

**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:                      | Las Encinas Hospital 2007 Master Development Plan  |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:       | City of Pasadena<br>Planning and Development Department<br>175 North Garfield Avenue<br>Pasadena, CA 91101 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:    | Scott Reimers, Associate Planner<br>(626) 744-6710<br>sreimers@cityofpasadena.net                          |
| 4. Project Location:                   | 2900 East Del Mar Boulevard<br>Pasadena, Los Angeles County<br>(See Part 8 and Figure 1 below)             |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: | Signature Healthcare Services<br>1101 California Street, Suite 104<br>Corona, CA 92881<br>(951) 549-8032   |
| 6. General Plan Designation:           | Institutional  |
| 7. Zoning:                             | PS (Public and Semi-Private)   |
| 8. Description of the Project:         |  |

The applicant, Signature Healthcare Services, proposes to revise the Las Encinas Hospital 2007 Master Development Plan (2007 Master Development Plan) to increase community care services within the approximately 24.7-acre site. The project site is located at 2900 East Del Mar Boulevard in the City of Pasadena (see Figure 1, Location Map). The site is bound by Del Mar Boulevard to the north, El Nido Avenue to the east, residential uses to the south, and residential uses and San Gabriel Boulevard to the west. Regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 210 (I-210, Foothill Freeway) located approximately 0.6



mile to the north, State Route 19 (SR 9, Rosemead Boulevard) located approximately 0.9 mile to the west, and State Route 110 (SR 110, Pasadena Freeway) located approximately 2.5 miles to the east.

The project site is zoned PS (Public and Semi-Public). The current land use of the site includes 87 retirement apartments (The Oaks), 90 psychiatric beds (main building and Mariah), 22 chemical dependency beds (Las Flores, Acacia, and Briar), 6 locked psychiatric beds (Cherokee), 38 residential treatment beds (Nash House, Villa, and Gables), 15 medical offices specializing in outpatient psychological and psychiatric care services (Rose Court), 8 assisted living beds (367 El Nido Avenue), and outpatient psychiatric and rehab services with support facilities (Las Palmas, Bungalow, and Willows). These uses are currently distributed throughout the campus. In addition, Signature Healthcare Services rents the residences located at 336 and 310 San Gabriel Boulevard. One residence located on San Gabriel Boulevard is currently vacant. There are two unused garages and storage buildings associated with these residences. In the south central portion of the site, there are 7 maintenance/storage buildings. In total, the site includes 87 independent living units, 8 assisted living beds, 38 residential treatment beds, 118 psychiatric and chemical dependency in-patient beds, 15 medical offices, and 3 single-family residences.

### **Project Overview**

The 2007 Master Development Plan would continue the programs approved under the current Master Development Plan. In anticipation of the needs for the City of Pasadena and surrounding communities, the 2007 Master Development Plan seeks to augment these services by increasing assisted living beds from the current 8 beds to a total of 60 beds, independent living units would be increased from 87 existing to 187 total units, and provide expanded medical (psychiatric) office space from the approved 28 units to 32 total office units (an additional 25,000 square feet). In addition, a new psychiatric hospital would be constructed to consolidate psychiatric patient care in a single, secure facility affording greater security to the neighborhood and modern facilities for staff and patient care. The new psychiatric hospital would accommodate 120 total beds, increasing the number of beds by an additional 20 beds. The new psychiatric hospital would also consolidate adolescent care facilities. To accommodate the growing elderly population, the project includes development of 34 new senior bungalow units. Thirty of the senior units would be located on the portion of the site roughly bound by San Gabriel Boulevard to the west, Millicent Way to the north, and Diana Street to the south. An additional 4 senior units would be constructed in the central portion of the campus south of the existing hospital building. Adolescent psychiatry/chemical dependency beds would be consolidated into a single building accommodating 20 beds in the central portion of the campus south of the existing hospital building. A description of the new buildings is provided below. Figure 2 shows the existing and proposed new facilities. Table 1 lists the existing and proposed facilities.

**TABLE 1 EXISTING AND PROPOSED USES**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Building Name</b>	<b>SF</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>
1	Main Building	47,655	Administration Psychiatric Unit (76 beds) Skill Nursing (20 beds)	Administration Assisted Living (20 beds) Museum Office
2	Acacia	1,653	Chemical Dependency (6 beds)	Chemical Dependency (6 beds)
3	Las Flores	1,629	Inpatient Psychiatric Services	Chemical Dependency Psychiatric Services
4	Willows (Water Tower)	1,140	Office	Office
5	Cherokee	2,135	ICU Patient Care (6 beds)	Office
6	Villa	1,777	Long-Term Care (2 beds)	Removed
7	Gables	5,360	Long-Term Care (11 beds)	Long-Term Care (11 beds)
8	2810 Del Mar Residence	5,374	Medical Office (5 units)	Medical Office (5 units)
9	Oaks Apartment (West)	43,403	Senior Living	Senior Living
10	Oaks Apartment (East)	51,477	Senior Living	Senior Living
11	336 San Gabriel Residence	4,100	Residential	Club House
11A	336 San Gabriel Storage	225	Vacant	Removed
11B	336 San Gabriel Garage	500	Garage	Removed
12	310 San Gabriel Residence	2,624	Residential	Removed
13	San Gabriel Residence	1,975	Residential	Removed
13A	San Gabriel Windmill	120	Vacant	Removed
13B	San Gabriel Garage	400	Garage	Removed
14	Mariah	6,000	Psychiatric Unit (18 beds)	Removed
15	Las Palmas	1,809	Classrooms	Removed
16	365 El Nido Cottage	1,200	Vacant	Removed
17	367 El Nido Cottage	3,516	Assisted Living (8 beds)	Assisted Living (8 beds)
18	Medical Office	5,200	Medical Office (5 units)	Medical Office (5 units)
19	Bungalow	2,716	Outpatient Psychiatric	Office
20	Willows	1,550	Rehab Services	Rehab Services
20A	Willows (Nurses Station)	400	Nurse Station for Long-Term Care	Administration
21	Willows (Office)	1,260	Office Social Service	Office Social Service
21A	Willows (Meeting Room)	510	Meeting Room	Meeting Room
22	Briar	2,640	Chemical Dependency (8 beds)	Recreation
23	Medical Office	3,600	Medical Office (5 units)	Medical Office (5 units)

<b>No.</b>	<b>Building Name</b>	<b>SF</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>
24	Maintenance Building	1,140	Maintenance	Removed
24a, b,c,d	Maintenance Building Maintenance Building	3,046		
25	Maintenance Building (Barn)	3,092	Maintenance	Removed
26	Maintenance Building (Stables)	5,289	Maintenance	Removed
27	Maintenance Building	2,300	Maintenance	Removed
28	Maintenance Building (Pump House)	1,924	Maintenance	Removed
29	Nash House	2,800	Chemical Dependency (8 beds)	Removed
30	Medical Office	17,000	-	Medical Office (10 units)
31	Medical Office	8,000	-	Medical Office (6 units)
32	Assisted Living	32,000	-	Assisted Living (52 beds)
33	Dining/Kitchen	6,500	-	Dining/Kitchen
34	Independent Living	85,000	-	Independent Living (100 units)
35	Psychiatric Hospital	65,000	-	Psychiatric Hospital (120 beds)
36	Senior Bungalows	59,280	-	Senior Apartments (34 units)
37	Chemical Dependency	8,400	-	Chemical Dependency (20 beds)

