

**Attachment 2:
Negative Declaration**

**CITY OF PASADENA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HALE BUILDING
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101-1704**

INITIAL STUDY

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

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Project Title: | Pasadena Pedestrian Plan |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | City of Pasadena – Department of Transportation
221 E. Walnut Street, Suite 210
Pasadena, CA 91101 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Eric C. Shen
(626) 744-7208 |
| 4. Project Location: | City of Pasadena, California |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: | City of Pasadena – Department of Transportation
Pasadena, CA 91101 |
| 6. General Plan Designation: | N/A- Citywide project |
| 7. Zoning: | N/A- Citywide project |
| 8. Description of the Project: | (See Project Description, Page 2) |
| 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: | (See Project Description, Page 2) |
| 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): | Pasadena City Council |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background

In 2005, the City completed an extensive public outreach and participation program that led to the comprehensive updates of the General Plan Land Use and Mobility Elements, the Central District Specific Plan, and the Zoning Code. In response to growing concerns about traffic and livability, these documents focused on targeting future growth in seven specific plan areas and developing a better multimodal transportation system that provides more travel options to neighborhoods, community centers, and major activity centers. Collectively, they provide guidance for the future by directing growth near transit facilities and providing an environment that supports transit, bicycle- and pedestrian-oriented mobility strategies. The Pedestrian Plan combines pedestrian-related policies from adopted policies and programs into one comprehensive document.

The Project

The project is the adoption and implementation of the Pasadena Pedestrian Plan. The Pedestrian Plan builds upon the strengths of adopted policy and nearly \$91 million in capital programs already underway to improve the pedestrian environment. The Plan establishes the direction to guide future pedestrian improvements within the framework of adopted policies and programs. It emphasizes the importance of the pedestrian in city life and aims to increase the public's awareness of the importance of walking for good health and fitness. The Pedestrian Plan provides guidance on how to implement several General Plan policies, such as preserving the walkability of pedestrian areas, designing and developing more pedestrian-friendly projects, providing better integration of pedestrian improvements into street maintenance and traffic management programs, and developing public education and enforcement programs that improve pedestrian safety and increase levels of walking Citywide. The Plan does not substantively change any of the previously adopted policies. There is no new development proposed under the Pedestrian Master Plan, and the document is intended to make available the applicable pedestrian goals and objectives that may be applicable to future development projects. The Plan does take previously adopted policies that may have been applicable to a specific area of the City, and as part of the Plan will now apply Citywide.

Project Location and Surrounding Uses

The City of Pasadena is located in the western San Gabriel Valley in Los Angeles County, approximately 10 miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles. Pasadena is bounded by Altadena (unincorporated Los Angeles County) to the north, the cities of Sierra Madre and Arcadia to the east, San Marino and South Pasadena to the south, and Los Angeles, Glendale, and La Canada to the west. Portions of the City abut the Angeles National Forest to the north. Adjacent land uses in surrounding jurisdictions are predominantly residential or open space, with the exception of the eastern boundary at Colorado Boulevard, which is primarily commercial.

With a population of approximately 134,000 and an area covering approximately 23 square miles, Pasadena is the largest city in the San Gabriel Valley. The City has a designated sphere of

influence area of 883 acres adjacent to its southwestern boundaries, generally north of Huntington Drive and west of Rosemead Boulevard.

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: Negative Declaration

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 project 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.	

Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige Saeki 4/12/06
Reviewed By/Date

Jolene Hayes
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: April 5, 2006

Department requiring checklist: Department of Transportation

Case Manager: Jolene M. Hayes

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?*

X

WHY? The Pedestrian Plan (the Plan) will be implemented Citywide and encourages enhancement of pedestrian projects in areas that offer views of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Arroyo Seco, the San Rafael Hills, Eaton Canyon, and Old Town Pasadena. However, the project includes the implementation of pedestrian improvements at the ground level that would not in any way obstruct the views of any of these scenic resources. Further, the proposed project would not entitle any development, rather it collects and organizes existing pedestrian policies and combines these policies into one comprehensive document. Some policies that were only applicable to certain areas of the City will be applied Citywide as part of the Plan.

Future projects subject to the proposed amendments may involve aesthetic changes within the City; however, the potential impacts of such future development which will incorporate Plan policies are too speculative to identify at this time. Regardless, subsequent projects seeking entitlements will require accompanying CEQA documentation. Therefore, a less than significant impact to aesthetics is anticipated with adoption of the Plan.

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

X

WHY? See response 3 a. The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan will not necessarily result in the destruction of any landmark eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcropping or natural feature, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway corridor. In and of itself the implementation of the plan will not affect

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway or any scenic roadway corridors identified in the City's General Plan documents.

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

X

WHY? The proposed Pedestrian Plan is consistent with City-wide Design Principles contained in the adopted General Plan Land Use Element. Implementation of the Plan itself will not result in the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the City. See also response 3 a.

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

X

WHY? The Pedestrian Plan supports implementation of roadway lighting to improve pedestrian safety. However, installation of new street lighting is subject to a stringent approval process, including 67 percent approval of abutting properties. Implementation of the Plan itself will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. See also response 3 a.

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? ()*

X

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? ()*

X

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

CO (Office Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), OS (Open Space) and PS (Public-Semi Public) Zoning Districts.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY? There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore adoption and implementation of the Plan 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? ()*

X

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 polluters; 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 SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, 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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

The proposed Pedestrian Plan is consistent with the General Plan and encourages walking as an alternative mode of transportation. As a result, the project is consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan, and would have no associated impacts.

Subsequent development in the areas where the Plan is applicable will likely affect the local air quality in the future. The potential air quality impacts of future development projects which will incorporate Plan policies are too speculative to evaluate at this time. Regardless, subsequent development projects will be required to adhere to the standards set forth in the AQMP, and will be subject to further CEQA analysis once the subsequent development project is approved. Therefore, no air quality impacts are anticipated at this time and no mitigation is required.

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

X

WHY? 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.

Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. However, the project could result in reductions in mobile emissions by encouraging people to walk rather than to drive. Therefore, implementation of the Plan itself would not violate an air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and would have no related significant impacts. See also response 5 a.

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)?* ()

X

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). This basin is a non-attainment area for Ozone (O₃), Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in O₃, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, or NO₂ will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures.

Implementation of the Pedestrian Plan could likely result in a reduction of mobile emissions, thus the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds or contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Since the implementation of the Plan itself would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, it would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, nor have related significant impacts. See also response 5 a.

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

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

 X

WHY? According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook the Pedestrian Plan does not include any new pedestrian facilities near sensitive receptors and is not likely to generate any significant toxic air emissions. See also response 5 a.

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

 X

WHY? This type of use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." The proposal does not include any physical development at this time. The proposed Plan may apply to future development projects within the City. However, the proposed amendments do not remove any odor-related regulations and would not foreseeably lead to a change in the generation of odor. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, and would have no associated impacts.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

()

WHY?

 X

Pasadena is a highly urbanized and has only a few areas with sensitive biological resources remaining. The Pedestrian Plan affirms the City's goals, policies, and programs to preserve sensitive areas identified in plans for the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Wash (including Eaton Canyon). No conflict with adopted conservation plans will result. No change to City's policies and regulations protecting trees is proposed. The Pedestrian Plan incorporates programs and policies to protect biological resources and does not reduce the amount of land designated as open space nor changes any policy with respect to other areas where sensitive resources may be located.

The proposed Plan does not include the modification of any habitat and would not otherwise affect any candidate, sensitive or special status species identified by the Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Further, the proposed Plan will not have any adverse affect on any riparian habitat or wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The proposed Plan will help to guide pedestrian improvements within the City and will not change any land use entitlements. In addition, there is no proposed alteration to any wildlife corridor or migratory fish corridor proposed and no change to any regulation or code protecting such resources. Therefore, the proposed Plan would cause no impacts to

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

sensitive species, sensitive natural community, riparian habitat, or wetlands. No significant impact on biological resources is anticipated.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 6 a.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 6 a.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 6 a.

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

X

WHY?

See response 6 a.

- 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? ()*

X

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY?

See response 6 a.

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? ()

WHY? The proposed Plan will not have any impact on cultural resources. The Plan will not alter any unique geological feature, paleontological resource, any human remains or affect any historical or archeological resource. However, the proposed Plan will affect pedestrian improvements for future development activity, which may impact cultural resources. However, the potential impact of future development which would incorporate Plan policies is too speculative to evaluate at this time; and all future development activity within the established areas would be required to comply with all existing City policies related to the preservation and protection of cultural resources. Therefore, no impact to any archeological, historical or cultural resource would be caused by the proposed Plan.

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

WHY? See response 7 a.

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

WHY? See response 7 a.

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

WHY? Implementation of the proposed Plan would involve minor grading to refurbish sidewalks. However, the proposed grading would not encroach into undisturbed soils. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to affect any human remains. See also response 7 a.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

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

X

WHY? The Plan, in and of itself, will not result in any new construction. The Plan affirms the policies of the adopted Energy Element by encouraging walking as an alternative mode of transportation. Therefore, the Plan does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan and will not result in impacts related to Energy consumption.

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

X

WHY? The Plan, in and of itself, will not result in any new construction. However, the Plan encourages installation of pedestrian amenities, such as lighting, that requires the use of energy. However, the potential impact of future development which will implement Plan policies is too speculative to evaluate at this time; and all future development activity would be required to comply with existing City policies related to Energy standards and conservation. Therefore, no impact to Energy resources would be caused by the proposed Plan.

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.* ()

X

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. Other faults that traverse the City are the Sierra Madre Fault, San Gabriel Fault, Eagle Rock Fault, and two unnamed faults. 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. Pasadena is also affected by the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately 18 miles southwest of the City, among others. 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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock. Areas subject to landslides and liquefaction have been identified around Eaton Canyon and Arroyo Seco.

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. The Plan in and of itself will not directly result in any construction. However, the construction of any pedestrian facilities will conform to these required standards. Therefore, the Plan would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking. Policies identified to minimize potential seismic and other geotechnical hazards, as well as implementation programs, are fully addressed in the adopted Safety Element. Implementation of the identified programs and policies will insure a less than significant impact.

The natural water erosion potential of soils in Pasadena is low, unless these soils are disturbed during the wet season. Both the Ramona and Hanford soils associations, which underlay much of the City, have high permeability, low surface runoff and slight erosion hazard due to the gravelly surface layer and low topographic relief away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains. Water erosion during construction of future projects can be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. However, the potential impact of future development is too speculative to evaluate at this time; and all future development activity would be required to comply with existing City policies related to ensure less than significant impacts related geology, soils and seismic safety.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?* ()

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

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?* ()

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

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?* ()

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

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? ()

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

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? ()

X

WHY?

See response 9 a.

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? ()

X

WHY? The Plan does not propose any new development and will not result in the generation of wastewater. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case. The policies and required improvements of the Plan may apply to future projects. However, the potential impact of future development which will implement Plan policies is too speculative to evaluate at this time; and all future development activity would be required to comply with CEQA and existing City policies related to wastewater disposal to ensure less than significant 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? ()

X

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY?

The proposed Plan would not directly expose people to health hazards or hazardous materials and would not interfere with any emergency response plans or release hazardous materials into the environment. Subsequent development that is subject to the standards of the Plan would be required to comply with the City's General Plan and development codes and federal, state, and local hazardous material regulations related to the use, storage, transport or disposal of hazardous materials. Furthermore, no development is associated with the Plan. Therefore, no impact due to hazardous materials is anticipated with the proposed Plan.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 10 b.

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

X

WHY?

See response 10 b.

- 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? ()*

X

WHY?

See response 10 b.

- 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? ()*

X