

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY**

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

---

**DRAFT 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: Enterprise Zone Application
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena,  
236 W. Mountain Avenue, Suite 201  
Pasadena, CA 91103
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Lola Osborne, Northwest Program Project Manager  
(626) 744-6879
4. Project Location: The project site consists of the City of Pasadena's existing Enterprise Zone, plus the segment of the Colorado Boulevard corridor from Catalina Avenue to South Altadena Drive, which is proposed for addition to the Enterprise Zone. The existing and proposed Enterprise Zone boundaries are depicted on Figure 1, and generally consists of:
  - The Northwest Program area;
  - The South Fair Oaks Biotech Area;
  - The Walnut Street corridor from Marengo Avenue to Foothill Boulevard with north/south spurs generally along Hill and Allen Avenues;
  - The Foothill Boulevard and Walnut Street corridors from the Foothill/Walnut intersection to the eastern City limits, with a north spur to the I-210 along Vista Street (east frontage only), Carmelo Avenue, and Altadena Drive; and
  - The Colorado Boulevard corridor from Altadena Drive to the eastern City limits, with the Enterprise Zone through this corridor extending north to Walnut Street and encompassing Nina Street.
  - Additionally, the segment of the Colorado Boulevard corridor from Catalina Avenue to South Altadena Drive, with a north spur along Hill Avenue, is proposed for addition to the Enterprise Zone.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena,  
236 W. Mountain Avenue, Suite 201  
Pasadena, CA 91103
6. General Plan Designation: Various
7. Zoning: Various

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 a reapplication of the City's Enterprise Zone and adding the portion of the Colorado Boulevard corridor from Catalina Avenue to South Altadena Drive into the Enterprise Zone (see Section 4 "Project Location" for a detailed description of the Enterprise Zone boundaries). The purpose of the Enterprise Zone is to stimulate growth in the designated economically distressed areas by making additional State and local incentives and programs available to businesses within the zones. The ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate buildout of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations.

The City of Pasadena established the Enterprise Zone in 1992 in partnership with the County of Los Angeles Community Development Commission (Pasadena-Altadena Enterprise Zone [PAEZ]). In 1999 the State approved an expansion of the original Enterprise Zone, which is referred to as the "expanded area". On April 10, 2007 the Pasadena Enterprise Zone will expire and, to continue the program, an application to request a new designation must be submitted to the State by the September 6, 2006 deadline.

Approval of the proposed project could stimulate development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone. However, no specific development/redevelopment projects or other physical changes to the environment known to the lead agency are dependent on the proposed approval. As such, in accordance with Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the potential environmental impacts of specific future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone that may result from the proposed approval are too speculative to evaluate at this time. However, the proposed approval would not eliminate any discretionary entitlement/approval requirements for potential future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone, and any such discretionary projects would be subject to individual environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

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 existing and proposed Enterprise Zone areas are built portions of the City of Pasadena and include a variety of land uses. The Northwest Program area, in particular, contains a wide variety of land uses ranging from industrial to single family residential to retail commercial. The South Fair Oaks Biotech area includes technology-based industrial space, transit-oriented development, retail, and miscellaneous commercial uses. The remaining project areas consist primarily of commercial corridors and light industrial space.

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

City Council  
State of California Housing and Community Development Department

**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.	

John Bellas 7/11/06  
Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige-Saeki 7/11/06  
Reviewed By/Date

John Bellas  
Printed Name

Jennifer Paige-Saeki  
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: July 11, 2006

Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development

Case Manager: Lola Workman-Osborne

### 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 views in the City of Pasadena include the San Gabriel Mountains, the Arroyo Seco, the San Rafael Hills, Eaton Canyon, or Old Town Pasadena. The proposed project provides for the rehabilitation or redevelopment over time of portions of Pasadena's built environment. All subsequent development/redevelopment building construction would be subject to the City's development standards, which include building height and massing restrictions and, in some cases, design review. These standards provide protection of the views of the City's scenic resources. As such, the proposed project would not significantly impact a scenic vista.

