

**ATTACHMENT 2  
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY**

**CITY OF PASADENA  
PLANNING DIVISION  
HALE BUILDING  
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE  
PASADENA, CA 91101-1704**

---

**INITIAL STUDY**

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this analysis, the associated "Master Application Form," and/or Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and supporting data constitute the Initial Study for the subject project. This Initial Study provides the assessment for a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

**SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Project Title: Municipal Code Revisions for Adult Businesses
  
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena,  
175 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101
  
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: John Poindexter, Planning Manager  
(626) 744-4009
  
4. Project Location: The proposed revisions to the Pasadena Municipal Code (PMC) would apply City-wide; however, adult businesses are currently only allowed in the City's General Commercial (CG) zone and within the East Pasadena Specific Plan and the East Colorado Specific Plan areas where CG is the underlying designation.
  
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena  
175 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101
  
6. General Plan Designation: The proposed revisions to the PMC would apply City-wide; however, adult businesses are currently only allowed in the General Commercial (CG) land use designation and in certain Specific Plan land use designations.
  
7. Zoning: The proposed revisions to the PMC would apply City-wide; however, adult businesses are currently only allowed in the General Commercial (CG) zone and in the East Pasadena Specific Plan and the East Colorado Specific Plan where CG is the underlying designation.

8. Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. A location map and a site plan should be included. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project consists of revisions to the Pasadena Municipal Code (PMC) regarding adult business. The proposed revisions include the following:

- Modify § 17.50.030 of the Zoning Code to change the required distance between adult uses and sensitive uses, as well as between two adult uses (including an adult use and an alcohol use);
- Modify § 17.50.030 to eliminate non-locational criteria and the Expressive Use Permit requirement for adult businesses, making adult uses permitted as of right subject to objective criteria (district and setback requirements);
- Create a new Municipal Code Chapter (5.45, subject to change) to comprehensively regulate adult businesses as follows:
  - Set forth purpose and findings related to regulation of adult uses
  - Set forth updated definitions for adult uses and regulations related thereto
  - Set forth licensing requirements and criteria (including being located in a permitted location) for adult businesses and their employees
  - Set forth annual licensing fees for adult businesses and their employees
  - Provide for administrative inspections of the public areas of adult businesses during business hours
  - Set forth standards for license suspensions and revocations
  - Set forth procedures for hearings related to license denials, suspensions, and revocations
  - Prescribe hours of operation (similar to the present § 17.50.030)
  - Prescribe configuration and cleaning requirements for peep show booths
  - Prescribe no-loitering requirement and standards for exterior lighting and monitoring
  - Prescribe penalties for violation
  - Set forth grace period for current adult businesses to meet interior configuration requirements
  - Detail prohibited conduct, including:
    - Prohibit nudity on the premises of sexually oriented businesses
    - Regulate semi-nudity by requiring semi-nude conduct to occur on a stage at least 6 feet removed from all patrons, in a room of at least 1,000 square feet, and within a direct line of sight from a fixed manager's station
    - Prohibit any person who regularly appears in a state of nudity from touching a patron or the clothing of a patron

- Set forth scienter requirement for violations of Chapter 5.45
- Provide for severability
- Provide for repeal of conflicting code provisions (see below)
- Establish effective date
- Modify Article 8 of the Zoning Code so that adult business definitions comport with those in the new Chapter 5.45
- Eliminate the following Code provisions because they would duplicate or conflict with the new Chapter 5.45:
  - Chapter 5.52 (dealing with nude or semi-nude model studios)
  - Chapter 5.73 (dealing with picture arcades)

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

The City of Pasadena lies in the San Gabriel Valley portion of the Los Angeles Basin. The San Gabriel Valley is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and a series of hills to the west, east, and south, including the San Rafael Hills on the west, the Montebello and Puente Hills on the south, and the San Jose Hills on the east. The City of Pasadena is located in the western portion of the San Gabriel Valley with the San Rafael Hills traversing the western portion of the City.

