

ERRATA

Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project

SCH No. 2004101073

June 2008

The following contains further text changes to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project. Text deletions are denoted in ~~striketrough~~ text, while text additions are indicated in double-underline format.

Introduction to the Final SEIR

Page ix, text has been amended as follows:

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) was distributed to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 60-day public review period, which began on December ~~6~~17, 2007, and ended on February 14, 2008. The Draft SEIR was circulated for review and comment to the public, other interested parties, agencies that commented on the IS/NOP, and surrounding jurisdictions... The Draft SEIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the Draft SEIR were available for review on the City's website, at ~~all~~ the San Rafael and Linda Vista Branch libraries within the City of Pasadena, as well as at the Central Library, City Planning Counter Permit Center, and the Economic Development Office at City Hall. During the review period, the public was provided with the opportunity to submit written comments on the Draft SEIR. ~~Seven public hearings~~ Three public meetings were held during the review period.

The public was invited to attend all of these ~~hearings~~ meetings through publication of a hearing meeting notice in the appropriate venues ~~and the local newspapers~~. Oral comments were received at these ~~hearings~~ meetings from commission members as well as the public.

...

USE OF THE FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The FSEIR allows the public and the Lead Agency an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft SEIR, the responses to comments, and other components of the SEIR—such as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)—prior to approval of the project. The FSEIR serves as the environmental document used by the City when considering approval of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project.

Page x, text has been amended as follows:

Each finding must be accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for the finding. In addition, pursuant to Section 15091(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the agency must adopt, in conjunction with the findings, a program for reporting or monitoring the changes that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. This program is referred to as the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

...

These certifications and, the Findings of Fact, ~~and the Statement of Overriding Considerations~~ are included in a separate Findings document that accompanies the City's staff report. Both the FSEIR and the Findings are submitted to the City for consideration of the proposed project.

Executive Summary

Page xv, Objectives of Revised Project, text has been amended as follows:

The purpose of the renovation of the Rose Bowl is to extend the building's long-term use and financial viability by upgrading the stadium and maintaining its character-defining features. The project objectives are as follows:

- Public safety upgrades for the improvement of emergency exiting for patrons at the Rose Bowl
- To upgrade the major infrastructure of the stadium, including plumbing, electrical, safety, and mechanical systems...

Page xxvi, Table ES-1, Impact 3.2-6 text has been amended as follows:

<i>Impacts</i>	<i>FEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>Does the FEIR Significance Conclusion Change with the Proposed Project Revisions?</i>	<i>Draft SEIR Significance Conclusion</i>	<i>FEIR Mitigation Measures Required</i>	<i>New Mitigation Measures Required</i>
Impact 3.2-6 Revised project implementation would exceed daily operational emissions thresholds.	SU	No <u>Yes</u>	SU <u>LTS</u>	None	None

Page xxxviii, Table ES-1, first column, text has been amended as follows:

Impact 3.4-5 The revised project under Options A or C could alter the significance of the Arroyo Seco Cultural Landscape.

Chapter 1.0 Introduction

Page 1-1, text has been amended as follows:

The Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project as originally proposed was analyzed in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was certified by the Pasadena City Council on May 916, 2005.

Page 1-3, text has been amended as follows:

The FEIR was certified by the Pasadena City Council on May 916, 2005. The project was neither approved nor denied at that time, and the City Council asked the Rose Bowl Operating Company (RBOC), the project Applicant, to consider further alternatives to the NFL proposal. Findings were not made and no Statement of Overriding Considerations was approved.

Chapter 2.0 Project Description

Section 2.6, Page 2-26, Objectives of the Revised Project, text has been amended as follows:

The purpose of the renovation of the Rose Bowl is to extend the building's long-term use and financial viability by upgrading the stadium and maintaining its character-defining features. The project objectives are as follows:

- Public safety upgrades for the improvement of emergency exiting for patrons at the Rose Bowl
- To upgrade the major infrastructure of the stadium, including plumbing, electrical, safety, and mechanical systems...

Section 2.7, Public Actions and Approvals, page 2-27, text has been amended as follows:

Amendment of Rose Bowl Lease Agreements—The agreements with UCLA and the Tournament of Roses Association may require amendment to modify the terms of the agreements to allow the proposed reduced bowl seating capacity.

Chapter 3.0 Environmental Analysis

Page 3-1, text has been amended as follows:

This chapter provides an analysis...This chapter ~~section~~ discusses potential impacts from the project modifications. For each environmental topic in this chapter, ~~Section~~, this Draft Supplemental EIR (Draft SEIR) presents the methodology and Thresholds of Significance used to analyze the impacts. The complete text of all project-specific mitigation measures that apply to the Draft SEIR will be included in the Rose Bowl Revised Renovation Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). It

should be noted that some mitigation measures from the FEIR may no longer be required with the project as revised.

■ Section 3.1 Aesthetics

Page 3.1-1, text has been amended as follows:

Numerous comments regarding the visual character of neighborhoods in the Arroyo as well as the Arroyo and the Rose Bowl Stadium were received during the IS/NOP comment period for the original project and in the scoping sessions held in October and November 2004 and the scoping session held on July 18¹⁹, 2007 for the revised project.... Sharon Yonashiro commented that poles and flags are needed for a sight line study. Lee ~~Zariteson~~ Zanteson commented on the height of the proposed press box and requested that poles be used to show the actual height of the proposed revised project.

Page 3.1-3, text has been amended as follows:

The ribbon lighting on the façade of the press box would not change from the previous design. New field lighting would be the same as that analyzed in the previous EIR. Under Options A and C, a horizon-level concourse would be constructed around the rim of the stadium connecting with the new suites/press box. ...

...

Another difference in the revised project (Options A and C) includes four vertical towers up to 102 feet that would be constructed to provide improved patron access to other levels of the stadium and the club amenities.

Page 3.1-4, text has been amended as follows:

Views from the West

As noted in the FEIR, views of the Rose Bowl from the west at about Linda Vista Avenue would not be substantially different with the project. The interior of the stadium may be partially visible, as would the ridgeline of San Rafael Hills, although the upper slopes of the hillside would not. The primary difference would be new views of the elongated press box structure. As the press box structure for the revised project remains substantially the same as for the original project, including the vertical access towers (which, though larger in this design, would remain within the overall development footprint of the original design), this impact, identified as less than significant in the FEIR, would not change with the revised project. Similarly, if Option A or C for the revised project is selected, the impact of the horizon-level concourse on this viewshed was fully analyzed in the previous EIR. From the interior, the impact on views toward the east would be less significant than with the proposed project, as there would be no east side structure and new structure massing on the east side would consist only of the two vertical access towers.

...

Views from the East

Views of the stadium from the east (Armada Drive) would include the exterior columns supporting the new horizon-level concourse (with Options A and C) and the new, taller, elongated press box structure on the west side of the stadium. These are project elements that were analyzed in the previous EIR. The original project included a substantial structure on the east side of the stadium that would have resulted in view of a substantial built element with the San Rafael ridgeline in the background. The large scale of the built elements on the east side would have dominated within this viewshed and substantially adversely affected this scenic vista. This was identified as a significant and unavoidable impact for the previous project design. As there would be no large-scale built elements on the east side of the stadium with the revised project, the impact on this scenic vista would be reduced compared to the original project from significant and unavoidable to less than significant. The selection of Options A, B, or C would not change this conclusion, and impacts on this scenic vista would remain less than significant.

Subsection 3.1.7, Cumulative Impacts, page 3.1-34, text has been amended as follows:

With regard to other scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or trees within a California scenic highway, cumulative development in the Central Arroyo would not affect any such resources. The revised project's cumulative impact would be less than significant. All historic buildings in the project vicinity have been described in Section 3.4 (Cultural and Historic Resources), of this Draft SEIR. Cumulative development could adversely affect these historic resources; however, policies contained in the City's General Plan and the Arroyo Seco Master Plan, as well as Secretary of Interior standards, would help minimize any adverse effects on these resources. The cumulative impact on historic structures is analyzed in Section 3.4.

■ Section 3.2 Air Quality

Page 3.2-13, text has been amended as follows:

The analysis of operational emissions has been prepared utilizing the URBEMIS 2007 computer model recommended by the SCAQMD. The results of these calculations ~~for a weekend special event~~ are presented in Table 3.2-4 (Project Operational Emissions ~~for a Weekend Special Event~~). As shown, the baseline operational emissions with the existing number of displacement events ~~associated with the proposed revised project~~ would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. ~~As there is no other feasible mitigation to reduce the impact, it would remain significant and unavoidable.~~ Weekday displacement A maximum of 12 displacement events would occur as part of the proposed revised project, but would not ~~be above~~ differ from the number of displacement events that are currently ~~occur~~ allowed on the project site, nor would future ~~weekday~~ displacement events be more intense than those that occur under existing conditions. As such, emissions from ~~weekday~~ displacement events would not change from those that occur under the existing operation of the Rose Bowl Stadium. Exceedance of SCAQMD thresholds for air quality is not a continuous impact and would occur only on days events occur, as NO_x is primarily a motor vehicle emission. It should further be noted that exceedance of NO_x thresholds is an existing

condition on event days, and the revised project would not result in a substantial worsening of this condition, as it will not contribute additional motor vehicle traffic compared to existing conditions.

The SCAQMD has not established a threshold of significance that distinguishes between baseline conditions which are already significant, and the incremental effects a project may add to an already-significant effect. However, since the proposed revised project’s incremental operational impact is no increase, in any event it is less than significant.

It should be noted that, while the analysis is similar to the analysis provided in the FEIR, operational emissions have been reanalyzed in this Draft SEIR to provide necessary updates to the methodology, primarily the use of URBEMIS 2007 and updated emissions factors, and to compare operational emissions of PM_{2.5} to the SCAQMD’s daily significance threshold for PM_{2.5} which was not available at the time the FEIR was published.

Table 3.2-4 Project Operational Emissions for a Weekend Special Event						
<i>Emissions Source</i>	<i>Emissions in Pounds per Day</i>					
	<i>VOC</i>	<i>NO_x</i>	<i>CO</i>	<i>SO_x</i>	<i>PM₁₀</i>	<i>PM_{2.5}</i>
Water and Space Heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscape Maintenance	0.12	0.02	1.55	0.00	0.01	0.01
Consumer Products	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
Architectural Coatings	3.82	—	—	—	—	—
Motor Vehicles [‡]	40.04	61.61	537.98	0.61	100.33	19.50
<i>Total Emissions</i>	<i>43.98</i>	<i>61.63</i>	<i>539.53</i>	<i>0.61</i>	<i>100.34</i>	<i>19.51</i>
Thresholds (lb/day)	55.00	55.00	550.00	150.00	150.00	55.00
Significant Impact	No	Yes	No	No	No	No

NOTES:
[‡] Exceedance of NO_x threshold is not an ongoing condition and will occur only on event days.
 SOURCE: PBS&J, 2007. Computer sheets are provided in Appendix B.

Page 3.2-14, Subsection 3.2-8, Conclusion, text has been amended as follows:

In sum, the air quality impacts of the proposed project revision would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The revised project would reduce PM₁₀ levels during construction activities, but would increase the amount of VOC emitted during construction activities, and would reduce overall operational emissions with the exclusion of weekday additional special events as analyzed in the FEIR, even though operational emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. Project-specific mitigation measures identified above will continue to be implemented, and no new or different mitigation measures are required.

■ Section 3.3 Biological Resources

Page 3.3-1 and 3.3-2, text has been amended as follows:

As stated on pages 3.3-17 through 3.3-20 of the FEIR, the proposed revised project would be required to comply with all regulations set forth by the federal, state, and local regulatory agencies. On a federal level, the revised project would be required to adhere to the *Clean Water Act* as well as the *Migratory Bird Treaty Act*, and the *Federal Endangered Species Act*. Locally, the revised project would adhere to the goals and policies established by the City of Pasadena's General Plan, including the Conservation Element as well as the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. For a detailed explanation of the regulatory framework...

■ Section 3.4 Cultural and Historic Resources

Page 3.4-2, text has been amended as follows:

Historic Resources Group (HRG) previously completed for the City of Pasadena a Historic Structures Report (HSR), which contained a thorough analysis of character-defining features of the Rose Bowl ~~which~~ and is contained in the FEIR.

Page 3.4-6, text has been amended as follows:

Figure 2-7 of the Draft SEIR more clearly illustrates the visual effects of the widened tunnels. The new tunnel openings would retain a similar height to width ratio the identical shape and height as the original existing trapezoidal openings. Their new concrete surrounds would be detailed as the existing concrete surrounds....

Pages 3.4-12 and 3.4-13, text has been amended as follows:

Impact 3.4-5 **The revised project under Options A or C could alter the significance of the Arroyo Seco Cultural Landscape. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.4-3(b) would reduce this impact, but not to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.**

...

...However, there would still be a significant effect under Options A or C after mitigation because archival documentation would not mitigate demolition of the historical resource to a level less than significant. This impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

■ Section 3.5 Geology and Soils

Page 3.5-8, text has been amended as follows:

The geographic context for cumulative impacts is probable/future development within the City, as this is the development that the City will be in charge of regulating in regards to geologic conditions. Therefore, the cumulative analysis is based on full build-out of the City's General Plan and the related projects list contained in Table 2-2 in Chapter 2 (Description of the Revised Project).

■ Section 3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Subsection 3.6.4, Methodology, page 3.6-2, text has been amended as follows:

For purposes of this analysis, the typical use of hazardous materials and their effects were qualitatively assessed through review and evaluation of available documents that identified potential contaminants and hazardous materials uses within the project site, such as the Arroyo Seco Master Plan ~~Master~~ EIR.

■ Chapter 5 Changes to the Draft SEIR

Page 5-29, text has been amended as follows:

Figure 2-7 of the Draft SEIR more clearly illustrates the visual effects of the widened tunnels. The new tunnel openings would retain a similar height to width ratio, the identical shape and height as the original existing trapezoidal openings. Their new concrete surrounds would be detailed as the existing concrete surrounds....

Section 5.4, Figure Changes, Page 5-35, text has been amended as follows:

A new Figure 2-9 (Comparison of Proposed Project to Existing Stadium), provided on the following page, illustrates the existing conditions and a graphic illustration of the proposed revised project, including the new press box, scoreboard, new aisles, and tunnel openings on the inside of the stadium. ~~A new Figure 2-10 (Comparison of Proposed Press Box with Existing Structure) has also been included, which depicts an overlay of the new proposed structure over the existing building, and depicts height markers for each level.~~

Page 5-39, Figure 2-10 has been removed