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 135 to the northwest City limits and beyond is an Eligible State Scenic Highway. None of the proposed Enterprise Zone areas are within the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway. However, the eligible segment of the Foothill Freeway traverses the Northwest Program area, and a portion of the Enterprise Zone areas is along a segment of Sierra Madre Boulevard that is a City designated scenic corridor.

Despite including areas along scenic roadways, the proposed Enterprise Zone project would not result in a significant adverse impact to the scenic value of these roadways. Conversely, the Enterprise Zone would encourage investment in the built environment which could aide in the removal of deteriorated structures and blighted conditions. Furthermore, all subsequent development/redevelopment building construction would remain subject to the City's development standards, which include building height and massing restrictions, landscape requirements, and in some cases, design review. These standards provide protection for the views from the scenic roadways in the City.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? The proposed Enterprise Zone project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of any involved areas. Conversely, the Enterprise Zone would encourage investment in the built environment which could aid in the removal of deteriorated structures and blighted conditions. Furthermore, all subsequent development/redevelopment building construction would remain subject to the City's development standards, which include building height and massing restrictions, landscape requirements, and in some cases, design review. These standards provide protection for a variety of visual character features including neighborhood scale, building/landscape materials, and setbacks.

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

WHY? While the proposed Enterprise Zone approval does not include any development projects, it could facilitate development within the involved areas. Any such development/redevelopment projects would be subject to the lighting standards in the City's zoning code, including height and direction restrictions for outdoor lighting. Furthermore, no unique lighting sources, such as stadium lights or searchlights are anticipated. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial new source of light or glare and any project-induced lighting would not result in a significant impact.

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? ( )

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? ( )

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



Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

- 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? ( )*

**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). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMD.

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

The proposed project Enterprise Zone would strive to develop/redevelop the involved areas in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations. As a result, the Enterprise Zone is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. The proposed project is, therefore, consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan, and would have no associated impacts.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

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)? ( )

**WHY? (B and C)** Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore 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 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>).

Approval of the proposed Enterprise Zone, itself, would not generate any air pollutants and would not cause or contribute to an air quality violation. However, future development/redevelopment activities that take advantage of the Enterprise Zone programs would generate air pollutants, including construction-induced fugitive dust, construction and maintenance equipment emissions, vehicle emissions, and area sources. The pollutants generated by such projects will likely include the following criteria pollutants: particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), precursors to ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and oxides of nitrogen. However, since no specific development/redevelopment projects are dependent on the proposed Enterprise Zone, the precise type and quantity of air pollutants that would result from approval of the proposed Enterprise Zone are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, any future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects requiring discretionary review would be subject to project-specific CEQA review and SCAQMD Rules to reduce air pollution, including Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).

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

**WHY?** The proposed project is the reapplication of the City's Enterprise Zone and adding a new area to the Enterprise Zone. This project, in-and-of-itself, would neither generate any air pollutants nor locate any sensitive receptors in the vicinity of substantial pollutant concentrations. The potential sensitive receptor impacts of any future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time. Regardless, such projects would be subject to SCAQMD regulations, including permit requirements for certain point-source air pollutants, and any future projects requiring discretionary approval would be subject to project-specific CEQA review.

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

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The proposed project is the reapplication of the City's Enterprise Zone and adding a new area to the Enterprise Zone. This project, in-and-of-itself, would neither generate any odors nor locate any sensitive receptors in the vicinity of odor sources. The potential odor impacts of any future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time.

**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?*

( )

**WHY?** The Enterprise Zone areas are not located within an area that has been identified as containing 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. On the contrary, the project site is located within a completely urbanized area in the City of Pasadena. Therefore, the project would not impact special-status species.

- 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?* ( )

**WHY?** There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The Enterprise Zone areas are not located in any of these natural habitat areas, and do not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified by the City of Pasadena, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The involved areas do not contain any natural-bottom stream courses or any tracts of natural open space. Therefore, no adverse impacts would occur to sensitive habitats.

- c. *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?* ( )

**WHY?** Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that,

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season.

