



VII. Response to Comments

VII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the Final EIR shall consist of: “(a) the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft; (b) comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary; (c) a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; and (d) the responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.”

The Revised Draft EIR for the Project was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review on August 17, 2004. A 45-day comment period is required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15087. However, an 86-day comment period was provided and concluded on November 10, 2004.

The Revised Draft EIR was presented for comment before meetings/hearings of the Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission, the Pasadena Design Commission and the Pasadena Planning Commission. In addition, written comments were received from the California Department of Transportation.

The comments received on the Revised Draft EIR are presented with responses below. Comments made orally at commission meetings/hearings are presented in summary; comments received in written form are presented verbatim. A copy of the comment letter is also included at the end of this section.

2.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

A. Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission Meeting, August 8, 2004

Comment A-1

Please briefly discuss the effects of the new parking structure and how you see that impacting the trips to the conference center. We are concerned about the visitors to the conference center using the parking at the Paseo Colorado and crossing over. We are concerned with the pedestrian movement in general and the problem that we already have between Paseo Colorado and this site. We’re increasing the number of days, not necessarily the number of

people on one particular event, but we're increasing the number of events and are concerned about pedestrian movement there and how the change and the introduction of the larger parking structure would interact with that. It might actually cause a decrease in the number of pedestrians trying to get to the site because there is increased parking on the site. Please provide some discussion on that.

Response A-1

As stated in Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, the availability of on-site parking would increase with the development of either the 5-level or 7-level parking structure. Relative to existing conditions, on-site parking with the 5-level and 7-level parking structure would increase by 147 and 391 spaces, respectively. In both of these cases, the additional spaces that would be provided on site would be occupied by those vehicles currently parking off-site. Therefore, since the Project would provide additional parking on site, it would reduce the number of visitors parking off site and having to cross the street to access the facility. As such, the use of the parking facilities at the Paseo Colorado by visitors to the Project is not anticipated to increase, and may potentially decrease.

As further stated in Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the Revised Draft EIR, pedestrians walking between the Project site and the Paseo Colorado mixed use development have access to the existing crosswalk located at the mid-block traffic signal (on Green Street, between Marengo Avenue and Euclid Avenue). This crossing is located on the west side of the westerly Paseo Colorado driveway (on Green Street). The existing crosswalk is 30 feet wide and is well utilized as a formal connection between the Paseo Colorado mixed use development and the Project site. The Applicant will implement the streetscape requirements pursuant to the approved Pasadena Civic Center/Mid-Town District Design Project; Refined Concept Plan. This Plan includes the installation of special paving for: 1) the sidewalks on the Civic Auditorium side of Green Street; 2) the corners on Garfield Avenue at the northern side of the intersection, and 3) a non-travel lane on Green Street parallel to the Civic Auditorium. The use of special paving will clearly demarcate the pedestrian areas. The Applicant has indicated that additional consideration will be given to the issues raised in this comment during the Project's design review process with the City. Additional design elements would focus on improving pedestrian safety, additional signage directing visitors to and from the Gold Line Station, the establishment of convenient and accessible bus stops and bus service to the site. These additional measures would not result in environmental impacts beyond those identified in the EIR.

Comment A-2

Earlier in our meeting we talked about decreasing bus service. However, we want to encourage people going to a conference to use restaurants in this area and also on Colorado. If

someone is at a conference here it would be nice to go into Old Town to a restaurant and back in less than an hour and that's pretty hard to do.

Response A-2

The comment addresses planning issues that do not pertain to the potential environmental impacts of the Project. As such, the comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project.

Comment A-3

There is nothing in the document about the pedestrian experience but just some comments that we want to have a good pedestrian experience. Was any design element as to how that would occur be considered, such as the treatment for even the cross walks between the Civic Center and Paseo Colorado and how it is going to work in the future because right now it is totally dysfunctional and dangerous. If people are going to take their lunch and go to Paseo Colorado it is a mess. I think we have to think about not just new striping but maybe have an architectural element that may encourage pedestrian activity that would also aid in safety as well as an enhancement of the whole area from a pedestrian standpoint. There also needs to be consideration of the pedestrian experience from the site to the Gold Line. I don't see any encouragement, architecturally or otherwise, for convention goers to say let's go this way to the Gold Line. They have to find their way through a maze. I can't tell where your openings are going to be from the elevations. It should be very clear to them where to go to catch the Gold Line and it should be an enticing, beautiful way with shade and the amenities that encourage pedestrianism. This is still a car based convention center rather than a non-auto based convention center.

Response A-3

As discussed in Response to Comment No. A-1, pedestrians traveling between the Project site and the Paseo Colorado mixed use development have an existing crosswalk to use, which is located at the mid-block Green Street traffic signal between Marengo Avenue and Euclid Avenue. The existing crosswalk is sufficient to ensure the safe movement of pedestrians to and from the Project site.

The Project as currently designed includes features that enhance the pedestrian experience. For example, the proposed reconfigured steps on Green Street would create an expansive public plaza for pedestrians entering and exiting the Civic Auditorium. The existing Ficus street trees along Green Street would remain as part of the design, serving to provide shade

and an aesthetically pleasing pedestrian-oriented streetscape. In addition, the new Exhibition Hall and Ballroom building would be constructed at grade rather than below sidewalk level to encourage pedestrians to enter and use the site. The Project also includes new plaza spaces which would create an improved system of public space that would connect Green Street and Euclid Avenue to the interior of the site.

With regard to pedestrian access to the Gold Line Station, pedestrians traveling to or from the Gold Line Station at Del Mar Boulevard to the Project site are anticipated to travel east on Del Mar Boulevard to Marengo Avenue, then north to the Project site. There are currently sidewalks, cross walks, and signal phasing provided for pedestrians traveling along this route from the Project to the station.

The Applicant has also indicated that additional consideration will be given to the issues raised during the Project's design review process. Particular attention will be paid to the aesthetics of the pedestrian experience, improving pedestrian safety, providing additional signage directing visitors to and from the Gold Line Station, and the provision of bus stops and bus service to the site. Additional wayfinding signs will be installed on Cordova Street, Del Mar Boulevard, and Marengo Avenue to enhance the pedestrian experience. Furthermore, the Pasadena Conference Center staff has indicated that there will be a joint marketing effort with event organizers to distribute information about using the Gold Line to access the site.

Comment A-4

I don't know where the bus stops are going to be located. The bus stops should be an enticing place to wait for the bus and should be incorporated architecturally into the design. Since all I see are these general elevations, where is the bus stop and what will it look like? A bus stop, or maybe even a plaza, is more enticing to get people to ride the bus. What is it going to be like to wait for the bus?

Response A-4

The comment addresses planning issues that do not pertain to the potential environmental impacts of the Project. As such, the comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project. The Applicant has indicated that they will review design issues as they relate to accommodating bus service at the Project site including, but not limited to, those identified in the comment. The Applicant will work with the Department of Transportation during the design phase to place bus stops at the most appropriate locations.

Comment A-5

The sidewalk width around the convention center is not clear. The Central District Specific Plan indicates that there should be wider sidewalks especially on a street where you have a lot of auto-pedestrian conflict such as Marengo and Green. I think Green is pretty wide right now. I think we should really take a look at that and report on that.

Response A-5

As stated in Section III.A, Land Use, of the Revised Draft EIR, the draft Central District Specific Plan specifies that Green Street, which borders the northern portion of the Project site, have sidewalks with a minimum width of 10 feet. Under the proposed Project, existing sidewalks along Green Street will be preserved and thus, will meet the minimum width requirement.

In addition, the Project is designed to provide pedestrian space adjoining the sidewalks along Green Street. The Exhibition Hall and Ballroom building fronting Green Street would have a setback of 6 feet from the property line to preserve existing street trees. In addition, the Civic Auditorium would feature a 24,650 square foot entry plaza along Green Street that would create a more active pedestrian streetscape. The Conference Center would be located at the property line fronting Green Street and would feature a covered pedestrian arcade. Along Marengo Avenue, the new Exhibition Hall and Ballroom building is designed to be setback 13-15 feet with existing sidewalks to remain.

Comment A-6

Parking should be shared. Could the parking become easily available for development in the area? There is a lot of residential development going in on Cordova and over just a couple blocks. The move at least in the Central District is to try and come up with more shared parking so that the available parking spaces can be utilized more effectively.

Response A-6

The uses in the area currently operate with shared parking, which would continue with implementation of the Project. As indicated in Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the Revised Draft EIR, several parking structures in the vicinity of the Conference Center (e.g., the Pasco Colorado subterranean parking garage, Los Robles parking structure, Ameron parking structure, and the Marengo parking structure) are used to meet the existing parking demand associated with the activities occurring within the Project site. Existing and future agreements between the PCOC and the operators of these facilities would ensure the accessibility of needed parking. In

addition, parking on the site would continue to be available to the public at times when events are not occurring at the facility.

Comment A-7

The project proposes several levels of parking above grade. The elevations look good. But to have parking at the street level was negatively received by the neighborhoods and the Commission would like to see a camouflage of that. What we really want is retail along the edge instead of just looking into a parking structure.

Response A-7

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project.

As discussed in Section III.D, Aesthetics, design elements are proposed along Euclid Avenue that are intended to shift the visual focus away from the Parking Structure itself. Specifically, the Project would feature two towers along Euclid Avenue that flank the pedestrian entryway into the plaza between the Conference Building and the Parking Structure. These towers would provide an open-air passage which reduces building mass and establish visual connections into the plaza and the Civic Auditorium from Euclid Avenue. The EIR concludes that the Parking Structure would not result in a significant aesthetic impact and would not result in significant impacts at off-site locations from the operation of the Parking Structure. In addition, the Parking Structure, like the entire project, is subject to design review.

Comment A-8

The discussion on page 165 looks like an urban edge feeling is being created. I thought we were moving away from that theme. The third paragraph, which is shown in redline, says the structure would be located at the property line on Euclid. This is starting to become a neighborhood area. I don't have an answer for it but that kind of hit me.

Response A-8

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project.

As stated in Section III.D, Aesthetics, the Project would create a new building-street relationship. The Conference Building and adjacent sidewalks are currently separated by a 25-foot-wide sunken embankment, which results in an awkward building-street interface. With

the addition of the administrative office space along Green Street and Euclid Avenue in the renovated Conference Building, the building setback would be located at the property line along both streets. This renovation would create a stronger building-street relationship as specified in the Central District Specific Plan and would enhance pedestrian access to the interior of the Project site. The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in significant impacts on adjacent uses.

Comment A-9

Is the project going forward pursuant to a planned development?

Response A-9

The comment addresses planning issues that do not pertain to the potential environmental impacts of the Project. A planned development is not proposed for the Project and the Project would be subject to discretionary entitlements (e.g., CUP and design review processes).

Comment A-10

There may be an opportunity for shared parking. Council in the next three or four weeks is going to address the issue of parking in the Central District and may look to shared parking as a way to address concerns businesses have about wanting to have parking at the same time trying to keep these caps as proposed in place.

Response A-10

The comment addresses planning issues that do not pertain to the potential environmental impacts of the Project. Please see Response to Comment No. A-6, above, regarding shared parking.

Comment A-11

With the new parking structure, the intersections would be impacted differently. There is not really an analysis of what that does to the pedestrians at the intersection. The project is changing where people will park and how they come into the parking structure at the same time pedestrians will be using the intersections in different ways. There is no discussion of that interface.

Response A-11

The configuration of the existing vehicular access to the site would not change under the proposed Project. Under the proposed design, vehicular access to the on-site parking facilities would continue to be provided via two driveways along Marengo Avenue and Euclid Avenue, south of the Sheraton Hotel. Primary pedestrian access to the Project site would continue to be provided along Green Street through a system of integrated public plazas. Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the EIR concludes that the Project would not result in a significant impact with regard to roadway intersections and pedestrian safety. For additional information regarding pedestrian access to the Project site please refer to Response to Comment No. A-6.

Comment A-12

The document identifies that there would not be any daytime or peak time traffic volume increases on the de-emphasized streets yet I would think that when there are events there would be impacts on those streets. What steps will be taken to protect the de-emphasized streets when there are major events at the convention center or hall?

Response A-12

Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the EIR provides an analysis of the Project's impacts on the intersections surrounding the Project site and on neighborhood streets. As discussed therein, although the Project would increase the number of events held annually, it would not increase the size of events. Therefore, the Project would not increase the number of vehicle trips occurring on a peak day. As stated in Response to Comment Nos. A-6 and A-11, the Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to pedestrian safety and the existing vehicular access points to the Project site would be maintained with the proposed Project. The Project would not result in any significant impacts with regard to traffic or pedestrian safety.

Comment A-13

The construction truck routes and enforcement is an issue. What I witness, if every project has these truck routes, is that they are not enforced because I followed a construction truck that had a bobcat on it, 18 wheeler, all the way down from Pasadena into Alhambra down Los Robles. Can there be enforcement on those truck routes?

Response A-13

As indicated in Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the EIR, as part of the approval process for this Project, a Truck Haul Route program must be prepared and approved by the

Pasadena Department of Transportation. This program would minimize usage of non-truck routes and whenever feasible would restrict the number of construction truck trips along major roadways during any particular hour of the day (i.e., peak commute periods). This program will be the responsibility of the Pasadena Police Department. The Police Department will be responsible for enforcement of any violations to the approved truck haul route and/or violations of the truck route ordinance.

