

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

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

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

WHY? The project is a temporary short-term event that will occur four times a year at Memorial Park. The project does not involve physical changes to Memorial Park and no construction is proposed. The project would not change the drainage pattern of the site or area, and would have no related erosion or siltation impacts.

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

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

WHY? The project is a temporary short-term event that will occur four times a year at Memorial Park. The project does not involve physical changes to Memorial Park and no construction is proposed. The project would not change the drainage pattern of the site or area, and would have no related flooding impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project would not create or increase runoff, and would not add any impermeable surfaces to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()*

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

WHY? The proposed project would generate any new water pollutants and, therefore, would have no impact to water quality.

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHY? As discussed, the proposed project would no install any new structures and no portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to flooding risks, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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

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

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community? ()

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

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for four Cinema in the Park events on Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. No adverse impact will result.

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

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning Code, and Park Master Plan. The proposed project could, however, conflict with the City's "Policy for Large Events in Public Parks". This policy requires a 21-day cooling off period between large events (defined as an event that would host more than 800 people during its duration) at one park. The project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for four Cinema in the Park events on consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. The Cinema in the Park events could attract more than 800 people at the same park on four consecutive Saturdays and, as such, could cause temporary noise, parking, and traffic impacts associated with an event of more than 800 patrons more than once within 21 days. However, as discussed throughout this document none of the potential environmental impacts caused by the proposed project would be significant. Therefore, although the proposed project has the potential to conflict with the City's "Policy for Large Events in Public Parks", the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental impacts for which the policy was adopted to avoid or mitigate.

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

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

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

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

WHY? The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have not impact to a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

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

 X

WHY? The proposed project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for four Cinema in the Park events on consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. The proposed events could generate typical noise from the congregation of persons, and includes amplified noise for the audio portion of the movie being shown. The typical urban noises that could result from the congregation of persons at Memorial Park are not anticipated to be uniquely loud. Rather, this noise would temporarily increase the ambient noise level in the vicinity of the park. Due to the temporary nature of this potential noise source, the potential typical urban noise that would result from the proposed events would not be a significant adverse impact.

The propose amplified sound would at no time exceeded 15 decibels above the ambient reading at the closest affected property and will comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance. Memorial Park is in Noise District III and is subject to the following Noise Ordinance requirements below:

9.36.163 Amplified sound--Old Pasadena.

The commercial use of sound amplifying equipment in the Old Pasadena section of Noise District III shall be subject to the following regulations:

- A. In this section “Amplified sound” shall mean amplified music or the human voice used for entertainment only.
- B. The presumed ambient noise level in the Old Pasadena section of Noise District III shall be 60 decibels between 6:00 a.m. and 1:30 a.m. of the following day; and 50 decibels between 1:30 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.
- C. Amplified music on private property shall not exceed 15 decibels above the ambient noise level, which is defined as the higher of either the actual ambient noise level or the presumed ambient noise level set forth above.
- D. Use of sound amplifying equipment shall be limited to the hours between 6:00 p.m. and 1:30 a.m. of the following day.
- E. Operators of sound amplifying equipment within 500 feet of a functioning church, school or hospital site shall initially obtain the written consent of such facility prior to commencing operation of amplified sound equipment.
- F. Any business owner within 300 feet of a business using amplified sound equipment may request the health officer or a designee to mediate informally any dispute related to the use of such amplified sound equipment.
- G. Notwithstanding the enactment of the ordinance codified in this section, the City Council reserves the right at a future time to amend or repeal this provision in its entirety, and does not intend the creation of any special property rights by this amendment. (Ord. 6594 § 1, 1994)

The amplified noise generated by the proposed movie screenings will be noticeably quieter that the musical concerts that occur at Memorial Park 52 times annually. These events have operated in previous years in compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance and are monitored by a City attendant trained in enforcing the City’s Amplified Sound Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in significant averse impacts related to the 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

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

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

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

WHY? The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration and would not be a source of groundborne noise or vibration.

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

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The project will not lead to a permanent increase in ambient noise, as the proposed project is temporary in nature.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project will temporarily increase noise levels on four consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. However, as discussed in response to 14.a, the project's potential temporary increase in noise levels would not be a significant adverse impact.

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

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

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for Cinema in the Park events on four consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. The proposed events would not induce population growth, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for Cinema in the Park events on four consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. The proposed events would not displace any residents or housing, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of utilizing Memorial Park for Cinema in the Park events on four consecutive Saturdays in May of 2006 and 2007. The proposed events would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts.

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

a. Fire Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of Cinema in the Park events at Memorial Park which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project is within the scope of services for the Fire Department and is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities.

b. Libraries? ()

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

WHY? The project is located less than one mile from the Central Library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ()

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The project is located in Memorial Park. The Memorial Park Master Plan calls for more frequent use of the park and the Levitt Pavilion Gold Shell. The park and its facilities were built to accommodate far more users than are currently utilizing the park and the additional events for Cinema in the Park will not result in the need for new or additional parks, rather it will promote the use of existing underutilized park space.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed site is in an area which has reported higher service call rates according to Police Department statistics (the park has higher number of service calls than the immediate surrounding area). The project will not increase the need for police protection; and the event promoter would be responsible for all additional policing costs should additional pedestrian assistance/monitoring be required for their events. The proposed project could decrease the amount of service calls for the Police Department because it's been noted that some of the policing issues have been related to under utilization of the park and the loitering by transients. Overall, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. *Schools?* ()

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

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. Cost for mowing, edging, fertilization, cultural practices, and irrigation system repairs is estimated at: \$5,500 annually for all current activities at the park.