The Enterprise Zone areas do not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- d. *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?* ( )

**WHY?** The Enterprise Zone areas are located in developed urban areas that not involve the dispersal of wildlife. The proposed Enterprise Zone will not result in a barrier to migration or movement. Therefore, the project will have no impact to wildlife movement.

- e. *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?* ( )

**WHY?** The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". The proposed Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would have no impact to protected trees. Furthermore, all future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects would remain subject to the "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would have no related impacts.

- f. *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?* ( )

**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.

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

- a. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?* ( )

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

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

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

**WHY? (A, B, and C)** The proposed Enterprise Zone project, itself, does not involve any development or other physical changes in the environment and, as such, would have no impact on historic resources, archeological resources, or paleontological resources. While the proposed Enterprise Zone could facilitate future development projects, the potential impacts of such project on cultural resources are too speculative to evaluate.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone project, itself, does not involve any development or other physical changes in the environment and, as such, would have no impact on human remains. Potential future projects facilitated by the Enterprise Zone would be subject to State regulations, should any human remains be discovered. In the event that human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

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

a. *Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan. Further, future Enterprise Zone-related projects are required to comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would not affect the use of non-renewable resources. Future Enterprise Zone-related projects may involve demolition of existing structures, use of non-renewable building materials, and may commit energy and water resources as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance of new development. However, future development would be required to comply with the City's solid waste requirements, including the requirement for a recycling plan for demolished and

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

excess/waste construction materials. The energy and water resources that would be utilized by the future Enterprise Zone-related projects would be supplied by utility purveyors that participate in various conservation programs. Furthermore, there are no unique conditions in the Enterprise Zone areas that would require excessive use of nonrenewable resources, and new development with contemporary insulation and plumbing and electrical fixtures is expected to utilize energy and water resources more efficiently than older structures. Therefore, future Enterprise Zone-related projects are not anticipated to use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

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

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. ( )*

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena's General Plan, the San Andreas Fault is a "master" active fault and controls seismic hazard in Southern California. This fault is located approximately 21 miles north of Pasadena.

The County of Los Angeles and the City of Pasadena are both affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Pasadena is in four USGS Quadrants, the Los Angeles, and the Mt. Wilson quadrants were mapped for earthquake fault zones under the Alquist-Priolo Act in 1977. The Pasadena and Condor Peak USGS Quadrangles have not yet been mapped per the Alquist-Priolo Act.

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This fault is located primarily south of City limits, however, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the following three additional zones of potential fault rupture in the City:

- The Eagle Rock Fault Hazard Management Zone, which traverses the southwestern portion of the City;
- The Sierra Madre Fault Hazard Management Zone, which includes the Tujunga Fault, the North Sawpit Fault, and the South Branch of the San Gabriel Fault. This Fault Zone is primarily north of the City, and only the very northeast portion of the City and portions of the Upper Arroyo lie within the mapped fault zone.
- A Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, which appears to join a continuation of the Sycamore Canyon Fault. This fault area traverses the northern portion of the City as is identified as a Fault Hazard Management Zone for Critical Facilities Only.

Of these fault zones, only the Eagle Rock Fault and the Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault traverse the proposed Enterprise Zone areas. The Eagle Rock Fault traverses the South Fair Oaks Biotech Area and the Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault traverses the Northwest Area Enterprise Zone. In accordance with the City's building code requirements and Safety Element Program S1-2, all future development/redevelopment activities within the mapped Eagle Rock Fault zone require geological studies, such as fault trenching, per the guidelines established in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Studies Act. If such geologic studies reveal active fault traces through the site, development must be setback from the identified fault. This requirement also applies to future development/redevelopment of critical facilities within the mapped Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault. Compliance with the

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

City's building code requirements and Safety Element Program ensures the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?* ( )

**WHY?** Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to 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?* ( )

**WHY?** None of the proposed Enterprise Zone areas are within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Liquefaction and Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic related ground failure.

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?** None of the proposed Enterprise Zone areas are within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

**WHY?** No construction or physical changes to the environment are currently proposed. As such, approval of the Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would not result in the loss of topsoil. Future development/redevelopment activities within the Enterprise Zone could involve excavation and export of

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

soil. However, the amount of soil to be excavated and exported is too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, in Pasadena the displacement of soil through cut and fill is controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation. No significant loss of topsoil impacts are anticipated.

**EROSION:** The only erosion that may result from the Enterprise Zone would be from construction of future development/redevelopment activities. During construction, soils may become exposed and, thus, subject to wind and water erosion. However, as discussed, the specific impacts of future development/redevelopment projects are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, the future development/redevelopment projects are required to comply with existing regulations that reduce erosion potential. These regulations include SCAQMD Rule 403, which as described in Section 5 of this report, would reduce the potential for wind erosion. Similarly, water erosion during construction would be substantially reduced by complying with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). As further detailed in Section 11 of this report, NPDES requires the construction of the project to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and prevent eroded soils from washing offsite. Thus, the potential to increase erosion during any construction activity would be effectively mitigated through the required compliance activities.

- 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?* ( )

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain. As shown on Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The proposed Enterprise Zone areas are not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not likely cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, will ensure that future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone would not cause 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?* ( )

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential.

- 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?* ( )



Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The City is served by a sewer system and all future development/redevelopment projects would be 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? ( )

WHY? Future development/redevelopment projects within the proposed Enterprise Zone may involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Such future projects may include industrial-type developments along the Fair Oaks Avenue corridor in the Northwest Program Area and in the South Fair Oaks Biotech Area. However, since no specific transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is known to the lead agency at this time, the specific impacts of such activities are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, the proposed Enterprise Zone would not change the zoning or General Plan land use designations of any of the involved areas. As such, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to result in placing incompatible uses adjacent to one another. Thus, future development/redevelopment projects that may involve hazardous materials are only expected to occur in the portions of the City that are designated for such activities, and are not expected to occur in residential areas or other sensitive areas.

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? ( )

WHY? Subsequent site-specific projects could potentially involve the use/storage of hazardous materials. However, since no specific use/storage of hazardous materials is known to the lead agency at this time, the specific impacts of such activities are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, subsequent projects are required to adhere to the City's zoning and General Plan land use designations, which do not allow land uses that utilize substantial amounts of hazardous materials to be placed in sensitive areas. Further, the storage and handling of hazardous materials are required to comply with various federal, state and local regulations that govern the handling of hazardous materials. In the event of an upset condition resulting in the release of a hazardous material, implementation of the City's established emergency procedures will decrease the potential for health and safety risks from hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

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

WHY? Subsequent projects in the Enterprise Zone area could potentially involve the use or handling of hazardous materials. However, the use, transport, and handling of hazardous materials, both during operation and construction, are subject to various federal, state, and local regulations and oversight agencies, including:

- (Regulations) the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

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

(RCRA), the Superfund Act, health and safety codes (state and local), and fire codes (state and local);

- (Oversight Agencies) the federal and state Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), and the Ontario Fire Department.

Compliance with these regulations and oversight agencies ensures that any risks from the use or handling of hazardous materials would be minimized. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to result in significant impacts related to the emission of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Enterprise Zone areas do not contain any Superfund or Cortese sites. However, the involved areas contain a variety of commercial and industrial properties that may be included on hazardous material databases, including automotive uses, dry cleaners, gas stations, and industrial facilities. The proposed Enterprise Zone may lead to the redevelopment or reuse of some of these properties. However, any such future activity would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations governing such properties; and in most cases, would require approval from an oversight agency such as the State Department of Toxic Substance Control, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, and the Pasadena Fire Department. Compliance with these regulations and oversight agencies would ensure that future redevelopment activities would not create a hazard to the public or the environment and no impact is anticipated.

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?* ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Enterprise Zone areas are not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

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?* ( )

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The involved areas are not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone and future related activities would not impair implementation of any emergency resource or evacuation plans. The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Pasadena Fire Department maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Department is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency. The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir.

- 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?* ( )

**WHY?** As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the involved portions of the City are not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the involved areas are within urbanized portions of the City and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

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

**WHY?** Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Los Angeles County and 85 incorporated Cities therein, including the City of Pasadena, obtained an MS4 (Permit # 01-182) from the Los Angeles RWQCB, most recently in 2001. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP.

In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Pasadena has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP.

The proposed Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would not generate any water pollutants. Future development/redevelopment projects in the Enterprise Zone, as an urban development, would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. However, the specific impacts of future development/redevelopment in the Enterprise Zone is too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, in accordance with the City's SUSMP ordinance, future projects that are within the following categories would be required to develop and implement SUSMP compliance plans.

- *Hillside new development/redevelopment (includes non-discretionary hillside development also) (Redevelopment is defined as the creation, addition, modification or alteration of at least 1,000 square feet of surface area for hillside projects or 5,000 square feet of surface elsewhere.)*
- *100,000 square foot or greater commercial developments, or*
- *Automotive repair shops, or*
- *Retail gasoline outlets, or*
- *Stand alone restaurants, or*
- *Home subdivisions with 10 or more units, or*
- *Parking lots greater than 5,000 square feet or 25 spaces exposed to rainfall,*
- *Or have as part of the proposed project:*
  - *Vehicle or equipment fueling areas, or*
  - *Vehicle or equipment maintenance areas, including washing, or*
  - *Commercial or industrial waste handling or storage, excluding typical office or household wastes, or*
  - *Outdoor handling or storage of hazardous materials or waste, or Outdoor work areas for activities such as, but not limited to: welding, cutting, metal fabrication, assembly, application of paints, coating, or finishing: pre-cast concrete fabrication: etc., or 100,000 square foot or greater industrial development, or*
  - *Outdoor animal confinement (kennels, stables, etc.).*

Due to required compliance with the NPDES, future developments are not anticipated to result in a violation of 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)? ( )*

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** No new groundwater wells or other direct withdraw of any groundwater is proposed or anticipated. Future developments within the Enterprise Zones will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. However, the use of water in the Raymond Basin does not and is not expected to exceed the City's water rights. Therefore, no significant impacts to groundwater is expected.

- 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? ( )*

**(C and D) WHY?** There are no natural drainages courses within the proposed Enterprise Zone areas. While the specific impacts of future development/redevelopment in the Enterprise Zone is too speculative to evaluate, it is not anticipated that any future development/redevelopment would alter the drainage patterns in a manner that would result in erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site. Subsequent projects will be required to comply with all drainage requirements established by the City and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, the proposed Enterprise Zone would not substantially alter drainage patterns and would have no related significant 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? ( )*

**WHY?** Subsequent projects within the proposed Enterprise Zone will be required to provide drainage improvements that prevent post-development storm water flows from exceeding the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Because the involved areas are urbanized, future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment does not pose any unique drainage concerns, and standard engineering practices are expected to achieve a drainage system adequate to meet future drainage requirements. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to cause an exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

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

**WHY?** Activities associated with subsequent construction projects could result in temporary increases in the amount of suspended solids in surface flows during a concurrent storm event, thus resulting in surface water quality impacts. However, with the required compliance with NPDES and Regional Quality Control Board requirements and the City's SUSMP Ordinance, no significant water quality impacts are anticipated.

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? ( )

**(G and H) 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. .

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?** 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 involved areas are not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would have no flood risk impacts.

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 Enterprise Zone and future developments/redevelopment within are not expected to physically divide a community. The ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate buildout of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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? ( )

**WHY?** As discussed in the previous response, the ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate buildout of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations. No conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations are proposed.

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 proposed Enterprise Zones are 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 Enterprise Zone would have no impacts to locally-important mineral resource recovery sites. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

**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? ( )

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone is intended is to stimulate growth in the designated economically distressed areas by making additional State and local incentives and programs available to businesses within the zones. The ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate buildout of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations.

Future commercial or industrial facilities within the Enterprise Zone may generate noise. However, no specific noise-generating facilities are known to the lead agency and the specific noise impacts of such facilities are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, the proposed Enterprise Zone would not change the zoning or General Plan land use designations of any parcels and, as such, is not expected to result in an incompatible mix of uses. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to expose persons to noise levels in excess of established standards.

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone areas will continue to be utilized for urban uses as they are currently. The proposed Enterprise Zone would not result in an incompatible mix of land uses. Furthermore, vibration and ground-borne noise travel only very short distances. Vibrations are only perceptible to receptors directly adjacent to the sources. The proposed Enterprise Zone would not alter land uses in a manner that would place sensitive receptors adjacent to vibration sources. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone would not result in vibration impacts.

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

**WHY?** See response to 14.a. The proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise.

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

**WHY?** Construction of future development/redevelopment projects in the Enterprise Zone would temporarily generate noise due. However, the specific noise impacts of future construction activities is too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, future construction would be subject to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan would also be required to ensure that



Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the area. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase must also be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, the proposed Enterprise Zone is not expected to result in any significant temporary or periodic noise impacts.

- 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? ( )

**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? ( )

**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)? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone is intended is to stimulate growth in the designated economically distressed areas by making additional State and local incentives and programs available to businesses within the zones. The ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate build-out of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations. While this build-out may result in a population growth, such growth is anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the involved areas area located in a developed urban area with established roadway networks and in-place infrastructure. No infrastructure expansion or extension that could facilitate off-site growth is proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

(B and C) WHY? The proposed Enterprise Zone is consistent with the City's General Plan Housing Element. It is also consistent with the housing forecast for Pasadena contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments. No need to development replacement housing is known or anticipated.

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? ( )

WHY? The proposed Enterprise Zone could result in new development or redevelopment in accordance with the City's General Plan. Such development would add to the service responsibilities of the City's Fire Department. However, as discussed above in Section 15(a), the growth that may result from the Enterprise Zone is anticipated by the City's General Plan and, therefore, within the Fire Department's planning expectations. Furthermore, the involved areas are within built portions of the City that are currently served by the City's Fire Department. As such, no new or expanded fire protection facilities are anticipated to be necessary to serve the project. Regardless, subsequent projects within the Enterprise Zone would be subject to Fire Department review and approval.

b. Libraries? ( )

WHY? The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the Enterprise Zone is not expected to significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ( )

WHY? According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents. While the proposed Enterprise Zone may cause population growth (See Section 15.a), the City's park mitigation fees would prevent any significant park impacts. Park mitigation fees in Pasadena are \$19,743 per residential unit and \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space.

d. Police Protection? ( )

WHY? The proposed Enterprise Zone could result in new development or redevelopment in accordance with the City's General Plan. Such development would add to the service responsibilities of the City's

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

Police Department. However, as discussed above in Section 15(a), the growth that may result from the Enterprise Zone is anticipated by the City's General Plan and, therefore, within the Police Department's planning expectations. Furthermore, the involved areas are within built portions of the City that are currently served by the City's Police Department. As such, no new or expanded police protection facilities are anticipated to be necessary to serve the project.

e. Schools? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone could result in new development or redevelopment in accordance with the City's General Plan. However, 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?** New development in the Enterprise Zone may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and additional sales tax, this impact is not significant.

**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?** While the proposed Enterprise Zone may cause population growth (See Section 15.a), the City's park mitigation fees would prevent any significant park impacts. Park mitigation fees in Pasadena are \$19,743 per residential unit and \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space.

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?** No new or expanded recreational facilities are proposed. Furthermore, the proposed Enterprise Zone areas are within built portions of the City with existing parks and recreational facilities in place. No new or expanded recreational facilities would be required, other than those planned in the City's master plan of parks to serve existing and future City populations.

**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)?* ( )

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would not generate any traffic. Future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone would generate new vehicle trips. However, the type and size of development project that could result from approval of the Enterprise Zone are not known to the lead agency. As such, the potential traffic impacts of future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects on the load and capacity of the street system are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, such future projects would be subject to review by the City's Department of Transportation (PASDOT), and those projects that meet any of the thresholds in the following table would require further traffic analysis:

**TABLE 18-1  
TRAFFIC STUDY DETERMINATION MATRIX**

TYPE	Exempt	Traffic Assessment	Traffic and Parking Impact Analysis
Residential (based on # of units)	4 units or less	5 – 25 units	26+ units
Commercial (based on # of trips*)	Less than 70 daily trips and less than 10 trips in any peak hour	71 – 150 daily trips or 11 – 20 trips in any peak hour	151+ daily trips or more than 21 trips in any peak hour
*Trip generation are normally calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) "Trip Generation 7 <sup>th</sup> Edition" handbook, or successor to this document. In instances where the project does not fit into a land use analyzed in the handbook, or where the handbook cites outdated or insufficient studies for its basis (even in the latest edition of the handbook) contact the Pasadena Department of Transportation for guidance in determining the project's trip generation.			

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 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

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

The proposed Enterprise Zone, in-and-of-itself, would not generate any traffic and, therefore, would not impact any CMP roadways. Future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone would generate new vehicle trips. However, the type and size of development project that could result from approval of the Enterprise Zone are not known to the lead agency. As such, the potential traffic impacts of future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment projects on CMP roadways are too speculative to evaluate. Regardless, any future projects add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, or add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway require an impact analysis for CMP facilities.

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 involved areas 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 Enterprise Zone 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 proposed Enterprise Zone areas are within urbanized portions of Pasadena, where all street improvements are presently in place. Any design feature hazards are too speculative to evaluate as no subsequent projects that would result from approval of the Enterprise Zone are known to the lead agency. However, subsequent projects are required to adhere to the City's design standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** All subsequent projects are required to be designed to provide access for all emergency vehicles and will not create inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

**WHY?** Although no specific developments that would result from approval of the Enterprise Zone are known to the lead agency, approval of the proposed Enterprise Zone would likely lead to increased development activity within the involved areas. Such subsequent development would increase the demand for parking. However, future subsequent projects would be required to comply with the City's parking standards, which require adequate parking be provided for all new development. Compliance with these standards ensures the proposed Enterprise Zone would not lead to significant parking impacts. Furthermore, new development

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

within the project areas, including that resulting from the proposed Enterprise Zone, could improve parking conditions by increasing the parking supply to parking demand ratio.

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

**WHY?** The proposed project is not in conflict with any transportation policies, plans or programs. Therefore, the project will have no related impacts. In addition, subsequent projects will adhere to the City's General Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, and bicycle parking requirements and, therefore, would not significantly conflict with adopted 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? ( )*

**WHY?** Future projects in the Enterprise Zone 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. No unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system is anticipated. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

- 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? ( )*

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone would encourage build-out largely in accordance with current projections. Future projects within the Enterprise Zone areas are required to comply with the City's water and sewer master plans. No new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities, other than those identified in the City's master plans, are expected to be required to serve future development within the Enterprise Zones. As such, no significant environment impacts related to new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities are anticipated.

- 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? ( )*

**WHY?** Subsequent projects within the proposed Enterprise Zone will be required to provide drainage improvements that prevent post-development storm water flows from exceeding the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Because the involved areas are urbanized, future Enterprise Zone-related development/redevelopment does not pose any unique drainage concerns, and standard engineering practices are expected to achieve site specific drainage systems adequate to meet future drainage requirements. No area-wide storm water drainage facility improvements are anticipated to be

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

necessary to accommodate Enterprise Zone-related development. As such, no significant environment impacts related to new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities are anticipated.

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

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone would encourage build-out largely in accordance with current projections. While the specific water needs of future projects within the Enterprise Zones are too speculative to evaluate, such projects would be subject to individual review by Pasadena Power and Water to determine if adequate water supplies are available to serve the projects. Regardless, future projects within the Enterprise Zone areas are required to comply with the City's water master plan; and no new or expanded water entitlements, other than those identified in the City's master plans, are expected to be required to serve future development within the Enterprise Zones.

- 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?* ( )

**WHY?** The proposed Enterprise Zone would encourage build-out largely in accordance with current projections. While the specific wastewater needs of future projects within the Enterprise Zones are too speculative to evaluate, such projects would be subject to individual review by the City's Public Works Department to determine if adequate water supplies are available to serve the projects. Regardless, future projects within the Enterprise Zone areas are required to comply with the City's wastewater master plan; and future development within the Enterprise Zones is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment capacity.

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

**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 re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years. The Enterprise Zone is not expected to have any noticeable affect on the area's or region's disposal of solid waste.

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

**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%

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

on both a monthly basis and annual basis. Future projects in the Enterprise Zone are 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. In addition, the future projects must comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

**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 not have discernable substantial impacts to Aesthetic or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have discernable 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 any discernable 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 any discernable 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.

- 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

**WHY?** The proposed project would not cause any discernable impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Future development in the Enterprise Zones has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality, hydrology, water quality, noise, population, housing, public services, recreation, traffic, and utility impacts. However, the discernable incremental impacts of the proposed Enterprise Zone would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial and would not be a substantial contribution to any significant 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?* (      )

**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 residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly 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   |

# CITY OF PASADENA

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

### PROPERTY INFORMATION

APPLICANT NAME: City of Pasadena  
PROJECT SITE ADDRESS: Enterprise Zone Boundaries as indicated on Attachment No.1  
ZONING DISTRICT: Commercial and Industrial  
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Commercial, Specific Plan and Industrial

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposed project consists of a reapplication of the City's Enterprise Zone and adding the portion of the Colorado Boulevard corridor from Catalina Avenue to South Altadena Drive into the Enterprise Zone (see Section 4 "Project Location" for a detailed description of the Enterprise Zone boundaries). The purpose of the Enterprise Zone is to stimulate growth in the designated economically distressed areas by making additional State and local incentives and programs available to businesses within the zones. The ideal result of the Enterprise Zone would be the ultimate buildout of commercial and industrially zoned property within the zones in accordance with the City of Pasadena's Comprehensive General Plan and Zoning regulations.

The City of Pasadena established the Enterprise Zone in 1992 in partnership with the County of Los Angeles Community Development Commission (Pasadena-Altadena Enterprise Zone [PAEZ]). In 1999 the State approved and expansion of the original Enterprise Zone, which is referred to as the "expanded area". On April 10, 2007 the Pasadena Enterprise Zone will expire and, to continue the program, an application to request a new designation must be submitted to the State by the September 6, 2006 deadline.

Approval of the proposed project could stimulate development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone. However, no specific development/redevelopment projects or other physical changes to the environment known to the lead agency are dependent on the proposed approval. As such, in accordance with Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the potential environmental impacts of specific future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone that may result from the proposed approval are too speculative to evaluate at this time. However, the proposed approval would not eliminate any discretionary entitlement/approval requirements for potential future development/redevelopment projects within the Enterprise Zone, and any such discretionary projects would be subject to individual environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

**APPROVALS NEEDED:** City Council approval is of the request is needed to apply for designation of an Enterprise Zone and for approval of the Target Employment Areas. The State of California Housing and Community Development Department will approve the designation in November, 2006.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** An initial environmental study recommending a Negative Declaration without mitigation measures has been prepared.

**PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:** Comments on the Initial Study and Negative Declaration may be received in writing between July 12 through July 31, 2006 and orally at public hearings or meetings considering these documents. Written comments should be sent to Lola Osborne, City Hall, 117 E. Colorado Boulevard, Northwest Programs, and Pasadena, CA 91105. If you wish to challenge the Initial Study and Negative Declaration in court, you may be limited to raising those issues that you or someone else raised at any public hearing or meetings where these documents were considered.

**AVAILABILITY OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION** The draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration may be viewed at Northwest Programs Office, 236 West Mountain Street, Pasadena, California 91103, between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM Mondays through Friday, and the Permit Center at 175 N. Garfield Avenue. The documents may also be viewed at the following locations:

Central Library	La Pintoresca Library	Hill Avenue Library	Hastings Library	City Clerk's Office
285 E. Walnut St.	1355 N. Raymond Avenue	55 S. Hill Avenue	3325 E. Orange Grove	117 E. Colorado Boulevard, 6 <sup>th</sup> floor

For additional information contact: Lola Osborne, Northwest Programs Division, (626) 744-6879.