Pasadena is a largely developed, urban/suburban City in Los Angeles County with a historic urban core, suburban residential neighborhoods, hillside communities, and the natural areas of the Arroyo Seco and San Rafael Hills. Other notable land uses in the City include the Rose Bowl, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), Pasadena City College, and the California Institute of Technology (Caltech).

The proposed modifications to the PMC apply to adult businesses. Adult businesses are only allowed in the General Commercial (CG) zones of the City. Land Uses in the CG zones include but are not limited to: retail, restaurants, service commercial, and office, professional, and business support uses.

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

Discretionary approval of public agencies other than the City of Pasadena is not required for the proposed project.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	X
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

APB for John Bellas 10/20/04  
 Prepared By/Date  
John Bellas  
 Printed Name

Jennifer Puzo Sacki 10/20/04  
 Reviewed By/Date  
Jennifer Puzo Sacki  
 Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: \_\_\_\_\_

Adoption attested to by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Printed name/Signature Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
  - 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
  - 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
  - 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
  - 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063( c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.
    - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
  - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
  - 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
    - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant
-

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

## SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

### 1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted:  
Department requiring checklist:  
Case Manager:

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

### 3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. Since no physical changes to the environment are proposed, approval of the proposed PMC modifications would not directly impact scenic vistas. Similarly, the proposed PMC revisions would not indirectly impact scenic vistas, as none of the proposed changes would affect height restrictions, setbacks, or other requirements in the PMC that protect scenic vistas. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ( )

**WHY?** There are two roadways in Pasadena identified in the California Scenic Highway Program, the Angeles Crest Highway (SR 2) and a portion of the Foothill Freeway (I-210). The Angeles Crest Highway, which located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City, is an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway. The Foothill Freeway from SR 134 to the northwest City limits and beyond is an Eligible State Scenic Highway.

The proposed modifications to the PMC apply to adult businesses, which are only allowed in the CG zones of the City. There are no parcels within the City zoned for CG along Angeles Crest Highway and, as such, no direct or indirect impacts to this state scenic highway would result from approval of the proposed project. CG zoned property does exist along the Foothill Freeway corridor; however, the proposed PMC modifications would not impact scenic resources along this roadway.

No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and none of the proposed revisions to the City's municipal code would affect height restrictions, setbacks, or other requirements in the PMC that protect scenic resources. Therefore, approval of the proposed PMC modifications would not directly indirectly damage scenic resources, including scenic resources along a scenic roadway.

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

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and none of the proposed revisions to the City's municipal code would affect design review provisions, height restrictions, setbacks, or other requirements in the PMC that protect visual character or quality. As such, the proposed municipal code revisions would not impact the visual character or quality of the City.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and none of the proposed revisions to the City's municipal code would affect the existing lighting and glare requirements of the PMC. As such, the proposed municipal code revisions would not create a new source of light or glare and would cause no related impacts.

**4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project.

a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. It has commercial recreation, park, natural and open space. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?* ( )

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

**WHY?** See item 2 (a) above. The City of Pasadena has no agricultural zoning designations and no Williamson Act contract land.

c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?* ( )

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



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

**WHY?** There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source pollutants; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2003 AQMP, adopted on August 1, 2003. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act. The AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth.

The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect the City's goals, policies, and programs related to air quality. As such, the proposed municipal code revisions would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP or the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

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

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

d. *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?* ( )

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

**WHY? (B – D)** Due to its geographical location and the prevailing offshore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high and, largely as a result, Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes the City of Pasadena, is a designated non-attainment area for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and carbon monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).

The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect the City's goals, policies, and programs related to air quality. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect any rules or regulations that protect air quality, such as the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which minimizes fugitive dust emitted from construction activity. Approval of the proposed PMC revisions would not generate any air pollutants and would not cause or contribute to an air quality violation. No impacts related to air quality standards, air quality violations, or concentration of criteria pollutants would occur and the proposed PMC revisions would have no impact on sensitive receptors.

e. *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed project would neither generate any odors nor locate any sensitive receptors in the vicinity of odor sources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no odor-related impacts.