Comment A-14

On large events can we get collaboration for extra bus service to get people from the Gold Line stations (i.e., shuttling people around)? Maybe the convention center can subsidize something with the City to help move traffic around for major events.

Response A-14

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project. The comment addresses planning issues that do not pertain to the potential environmental impacts of the Project. Notwithstanding and as indicated in Response to Comment No. A-3, there are sidewalks, cross walks, and signal phasing provided for pedestrians traveling to and from the site to the station.

B. Pasadena Design Commission Meeting, August 23, 3004

Comment B-1

There are quite a few trees being removed and the replacement trees are not addressed in the Draft EIR. There is a need to determine the appropriate locations for the replacement trees and this should be addressed in the EIR.

Response B-1

Removal of existing trees is discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Revised Draft EIR. Of the approximately 152 trees identified on and around the site, the Project would result in the removal of 77 trees, of which 72 are on the site and 5 are street trees. Of these 77 trees, 8 would be replanted. Thus, the Project would result in the preservation of 75 trees (not including the replanted trees) and a net loss of 69 trees on and around the site. This loss would be offset by new landscaping within the Project site and along the streets. Therefore, the increase in the number of trees to be removed would not result in a change in the conclusions reached in the Revised Draft EIR. All tree removal would be completed in accordance with City

requirements. Furthermore, the locations of the replacement trees would be determined as part of the Project's overall design review process.

Comment B-2

There is a typographical error in the Aesthetics section, in Section 6, Cumulative. The analysis states that the site is relatively flat and most of Pasadena is somewhat sloped. This should be reviewed again.

Response B-2

The sentence has been revised to delete reference to the topography in the Project area.

Comment B-3

The 7-story parking structure looks out of scale with the elevations of the rest of the buildings. The smaller structure would be better. Do the drawings represent the tallest structure?

Response B-3

The elevation (on the left) provided in Figure 15 in Section III.D, Aesthetics, of the EIR reflects the 7-story parking structure. However, the Applicant has indicated that they anticipate constructing a 5-story structure, rather than a 7-story structure. Both structures have been analyzed. The 5-story structure would be approximately 20 feet shorter than what is shown in Figure 15 and would be approximately the height of the Conference Building. The 7-story structure continues to be analyzed in the EIR as decision making regarding the final design of the parking structure has not occurred as of this date.

C. Pasadena Planning Commission Public Hearing, November 10, 2004

Comment C-1

How does transit oriented development parking reductions impact this project? If a CUP were not required, how would it be impacted?

Response C-1

The Pasadena Municipal Code specifies that parking requirements for a Commercial Recreation use are established per the CUP required for the use. Also, under the proposed Zoning Code, Conference Center will be its own use with regard to parking requirements, and parking will be determined per the CUP for the use. As part of this process consideration will be made as to the potential for integrating transit oriented parking reductions per the recent actions of the City Council. If a CUP were not required for the Project, a direct application of the City's policies for transit oriented parking reductions could be directly applied to the Project.

Comment C-2

Will the two existing underground levels of parking be removed? Will all of the parking be located in the new structure? The Commission also asked about the subterranean parking on the west side.

Response C-2

The two existing levels of underground parking on the east side of the Project site would be replaced with the two subterranean levels of the proposed parking structure. The two existing levels of underground parking on the west side of the site would be removed to accommodate the structures proposed for that area of the Project site. The parking that would be displaced would be provided within the proposed parking structure. Relative to existing conditions, on-site parking with the proposed 5-level and 7-level parking structure would increase by 147 and 391 spaces, respectively. In addition, all of the parking beneath the Sheraton Hotel would remain. On-site parking would be provided in the new parking structure (the 5-level structure would provide approximately 653 parking spaces, while the 7-level structure would provide approximately 897 spaces), the reconfigured loading dock (24 spaces), and 295 existing spaces would remain.

Comment C-3

The 7-story parking structure seems large. It would be better to have the parking subterranean, if possible. When will a decision regarding a 5- or 7-story structure be made? What alternatives were considered for that structure? With the parking structure located on the east side along Euclid, it is adjacent to low, 1- and 2-story structures, including an office building, psychotherapist office, Euclid Villa transitional housing, and the Masonic Auditorium. On the west side along Marengo there is a box building across the street. Why is the parking structure not located on the west side away from the nicer, lower scale buildings and closer to the Marengo side, which is also closer to Arroyo Parkway and closer to the freeway entrance. The

west side seems a better place for the parking structure. Also, do the drawings reflect the 5- or 7-story structure? The Summary of the Draft EIR refers to seven levels. Is that wrong?