Water and Power costs are based on a "for all four movie days" estimate: \$65. These costs are viewed as within the City's operating budget and are viewed as less than significant. Further, it has been shown that increased use of the park for community oriented events decreases vandalism, loitering and other activities that may incur costs to the City.

17. RECREATION.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

WHY? Recreational opportunities in the vicinity have already been established and this project will not impact their quality or quantity. The Memorial Park Master Plan calls for more frequent use of the park and the Levitt Pavilion Gold Shell. The park and its facilities were built to accommodate far more users than are currently utilizing the park. This project would add four additional events per year, which will not substantially degrade the quality of the park.

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

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

WHY? The project will utilize the existing facilities in Memorial Park and will not require any expansion or construction to accommodate the four additional events per year. Amending the license agreement to allow four large events within a month period will also not result in the need to make any changes to the park. Cinema in the Park is a passive recreation family oriented even that lasts for a few hours once a week, and will not lead to activities that could have an adverse effect on the park or surrounding area.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

The regional roadway network in the vicinity of the Levitt Pavilion includes the I-210 Foothill Freeway and the Route 110 Pasadena Freeway. The local roadway network immediately adjacent to Memorial Park consists of Walnut Street, Holly Street, and Raymond Avenue. A description of these and other roadways in the project vicinity is provided below:

Walnut Street is an east-west roadway located north of the project site and is classified as a Principal Mobility Corridor in the City of Pasadena General Plan. Two through travel lanes are generally provided in each direction of travel in the project vicinity. Exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in both directions at major intersections. East of Raymond Avenue, curbside parking is prohibited along both sides of Walnut Street with No Stopping Any Time signs posted.

Holly Street is an east-west roadway located south of the project site. One through travel lane is generally provided in each direction in the project vicinity. Exclusive left turn lanes are provided at major intersections. Holly Street terminates to the east at Garfield Avenue.

Union Street is an east-west roadway located south of the project site. Union Street is one-way westbound and provides three through travel lanes east of Marengo Avenue and two through travel lanes west of Marengo Avenue. An exclusive right-turn only lane is provided at the Arroyo Parkway intersection. Between Arroyo Parkway and Marengo Avenue, one-hour metered parking is provided along the north side of Union Street. The parking meters are free between 8:00 AM and 11:00 AM daily. Curbside parking is prohibited along the south side of Union Street with No Stopping Any Time signs posted.

Raymond Avenue is a north-south roadway located west of the project site and is classified as a collector street in the City of Pasadena General Plan. Two through travel lanes are generally provided in each direction of travel in the project vicinity.

Arroyo Parkway is a north-south roadway located south of the project site and is classified as a major arterial in the City of Pasadena General Plan. Two through travel lanes are generally provided in each

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

direction in the project vicinity. Arroyo Parkway terminates to the north at Holly Street. Two-hour metered parking is provided along both sides of Arroyo Parkway in the project vicinity.

Marengo Avenue is a north-south roadway located east of the project site and is classified as a minor arterial in the City of Pasadena General Plan. Two through travel lanes are generally provided in each direction of travel in the project vicinity. Exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in both directions at major intersections. North of Holly Street, two-hour metered parking is provided on the west side of the street.

In addition to the curbside parking along the roadway network as described above, parking is provided in parking structures in the vicinity of the Levitt Pavilion. The parking structures in the vicinity of the proposed project include the County of Los Angeles parking structure located on the southeast corner of the Marengo Avenue and Walnut Street intersection, the Holly Street parking structure located on the southeast corner of the Arroyo Parkway and Holly Street intersection, and the Marriott parking structure located on the southwest corner of the Raymond Avenue and Walnut Street intersection.

Would the project:

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

WHY?

Estimated Vehicular Trip Generation of the Project

It is estimated that a maximum of 800-1200 persons would attend the Summer movie series at the Levitt Pavilion. It is estimated that a total of 15 percent of patrons would arrive by transit (e.g., local public transit including the City of Pasadena Arts Bus, the future Metro Gold Line, etc.). It is also assumed that a total of 20 percent of the movie patronage would be attracted from adjacent Old Town residential areas (e.g., Holly Street Apartments, Paseo Colorado Apartments, etc.), therefore, resulting in 65 percent of the patrons arriving via automobiles. With an assumed vehicle occupancy of 2.5 persons per car, a total of 312 vehicles could be expected to be generated to and from the adjacent parking areas during the movie arrival and departure periods. For those patrons arriving by automobile, it can be expected that many will arrive approximately 30 minutes prior to performance start time. Arrival at the parking structures described above and the movie arrival and departure patterns will not coincide with typical PM peak hour operations (i.e., PM peak hour traffic volumes typically occur one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 PM), no substantial LOS impacts are expected to occur.

