project site would be used for commercial office space. The existing YWCA building would be rehabilitated to include the office lobby, conference and meeting rooms, and offices. A new building would be constructed within the same building envelope (i.e., setbacks and height) as the proposed project, and would also be used for commercial office space. This

building would be separate and adjacent to the YWCA building and would be a maximum of six stories. The total square footage of the office space, including the YWCA building and new building would be similar to the proposed project, at approximately 135,000 square feet. Assuming 250 square feet per employee (Pasadena Chamber of Commerce 2009), this alternative would support about 540 employees.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to energy, land use and planning, and noise and vibration as the proposed project. Impacts to these resources for both alternatives would be less than significant. Alternative 3 would result in new potentially significant impacts to cultural resources because of vibration associated with the subterranean parking garage that would not occur under the proposed project. Vibration impacts could affect the structural integrity of the YWCA building, which would be significant, but could be mitigated to be a level that is less than significant. Alternative 3 would result in increased vehicular travel relative to the proposed project, but impacts would remain less than significant. Impacts to traffic safety hazards would be less than significant under Alternative 3. (Draft EIR, pp. 4-72 to 4-76)

Alternative 3 would meet some of the project objectives. However, it would not meet the objective of adding a premier four-star hotel with restaurant and banquet facilities in the Civic Center area or creating a premier four-star hotel that supports and contributes to the economic vitality of the city's business districts. This is a key objective that arose out of the City's RFP process for the project site. That process sought to objectively identify a use that would result in rehabilitation of historic asset, provide direct economic benefit to the City (i.e. return on General Fund investment), and serve as a catalyst for continued economic development. (See Final EIR, p. 3-3) As also discussed above, project economic vitality is a must in order to achieve the linchpin purpose of the project, namely renovation of the Julia Morgan Building at an estimated cost of approximately \$14M - \$16M. Of the six proposals received, all were for hotel uses (one also proposed a separate commercial building on the City-owned property on the north side of Holly Street between Garfield and Marengo Avenues), and in particular the two most economically viable ones were hotels.

For CEQA purposes, this alternative is rejected. This alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the project (i.e., it would not reduce any unmitigable significant effects of the project), and it would not meet important project objectives that would be met with the proposed project.

VI. RESOLUTION REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires an EIR to discuss the significant irreversible environmental changes which would be caused by the proposed project. Generally, an impact would occur under this category if, for

example: (1) the project involved a large commitment of nonrenewable resources; (2) the primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses; (3) the project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental incidents associated with the project; and (4) the proposed consumption of resources are not justified (for example, results in wasteful use of resources).

Construction of the project would result in a commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources, such as construction materials and fossil fuels. Additionally, 1.93 acres of land, including the existing vacant YWCA building, a parking lot, and landscaped area, would be redeveloped with uses of a higher intensity than what previously occurred at the site. Operation of the project would require water for landscaping and domestic use, as well as energy resources in the form of natural gas and electricity. In addition, fossil fuels would be used by vehicles traveling to and from the proposed project site. However, impacts associated with increased resource use and consumption would not be significant. Nonetheless, the resources utilized in association with the project would be permanently committed to the project and, therefore, their use would be irreversible. (Draft EIR, pp. 5-1 through 5-2)

VII. RESOLUTION REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires an EIR to discuss the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Growth inducement, however, is not considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or significant to the environment.

A temporary increase in the number of workers associated with the construction of the project would occur in the short-term. Upon completion of construction, the project would provide an estimate 244 new jobs within the central area of the City. Based on the SCAG 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), adopted by SCAG in April 2015, employment in the City of Pasadena is forecast to grow at a healthy pace between now and 2035, with approximately 19,952 additional jobs occurring within the City between 2013 and 2035. The new jobs associated with the project would support that projection of a substantial increase in employment within the City of Pasadena over the upcoming years. The growth associated with the project would not result in significant environmental impacts beyond those identified in the analysis included in Section 3 of the Draft EIR. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project do not have the potential to result in significant growth-inducing impacts. (Draft EIR, p. 5-2)

VIII. RESOLUTION REGARDING ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City Council hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP") attached to this Resolution as Attachment #1, and incorporated herein. This MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures analyzed in the EIR that are applicable to the Alternative 2A.

IX. RESOLUTION REGARDING CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which these findings are based are located at the City of Pasadena, Planning & Community Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101 and with the Director of Planning & Community Development, who serves as the custodian of these records.

X. RESOLUTION REGARDING NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Staff is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the Clerk of the County of Los Angeles within five working days of final approval of Alternative 2A, as may be further modified by any conditions of approval imposed by the City Council.