Response C-3

The western portion of the Project site is substantially wider than the eastern portion. Specifically, the Project site is approximately 100 feet wider on the west compared to the east. The Applicant has indicated that the floorplates required to accommodate the programs envisioned for the Project could only fit on the west side of the Project site and that these structures include a subterranean level. The Applicant has further indicated that subterranean parking below the new structures is not feasible.

As discussed in Response to Comment No. B-3, above, the elevation provided in Figure 15 in the EIR reflects the 7-story parking structure. However, the Applicant has indicated that they anticipate constructing a 5-story structure, rather than a 7-story structure. Both structures have been analyzed. The 5-story structure would be approximately 20 feet shorter than what is shown in Figure 15 and would be approximately the height of the Conference Building. The 7-story structure continues to be analyzed in the EIR as decision making regarding the final design of the parking structure has not occurred as of this date.

Comment C-4

Why is there is a new ballroom and then the conversion of the skating rink? Is that the most appropriate use for the skating rink? Do we need two full ballrooms?

Response C-4

The Applicant has indicated that the marketing analysis conducted for the Project shows that there would be support for both ballrooms. The new space would be a modern ballroom and would have state of the art systems. The only existing alternative in Pasadena is the Ritz Carlton and that ballroom is approximately 12,000 square feet in area. The Applicant anticipates being able to fill the skating rink ballroom with local and other special events and to use the new. Larger on-site ballroom to support convention uses and similarly sized business meetings.

Comment C-5

This would be an ideal site with regard to mass transit. What would it mean if the Project were to incorporate the 25 percent reduction in parking?

Response C-5

Based on information provided by the Applicant, facilities such as the proposed Project have traditionally provided parking at or in close proximity to the facility. The Applicant has also indicated that the Project would not overbuild parking but rather would provide a reasonable amount of parking. It is important to note that the Project during peak events would continue to need other surrounding garages to meet the Project's peak parking demand. The applicability and desirability of incorporating parking reductions into the Project per the recent actions of the City Council will be addressed as part of the CUP process for the Project wherein the parking requirements for the Project would be established.

Comment C-6

There was recently a discussion about open space and the Planning Commission expanded the recommendation by staff to include the dedication of two acres of open space throughout the Central District with a goal of providing five to seven acres of open space. There seems to be some opportunity for open space at the Project site. I am disappointed that the open space areas would retain the plaza feel and not be more of a public space since right now the spaces are unused. The plazas are not very user friendly right now. Will the open space be concrete like it is today?

Response C-6

The Project has been designed to balance its needs for floor area and the provision of open space and that the open space that is provided exhibit a high degree of usability in relation to the buildings. The Project would greatly expand the courtyard area in front of the Civic Auditorium. The Project would create a larger plaza in front of the Auditorium thereby creating space for public interaction. In addition, the Project would create additional outdoor area on the eastern side of the site to the north of the parking garage. Finally, the Project would create two plazas between the new development and the Civic Auditorium. While the amount of plaza space is decreased under the Project, the usability of the space that would be provided would be greatly enhanced relative to existing conditions.

Comment C-7

Please discuss the tree removal that is proposed as part of the Project.

Response C-7

As discussed in Response to Comment No. B-1, removal of existing trees is discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the EIR. Of the approximately 152 trees identified on and around the site, the Project would result in the removal of 77 trees, of which 72 are on the site and 5 are street trees. Of these 77 trees, 8 would be replanted. The project would result in the preservation of 75 trees (not including the replanted trees) and a net loss of 69 trees. This loss would be offset by new landscaping within the Project site and along the streets. Therefore, the increase in the number of trees to be removed would not result in a change in the conclusions reached in the Revised Draft EIR.

As indicated in Section II, Project Description, of the EIR, the trees on the site are protected by the City's ordinance only because they are on City property and as such are considered public trees. The existing trees do not meet the specimen or native tree criteria that apply to trees on private property. In addition, the trees on the Project site are not in a natural environment as they are planted above a subterranean parking structure in tree wells. Therefore, the growth of the trees is constrained and the trees cannot grow to their natural size and form. As indicated in the EIR, all tree removal would be completed in accordance with City requirements.

Comment C-8

What is the number of proposed parking spaces?