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

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*  
( )

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ( )</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ( )</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ( )</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? ( )</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY? (A - F)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not change any portions of the PMC that deal with biological resources, such as the City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance, landscape requirements, and fuel modification requirements. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect any rules or regulations of other agencies that protect biological resources, such as the California Department of Fish and Game Code, the state and federal Endangered Species Act, and wetlands regulations. As such, the project would not affect special status species or their habitat; riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities; wetlands; wildlife movement, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites; local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; or habitat/natural community conservation plans. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on biological resources.

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

a. <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? ( )</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY? (A - D)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not change any portions of the PMC that deal with cultural resources, such as the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect any rules or regulations of other agencies that protect cultural resources, such as the Mills Act and historic places/resources/landmark designations. As such, the project would have no impact on historic resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, unique geologic features or human remains.

**8. ENERGY.** Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed municipal code amendment does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed modifications to the PMC apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. Adult businesses would remain subject to the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's zoning code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed municipal code revisions would not affect the use of non-renewable resources.

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

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

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

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ( )

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ( )

iv. Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides? ( )

**WHY? (A.i – A.iv)** The proposed modifications to the City's zoning code apply to the operation and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed municipal code revisions would not affect the City's building standards. Therefore, the proposed project would cause no impacts related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides.

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

**WHY?** No construction or physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed municipal code revisions would not affect grading requirements or protections against erosion afforded by the Clean Water Act or SCAQMD Rule 403. As such, approval of the municipal code revisions would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ( )

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**WHY?** No construction or physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed municipal code revisions would not affect building code requirements. As such, approval of the code revision would not cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils.

d. *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? ( )*

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

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the City is underlain primarily by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. Regardless, the proposed project consists of a revision to the City's municipal code that governs the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No expansive soil-related impacts are anticipated.

e. *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The City is served by a sewer system and all development projects are required to connect to this system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

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

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

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

b. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ( )*

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

c. *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ( )*

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

d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ( )*

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

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

**WHY? (A – D)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect any local, state, or federal regulations governing hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would cause no impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials; the emission or handling of hazardous materials in the vicinity of schools; or hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5;

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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ( )*

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

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

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

**WHY? (E – F)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. There are no public or private airports in or within two miles of the City of Pasadena and no portions of the City are within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed code revisions would cause no hazards related to placing people or structures within the vicinity of an airport, airport land use plan, or private airstrip.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No changes to the City's emergency response plans or policies are proposed. Therefore, the proposed revisions to the PMC would not impair implementation of any emergency response or evacuation plans.

h. *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect any fire codes or other regulations intended to reduce the risk of wildfire. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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

a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?* ( )

                                                                

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

                                                                

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?* ( )

                                                                

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?* ( )

                                                                

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?* ( )

                                                                

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

                                                                

**WHY? (A – F)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect any codes, regulations, policies, or rules protecting water quality or drainage, such as the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), the City's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance, and storm water engineering requirements. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would not 1) cause a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 2) deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge; 3) alter drainage patterns; 4) create runoff; or 5) degrade water quality.



Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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? ( )

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

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

WHY? (G - I) No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The City's General Plan identifies dam inundation zones for Devil's Gate Dam and Eaton Wash Dam. No changes to floodplain regulations or dam inundation policies are proposed. No flooding or floodplain-related impacts would result from approval of the proposed modifications to the PMC.

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

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? ( )

WHY? The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No community barriers are proposed and none are expected to result from the proposed municipal code modifications. Therefore, the proposed code revisions would cause no impacts related to physical division of a community.

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? ( )

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications do not conflict with any goals or policies identified in the City's General Plan. No conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations are proposed or anticipated.

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? ( )

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 proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and no mining operations exist in the Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? (A – D) The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not change the portions of the PMC that deal with noise, such as Section 9.36 "Noise Restrictions". Furthermore, the proposed municipal code amendment would establish siting distances between adult uses and residential neighborhoods, which are partially intended to prevent noise conflicts. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would not 1) expose persons to, or generate noise levels in excess of established standards; 2) expose persons to vibrations or generate vibrations; 3) permanently increase ambient noise levels; or 4) temporarily or periodically increase ambient noise levels.

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? ( )

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? ( )

WHY? (E – F) The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. There are no public or private airports in or within two miles of the City of Pasadena and no portions of the City are within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would cause no noise impacts related to placing people or structures within the vicinity of an airport, airport land use plan, or private airstrip.

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)? ( )

WHY? The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not change the amount of land available for residential, commercial, or industrial uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce population growth and would have no related impacts.

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

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

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

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

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

**WHY? (B and C)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not change the amount of land available for residential use. No displacement of housing or residents is proposed or expected.

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

b. Libraries? ( )

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

c. Parks? ( )

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

d. Police Protection? ( )

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

e. Schools? ( )

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

f. Other public facilities? ( )

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

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

**WHY? (A – F)** The proposed municipal code revisions would not physically interfere with any public services and would not increase the demand for any public services in a manner that would require new or physically altered governmental facilities. The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications are not expected to affect the City's growth rate. Therefore, the proposed municipal code amendments would have no impact on fire protection, libraries, parks, police protection, schools, or other public facilities.

**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?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed code revisions are not expected to increase the use of any recreational facilities. Therefore, no deterioration or other physical impacts to existing recreational facilities would occur.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project consists of revisions to the City's municipal code as it relates to adult businesses. No new or expanded recreational facilities are proposed or anticipated.

**18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** 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)?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed municipal code revisions are not expected to generate, or lead to the generation of, any traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on the traffic load or capacity of the street system and would not impact the level of service on any roadways.

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

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed modifications to the City's zoning code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed code revisions would not affect the City's growth rate and there are no airports in or within two miles of the City of Pasadena. 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 municipal code revisions would have no impact on air traffic patterns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**WHY? (D – F)** The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. The proposed municipal code revisions would not affect roadway design requirements, access requirements, or parking standards. Therefore, the proposed municipal code revisions would not 1) increase hazards due to a design feature; 2) result in inadequate emergency access; or 3) result in inadequate parking capacity.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed municipal code revisions are unrelated to transportation policies, plans, or programs and all such existing policies, plans, and programs would remain in place. Therefore, the project would have no impacts related to conflicts with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

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

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

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

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

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? ( )*

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

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? ( )*

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

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

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

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

**WHY? (A – F)** The proposed municipal code amendments would not physically interfere with any utilities or service systems and would not increase the demand for any utilities or service systems. The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed PMC modifications would not affect the City's growth rate in a manner that would require expanded or improved utility infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements, water or wastewater treatment facilities, storm water drainage facilities, water supply, wastewater treatment capacity, or landfill capacity.

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

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

**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 City also has a Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240).

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

The proposed municipal code amendments would revise the PMC as it relates to adult businesses. No revisions to the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System", Construction and Demolition Ordinance, or design requirements for refuge storage areas are proposed. Therefore, the project would have no impacts related to solid waste statutes or regulations.

**20. EARLIER 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. (Identify and state where they are available for review.) No program EIR, tiering, or other process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.
- 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.) None.
- 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.) None.

**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 have no impact on Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would have no impact on special status species, stream habitat, or 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 have no impact on 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 have no impact on water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

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

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



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

**WHY?** The proposed project would not cause any impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The proposed modifications to the City's municipal code apply to the operations and potential location of adult businesses. No physical changes to the environment are included in the proposed project and the proposed changes to the municipal code are not expected to contribute to any cumulative impacts. 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? ( )*

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

**WHY?** As discussed in Sections 5, 9, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, geologic hazards, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. 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   |