



# **INITIAL STUDY**

**All Saints Church**

**Master Development Plan**

**132 North Euclid Avenue**

**PLN2009-00330**

Contact Person:  
Antonio Gardea  
City of Pasadena  
Planning and Development Department  
Community Planning Section  
175 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, California 91101



## Contents

<b>SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	3
DETERMINATION .....	3
<b>SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. BACKGROUND .....	5
2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	5
3. AESTHETICS.....	5
4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.....	6
5. AIR QUALITY .....	7
6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	9
7. CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	11
8. ENERGY .....	13
9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	14
10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	17
11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	19
12. LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	23
13. MINERAL RESOURCES .....	24
14. NOISE .....	24
15. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	26
16. PUBLIC SERVICES .....	27
17. RECREATION.....	29
18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.....	29
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	31
20. EARLIER ANALYSIS .....	34
21. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE .....	34

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

---

**INITIAL STUDY**

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

**SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Project Title: **All Saints Church  
Master Development Plan**
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: **City of Pasadena –  
Planning & Development Dept.  
175 N. Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101-1704**
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: **Antonio Gardea  
Associate Planner  
626-744-6725**
4. Project Location: **132 North Euclid Avenue  
Pasadena CA 91101  
Los Angeles County**
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: **Rector Ed Bacon  
All Saints Church  
132 N. Euclid Avenue  
Pasadena CA 91101**
6. General Plan Designation: **Central District Specific Plan**
7. Zoning: **Central District Sub-District #2 (CD-2)  
Civic Center Midtown Sub-District,  
Civic Center Core Precinct**
8. Description of the Project: Demolition of a commercial building used for storage (1,487 square feet), a building used for Sunday School/day care purposes (Scott Hall 6,195 square feet) and a Trailer used for office and meeting space (1,800 square feet); Interior renovation of the existing Regas House and Rectory buildings; Construction of a multiple-story, four building complex and construction of a single subterranean level to contain 122 parking spaces and 12,600 square feet of maintenance uses.

Above ground new buildings include a two-story 14,300 square foot building (Building A: West Building) with offices, conference rooms (social hall with kitchen) and a kitchen for an outdoor cafe; a two-level 6,700 square foot assembly building (Building B: Forum - alternate worship);

and a three-story 18,000 square foot building (Building C: East Building) that will house a youth program, daycare, and classroom areas. A fourth building (Building E North Building) will be situated on the corner of North Euclid Avenue and Walnut Street; however, there are two different scenarios under consideration. Scenario 1 for Building E would consist of a 46,700 square-foot, six-story structure to house 45 senior residential units, while Scenario 2 would consist of a 13,000 square foot two-story youth recreation building.

Therefore, the proposed project in total would include either 39,000 square feet of new church support uses and 45 residential units for senior citizens, or 52,000 square feet of new church support uses. The potential impacts of both scenarios will be analyzed in this study.

The outdoor spaces include a forecourt between the existing Rectory and West Building, a pre-function garden, an outdoor seating area on the north side of the West Building, two play yards, and a contemplative garden with a labyrinth.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project site is 2.79 acres and is bordered by two major streets – Walnut Street to the north and Euclid Avenue to the west. City Hall is across Euclid Avenue to the west. The Kaiser Permanente parking lot and offices are across Walnut Street to the north. Adjacent uses immediately to the east and south include the Plaza las Fuentes complex, multi-story residential and office buildings, multi-level parking structures, surface parking lots, and the Western Asset office complex. Paseo Colorado shopping center and residences are located across Colorado Boulevard one block to the south.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

The City of Pasadena approval will be required for the following actions:

**Conditional Use Permit** for the following ancillary uses: conference center (auditorium, meeting rooms, exhibition space, banquet facilities); commercial off-street parking (parking for unspecified, non-residential uses); tandem parking spaces; and restaurant(s) with walk-up window (outdoor café).

**Minor Variances** to exceed the minimum required front yard setback and exterior side yard setback; and a **Minor Variance** to construct a columbarium along an interior (east) property line.

**Certificate of Exception (lot line adjustment)** to consolidate the three existing parcels into one lot. A lot tie may be used to join the parcels together prior to issuance of a building permit.

**Historic Preservation and Design Review** by the Design Commission to review the proposed construction for compatibility with the existing facilities and consider the proposed building as part of the Concept and Final Design Review prior to receiving a building permit.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**DETERMINATION**

(to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Prepared By/Date \_\_\_\_\_

Antonio Gardea  
Printed Name

Reviewed By/Date \_\_\_\_\_

Kevin Johnson  
Printed Name

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

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
  - 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
  - 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
  - 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
  - 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.
    - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
  - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
  - 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
    - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
-

**SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

**1. BACKGROUND**

Date checklist submitted: October 12, 2009  
 Department requiring checklist: Planning & Development  
 Case Manager: Antonio Gardea, Associate Planner

**2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

(Explanations of all answers are required)

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**3. AESTHETICS**

Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located along Euclid Avenue at the intersection with Walnut Street. The Central District Specific Plan design guidelines discourage developments that obscure existing views of the City Hall Dome from Hudson Avenue and Union Street and mountain views along the public right-of-way. The view corridor to the City Hall Dome traverses the southern boundary of the site. All Saints Church expansion is to the north of the existing Church and thereby does not affect the view corridor.

The project site offers views of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. The Central District Specific Plan identifies the views of the San Gabriel Mountains as key vistas that occur along the north/south streets, specifically along Los Robles, Fair Oaks and Lake Avenues. In this urbanized setting, new infill construction—built within the height and setback limits of the code—has no impact on identified scenic views. In accordance with section 17.61.030 of the City’s Zoning Code, the design of this project will be reviewed by the Design Commission. Although the project would not significantly impact a scenic vista, this regulatory procedure provides the City with an additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway, and not along any scenic roadway corridors identified in the City’s General Plan documents. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to scenic resources within state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

Further, the proposed project would not result in the destruction of any landmark-eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcropping or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value. Although

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

the project site contains mature native trees, the central courtyard is not being modified. The applicant must also submit landscape plans for review and approval as part of the design review process. In compliance with existing City regulations, if street tree vacancies are found to exist, the applicant will plant and maintain (for a period of three years) along the site frontages the officially designated street trees per the City-approved master street tree plan.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed project consists of constructing a four-building complex on parcels that are currently under-utilized as surface parking, child day care facilities, and general office use. The site is within the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District and the Central District of the City. The proposed project is within the height and mass limitations of the Zoning Code and will be subject to design review. However, because the project is located opposite City Hall, which is a protected and revered building, and within a Historic District that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the proposed project will be further evaluated for potential to adversely affect the visual character of the site and surroundings. In addition, because of the importance of the surrounding area, additional analysis of the project for consistency with the policies of the Central District Specific Plan, Civic Center Midtown sub district will also be completed. These issues are potentially significant impacts that warrant further investigation in the EIR.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project will not create new sources of light and glare. Outdoor lighting, reflective surfaces, and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to Zoning Code requirements. New light poles may be installed near the corner of Walnut Street and Euclid Avenue. The outdoor lighting would be used to illuminate the outdoor courtyards during evening hours and on an intermittent basis during night-time events. Moreover, the project design includes reflective materials in compliance with Title 24 (California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and non-residential Buildings) requirements. However, these are not considered new sources of substantial light and glare because the area is adjacent to a multimodal vehicular corridor designed with overhead street lighting, pedestrian scale lights along sidewalks, and other sources of light typical to an urban environment. The project is also subject to Design Review by the Design Commission where the finish color and materials will be regulated. Thus, impacts will be less than significant.

**4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

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

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site is in a developed urban area and would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. Commercial Growing Area/Grounds is not permitted in the Central District Specific Plan.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; See Response 4.a.

**5. AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP. The AQMP is the South Coast Air Basin’s portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and designed to achieve the five percent (5%) annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act. The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth. The proposed project is consistent with the Land Use Element of the City’s General, the AQMP, and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. The project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high.

Pasadena is located in an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. The SCAQMD has developed significance thresholds that correspond to the air quality standards for the SCAB. These thresholds are described in Chapter 6 of the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (1993) and shown in Table 5.1 of this report.

The proposed project would generate short-term air pollutants from construction activities and long-term air pollutants from typical vehicle trips and household practices (i.e., natural gas combustion). In addition, the proposed project has the potential to contribute greenhouse gases that could contribute to the cumulative problem of Global Climate Change. These issues are considered potentially significant impacts and will be further discussed in an EIR.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin, a non-attainment area for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, or NO<sub>2</sub> will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures. This issue is considered a potentially significant impact, pending further investigation in an EIR.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook the project is a sensitive receptor to air pollution. However, none of the site's surrounding land uses generate toxic air pollutants. In addition, the project site is not in the vicinity of a congested intersection or otherwise in the vicinity of a carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot. CO is the primary pollutant generated by vehicles in the highest localized concentration; and, as such, CO hotspot analyses are used to identify potential impacts to sensitive receptors from operational emissions. (A primary pollutant, such as CO is a pollutant that has the potential to directly impact human health as opposed to secondary pollutants, such as ROC, which require further chemical reactions before human health is affected.)

The traffic analysis will analyze the impacts to traffic intersections including CO hotspot analysis. The project's operation would not significantly impact sensitive receptors. The project's construction-generated pollutants would not exceed SCAQMD established Localized Significant Thresholds. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be significantly impacted.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** This type of use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, and would have no associated impacts.

**6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is in a developed urban area. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plants or animal species or habitats on or near the site.



<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If the project cannot avoid the breeding season, nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to demolition or removal of trees. Active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for Raptors). No work shall occur within the buffer zone until all young have fledged the nest as confirmed by the site biologist, which will not likely occur until the end of the breeding season. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 “City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance”. The site contains four trees protected by this ordinance. Two specimen-type trees have been removed because of hazardous conditions due to declining health (fungal disease). Because only non-protected trees are subject to removal, the Impact to biological resources is less than significant.

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

                                                                

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

**7. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

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

                                                                

**WHY?** There are no known buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site having a significant historic value to the City which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered by the project.

The entire property of All Saints Church and the Maryland Hotel Apartments is in the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places at the national level of significance. The Georgian-style wall of the Maryland Hotel, which is on the property of All Saints Church, is a contributing feature to the district. The adjacent historic buildings are the 1920s-era buildings of All Saints Church (to the south) and City Hall (to the south west). Most of the project site is bordered by non-contributing properties in the district (e.g., County Courthouse) and by office buildings and a Hotel (all of which were constructed in the 1970s and 1980s and are not historic resources).

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

Because the construction of the project will be within the Pasadena Civic Center Historic District and in close proximity to structures that are contributing to the district, the project's impact to historic resources is considered potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. The site was previously used for lodging, residential, office and commercial purposes and was entirely developed with associated structures and facilities. However, the project involves grading into previously undisturbed soils and the project site itself has not been surveyed for archeological resources. Thus, construction of the project could encounter previously undiscovered archeological resources. In the unlikely event that archaeological resources are encountered during grading or construction of the project, mitigation measure, MM CR 1, requires all project grading and construction efforts, to halt until an archeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Incorporation of the mitigation measure ensures that archaeological resources would not be significantly impacted.

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

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project site lies on the valley floor in an urbanized portion of the City of Pasadena. This portion of the City does not contain any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to contain paleontological resources. However, the project does propose excavation of undisturbed soils for a subterranean level. Therefore, a mitigation measure is included that would reduce any potential impacts, in the unlikely event that paleontological resources are encountered. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

                                                                

**WHY?** There are no known human remains on the site. The project site is not known to have been used as cemetery or for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. The Phase I Environmental Site Evaluation prepared by Fero Environmental Engineering, Inc. (August 30, 2007) documents the previous uses on and around the All Saints Episcopal Church site. The immediately adjacent properties were previously developed with residential uses. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

**8. ENERGY**

Would the proposal:

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan. Further the project will comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows. Furthermore, the project is required to comply with the City's Green Building Practices Ordinance and obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources. Construction of the project will result in a short-term insignificant consumption of oil-based energy products. However, the additional amount of resources used will not cause a significant reduction in available supplies. Consumption of gasoline by project-generated vehicles will be reduced by adherence to the Trip Reduction Ordinance to a level that is less than significant.

The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. The project will use approximately

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

9,658 cubic feet of natural gas per day under Scenario 1 with 45 senior residences, or approximately 4,961 cubic feet of natural gas per day under Scenario 2 with a youth recreation building. The increase in the consumption of natural gas will be lessened by adherence to the performance standards of California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code Title 24.

The project will result in the increased consumption of 1,096 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day under Scenario 1 with senior residences, and a 698 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day under Scenario 2 with a youth recreation building. By meeting the above referenced energy standards, the increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level. Measures to meet these performance standards may include high efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows. Energy conservation measures will be prepared and shown on a building plan(s). Prior to the issuance of a building permit, construction plans are subject to review and approval by the Water and Power Department and Building Official. Installation of energy-saving features will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to electricity and natural gas consumption and these issues will not be further discussed in an EIR.

## 9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a. *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
  - i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ( )*





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

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

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This fault is located primarily south of City limits, however, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The project site is not within any of the potential fault rupture zones identified in the 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The closest mapped fault zone, the Sierra Madre Fault Zone, is 1.5 miles north of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**WHY?** The project site is not within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone, as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. The State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps that show the Liquefaction and Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas for the City were used to develop Plate P-1. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic related ground failure.

iv. Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**WHY?** The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides. See response 9.a.iii.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** Construction of the project will lead to 23,044 cubic yards of cut to be exported. The project will cover approximately 36% of the site as compared to the present use, which occupies 20% of the site. The geotechnical report that was prepared for the project indicates the site is suitable for excavation of the subterranean garage and construction of the proposed project (Kovaks, Byer and Associates Inc., 1990). The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by the City's grading ordinance, Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation and standard construction techniques; therefore there will be a less than significant impact.

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

**EROSION:** The natural water erosion potential of soils in Pasadena is low, unless these soils are disturbed during the wet season. Both the Ramona and Hanford soils associations, which underlay much of the City, have high permeability, low surface runoff and slight erosion hazard due to the gravelly surface layer and low topographic relief away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains.

Water erosion during construction will be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind erosion. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations will be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site.

As part of the applicant's grading plan, an erosion and sediment transport control plan is required as the project involves 23,044 cubic yards of exported soil. The Building Official and the Public Works Department will review the grading plan prior to the issuance of any building permits.

*c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain. As shown on Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The proposed project is not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not likely cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The geotechnical report that was prepared for the site indicates the soils are suitable for construction of the subterranean garage and proposed structures (Kovaks, Byer and Associates Inc., 1990). Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, will ensure the project will not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils. There is a less than significant impact with respect to unstable soils.

*d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. The Phase I Environmental Site Evaluation prepared by Fero Environmental Engineering, Inc. (August 30, 2007) and the Soils Engineering Investigation report prepared by Kovacs-Byer and Associates, Inc. (September 18, 1990) indicates that the underlying native soils are Holocene alluvium consisting primarily of gravel, sand, silt,

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

and clay. Fill material to depths between two and a half to five feet below grade. The native soils are in the very low to low expansion range.

*e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ( )*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**WHY?** The project will be required to connect to the existing sewer system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

**10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

*a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? ( )*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

*b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ( )*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project does not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material. A Phase I Environmental Site Evaluation was prepared on August 30, 2007 by Fero Environmental Engineering, Inc. and a Soils Engineering Investigation report was prepared on September 18, 1990 by Kovacs-Byer and Associates, Inc. to evaluate the soils underlying the All Saints Church site. Both reports indicate that the fill material to five feet below the existing grade and native sedimentary soils. The only hazardous materials on site are small quantities of janitorial supplies. The buildings and fixtures may also contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), lead based paint and asbestos containing materials (ACM) based on the age of the existing structures. In accordance with existing environmental regulations, the occurrence of lead based paint and ACM requires proper handling in the event that buildings or fixtures containing such materials were demolished or remodeled. These issues of lead based paint and asbestos will be further evaluated in the Air Quality section of the EIR and are considered potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated.

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

c. *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing school. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to hazardous material impacts to schools. See Response 10.b.

d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project site is not located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA). Commercial, office, lodging, and residential uses existed previously on the site, which are not land uses associated with hazardous materials. The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist onsite (Fero Environmental Engineering, Inc., 2007). There would be no impact.

e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

*g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Pasadena Fire Department maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Department is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency. The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir.

The construction and operation of the proposed project would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

*h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is not in an area of moderate to very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

**11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with



<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site? ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** The project site is currently gently sloping, and runoff onsite drains as sheet flow from north to south. The project site does not contain any discernable streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Development of the site will involve minor grading, but will not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area. The project site is developed with six structures and surface parking lots. The project will not increase the amount of surface paving. There will be no alterations to the course of a stream, river or other natural water feature, and the project's impact with respect to alternation of drainage patterns is less than significant. See response 11.a.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek; the project is not located near either stream. As discussed, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernable drainage course. The project is required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance that mandates post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. The project will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff which would result in flooding. There would be a less than significant impact with respect to drainage pattern alteration and flooding. See response 11.a and 11.c.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed project could increase runoff but is required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance. See response to Sections 11.a. and 11.c. Project runoff would not exceed the capacity of the storm drain system.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

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

The project, however, also has the potential to generate short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The County-wide MS4 permit requires construction sites to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce the potential for construction-induced water pollutant impacts. These BMPs include methods to prevent contaminated construction site stormwater from entering the drainage system and preventing construction-induced contaminants from entering the drainage system.

In addition, project sites of one acre or greater are subject to additional stormwater pollution requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The SWRCB maintains a statewide NPDES permit known as the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit or the State's General NPDES Permit. Since the proposed project involves disturbance of a 2.63 acre site, a Notice of Intent (NOI) is required to be submitted to the SWRCB to comply with the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. This NOI must include a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that outlines the BMPs that will be incorporated during construction. These BMPs will minimize construction-induced water pollutants by controlling erosion and sediment, establishing waste handling/disposal requirements, and providing non-storm water management procedures.

Complying with the both the MS4's construction site requirements and the State's General Construction Permit, as well as implementing an SWPPP will ensure that construction of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality and the impact would be less than significant.

*g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or dam inundation area as shown in the City of Pasadena adopted Safety Element of the General Plan or other flood or inundation delineation map? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. There would be no impact

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts. See response 11.g.

*i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? ( )*

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**WHY?** According to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would have no impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. See response 11.g.

j. *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

**12. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by development on all sides, and the project consists of an infill development within a highly urbanized area. No adverse impact will result.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project appears generally consistent with both the CD-2 (Central District subarea 2, Civic Center / Midtown) zoning designation and the Central District Specific Plan General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element. The project layout implements the objectives of the Specific Plan to provide active uses and a comfortable pedestrian environment along the street edge. However, the site plan has been modified in response to direction from the Planning Commission and Design Commission and the project is located within a sensitive historic district across from City Hall. Additional discussion regarding consistency with the plans and policies of the Central District Specific Plan subarea 2, Civic Center / Midtown Sub-District, Civic Center Specific Plan, and the Civic Center / Midtown Programming Effort Report "Grey Report" will be contained in the aesthetics section of the EIR. The issue is considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in the EIR. See 3.c and 7.a for additional discussion of aesthetics and historic resources.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

**13. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. The two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources are Eaton Wash, which was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. The project is not near these areas. There would be no impact.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also response 13.a.

**14. NOISE**

Will the project result in:

a. *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. The project includes new outdoor spaces that will be used for church functions. The project includes a long, rectilinear garden and forecourt created for larger gatherings between the proposed buildings, classroom space, and an outdoor, active play area for children. An existing day-care use, currently operating at the All Saints Church property, may return once the project is complete. The project also includes a café with an outdoor seating area at the

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

northerly end of the project site. These outdoor activities could result in periodic noise increases. The project could generate excessive short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan and noise ordinance.

The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. According to Figure 1, Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use, of this element, religious facilities should be located in an area with a clearly to normally acceptable ambient noise range of 50-70 dBA. Land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive include but are not limited to: residences, hotels, single room occupancy buildings, group care and convalescent homes, schools, churches, libraries, performance halls, parks and hospitals. According to Figure 2 of the City's Noise Element (2002) the project site lies between the 65 and 70 dBA noise contours. This level of noise is within the "Normally Acceptable" range, as shown in Figure 1 of the City's Noise Element (2002). No mitigation measures are required.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed building is approximately 900 feet from the Gold Line light rail tracks. This light rail system has been designed to limit excessive ground-borne vibration to surrounding land uses, and no significant vibration levels are experienced outside of the railway's right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed project will not be significantly impacted by ground-borne vibration or noise. The proposed project may generate groundborne vibrations during demolition and construction activities. The project is located within a historic district, opposite City Hall and the site itself also contains historic resources including the Maryland Hotel wall and the All Saints Church. There is potential for adverse effects from construction vibration if vibrations were strong enough to cause damage to nearby historic resources. This issue is considered potentially significant and will be further addressed in the Historic Resources section of the EIR. See also response 7.a.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. The project will have a less than significant impact with respect to causing a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. See response to 14.a.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. A Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan will be submitted for approval by the Department of Public Works

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

prior to the issuance of any permits. The plan establishes transportation routes with consideration for sensitive uses.

The project includes new outdoor spaces that will be used for church functions that may cause temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. The project includes garden areas designed for outdoor gatherings, classroom space and an outdoor, active play area for children. An existing day-care use, currently operating at the All Saints Church property, may return once the project is complete. The project also includes a café with an outdoor seating area at the northerly end of the project site. The outdoor activities could result in periodic noise increases. Adherence to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards and there would be a less than significant impact.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport (formerly the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport), which is located more than 10 miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no private-use airports or airstrips within or near the City of Pasadena. There would be no impact.

**15. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Would the project:

a. *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project involves construction of new facilities for religious uses and Scenario 1 includes a building with 45 senior housing units which are consistent with the land use designations for the site (See Section 12 of this document). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City’s General Plan. Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. The proposed project would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will

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

be the responsibility of the applicant. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project does not involve removal of any dwelling units and will add 45 net new units for senior citizens. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any residents or housing, and would have no related impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** No persons currently reside on the project site and the project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts.

**16. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

a. *Fire Protection?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of constructing new buildings for religious use, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to fire protection services. See also Section 10.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. *Libraries?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located approximately 500 feet from the nearest branch library – Central Branch. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (Library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

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

c. Parks? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project is located within ½ mile of the nearest park, Memorial Park. According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents. The proposed project could involve development of up to 45 residential units for seniors. In addition, the proposed project includes development of gardens and open spaces on site that would be available for use by residents of the project. The project would have a less than significant impact to parks.

d. Police Protection? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of new buildings for religious uses, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Police facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. Schools? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

f. Other public facilities? ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. With the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees and development fees, the additional maintenance is not significant.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**17. RECREATION**

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located within ½ mile of the nearest park, Memorial Park. Scenario 1 of the proposed project includes a 45-unit senior housing component that may nominally increase the City’s population. However, as discussed under item 16.c above, the project also incorporates outdoor gardens that would be utilized by residents of the project. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project does include recreational facilities (Scenario 2 includes a 13,000 square foot youth recreation building), but would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities elsewhere. No adverse physical environmental effects from construction of this facility as well as the other proposed buildings and garage are anticipated as the project is an infill development. There are potential for adverse cultural resource impacts, aesthetic impact, air quality impacts, water resource impacts and traffic impacts. These impacts are considered less than significant.

**18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Would the project:

a. *Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located along Walnut Street and Euclid Avenue and is supported by a roadway network consisting of Union Street, Corson Street, Maple Street, Colorado Boulevard, Los Robles Avenue, Marengo Avenue, and Fair Oaks Avenue. Of these roadways, Corson, Union, and Maple Streets, Fair Oaks and Los Robles Avenues are Principal Mobility/Multimodal Corridors and El Molino Avenue, which is four blocks east of the project, is a de-emphasized street, as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. There is potential for significant impacts to the local street system, and the traffic impacts are considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in an EIR.

b. *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?* ( )

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) adopted their most recent Congestion Management Program (CMP) in 2004. This CMP identifies level of service (LOS) E or better as acceptable for the designated CMP highway and road system. The CMP further states, “a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C [volume to capacity ratio] = 0.02), causing LOS F (V/C > 1.00). If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C = 0.02).” Traffic CMP impacts are considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in an EIR.

c. *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?* ( )

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**WHY?** The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

d. *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?* ( )

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project’s impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design will be evaluated in a new Traffic Study. Vehicular access to the subterranean garage will be provided from Walnut Street, with only right-turn in and right-turn out ingress/egress. The issue of design hazards is considered potentially significant pending further investigation in an EIR.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** Emergency access is provided along Walnut Street and Euclid Avenue. The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. The ingress and egress for the site will be evaluated by the Department of Transportation for emergency access. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes are being designed to meet Pasadena Fire Department’s access standards. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with respect to inadequate emergency access.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?* ( )

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** Due to the increased intensity of land use, the project will increase the demand for parking. However, the project will need to comply with the number of parking and loading spaces required by the Zoning Code. This issue is considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in an EIR.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater; individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is connected to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system which cannot be treated by L.A. County Sanitation District. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the impact would be less than significant. .

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**WHY?** The proposed project consists of a multiple-story, four building complex with subterranean levels, and as a result, would increase the demand for both water and wastewater service. The proposed project would utilize a net increase of 15,150 gallons of potable water per day under Scenario 1 senior residential, and would use a net increase of 5,200 gallons of potable water per day under Scenario 2 youth recreation. The City Council declared a level 1 water shortage on July 13, 2009. The issue of water resource consumption is considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in an EIR. See response 8.b and 11.b. for additional discussion of water usage.

The City's sewer system has adequate capacity to accommodate current demands, and the majority of the system has adequate surplus capacity to accommodate anticipated buildout (City of Pasadena General Plan EIR, 2004). The capacity of the sewer system to accept flow from new developments is currently being addressed on a case-by-case basis by requiring each development to prepare a comprehensive analysis of the impact of the development on the affected segments of the City's sewer system. This analysis typically includes flow monitoring to accurately determine the current load on the sewer system. See additional discussion on City conveyance infrastructure deficiencies under item 19.e.

The proposed project would generate approximately 11,475 gallons of wastewater per day under Scenario 1 senior residential, or would generate approximately 3,900 gallons of wastewater per day under Scenario 2 youth recreation. As discussed in the City's 2004 General Plan FEIR, new development built pursuant to the 2004 Land Use Element, as implemented by the Zoning Code

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

Revisions, will increase wastewater generation. Approximately 90% of water consumed within the City becomes wastewater. Using this factor, Pasadena is expected to generate approximately 24.2 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater in 2015, an increase of 4.28 million gpd (18%) over 2000 conditions. The City's wastewater is treated at the Whittier Narrows, Los Coyotes and the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plants. These plants provide primary, secondary and tertiary treatment. No existing deficiencies have been identified in the County Sanitation Districts' collection or treatment facilities serving Pasadena. County Sanitation Districts indicated the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant has a design capacity of the plant is 15 mgd and that the plant currently processes an average flow of 8.5 mgd. The District also indicated the Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 mgd and processes an average flow of 22.6 mgd. The design capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by SCAG. All expansions of the Districts' facilities must be sized and serviced in a manner that is consistent with SCAG regional growth forecasts. For these reasons, impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant. Further discussion in an EIR is not warranted. Please see item 19.e for a discussion of local conveyance infrastructure.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 11, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

The project is required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance and an on-site drainage plan must be submitted for review and approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department. See response 11.c. The City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. The proposed project would utilize a net increase of 15,150 gallons of potable water per day under Scenario 1 senior residential, and would use a net increase of 5,200 gallons of potable water per day under Scenario 2 youth recreation. The City Council declared a level 1 water shortage on July 13, 2009. The issue of water resource consumption is considered potentially significant pending further evaluation in an EIR. See response 8.b, 11.b, and 19.b. for additional discussion of water usage.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** As discussed in Section 19.b. of this report, the proposed project entails construction of a multiple-level, four building complex for use as religious facilities, and as a result, would increase the demand for wastewater service. The proposed project would generate approximately 11,475 gallons of wastewater per day under Scenario 1 senior residential, or would generate approximately 3,900 gallons of wastewater per day under Scenario 2 youth recreation. Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16 treats the City's wastewater; individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is connected to a sewer line. As discussed earlier under item 19.b, there is adequate capacity at the treatment facilities. However, two sewer capacity deficiencies exist downstream from the proposed development; in Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue, a length of 456 feet; and in Los Robles Avenue between Marengo Avenue and 315 feet north of Marengo Avenue. The Public Works Department has stated that the applicant must either correct the deficiency on Colorado Boulevard between Euclid Avenue and Los Robles Avenue or pay their share of a fee that the City will use to correct the deficiency. A mitigation measure is included that will reduce this impact to less than significant:

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

f. *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is required to



<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project has potentially significant adverse effects in the areas of Aesthetics and Air Quality. Moreover, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project has significant but mitigable impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources that can be lessened with mitigation measures contained in this initial study (please see CR1 and CR2). However, the proposed project has potentially significant impacts related to historic resources due to the project's location in a historic district. These potentially significant historical resource impacts require further evaluation in an EIR.

Therefore, in summary, the proposed project will be further evaluated in an EIR for potentially significant impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Historic Resources. However, the issue of biological resources will not be evaluated in an EIR.

*b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project? (      )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative public services, and utility/service system impacts; the proposed project is an institutional infill development and will not have potentially significant, unless mitigated, impacts related to utilities and service systems. Because the Department of Public Works maintains a , these impacts are not cumulatively considerable. The proposed project also has the potential for cumulative air quality, traffic and water consumption impacts. These impacts are considered potentially significant pending further investigation in an EIR.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** As discussed in Sections 10 and 11, of this document, the proposed project has the potential to expose persons to PCBs, lead based paint, and/or ACM. Otherwise the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of chemical or explosive materials, or flooding hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. As discussed in Section 5 and 18, the proposed project does have the potential for potentially significant impacts in the areas of air quality and traffic. These effects will be further studied in an EIR.



## INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

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