Some of the existing facilities would continue to operate in their current form, as described herein. The existing medical offices buildings (Rose Court, Buildings 8, 23, and 18) would continue to operate under existing conditions. Acacia (Building 2), a 6-bed psychiatric/chemical dependency unit, would be converted to senior living. Willows Water Tower (Building 4) would be retained as an office. Gables (Building 7) would continue to operate as a 38-bed residential treatment unit. Smith House (Building 8) would continue to operate as a 5-unit medical office building. The Oaks retirement apartments (Buildings 9 and 10) would not be modified and would continue to house 87 residential units. The residence at 367 El Nido Avenue (Building 17) would continue to operate as an 8-bed assisted living unit. Willows (Buildings 20A) would be maintained as outpatient psychiatric and rehab support facilities.

Other site facilities would be renovated and the use modified. The existing main hospital building (Building 1) currently housing patients would modify the south wing to create a 20-bed assisted living unit. The remainder of the building would be renovated to provide support facility administrative offices, a museum, and support facilities for independent and assisted living units. The east end of the existing main hospital building would become the campus maintenance area. The existing water tower (adjacent to Willows) would be refurbished and maintained as a historical icon. The small water tower near San Gabriel Boulevard would be relocated. Las Flores (Building 3) would be converted to senior living. Cherokee (Building 5) would be converted to senior living. The residence at 336 San Gabriel Boulevard (Building 11) would be converted to a clubhouse to provide meeting rooms and support services for the 30 senior residential units located off of San Gabriel Boulevard. The Bungalow building (Building 19) would be converted from outpatient psychiatric services to offices or a patient support/recreational space. The Briar building (Building 22) would be converted from an 8-unit chemical dependency unit to senior living.

The applicant seeks to adopt the Las Encinas Hospital 2007 Master Development Plan to permit the new uses described below. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code.

### **New Site Features**

***Psychiatric Hospital.*** The approximately 69,000 sf psychiatric hospital (Building 35) would accommodate 120 acute psychiatric beds, a kitchen, dining room, half-court gymnasium, classrooms, and other patient/staff support areas. The proposed structure would be two stories (40 feet tall) on the northern wing and three stories (52 feet tall) on the southern and central wings. Adolescent programs would also be accommodated in the hospital building. Approximately 180 parking spaces would be provided in the 90,000 sf subterranean parking garage located beneath this building. The existing psychiatric hospital patients and staff would be transferred from the existing hospital building to this facility upon completion. Four maintenance buildings (Buildings 25, 26, 27, and 28) would be demolished to make room for the new psychiatric hospital.

***Skilled Nursing/Assisted Living.*** This approximately 32,000 sf facility (Building 32) would be located in the southern portion of the campus. The facility would accommodate 52 beds for persons requiring skilled and assisted daily living. The portion of the building fronting El Nido Street would be one-story in height and increase to two-stories in height (36 feet tall) towards the interior of the campus west of the 367 El Nido residence (Building 17). The Las Palmas (Building 15) and 365 East El Nido Cottage (Building 16) would be removed to

Figure 2 Site Plan

11X17, landscape

Back of Figure 2 Site Plan

accommodate the skilled nursing/assisted living facility. The Las Palmas building is currently used as classrooms for adolescent patients. The 365 East El Nido Cottage is currently vacant.

**Dining Hall.** The approximately 10,800 sf dining hall (Building 33) would function as a dining and meeting space for the assisted and independent living buildings. This would be a single-story structure with a kitchen, restrooms, dining facilities, and a small meeting room for private gatherings. A pool may be located to the south of the dining room. The dining hall would be located on the southern boundary of the project site west of the skilled nursing/assisted living facility. The single-story Mariah building (Building 14) would be demolished to make room for the new dining hall. Mariah is currently used as an 20-bed psychiatric unit.

**Independent Living.** This facility (Building 34) would be three stories in height (52 feet tall) and consist of 100 independent living units (approximately 107,750 sf). This building would be similar to the Oaks apartments. Each living unit would be approximately 700 sf and designed with a sleeping area, bathroom, living area, and small kitchen. These units would accommodate seniors who are capable of meeting their daily needs unassisted. The facility would be located west of the dining hall along the southern boundary of the project site. Three maintenance buildings (Buildings 24, 24A, and 24B-C-D) would be demolished to make room for the independent living facility.

**Medical Office Buildings.** The new medical buildings (Buildings 30 and 31) would be located in the northwest portion of the site adjacent to the existing medical offices constructed as part of the 1986 Master Plan. The medical office buildings would be two-stories in height (40 feet tall). The larger building would accommodate 10 office suites, and the smaller building would accommodate 4 suites. Each suite would be approximately 1,200 sf in size and would be used for outpatient consultation and treatment related to psychiatric and senior care by members of the Las Encinas staff doctors and patients. The Villa [Building 6] would be demolished to make room for the smaller medical office building (Building 31).

**Residential Bungalows.** On the portion of the site off of San Gabriel Boulevard south of Millicent Way and north of Diana Street, 30 residential bungalows (Building 36) would be constructed and operated. Thirty of the units would have a sleeping/bathing area, living/dining area, kitchen, and 2-car garage. The units closest to San Gabriel Boulevard and adjacent to the residences on Diana Street would be one-story in height (24 feet tall). Two-story units (36 feet tall) would be located in the interior of the site. Construction of these units would require the removal of two single-family residences (Buildings 12 and 13) located on San Gabriel Boulevard. One of these residences is currently rented out and the other remains vacant. Two storage buildings and two garages (Buildings 11A, 11B, 13A, and 13B) associated with these residences would also be demolished. Lastly, the 8-bed chemical dependency unit in Nash House (Building 29) would be removed. Twenty-six of the units would have a sleeping/bathing area, living/dining area, kitchen, and 2-car garage. Four other units would be of similar design, but would not have garages. An additional 4 senior residential bungalows would be constructed in the central portion of the project site north of the independent living building. Each of these bungalows would be one-story in height and would not include a garage. No existing structures would be demolished to accommodate these bungalows. With the completion of the new hospital building, psychiatric/CD beds would be removed from Los Flores, Acacia, Cherokee and Briar

cottages and these building interiors would be renovated to accommodate senior living. This conversion would add approximately 10 senior living units.

***Chemical Dependency Building.*** The chemical dependency building would replace existing medical buildings (the Willows [Building 20, 21, and 21A) with a single-story, 8,400 sf building. This contemporary facility would provide a single location for chemical dependency programs that are currently located in numerous buildings throughout the site. It would accommodate 20 beds and would be two-stories in height (30 feet tall). The new chemical dependency facility would be located south of the main hospital building adjacent to the water tower and east of the proposed hospital building.

## **Parking and Circulation**

Existing parking spaces on the north end of the site would be maintained. Approximately 10 new surface parking would be provided in the southeast corner of the site by the proposed skilled nursing/assisted living building. Approximately 44 surface parking spaces would be provided along the southern boundary of the project site south of the dining hall and the independent living building. A new 92-space surface parking lot would be provided south of the proposed psychiatric hospital. Approximately 180 parking spaces would be provided beneath the proposed psychiatric hospital for patients, visitors, and staff. This parking lot would also provide overflow parking for the medical office buildings located in Rose Court and general staff parking. The surface parking spaces are expected to be used by staff and residents of the independent living and assisted living facilities and their visitors. In addition, Las Encinas would continue to operate a van/shuttle service for senior residents. The residential cottages off of San Gabriel Boulevard include two-car garages for residents. No parking is provided for the independent living residential cottages in the middle of the site.

The existing ingress/egress points from Del Mar Avenue would remain the major vehicular access points to the site. The road that currently terminates on the west end of Rose Court would be extended to the south to provide access to the psychiatric hospital and subterranean and surface parking lots. Ingress for the Oaks would continue to be located off of Del Mar Boulevard at the northeastern corner of the site with egress onto El Nido Avenue near the proposed skilled nursing/assisted living facility. The service road in the center of the site along Del Mar Boulevard would be extended through the central portion of the campus to behind the dining hall. Ingress to the residential cottages would be located on the southern end of the site off of San Gabriel Boulevard and loop through the interior of this portion of the site to return to San Gabriel Boulevard. Seven bicycle racks would be located throughout the site.

## **Project Phasing**

The construction and renovation of these facilities would occur over the next ten years. Figure 3 shows the proposed phasing plan. The first phase would involve construction of the chemical dependency building and demolition of the Mariah building. Construction is anticipated to begin in September 2008 and take 6 months to complete. Phase 2 would involve construction of the skilled nursing/assisted living facility, dining hall, independent living facility, and four senior residential cottages located in the center of the main campus. The main surface parking lot and the underground parking structure would also be constructed as part of this phase. Construction is anticipated to begin in May 2009 and take 20 months to complete.

Figure 3 Phasing Plan  
11X17, color, landscape

Back of Figure 3

Phase 3 would involve construction of the 30 senior residential cottages on the 3.5-acre portion of the site located off San Gabriel Boulevard. Construction is anticipated to begin in May 2010 and take 10 months to complete. Phase 4 would involve construction of the new hospital building. Construction is anticipated to begin in May 2011 and take 14 months to complete. Phase 5 would involve construction of the new medical office buildings in Rose Court and the central portion of the project site. Construction is anticipated to begin in May 2012 and take 10 months to complete. Interior renovations to existing facilities vacated by the new structures would be done proceeding the appropriate phases. For example, the main building would be renovated after the new hospital has been completed in 2012.

## Construction

As part of project construction, numerous trees would be removed. There are approximately 93 protected trees on-site. These trees qualify for protection under the City of Pasadena Tree Protection Ordinance.<sup>1</sup> Approximately 77 of these protected trees would be removed. In addition, approximately 193 trees that do not qualify for protection under the City of Pasadena Tree Protection Ordinance would be removed. A total of 103 new trees would be planted on the project site and 5 trees would be relocated. The proposed project would also require the removal of 18 structures as part of buildout of the 2007 Master Development Plan. Some of these structures are at least 50 years of age or older.

Due to the age of on-site structures, there is the potential for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP). A preconstruction survey would be required to determine the presence of ACM and LBP. All ACM and LBP would be removed prior to the start of demolition in accordance with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements for LBP and the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) requirements for ACM (Rule 1403).<sup>2</sup>

### 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The project site is located at 2900 East Del Mar Boulevard. The site is roughly bound by Del Mar Boulevard and Millicent Way to the north, El Nido Avenue to the east, residential and life/care uses and Diana Street to the south, and residential uses and San Gabriel Boulevard to the west. The project site directly abuts single-family residential uses located on Millicent Way and Diana Street. A senior living community directly abuts the southern boundary of the project site along San Pasqual Street. Single-family residential uses are located to the north, west, and east of the project site across Del Mar Boulevard, San Gabriel Boulevard, and El Nido Avenue.

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

Various City permits and approvals would be required in order to approve and implement the proposed project. These include the following"

- City of Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission (review of traffic impacts)

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Pasadena. *Pasadena Municipal Code Title 8 Health and Safety, Chapter 8.52 City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance*. 2007.

<sup>2</sup> SCAQMD. *Rule 1403 – Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities*. Website <http://arb.ca.gov/DRDB/SC/CURHTML/R1403.HTM>.

- City of Pasadena Design Commission (review of building design)
- City of Pasadena Historic Preservation Commission (review of historic impacts)
- City of Pasadena Planning Commission (review of 2007 Master Development Plan and EIR)
- City of Pasadena City Council (approval of the Master Development Plan and certification of the EIR)

Other regulatory agencies and local jurisdictions would also require permits or approvals in order to construct and operate the proposed project. These include the following:

- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System)
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (letter of No Further Action)
- California Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement)

**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.

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

**DETERMINATION:**

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.	X
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.	

Melissa Hatcher 7/17/07  
Prepared By/Date

Melissa Hatcher, EDAW  
Printed Name

Scott A Reimers 7/17/07  
Reviewed By/Date

Scott A Reimers  
Printed Name

## 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. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**a. Less than Significant Impact.** The northern boundary of project site is in an area that offers views of the San Gabriel Mountains. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains are generally unobstructed from the northern boundary of the project site as a result of the single-story single-family residential uses located on the north side of Del Mar Boulevard. Views are also available to motorists and pedestrians traveling north on San Gabriel Boulevard and El Nido Avenue. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains are currently limited from the interior of the project site because the site slopes in a southerly direction. Further, buildings and mature trees are located throughout the project site that impede views of the mountains to the north. Public views of the mountains are very limited south of the project site because the adjacent uses to the south are at a lower elevation than the proposed project site. In addition to the existing 1- and 2-story buildings located throughout the site, mature trees line the project perimeter that virtually eliminate public views of the mountains to the north.

The proposed project would involve construction of new 1-, 2, and 3-story buildings in the project interior and removal of existing single-story structures and some trees. The 2007 Master Development Plan has been designed such that 2- and 3-story buildings would be located in the site interior where views of the mountains are already limited and these buildings would be blocked from view by the trees along the site perimeter. There are no plans to remove the perimeter trees that currently limit public views into the site and views of the mountains to the north. These perimeter trees would also limit public views of the proposed new buildings. Upon completion of the proposed new construction, private views of the mountains from the interior and public views south of the site would be limited or non-existent, as under current conditions. Views of the San Gabriel Mountains from the northern edge of the property would remain unchanged. Therefore, the impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

In accordance with section 17.61.030 of the City's Zoning Code, the design of this project, including its obstruction of any scenic vista or view, would 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. Potentially Significant Impact.** The only designated state scenic highway near 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 thus, would have no impacts to a state scenic highway. Further, the project site is not located near Foothill Freeway (I-210), Linda Vista Avenue, Orange Grove Boulevard [between the Ventura Freeway (Route 134) and the City's southern boundary], Ventura Freeway (Route 134), Pasadena Freeway (Route 110) [from the southern terminus of Arroyo Parkway to the City's southern boundary], Oak Knoll Avenue/Oak Knoll Circle/Lake Avenue [between California Boulevard and the City's southern boundary], California Boulevard [between Lake Avenue and Sierra Madre Boulevard], or Sierra Madre Boulevard [between California Boulevard and the City's eastern boundary]) corridor, all of which were identified in the 1987 Environmental Quality Element of the City's General Plan as Los Angeles County Recommended Scenic Highways or City Designated Scenic Corridors. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact any locally-recognized scenic roadway corridors.

However, the proposed project would result in the removal of approximately 77 protected trees, which are recognized as having significant aesthetic value, and 193 unprotected trees could be removed during project construction. In addition, the project site contains buildings that are potentially eligible for listing as historic resources, which may also have an aesthetic value. Thus, impacts to scenic resources will be examined in the EIR.

- c. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project consists of expansion of the medical office, hospital, assisted living, and independent living units within the Las Encinas Hospital campus. New buildings would be constructed in a similar style and of similar materials as the existing bungalow style. As required by section 17.61.030 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the design of this project will be reviewed for approval by the Design Commission. This regulatory procedure was established to ensure that the design, colors, and finish materials of development projects comply with adopted design guidelines and achieve compatibility with the surrounding area. This regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

However, construction of the proposed new facilities would require the removal of 77 protected trees and 193 unprotected trees. In addition, some of the structures that are proposed for removal are at least 50 years of age or older and could qualify for listing as historic resources. The loss of mature trees and removal of potentially eligible historic resources could have a negative visual impact on the project site. Therefore, this issue will be examined further in the EIR.

- d. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project consists of expansion of the medical office, hospital, assisted living, and independent living units within the Las Encinas Hospital campus. The proposed structures would be constructed in a similar design as the existing bungalow style and of similar materials. These buildings would not contain exterior glass walls or other reflective materials that would add light or glare

affecting daytime views. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

The project site currently contains security and general nighttime lighting. All lighting is directed down and into the project site or onto specific doors and entryways of buildings for security purposes. New lighting would be added to the project site for security and general nighttime lighting, including light fixtures associated with the new surface parking lot in the south of the new hospital building. All new lighting would be required to comply with the standards in the Zoning Code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. Interior lighting would not shine onto surrounding properties; and all proposed exterior lighting is typical safety, landscape, and parking lot lighting, which are required to comply with the outdoor lighting standards in the Zoning Code. As required by section 17.61.030 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the design of this project will be reviewed for approval by the Design Commission. This regulatory procedure was established to ensure that the design, colors, and finish materials of development projects comply with adopted design guidelines and achieve compatibility with the surrounding area. Design review would include consideration of proposed new lighting fixtures. Considering the proposed uses, any potential negative effect would be eliminated by conditions imposed by the Design Commission. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

The existing site structures range from 1- to 2-stories in height. The proposed new structures would be of a similar height, with the exception of the new hospital building and the new independent living building (Building 34). A portion of the hospital building closest to center of the project site would be up to 3-stories in height. In general, new structures around the perimeter of the project would be one-story in height. Minimum 20-foot setbacks are proposed where the project site abuts adjacent residential development. Where 2-story independent living bungalows are proposed near San Gabriel Boulevard, a 50-foot setback has been designated. By locating taller buildings in the project interior and maintaining 20-foot setbacks, the proposed project would not cast shadows on adjacent residences located on Millicent Way, Diana Street, and San Pasqual Street. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

**2. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a.-c. No Impact.** The proposed project site is located in a developed, urban area of the City of Pasadena. The project site is developed with institutional uses and is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. There are no Williamson Act contracts associated with the project site.<sup>3</sup> The project site is zoned PS (Public and Semi-Private) and would not convert agriculturally zoned land to non-agricultural uses. Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources, and no further study of this issue is required.

**3. 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Conservation. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*. Website [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/overview/survey\\_area\\_map.htm](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/overview/survey_area_map.htm), accessed June 12, 2007.

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by SCAQMD. The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements. The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP, adopted on June 11, 2007. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the forecasts made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMD. 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 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. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed new facilities, demolition of some existing structures, and interior renovation of other existing facilities would generate short-term construction emissions. Emissions would be generated from building demolition, site grading, construction equipment, worker vehicle exhaust, and fugitive dust during excavation, grading, and other site preparation activities. Construction activities would be short-term in nature and would not add to long-term air quality degradation. However, these emissions may exceed SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Temporary construction emission would, therefore, be considered potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

Long-term impacts would occur from emissions generated by new residents, and employees, and visitors to the site associated with the expansion of the facilities. Emissions would also be generated from stationary sources associated with increased natural gas and electrical energy consumption. Depending upon project trip generation, the proposed project may increase vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the project site beyond levels currently generated. An increase in daily vehicular emissions may exceed SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Stationary source emissions associated with natural gas and electrical consumption would also be increased due to the proposed expansion of facilities. Further analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The City of Pasadena is within the SCAB. This basin is a non-attainment area for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). The construction and operation of the proposed project would contribute to an increase in air quality emission for which the region is non-attainment. As such, air quality impacts from construction and operation of the new facilities will be evaluated using the thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. The project site currently includes long-term health facilities and retirement homes. The project proposes to expand the number of assisted living and senior residences located on-site. In addition, the Las Encinas Hospital campus is surrounded by single-family and senior residential uses. Therefore, sensitive receptors could be affected by project construction and operation. This issue will be examined as part of the EIR.

Carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots, or areas of high concentration, can occur at congested roadway intersections as a result of accumulating vehicle CO emissions. A significant air quality impact would occur if sensitive receptors are exposed to CO levels that exceed state or federal standards. Further analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

- e. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project consists of expansion of the medical office, hospital, assisted living, and independent living units within the Las Encinas Hospital campus. Odors from construction may be generated by heavy machinery used on-site, or from the application of paint and/or asphalt during the construction period. These odors, if perceptible, are common in the environment and would be limited in duration. Operation of the proposed project would not be expected to result in objectionable odors. Odors associated with operation of the proposed project would be controlled in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 402.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

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

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>4</sup> SCAQMD. *Rule 402 – Nuisance.* Adopted May 7, 1976.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a.-d. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is currently developed with medical and residential uses. Urban/Developed land cover is the only vegetation type/habitat community that occurs on the approximately 24.7-acre site. No native vegetation community exists on-site. A search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) for the Mt. Wilson and El Monte quadrangles revealed 16 sensitive plant species. None of these species were observed during site surveys or are expected to occur on-site. Although the majority of trees and other landscaping on the site are healthy, the absence of native vegetation communities detracts from the quality of habitat on the site for native wildlife.<sup>5</sup>

The CNDDDB search revealed 11 federally and state-listed sensitive species or species of concern. None of these species was observed during site surveys or is expected to occur on-site. No sensitive animals were observed on-site. However, the Cooper's hawk has the potential occur on-site. Further, the large number of tall, mature trees provides potential habitat for raptors (hawks and owls) as foraging perches or nest sites, although no nests (active or inactive) were observed during site surveys. Implementation of the proposed project could interfere with the migration or movement of bird species.

There are two drainages on the project site that could be subject to California Department of Fish and Game jurisdiction. These drainages may exhibit the characteristics of a streambed as defined by the California Fish and Game Code. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could potentially impact a riparian habitat, wetlands, or other sensitive natural community. As such, these issues will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**e. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the removal and replacement of some on-site trees. Approximately 270 trees would be removed, 77 of which are protected under the City of Pasadena Tree Protection Ordinance. A total of

<sup>5</sup> Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. *Las Encinas Hospital Biological Reconnaissance Survey Report*. September 22, 2005. p. 3.

103 new trees would be planted on the project site and 5 trees would be relocated. The applicant is required to submit a landscape plan to be approved by the Design Commission and Zoning Administrator. The landscape plan must describe, among other things, the number and location of any trees to be removed, and provisions for replacement of the trees. Review and approval of the landscape plan would ensure that any biological resources on the site are protected. A landscape plan is currently being prepared by the applicant. As such, this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

- f. **No Impact.** No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. No impacts would occur, and no further study of this issue is required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Historically significant buildings represent a particular architectural style or time period in California history. The project site includes approximately 25 buildings that meet the criteria for district contributors as defined by the City of Pasadena and the National Register of Historic Places.<sup>6</sup> Some of these structures would be demolished as part of construction of the proposed new facilities. Loss of these buildings would potentially result in a significant impact. In addition, construction of new buildings would potentially impact the historic setting in which the structures are located. As such, further discussion of this issue will be included as part of the EIR.

b.-c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve subsurface excavation to create the subterranean parking garage beneath the proposed new hospital building. Significant archaeological or paleontological resources may be uncovered during site excavation. The impacts of the proposed project on these resources will be evaluated in the EIR. Project plans include grading and excavation. On-site soils have been extensively disturbed by past activities at the site.

d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** No religious or sacred uses, including sacred burial grounds, have been identified on the project site. No known human remains exist on the

<sup>6</sup> Historic Resources Group. *Las Encinas Hospital Amendment to Master Plan and Preliminary Assessment of Historic Significance.* December 2006. pp. 14-15.

project site, and the project site is not designated nor has it been designated for use as a cemetery. Therefore, no impacts to human remains are anticipated to occur. In the event that human remains are encountered during site excavation, an approach to recover and respectfully treat the remains would be developed in accordance with state and federal laws. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

**6. ENERGY.** Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**a. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project would be within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan, for which energy supply has been allocated. The project would 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. However, because the proposed project includes more than 25,000 sf of new non-residential construction, the project would be required to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance.<sup>7</sup> As such, the proposed project would be required to obtain the services of a LEED Accredited Professional to demonstrate that the proposed new facilities meet the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards prior to obtaining a building permit. LEED standards are based on sustainable site planning, safeguarding water and water efficiency, energy efficiency and renewable energy, conservation of materials and resources, and indoor environmental quality. Compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance would ensure a less than significant impact, and no further study of this issue is required.

**b. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed expansion of Las Encinas Hospital would increase demand for energy. However, the proposed intensity of the project would be within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan, for which energy supply has been allocated. Further, the proposed project would be required to comply with LEED standards as described above. As such, operation of the proposed project would not require development of new energy sources. Construction of the proposed project would result in a short-term consumption of oil-based energy products. However, the additional amount of resources used would not cause a significant reduction in available supplies. The proposed project would also increase demand for water supply. Because the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan, the City of Pasadena Water and Power has anticipated the increase in demand and supplies

<sup>7</sup> City of Pasadena. *Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 14.90 Green Building Practices Ordinance*. Adopted December 19, 2005, effective April 15, 2006.

are available. Title 24 of the California Building Code requires that all new facilities be outfitted with water saving, low-flow devices. Building materials during demolition would be recycled and/or reused on site. As such, compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact to non-renewable resources. No further study of this issue is required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. <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.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a.i.-ii. Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within a seismically active region (Southern California). Primary ground rupture or fault rupture is defined as surface displacement, which occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone and no known faults cross the site.<sup>8</sup> The nearest known fault is the Raymond (Hill) Fault Special Study Zone located approximately 0.75 mile south of the project site. The Raymond Fault is considered to

<sup>8</sup> City of Pasadena. *Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, California.* August 2002. Plate P-1.

be active, and the site would be subject to strong seismic groundshaking in the event of an earthquake. Compliance with Uniform Building Code (UBC) Seismic Zone 4 requirements would ensure that proposed structures can withstand the expected worst-case seismic groundshaking.<sup>9</sup> The City's plan check and building inspection procedures would ensure that the project is constructed according to these standards. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of these issues is required.

**a.iii-iv.No Impact.** The project site is not located within an area of known liquefaction, or where geologic conditions indicate a potential for ground displacement.<sup>10</sup> In addition, the project site is generally flat and does not contain any hillsides or slopes on or adjacent to the site that would be susceptible to slope failure or landslide. No impact would occur, and no further study of these issues is required.

**b. Less Than Significant Impact.** The relatively flat nature of the proposed project site precludes it from being readily susceptible to erosion. However, construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disruption during grading and trenching that could create the potential for erosion to occur. Since the proposed project site is greater than one acre, the construction contractor would prepare and comply with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would feature erosion control measures.<sup>11</sup> In addition, the construction contractor would comply with the Storm Water Construction Activities General Permit and obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.<sup>12</sup> Further, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Standard Urban Storm water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as enforced by the City's Storm water Management and Discharge Control. New development projects must filter or retain the first  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch of storm water on-site. This measure ensures that pollutants are separated from storm water runoff prior to its release into the storm drain channels, catch basins, and eventually larger bodies of water. The SUSMP requires that:

- All construction sites within the City adhere to established Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the reduction of potential pollutants.
- Develop pollution prevention plans for construction sites.
- Incorporate structural as well as treatment control BMPs.
- Perform an on-going inspection and maintenance program for developments that install treatment control BMPs.<sup>13</sup>

The City of Pasadena requires water erosion during construction to 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 would be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations would be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site. This plan would be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or the appropriate staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a

---

<sup>9</sup> City of Pasadena. *2004 Land Use and Mobility Plan EIR*. October 2004. p. 153.

<sup>10</sup> City of Pasadena. *Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, California*. August 2002. Plate P-1.

<sup>11</sup> Clean Water Act. United States Code, Title 33, Sections 101-607. Amended November 27, 2002.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *National Pollution Discharge Elimination System*. website <http://cfpub2.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/cgp.cfm>, accessed June 7, 2007.

<sup>13</sup> City of Pasadena. Pasadena Municipal Code Section 8.70.097.

building permit. The City also requires that projects involving more than 250 cubic yards of cut or fill must have an erosion and sediment transport control plan as part of the applicant's grading plan. The grading plan must be approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Adherence to existing regulations and implementation of standard construction practices would ensure that soil erosion would be reduced to a less than significant level. No further study of this issue is required.

- c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Pasadena rests primarily on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is composed of stable soils. The proposed project is not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The project site is not located in a liquefaction or landslide zone, as delineated in the General Plan Safety Element.<sup>14</sup> Further, modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, would ensure the project would not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils. No further study of this issue is required.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** 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. Further, as described above, all site structures would be constructed and/or renovated in accordance with the California Building Code. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact from expansive soils. No further study of this issue is required.
- e. **No Impact.** The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area, which includes adequate sewer infrastructure of the ability to accommodate any additional sewer connections that may be needed. Therefore, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are not necessary. No impacts would occur, and no further study of this issue is required.

---

<sup>14</sup> City of Pasadena. *Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, California*. August 2002. Plate P-1.

**8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a.-b. Less Than Significant Impact.** Existing operation of the site involves mental health and assisted living facilities. These uses involve the handling and disposal of biological waste. Medical waste must be stored and handled separately from other waste generated at the project site. Medical waste is placed in separate red biohazard bags and is transported from the site by a medical waste/transporter facility. No on-site treatment of medical waste is performed at this facility. All medical waste would be handled, transported, and disposed of in accordance with applicable state and local regulations.

The proposed project consists of expansion of the medical office, hospital, assisted living, and independent living units within the Las Encinas Hospital campus. Operation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through routine transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials. Grading and construction activities may involve the limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials such as remodeling/demolition debris, lead and asbestos containing materials, in the fueling or servicing of construction equipment on-

site, or the removal and export of contaminated soils. However, these activities would be minimal, short-term, or one-time in nature, and would be subject to federal, state and local health and safety requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Long term operation of the proposed project would involve very little transport, storage, use or disposal of hazardous materials associated with janitorial, maintenance, and repair activities (i.e., commercial cleaners, lubricants and paints), and household cleaning supplies. Use of these hazardous materials would be very limited, and transport, storage, use and disposal of these materials would be subject to federal, state and local health and safety requirements. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of these issues is required.

- c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Walden School is located approximately ¼ mile north of the project site. However, the project would not involve the use of hazardous materials, acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes in sufficient quantities to pose a potential hazard. As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with all federal, state and local rules and regulations for hazardous materials handling to ensure that impacts would be less than significant. No further study of this issue is required.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact.** A Phase I (Phase I) Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site. The Phase I included a review of public records of past and present activities on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site to determine if these activities may have resulted in deposits of hazardous materials or contamination of the site by hazardous materials. A site investigation was also conducted on August 2, 2004. The project site has been used as a mental hospital since 1879. According to the Phase I, the present and past uses of the site have not involved deposits of hazardous materials or resulted in contamination of site with hazardous materials. The project site and the vicinity are not listed on local, state, or federal records of hazardous materials sites or sites contaminated with hazardous materials. There was no evidence of contaminated soils or hazardous materials found during the site visit.<sup>15</sup> However, due to the age of the structures to be removed during construction, there is the potential for ACM and LBP to be encountered. A preconstruction survey would be required to determine the presence of ACM and LBP. All ACM and LBP must be removed prior to the start of demolition in accordance with DTSC requirements for LBP and SCAQMD requirements for ACM. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact. No further study of this issue is required.
- e.-f. **No Impact.** The project site is not located within two miles of any public or private airstrip. No airport land use plan applies to the site. No impact would result, and no further study of this issue is required.
- g. **No Impact.** 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 would not have an impact on emergency response and evacuation plans. No further study of this issue is required.

---

<sup>15</sup> USA Environmental, Inc. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for Las Encinas Hospital*. August 2004.

- h. No Impact.** The proposed project site and surrounding area are largely developed and no wildland fire hazard risk exists. On-site landscaping would be controlled through trimming and watering so as to reduce fire hazard impacts. Therefore, no impact would result, and no further study of this issue is required.

**9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would 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 would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. <i>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. <i>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. <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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. <i>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is currently developed with hospital and senior living uses. Approximately 50 percent of the project site contains flat impervious surfaces. The proposed project would expand the existing hospital and senior/assisted living uses, thereby increasing the amount of impervious surfaces on the project site.

The project does not include any uses that might discharge unusual pollutants, such as industrial or manufacturing uses. However, in the long term, leaking automobile and truck fluids (due to surface parking), trash, disturbed soils, and other contaminants could be carried away by storm water into local and regional waterways. In the short term, water used to control dust during grading and construction, as well as storm water, could carry construction debris, spilled fluids (including petroleum products from construction vehicles), and disturbed soils into local and regional waterways.

Water quality in Pasadena is regulated by the State of California Water Quality Control Board (WQCB), Los Angeles Region (Region 4). The County of Los Angeles issues permits to cities to discharge storm water runoff under NPDES. The LARWQCB requires all discretionary projects, such as this project, to incorporate features to filter or retain the first  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch of storm water on-site. Further, the proposed project would be required to prepare a SUSMP, as enforced by the City's Storm water Management and Discharge Control. This measure ensures that pollutants are separated from storm water runoff prior to its release into the storm drain channels, catch basins, and eventually larger bodies of water.<sup>16</sup> Since most pollutants are carried away by the first  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch of rainfall, this requirement would ensure that long-term impacts are less than significant. Furthermore, the City requires that all projects submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Public Works and Transportation Department (Building Division) prior to issuance of building permits. This submittal must include the use of BMPs during construction and operation to limit discharge of sediment and pollutants. Thus, existing standard requirements would ensure that impacts on water quality, both during construction and operation are less than significant; no further study of this issue is required.

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not install any groundwater wells, and would 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, the proposed project would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies. The impact would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.
- c. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The relatively flat nature of the proposed project site precludes it from being readily susceptible to erosion. However, construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disruption during grading and trenching that could create the potential for erosion to occur. As described above, the construction contractor would be required to prepare and comply with a SWPPP, which would feature erosion control measures.<sup>17</sup> In addition, the construction contractor must comply with the Storm Water Construction Activities General Permit and obtain a NPDES permit.<sup>18</sup>

Further, the City of Pasadena requires water erosion during construction to 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 would be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations would be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be

---

<sup>16</sup> City of Pasadena. Pasadena Municipal Code Section 8.70.097.

<sup>17</sup> Clean Water Act. United States Code, Title 33, Sections 101-607. Amended November 27, 2002.

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *National Pollution Discharge Elimination System*. website <http://cfpub2.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/cgp.cfm>, accessed June 7, 2007.

transported in trucks to or from the site. This plan would be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or the appropriate staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The City also requires that projects involving more than 250 cubic yards of cut or fill must have an erosion and sediment transport control plan as part of the applicant's grading plan. The grading plan must be approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Adherence to existing regulations and implementation of standard construction practices would ensure that soil erosion would be reduced to a less than significant level. No further study of this issue is required.

- d.-e. Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed, the project would involve changes in the site's drainage patterns and increase the amount of impervious surfaces located on-site. The proposed project would involve altering two discernable drainage courses. Alteration of these drainages could result in flooding on- or off-site or create substantial new sources of pollutants if adequate new drainage and filtration is not provided. As such, this issue will be examined further in the EIR.
- f. Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the proposed project would not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban storm water pollutants. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact to water quality during construction and operation. No further study of this issue is required.
- g.-j. No Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone or any other flood zone.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, the project would not place housing or structure within a 100-year flood zone. No levees or dams are located uphill from the project site; therefore the project site will not be exposed to seiche and/or flooding due to a failure of a dam or levee. Pasadena is not subject to tsunami hazards. No hills or unstable lands are located in the vicinity, and no mudflows affecting the site would be expected. No potential impacts in regard to these issues are anticipated, and no further study is required.

**10. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Physically divide an existing community?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>19</sup> City of Pasadena. *Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, California.* August 2002.

- a. **No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an existing community. The proposed new development would occur entirely within the approximately 24.7-acre Las Encinas Hospital campus. No adverse impact will result.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is designated Institutional in the General Plan Land Use Element and zoned PS (Public and Semi-Public). Hospitals, life/care services, and medical offices are conditionally permitted within the PS zone.<sup>20</sup> Life/care services include independent living units, residential care facilities, and continuing care, Alzheimer and related facilities. With approval of the 2007 Master Development Plan by the City, the proposed project would be consistent with the zoning and land use designation. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.
- c. **No Impact.** Currently, there is 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.<sup>21</sup> No impact would occur, and no further study of this issue is required.

**11. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** 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 located in these areas.<sup>22</sup> The project site is currently developed with institutional uses associated with Las Encinas Hospital. The proposed project consists of expansion of the medical office, hospital, assisted living, and independent living units within the Las Encinas Hospital campus. The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. 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, no impact would occur, and no further study of this issue is required.

<sup>20</sup> City of Pasadena. 2004 Land Use and Mobility Plan EIR. October 2004.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

**12. NOISE.** Will the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a. Potentially Significant Impact.** Project construction and operation could potentially expose nearby sensitive receptors (such as residences located adjacent to the project site) and patient and residences residing within the project site to noise levels above established noise standards. The project would create noise on a short-term basis during construction from equipment and personnel. Long-term operation impacts associated with area traffic; mechanical equipment associated with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; on-site public address system; and building operations could also be significant sources of noise which could affect on-site residents and adjacent sensitive receptors.

Noise impacts associated with the exposure to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Pasadena Noise Ordinance will be analyzed in the EIR.

**b. Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would generally include conventional construction activities, including demolition, excavation, grading, site preparation, and building construction. Construction activities may temporarily increase groundborne vibration and noise levels. Operation of the project would not involve any activities with the potential to cause excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Further analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

**c.-d. Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would generally include conventional construction activities, including demolition, excavation, grading, site preparation and building construction. A temporary increase in noise would result from construction activities. The majority of noise generated by operation of the proposed project would be attributable to vehicles. Traffic noise may be potentially

significant depending upon traffic routes and volumes. The project includes residential uses above or next to commercial areas. The project site is also in the vicinity of residential uses. Noise would increase in the project area from project construction and operation. Further analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

**e.-f. No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

**13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>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)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**a. Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would result in increased residential population and economic activity on the site. The General Plan allows 48,780 net new residential units and 8,261,628 sf net new nonresidential development outside of the specific plan areas.<sup>23</sup> The amended Master Development Plan would provide 134 new residential units and 188,000 sf of nonresidential square footage. As such, the proposed project is within the growth parameters of residential and nonresidential development for the General Plan. The overall increase is considered consistent with existing City and regional policies regarding population and businesses. In addition, the proposed project does not include the extension of roads or infrastructure. Thus, development of the proposed project would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

**b.-c. No Impact.** In addition to the new senior residential units, independent living units, assisted living beds, hospital beds, and medical facilities, the proposed project involves the discontinuation of two single-family residences to construct 30 new senior living residential cottages. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people, necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Further, the proposed project would have the beneficial impact of providing approximately 134 new senior units in the residential cottages and independent living apartments. No impact would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, p. 36.

- 14. 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire Protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Libraries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Police Protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. Potentially Significant Impact.** Fire protection is provided to the project site by the City of Pasadena Fire Department. Fire Station No. 32, located at 2424 East Villa Street, is approximately 1 mile northwest of the project site. The project site is currently developed with medical offices, a psychiatric hospital, senior living units, and assisted living uses. Implementation of the proposed amendments to the Master Development Plan would substantially increase the use of the site and could generate increased calls for fire protection services. As such, this issue will be evaluated in detail in the EIR.
- b. Less Than Significant Impact.** Library service in Pasadena is provided through the Central Library and 9 branch libraries. The closest library to the project site is located on Altadena Drive less than 0.25 mile to the northwest. The Amendment to the Master Development Plan would add 134 senior/independent living units and 52 skilled nursing/assisted living units, along with medical office space and a new psychiatric hospital. Expanded operation of the project site would likely increase demand on library services within the City. However, the City adopted a Library Special Tax, which levies a tax on each residential dwelling unit and nonresidential parcel within the City for the purposes of maintaining and improving the library system.<sup>24</sup> In accordance with City regulations, the proposed project would be required to pay the Library Special Tax to offset increased demand on library services. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.
- c. Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Section 15, Recreation, for a discussion of the project's effects on nearby parks. Impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.
- d. Potentially Significant Impact.** The City of Pasadena Police Department provides police protection to the project site. In addition, the hospital maintains its own security force. Although the proposed new psychiatric care facilities are intended to be more

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

secure than existing facilities, the expansion of uses on the project site could increase calls for police protection services to the project site. As such, this issue will be evaluated in detail in the EIR.

- e. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would provide a total of 132 new senior living units, 52 skilled nursing/assisted living units, and additional medical office and psychiatric uses. The proposed new development would expand the senior and psychiatric care uses currently operated on the Las Encinas Hospital campus. These units would not contribute additional school-aged children to the area. Further, in accordance with City requirements, the project applicant would be required to pay the Pasadena Unified School District fees associated with all new development. Payment of these fees is intended to be used to fund school expansion and new school construction programs to accommodate population growth and would ensure a less than significant impact on schools.<sup>25</sup> No further evaluation of this issue is required.
- f. **Less Than Significant Impact.** 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 would be less than significant.<sup>26</sup> No further study of this issue is required.

**15. RECREATION.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a.-b. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would provide a total of 132 new senior living units, 52 skilled nursing/assisted living units, and additional medical office and psychiatric uses. The campus includes recreational facilities, such as pools, a recreation room, and open space. The proposed development would convert an existing residential building into a recreational center for the senior residential bungalows. A pool and common facilities would be added as part of the independent living units. As such, the residents of the project site are not anticipated to use recreational resources outside of the campus. However, in accordance with Ordinance #6252, the City collects a park impact fee for each residential unit constructed and for non-residential projects. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program.<sup>27</sup> The impacts to recreation and parks would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

**16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**a.-b. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of new senior living, assisted living, medical office, and psychiatric uses on the site. The expansion of the existing uses which would generate increase vehicle trips in and out of the project site. The additional traffic could have a negative impact to levels of service at nearby intersections. A traffic study is currently being prepared and further analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

**c. No Impact.** 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. No further study of this issue is required.

**d. Less Than Significant Impact.** Existing vehicular access to the project site is provided by 10 driveways: 4 vehicle driveways on Del Mar Boulevard, 4 driveways on San Gabriel Boulevard, and 2 driveways on El Nido Avenue. These driveways provide access to the site and existing surface parking spaces. All of the existing driveways accommodate full access (i.e., left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress). The driveways on Del Mar Boulevard and El Nido Avenue provide access to the main portion of the site. The driveways on San Gabriel Boulevard provide access to the existing residences. There are currently no internal connections between the main portion of the campus and the residences fronting San Gabriel Boulevard.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers. *Final Traffic Impact Study for Las Encinas Hospital Master Plan Amendment Project.* March 27, 2006. p. 8.

The existing driveways on San Gabriel Boulevard would be closed as part of the project. Closures would occur in accordance with City standards with concrete curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. With implementation of the proposed 2007 Master Development Plan, access would be provided by 8 driveways: 4 driveways on Del Mar Boulevard, 2 driveways on San Gabriel Boulevard, and 2 driveways on El Nido Avenue (see Figure 3). Changes to ingress/egress and turning movements are not proposed at the Del Mar Boulevard and El Nido Avenue driveways. The proposed northerly driveway on San Gabriel Boulevard would be located at the northwest corner of the project site. It would provide egress (exit) from the planned internal roadway accommodating access to the senior residential cottages. The internal roadway would be one-way only with a counterclockwise circulation pattern. Egress from this driveway would be limited to right-turn movements only to preclude hospital-related traffic from intruding through this portion of the campus to turn left on southbound San Gabriel Boulevard. The southerly San Gabriel Boulevard driveway would be located at the southwest corner of the site and provide ingress to the planned internal roadway. Ingress (entrance) would be accommodated by right- and left-turn movements into the project site. Egress (exit) would be prohibited at this driveway to prevent conflicts with vehicles turning into and out of Topsyfield Street, which is located just south of this driveway and extend westerly from San Gabriel Boulevard.<sup>29</sup> The proposed expansion of facilities and modifications to site circulation as part of the Amendment to the Master Development Plan has been evaluated by the City of Pasadena Department of Transportation. The project's impact on circulation due to the expanded uses and its design have been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project site or in the vicinity.<sup>30</sup> In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. The impacts would be less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.

- e. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The design of the project would provide adequate emergency access. The project will comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans will be reviewed by the City's Public Works and Transportation Department, the Building Division, as well as the Fire Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Compliance with these standard requirements would ensure a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.
- f. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Due to the increased intensity of land use, the project would increase the demand for parking. The project includes construction of 180 new parking spaces in a subterranean garage located beneath the proposed new psychiatric hospital and approximately 146 new surface parking spaces. Private garages would be provided for the majority of the senior residential cottages. However, the EIR will include further analysis of the City's parking requirements and the proposed number of new parking spaces.
- g. **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is located along numerous local and regional bus routes that travel along Del Mar Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard. The Hospital currently offers shuttle service for residents of the Oaks senior apartments and would expand the shuttle service to accommodate the additional senior units. The proposed amendments include the addition of bicycle parking in accordance with City requirements. Design of the proposed project would comply with all local and state requirements relating to public transportation. All City policies supporting alternative transportation would be implemented as part of the project. Compliance with

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 8-11.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*.

existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact. No further study of this issue is required.

**17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. <i>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**a.-b. Potentially Significant Impact.** The Amendment to the Master Plan would add 134 senior/independent living units and 52 skilled nursing/assisted living units, along with medical office space and a new psychiatric hospital. The expanded uses would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. As such, this issue will be examined further in the EIR.

**c. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces on-site. Further, the project would involve changes in the site's drainage patterns. As such, the applicant would be required to install new storm water drainage features. This issues will be examined further in the EIR.

**d.-e. Potentially Significant Impact.** As described above, the expansion of uses at the project site would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. As such, this issue will be examined further in the EIR.

**f.-g. Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste such as scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, and plastics. It is anticipated that a large amount of the construction debris would be recycled. Those materials that cannot be recycled would be disposed of at nearby landfills. Disposal and recycling of the construction debris would be required to

comply with all federal, state and local regulations, and no impacts would occur. An increase in use of the site would be expected to increase the amount of solid waste generated by the proposed mixed-use development. Because recycling is mandatory in the City, a substantial portion of the waste generated by the proposed project would be diverted away from area landfills and recycled. The remaining non-recyclable waste would likely be disposed of at one of the regional landfills, such as Scholl Canyon Landfill in Glendale. This landfill is active and has adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed project.<sup>31</sup> As such, impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant. No further evaluation of this issue is required.

**18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. <i>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?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>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?)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**a. Potentially Significant Impact.** Based on this initial study, the proposed project is not expected to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project could eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Further cultural resource investigations must be conducted in order to verify this conclusion.

**b. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts. It is anticipated that the project may occur at the same time as other projects in the area, and the incremental effect of this project may be cumulatively considerable. This issue will be further examined in the EIR.

**c. Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project has the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (i.e., air quality,

<sup>31</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board. *California Waste Stream Profiles*. website <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/>, accessed June 20, 2007.

noise, and traffic). Further analysis will be provided in the EIR to determine potentially significant impacts and identify mitigation measure that would reduce impacts to the extent feasible.

## References

California Department of Conservation. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*. Website [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/overview/survey\\_area\\_map.htm](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/overview/survey_area_map.htm), accessed June 12, 2007.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List). website [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm), accessed June 12, 2007.

City of Pasadena. *2004 Land Use and Mobility Plan EIR*. October 2004.

City of Pasadena. *Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 14.90 Green Building Practices Ordinance*. Adopted December 19, 2005, effective April 15, 2006.

City of Pasadena. *Pasadena Municipal Code Title 8 Health and Safety, Chapter 8.52 City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance*. 2007.

City of Pasadena. *Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, California*. August 2002.

Clean Water Act. United States Code, Title 33, Sections 101-607. Amended November 27, 2002.

Historic Resources Group. *Las Encinas Hospital Amendment to Master Plan and Preliminary Assessment of Historic Significance*. December 2006.

Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers. *Final Traffic Impact Study for Las Encinas Hospital Master Plan Amendment Project*. March 27, 2006.

Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. *Las Encinas Hospital Biological Reconnaissance Survey Report*. September 22, 2005.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). *Rule 402 – Nuisance*. Adopted May 7, 1976.

SCAQMD. *Rule 1403 – Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities*. Website <http://arb.ca.gov/DRDB/SC/CURHTML/R1403.HTM>.

USA Environmental, Inc. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for Las Encinas Hospital*. August 2004.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). *National Pollution Discharge Elimination System*. website <http://cfpub2.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/cgp.cfm>, accessed June 7, 2007.