Adopted at the _____ meeting of the City Council on the _____ day of _____, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Mark Jomsky, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Theresa E. Fuentes
Assistant City Attorney

Attachment #1

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Implementation Party	Monitoring Period	Monitor/ Reporter/ Monitoring Agency	Action/Reports	Documentation of Compliance Effectiveness	Sign-off/Date
Cultural Resources						
MM-CULTURAL-1: Compliance with Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The applicant will engage a historic preservation consultant that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to oversee the design development for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Design development will also be guided by the 2011 Pasadena YWCA Rehabilitation Study prepared for the City of Pasadena by Architectural Resources Group. The historic preservation consultant will conduct on-site construction monitoring throughout the construction phase. The historic preservation consultant will submit monthly written progress memoranda confirming Standards compliance and a final report prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City.	Project Applicant	Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit and during construction	Department of Planning and Community Development, Design and Historic Preservation Section			
MM-CULTURAL-2: Protection of Archaeological Resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, all construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until an archaeologist certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists 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.	Project Applicant	During grading/excavation	Department of Planning and Community Development, Design and Historic Preservation Section			
Noise and Vibration						
MM-NOISE-1: Consult with Structural Engineer and Project Historical Architect. Prior to approval of grading plans and/or prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the Applicant shall retain a team to include a Professional Structural Engineer with experience in structural vibration analysis and monitoring for historic buildings and a	Applicant	Prior to approval of grading plans and/or prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits,	Department of Planning and Community Development			

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Implementation Party	Monitoring Period	Monitor/ Reporter/ Monitoring Agency	Documentation of Compliance	Sign-off/Date
<p>Project Historical Architect (PHA) to perform the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the project plans for demolition and construction; ▪ Survey the project site and the existing YWCA building, including geological testing, if required; and ▪ Prepare and submit a report to the Director of Planning and Community Development to include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any survey information obtained from the survey identified above; ○ Any modifications to the estimated vibration level limits based on building conditions, soil conditions, and planned demolition and construction methods to ensure that vibration levels would remain below the potential for damage to the existing YWCA building; ○ Specific measures to be taken during construction to ensure the vibration level limits identified by the Professional Structural Engineer (or 0.12 ppv in/sec in lieu of such specified limits) are not exceeded, including modeling calculations that demonstrate the vibration levels following implementation of the identified measures; and ○ A monitoring plan to be implemented during demolition and construction that includes post-construction and post- 		<p>during demolition and construction</p>			

Section 4.0 • Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Implementation Party	Monitoring Period	Monitor/ Reporter/ Monitoring Agency	Action/Reports	Documentation of Compliance	Sign-off/Date
<p>demolition surveys of the existing YWCA building and documentation demonstrating that the measures identified in the report have been implemented.</p> <p>Examples of measures that may be specified for implementation during demolition or construction include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prohibition of certain types of construction equipment; ▪ Requirement for lighter tracked or wheeled equipment; ▪ Specifying demolition by non-impact methods, such as sawing concrete; ▪ Phasing operations to avoid simultaneous vibration sources; and ▪ Installation of vibration measuring devices to guide decision making for subsequent activities. 	Applicant	At the conclusion of vibration-causing activities	Department of Planning and Community Development			
<p>MM-NOISE-2: Post-Construction Survey and Repairs. At the conclusion of vibration-causing activities, in the unanticipated event of discovery of vibration-caused damage, the Structural Engineer and the PHA shall document any damage to the existing YWCA building and shall recommend necessary repairs. The Applicant shall be responsible for any repairs associated with vibration-caused damage. Repairs shall be undertaken and completed, as required, to conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 68) and any other codes, if applicable, such as the California Historical Building Code (24 CFR Part 8).</p>						

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Implementation Party	Monitoring Period	Monitor/ Reporter/ Monitoring Agency	Action/Reports	Documentation of Compliance	Sign-off/Date
<p>MM-NOISE-3: Coordination of Scheduled Construction Activities. The City of Pasadena will coordinate with developers of the YWCA Kimpton Hotel Project and the Union Street Condominiums Project to ensure that construction activities that have the potential to generate cumulatively significant vibration, namely excavation and grading/compaction, would be scheduled so as not to occur simultaneously.</p>	Applicant	Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, and immediately prior to start of construction activities that would generate vibration (i.e., excavation and grading/compaction)	Department of Planning and Community Development			
<p>Traffic and Transportation</p>						
<p>MM-TRAFFIC-1: Loading Zone Design. All loading spaces shall be designed and maintained so that the maneuvering, loading, or unloading of vehicles does not require backing movements onto or from any public street. If the applicant is unable to provide an on-site loading zone which does not prevent backing onto or from a public street, or an on-street loading area is unavoidable, the applicant is limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If an on-street commercial loading zone is proposed, the hours of operation for the on-street loading zone shall be limited to 2:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. every day of the week. ▪ If proposed, the on-street commercial loading zone along Union Street shall provide and maintain a lane closure throughout the hours of operation. ▪ Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall provide a traffic control plan to the Department of Transportation for review and approval of the lane closure associated with the on-street commercial loading zone. The plan shall identify measures to direct oncoming traffic onto 	Project Applicant and City of Pasadena Department of Transportation	Prior to issuance of building and occupancy permits and during construction	Department of Planning and Community Development; Building & Safety Division; Department of Transportation			

Section 4.0 • Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Implementation Party	Monitoring Period	Monitor/ Reporter/ Monitoring Agency	Documentation of Compliance	Sign-off/Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ remaining traffic lanes that would not be blocked by loading activity. ▪ The above-mentioned traffic management plan shall be prepared by a registered professional engineer in California. ▪ All lane closures shall be implemented in accordance with the WATCH Manual, 2012 Edition. 				Action/Reports Effectiveness	