The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed project and determined that no additional traffic analysis is required. This decision is in part based on the fact that the existing street system has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. The Cinema in the Park events will only occur four times per year on a Saturday evening (non-PM peak hours). PasDot has determined that the proposed project will not result in significant impacts to Traffic. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to the traffic load and capacity of the street system.

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

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

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

In addition to CMP thresholds, the City's "Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines" August, 2005 states that the following changes in LOS due to a project are considered a significant traffic impact:

Intersection Capacity Analysis (ICU)	
Current ICU	Change due to project
A	0.060
B	0.050
C	0.040
D	0.030
E	0.020
F	0.010

The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. Thus, due to the type of project and the once per week occurrence on a weekend, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, according to PasDOT, the project would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an establish level of service standard, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

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

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the PasDOT and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. A Parking Operations plan is required that will detail the location of parking for the events, and the management of parking (directional signs, staff etc.) to ensure there are no related parking impacts. The

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? There is no construction proposed and there will be no changes to ingress/egress in the area for the events. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

WHY?

Estimated Parking Demand

Movie attendance is expected to range between 800 and 1200 persons, with a maximum attendance of 1200 persons. Approximately 15% of the movie patrons will utilize existing and transit service provided in the area (e.g., local public transit including the City of Pasadena Arts Bus, the Metro Gold Line, etc.). In addition approximately 20% of the movie patrons will walk to Levitt Pavilion from the Old Pasadena area of the City of Pasadena. Therefore, it is estimated that 65% percent of the movie patrons will drive to the Levitt Pavilion. Assuming a vehicle occupancy rate of 2.5 persons per vehicle (with 65% of the 1200 patrons in automobiles) a total parking demand of 312 vehicles could be expected.

Based on discussions with City of Pasadena parking staff, a total of 110 parking spaces (surplus) are available for Levitt Pavilion movie patrons during weekend evenings. Additional parking is also provided along the adjacent roadways in the project vicinity, as well as in several parking structures in the immediate area (e.g. the Holly Street Garage directly south of the park has over 500 spaces in the structure). Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in impacts to transportation/traffic in relation to inadequate parking capacity. The proposed project would not remove existing parking.

Due to the increased intensity of land use, the project will temporarily increase the demand for parking. PasDOT has evaluated the project and has determined that a Parking Operations plan is required that will detail the location of parking for the events, and the management of parking (directional signs, staff dedicated to parking detail etc.) to ensure there are no related parking impacts. This plan must be reviewed and approved by PasDOT before the first Cinema in the Park event occurs. Based on the existing number of parking spaces that are available in the immediate vicinity of the park, the amount of patrons that will walk or use transit and the requirement for a Parking Operations plan, the impacts will be less than significant.

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

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

WHY? This project will not result in an increase in residential units or affect any bus turnouts or bicycle racks since it uses the existing park infrastructure. The project encourages use of the Gold Line and will attract people who may already be in Old Town and can walk or bike to the park.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

 X

WHY? The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are no unusual wastes in the project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by L.A. County Sanitation District.

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

 X

WHY? The proposed project consists of four Cinema in the Park events and allowing these events to occur each Saturday in May 2006 and May 2007. The project could result in a slight increase in the demand for water and wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to water/wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service areas of the water and wastewater service purveyors. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyors are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

 X

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

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

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

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

WHY? The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. This project is only expected to have a negligible increase the amount of water usage at the park, given the short duration (2-3 hours) of the event, four times per year. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to water.

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

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

WHY? See response 19 d.

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

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

WHY? The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was repermited in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic

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

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

WHY? In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable solid waste franchise's recycling system, and thus, will meet Pasadena's and California's solid waste diversion regulations. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

20. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.

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).

- a) Earlier Analysis Used: A Negative Declaration was prepared and adopted in December 2002 to allow the establishment of a Concert in the Park series at Memorial Park. Related park improvements to support the events (approximately 52 concerts per year) were analyzed under the document. This document was referenced for background information purposes only.

This document is available for review at the Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Thursday and from 8:00-12:00 p.m. every Friday and the City Clerk's Office Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and every other Friday during the same hours.

- 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.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

WHY?

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

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

X

WHY?

The proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality, noise, and parking impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

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

X

WHY?

As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although patrons of the park would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, the type of event will not cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

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

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- | # | Document |
|----|--|
| 1 | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. |
| 2 | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993 |
| 3 | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001 |
| 4 | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983 |
| 5 | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002 |
| 6 | Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004 |
| 7 | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002. |
| 8 | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868 |
| 9 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 10 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 11 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 12 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854 |
| 13 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997 |
| 14 | Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended |
| 15 | Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005 |
| 16 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994 |
| 17 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 18 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975 |
| 19 | Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002. |
| 20 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998 |
| 21 | State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology |
| 22 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837 |
| 23 | Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005 |
| 24 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896 |
| 25 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001 |
| 26 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |