CITY OF PASADENA
PLANNING DIVISION
HALE BUILDING
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: Construction of a new single- family residence for James Thornton & Mary House

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena, 175 N. Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101-1704

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Jeff Cronin, (626) 744-3757

4. Project Location: 1787 Loma Vista Street, Pasadena, CA 91104

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: James Thornton & Mary House
   1787 Loma Vista St.
   Pasadena, CA 91104

6. General Plan Designation: Single-family residential

7. Zoning: RS-6 (Single-family residential)

8. Description of the Project: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to authorize demolition of the existing 2,770-s.f. house on the property and design review of a replacement new house.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The property is in the North Pasadena Heights Landmark District. The surrounding properties have single-family houses. The existing lot (17,600 s.f.) is a double frontage lot.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None known

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	**X**
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.	
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 Reviewed By/Date

Jeff Cronin, Principal Planner _____

Printed Name 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: September 15, 2006
Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development
Case Manager: Jeff Cronin, Principal Planner

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

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

3. AESTHETICS. Will the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project site is not in an area with exceptional views of the San Gabriel Mountains or any other scenic resource, and the new house is proposed to be one-story replacing the existing two-story house.

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), 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, it has no impacts affecting state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The proposed project is within the height and mass limitations of the Zoning Code. The replacement house is also proposed to be lower than the existing house, which is two stories in height. The Historic Preservation Commission is authorized by code to conduct design review of the replacement house. No protected native or specimen trees are proposed for removal with this project.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The project will not have a significant impact on light and glare because it will be required to comply with the standards in the zoning code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. The height and direction of any outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must also conform to Zoning Code requirements.

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.

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? No, the project proposes to replace an existing single-family house in a built-out residential neighborhood with a new single-family house. The project, therefore, has no affect on agricultural resources.

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 nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the CO (Office Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), OS (Open Space) and PS (Public-Semi Public) Zoning Districts.

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; therefore the proposed project will not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY?
The project will have a less-than-significant effect on air quality because it involves small-scale construction of a new single-family house.

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

The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan land-use designations for the site. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan and will have no associated impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. However, the project itself is well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) land use, construction, and mobile emission thresholds for significant air quality impacts, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Therefore, it will not violate and air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and will have no related significant impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? Beyond the short-term effects of construction, construction of a replacement single-family house comparable in size to the existing house will have a minimal effect on air quality. The proposed project is a single-family residence on a previously developed site and no significant grading is required. The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). This basin is a non-attainment area for Ozone (O_3), Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10}), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in O_3, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, CO, or NO_2 will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures.

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

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 located near sensitive receptors but is not likely to generate any significant toxic air emissions. The proposed use is residential and is therefore compatible with the surrounding residential uses.

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 will not create objectionable odors, and will have no associated impacts.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Will 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 plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site. No trees are proposed for removal.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project is located in a developed urban area. The only vegetation present onsite is landscaping. The project site and surrounding area do not include any vegetation that constitutes a plant community. There are no designated natural communities in the City. Since the Final EIR for the 2004 General Plan Land Use and Mobility Elements does not provide baseline biological resource information for the City, the Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The project is not located near any of these natural habitat areas.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project is located in a developed urban area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat. The project site does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands.

Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project is located in a developed urban area and does not involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will the project result in a barrier to migration or movement. Therefore, the project will have no impact to wildlife movement.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY?
No protected specimen or native trees are proposed for removal with this application.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Will the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY?

Constructed in 1921 for contractor M. J. Repine, the two-story wood-frame house is a vernacular—and comparatively late—example of the Prairie Style with some minor Mission Revival detailing. Roughly square in plan, the 2,770-square foot house has a symmetrically organized front elevation with a projecting entry porch. It has cement-plaster walls, wood-framed windows, and a large, wooden front door flanked by full-height sidelights. The flat roof has a continuous raised parapet with a clay-tile coping; beneath the roof on all elevations is an extended canopy with a flush-boarded soffit. Apart from some replacement aluminum windows and a two-story porch on the rear elevation, the exterior of the house is relatively unaltered. With its boxy proportions, the house lacks the exaggerated horizontality, the broad overhanging roofs, and the art- glass windows that typify high-style Prairie Style houses.

The house occupies a double-frontage lot. A second dwelling unit, at 1789 Loma Vista, is at the rear of the property. This building, rehabilitated in 2006, and the garage, constructed in 2004, is non-contributing to the landmark district. The garage is accessed through a rear alley (Holbrook Alley).

The request to demolish the house is the result of extensive water damage to the interior of the house (see letter from property owners in ATTACHMENT A). Supporting evaluations about the compromised structural integrity of the house from the City's Building Official, CTL Environmental Sciences, and two reports from Vinci & Associates, a structural engineering firm, are on file with the City.

The evidence presented with the application for demolition confirms that the house could be rebuilt only by removing the existing roof, removing all of the exterior plaster to expose the structural frame, bracing the framing with new shear wall and replacing much of the existing framing to support properly the loads of a new roof. The cumulative effect of this work is demolition of the house.

In a historic district with 398 properties—nearly 300 of which are contributing to the historic significance—the removal of this house amounts to a less-than-significant effect on the historic integrity of the overall district. In addition, the Historic Preservation Commission will review the design of the replacement house to ensure that it is harmonious with the landmark district and consistent with the City's adopted design guidelines for new construction in historic districts and with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

The house is also not one of the large number of properties in the district that were designed by a well-known architect,* and its interpretation of Prairie Style architecture is not cited in the designation reports to the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council. (Note: the styles listed in these reports are, Spanish Colonial Revival, Italian Renaissance Revival, Mediterranean Revival, Colonial Revival, English Vernacular Revival, Tudor Revival, French Renaissance Revival, Pueblo Revival, California Bungalow, and varieties of Arts and Crafts design from the 1910's.) This information suggests that the house is not a major historic feature in the district.

This request to demolish a contributing house in a landmark district is the first one that the City has received since designation of the first landmark district in 1989. Any approval to demolish this house is likely to be an isolated event, based on the extraordinary damage that has occurred to this property, and not a precedent for multiple requests for demolition in the North Pasadena Heights district or the other landmark and historic districts in the City.

Therefore, based on the extensive amount of work required to repair the house, that the home is not considered a major work of architecture in the district (i.e., not designed by a well-known architect; not cited in designation reports to the City Council, and that this is a large district with nearly 300 contributing structures of 398 structures in the district, it is staff's determination that removal of the home results in a less than significant impact to cultural resources. The replacement project is required to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission, and this will ensure the new home is compatible with the surrounding area.

- *Among the architects whose work is represented in the N. Pasadena Heights District are: Henry M. Greene, Sylvanus Marston, David Renton (builder), Kenneth A. Gordon, George A. Clark, Cyril Bennett, Wallace Neff, Glen Ellwood Smith, and Harold J. Bissner .*

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 have undisturbed surficial soils. The site has been used for a single-family residence. If archaeological resources once existed on-site, it is likely that previous grading, construction, and modern use of the site have either removed or destroyed them. Consequently, surficial soils on the project site are devoid of archaeological resources.

Development of the proposed project will involve minor grading to establish building pads and develop onsite infrastructure. However, the proposed grading will not encroach into undisturbed soils. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impacts to archaeological resources.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project site is in an urbanized portion of the City of Pasadena. This portion of the City does not have any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to have paleontologicial resources. Therefore, the proposed project will not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature and will have no related impacts.

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 part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. 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 will ensure the proposed project will not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

8. ENERGY. Will 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.

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.

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. Occupation of the project will result in an insignificant increase in the consumption of natural gas. This consumption will be lessened by adherence to the performance standards of California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code Title 24. This project will result in the increased consumption of 30 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day. This increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards. 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. The energy conservation measures will be prepared by the developer and shown on a building plan(s). This plan will be submitted to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Installation of energy-saving features will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Because the project involves a single-family house replacing a single-family house, with a modest increase of 264 s.f., it will result in no appreciable increase in daily water consumption.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Will the project:

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

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

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

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

The project site is not within any of these potential fault rupture zones. The closest mapped fault zone, Eagle Rock Fault Management Hazard Zone, is approximately 0.7 miles south of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts will result from the proposed project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? See 9.a.i. (Also *check Policies S-1, Program S1-2, Program S1-3, Program S2-3, Program S3-5 of the 2002 Safety Element to see if a geologic report is required.)*

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

The 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 will 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? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project site is not within a Liquifaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Liquefaction and Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. 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? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY?
The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Construction of the project will lead to 0 cubic yards of fill and 0 cubic yards of cut because it is on a flat lot and the house will be constructed on a slab. The project will cover approximately 17% of the site as compared to the present use, which occupies approximately 16% of the site. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions.

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. Soil erosion after construction will be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. This plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or the appropriate staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind and/or water 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.

c. *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will 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, will not likely cause on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. 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.

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. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential.

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? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 will have no associated impacts.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Will the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Hazardous materials (e.g., asbestos, mold) have already been removed from the interior of the house. The interior of the house has been stripped to the structural framing.

The new 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? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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.

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, though within one-quarter mile of existing schools, does not produce hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste. Therefore, it will have no have impacts on schools because of hazardous materials.

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, will 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). The site is currently developed with residential structures, which is not a land use 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.

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, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The 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 will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and will have no associated impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The construction and operation of the proposed project will 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.

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 project is not located near these areas.

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 or very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project will have no associated impacts.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Will 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 receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Los Angeles County and 85 incorporated Cities therein, including the City of Pasadena, obtained an MS4 (Permit # 01-182) from the Los Angeles RWQCB, most recently in 2001. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP.

In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Pasadena has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP.

The project consists of a new single-family house replacing an existing single-family house. This use is not a point source generator of water pollutants, and, therefore, no quantifiable water quality standards apply to this case. Therefore, the proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and will have no related significant impacts.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there will be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells will drop to a level which will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project will not install any groundwater wells, and will not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions at the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of the project. Therefore, it will not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The proposed water usage will be negligible in comparison to the overall water service provided by the Department of Water and Power. This minor amount of water use will not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies. Under normal operation the project will use approximately 260 gallons of water per day.

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 will result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project site is flat. It does not have any 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.

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 will result in flooding on- or off-site? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? As discussed, the project will involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not alter a discernable drainage course. The proposed minor changes to the site's drainage patterns are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding will be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. This ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process.

Since the project does not involve alteration of a discernable watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates are required to not exceed pre-development rates, the proposed project does not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that will result in flooding. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause flooding and will have no associated impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed project will not increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces onsite. However, as discussed above in Sections 11.c) and 11.d), compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 11.a) and 11.c), the project will generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project will not create runoff that exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system and will not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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 stromwater pollutants will not substantially degrade water quality.

The project, however, also has the potential to generate minor and short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The County-wide MS4 permit requires construction sites to implement 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 contaminates from entering the drainage system. The MS4 identifies the following minimum requirements for construction sites in Los Angeles County:

1. Sediments generated on the project site shall be retained using adequate Treatment Control or Structural BMPs;
2. Construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be retained at the project site to avoid discharge to streets, drainage facilities, receiving waters, or adjacent properties by wind or runoff;
3. Non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity shall be contained at the project site; and
4. Erosion from slopes and channels shall be controlled by implementing an effective combination of BMPs (as approved in Regional Board Resolution No. 99-03), such as the limiting of grading scheduled during the wet season; inspecting graded areas during rain events; planting and maintenance of vegetation on slopes; and covering erosion susceptible slopes.

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.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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. Therefore, the proposed project will not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project will have no related impacts.

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? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 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 will not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not 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 liquifaction and landslides.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Will the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, because the site is surrounded by similar single-family houses on all sides, and the project consists of a replacing an existing single-family house with a new single-family house. 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 is consistent with both the RS-6 zoning designation and the low-density residential General Plan Land-use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land-use Element.

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.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Will the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas 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.

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. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project will not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

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 will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Replacing an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size does not affect the generation of noise levels. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

The project will generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) will minimize these effects to a less-than-significant level. In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction-related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project will not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? See response to 14.a. The project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project will be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The project will generate some short-term noise due to construction activities. However, City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment. (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) will minimize the noise levels. In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction-related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project will not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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, will 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 will not expose people to excessive airport-related noise and will have no associated impacts.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, will 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.

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Will 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 new construction of a single-family house replacing a single-family house. Therefore, it will not induce substantial population growth.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project does not displace any housing; a single-family house replacing a single-family house does not affect the local or regional demand for housing.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project involves the demolition of one housing unit and the unit will be replaced on-site.

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 increase density in the area and there will not produce a need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. Therefore, the project will not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. Libraries? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project is located within 1.5 miles from the nearest branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project will not significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Replacement of an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size has no new impacts or demands on public services.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged under the Quimby Act. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks.

d. Police Protection? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Replacement of an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size has no new impacts or demands on public services.

e. *Schools? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 schools.

f. *Other public facilities? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and development fees this impact is not significant.

17. RECREATION.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Replacement of an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size has no new impacts of existing parks or other recreational facilities.

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 not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that will have an adverse effect on the environment, and will have no associated impacts.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Will 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? Replacement of an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size has no impact of policies, plans, or programs for transportation. There are no proposed changes to the roadways or public infrastructure.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? See response 18 a.

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? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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 will not affect any airport facilities and will not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft—there will be no impact on 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)? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project involves no changes to streets, sidewalks, driveways; the existing garage on the site will remain. The setback for the new construction complies with the requirements of the zoning code. Therefore, there are no impacts under this topic.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? See response to 18(d).

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. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? No change to parking is proposed with the project. As part of the plan check process, Zoning staff will ensure the off-street parking requirements are met.

g. *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? Replacement of an existing single-family house with a new single-family house of a comparable size has no impact of policies, plans, or programs for transportation.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Will the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The replacement of an existing two-story single-family house with a new one-story house—with a net increase of 264 square feet—will have no new impacts on the existing levels of utilities and service systems. The project will generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and will have no associated impacts.

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 hooked up to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are not unusual wastes in the project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by L.A. County Sanitation District.

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? ( )*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The proposed project will not increase the demand for water and wastewater service. The only water and wastewater improvements required for the project are on-site unit connections to the existing systems, which are subject to connection fees. Therefore, the proposed project will not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project will have no associated impacts.

The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities.

Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater; individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line.

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, it will involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

Further, the project applicant must submit and implement an on-site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department; and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the proposed project will not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project will 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. This project will not increase current water consumption and will, therefore, have no impact under this topic.

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 produces no increased demand for water or sewage.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? 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 repermitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. 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. Therefore, it will cause no impacts under this topic

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The project will not produce only a minor amount of solid waster during demolition of the existing house. Nearly all of the interior walls and flooring inside the house have already been removed. The new house, which is of a comparable size to the existing house, will not generate any increase in sold waste; the net gain in square footage with the replacement house is negligible.

In accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code), the applicant must submit a Construction Waste Management Plan, because the project consists of new structures in excess of 1,000 square feet.

20. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis is not being used for this project.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ( )

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY?

As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

The effects of the project on air quality and noise are minor and related to completion of the demolition of the existing house and new construction of a one-story house, with comparable square footage, on the same site. The effect on the landmark district is less than significant as well because of the large number of contributing properties in the N. Pasadena Heights Landmark District and the fact that this house is not a major work of architecture in the district (i.e., not designed by a well-known architect; not cited in designation reports to the City Council). The Historic Preservation Commission is also authorized to apply two sets of guidelines to design review of the new house. This review ensures that the new house will be harmonious with the landmark district and appropriate in scale, detailing, orientation, and materials. These guidelines are the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

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 replacement of an existing single-family house with a new house of a comparable size will not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation 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. In addition, as discussed in Section 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The replacement of an existing single-family house with a new house of a comparable size—in a built-out residential neighborhood—will not cause substantial adverse effects on humans impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

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	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
4	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
5	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
6	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
7	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
8	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
9	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
10	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
11	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
12	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
13	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
14	Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended

15 Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005
16 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, “Growth Management Chapter,” Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
17 Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
18 Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
19 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.
20 South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
21 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
22 Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
23 Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005
24 Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
25 West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
26 Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code