Response C-8

There are approximately 825 spaces existing on the site. With the 5-level structure, the Project would result in a total of 972 spaces or an increase of approximately 147 spaces when compared with existing conditions. The 7-level structure would result in a total of 1,216 spaces, or an increase of approximately 391 spaces when compared with existing conditions.

Comment C-9

Last time we talked about shuttles and using parking in the area. Will the parking be the lower number because of this?

Response C-9

As discussed in Response to Comment No. C-7, the parking analysis contained in Section III.B, Traffic Circulation, of the Draft EIR does include the use of shared parking. As currently exists, the Project would rely on the use of parking in the surrounding garages. Refer

to Response to Comment No. C-5 regarding the Applicant's position relative to the provision of parking at the Project site.

Comment C-10

The open spaces that are being created are really captured for the convention center rather than having found a way to activate the plazas that exist today. The Project would result in the loss of those two plazas. Considering what we went through with the Central District Specific Plan, it is an unfortunate turn of events. It is a real cost that this development is putting on this community.

Response C-10

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project. As indicated in Section II, Project Description, of the EIR, the Project would reconfigure and relocate the two existing on-site plazas. However, the site area dedicated for plaza space would be reduced under the proposed Project. The Project design includes a total of 75,390 square feet, or 1.73 acres, of open space. As discussed in Response to Comment No. C-8, the Project would maximize the usability of open space in relation to the buildings. The Project would expand the plaza in front of the Auditorium, would create additional outdoor area on the eastern side of the site to the north of the parking garage, and would create two plazas between the new development and the Civic Auditorium. While the amount of plaza space is decreased under the Project, the usability of the space that would be provided would be greatly enhanced relative to existing conditions. In essence, the area, although reduced in size, would be used more so the functionality of the open space is actually increased with the proposed Project.

Comment C-11

On the design, the Project seems to have gone from modern design to a mimic design. The design is so iterative of the Civic Auditorium and has gone 180 degrees from the previous design. With historic structures, they are not supposed to mimic, but are supposed to be different. This design needs some work to make sure it respects the Civic Auditorium, but doesn't mimic it.

Response C-11

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project. It is concluded in Section III.C, Historic Resources, of the EIR that the Project's design would

have a less than significant impact on the historic resources on and in proximity to the Project site (e.g., the Civic Auditorium). In addition, the Project will be reviewed through the design review process and elements such as building articulation, exterior colors and materials will be reviewed.

D. California Department of Transportation

Comment D-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The proposed project is to renovate and expand the Pasadena Conference Center in order to provide modern amenities and facilities that would make it competitive with other conference centers in the region.

Response D-1

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project.

Comment D-2

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful of your need to discharge clean run-off water.

Response D-2

As identified in the Initial Study, which is provided in Appendix A of this Final EIR, the Project would not result in an increase in storm water run-off over current conditions. In accordance with City requirements, an on-site drainage plan would be prepared and approved by the Building Official and the Public Works and Transportation Departments prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Comment D-3

Any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods. Thank you for the opportunity to have reviewed this project.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897-3747 or Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 040854AL.

Response D-3

The comment is noted and is incorporated into the Final EIR for the review and consideration of the public and the decision makers prior to any approval action on the Project. Project implementation would require the preparation and approval of a Truck Haul Route program. This program would ensure that construction truck trips along major roadways during any particular hour of the day are limited (i.e., peak commute periods). In general, it is expected that the majority of truck traffic would be distributed evenly across the workday. All necessary permits and approvals will be obtained for the transport of heavy construction equipment and/or materials.

3.0 COMMENT LETTERS

A copy of the following letter appears on the following page:

- California Department of Transportation, September 27, 2004

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7, REGIONAL PLANNING
IGR/CEQA BRANCH
120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE: (213) 897-3747
FAX: (213) 897-1337

Commentor D



Flex your power.
Be energy efficient.

IGR/CEQA No. 040854AL, Revised DEIR
Pasadena Conference Center Expansion
Vic. LA-110 / PM 31.91, LA-210 / PM R24.86
SCH # 2003011026

September 27, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Paige-Saeki
City of Pasadena
175 N. Garfield Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91109

Dear Ms. Paige-Saeki:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The proposed project is to renovate and expand the Pasadena Conference Center in order to provide modern amenities and facilities that would make it competitive with other conference centers in the region.

D1

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful of your need to discharge clean run-off water.

D2

Any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods. Thank you for the opportunity to have reviewed this project.

D3

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897-3747 or Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 040854AL.

Sincerely,

CHERYL J. POWELL
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse