

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? Any project that requires a building permit will be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the existing drainage patterns. Future projects are subject to NPDES requirements, including the County-wide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. In accordance with these requirements, the applicant would be required to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP. To comply with the SUSMP, the project must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. Complying with the City's SUSMP and implementing the required BMPs will ensure that the any subsequent development projects would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to drainage patterns.

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? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific thus it is not possible to determine if the amendments will result in a substantial alteration of the existing drainage patterns. Any project that requires a building permit will be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the existing drainage patterns.

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? The proposed Zoning Code amendments do not propose any new development. Projects are required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. This ensures subsequent development projects would not exceed the City's existing storm drain system.

Similarly, any future project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()

WHY? As discussed above, any development proposed because of these zoning code amendments will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality. The proposed amendments would not change the applicability or substance of these requirements, and would have no impact to water quality.

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

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

WHY? The project consists of Zoning Code amendments as described on Page 1. A part of these amendments will allow WTFs in the Open Space District. However, a WTF is not housing. Therefore, the project would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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 East Pasadena Specific Plan area is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have any impacts related to exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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? ()

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

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

WHY? Because these are minor changes to the Zoning Code, they will not physically divide an existing community. There is no development proposed as part of the code amendments. No adverse impact will result.

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments will allow WTFs in the Open Space Zoning District. This amendment will require a public hearing, and a new WTF will be limited in terms of height (not more than 15 feet higher than a field light) and location of equipment (such equipment will be required to be below grade in a vault). Any amendments to the Zoning Code require that the City Council adopt a finding that the proposed amendments are consistent with the City's General Plan.

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

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

WHY? Currently, there is 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? ()*

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

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. There is no new development proposed as part of the Zoning Code Amendments.

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? ()*

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

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. 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?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific therefore it is not possible to identify specific noise impacts. However, there is no development proposed, only technical and procedural amendments to the Zoning Code. Future development projects may generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, construction activities must adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (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 is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will 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, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

The proposed amendments would also not expose persons to excessive noise. The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources.

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor in nature and propose no new development. The amendments will not result in a generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

- 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. 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.

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

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

WHY? While this project consists of Citywide Zoning Code amendments, there is no new development proposed with the amendments. Adhering to established City regulations will ensure that any project constructed as a result of these amendments will not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor and propose no new development that would 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? ()

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor and propose no new development that would displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

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

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor and would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

a. *Fire Protection?* ()

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code. These amendments are for the most part minor changes and do not induce any growth by changing the density or other development standards. Any future project applicants are required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to fire service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. *Libraries?* ()

WHY? The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services. See response 16 a.

c. *Parks?* ()

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are minor in nature and that do not induce increases in the need for library services as described on Page 1. Nevertheless, the City collects an impact fee of \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on parks.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are minor in nature. Furthermore, applicants for future projects are required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to police service demand and mitigate any potential impact. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. *Schools?* ()

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

WHY? There is a school impact fee collected for non-residential development. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on school services.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? These Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and do not induce further construction and development. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and development fees 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? This project consists of minor amendments to the Zoning Code that do not induce an increase in population or workforce employees. The City collects a park impact fee for non-residential projects. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. Future projects will not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed amendments will not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project and future related projects will not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

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)?* ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and are not related to a specific project. There is no development proposed as part of the amendments. Any individual project will be reviewed to determine its impacts on existing traffic load and street capacity.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and are not related to an individual project. There is no development proposed as part of the amendments. Individual projects will be reviewed to determine any impact on the level of services.

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 City of Pasadena is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project and any future related projects 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 Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and are not related to a specific project that will have design features that will result in an increase in hazards.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ()

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and are not related to a specific project that will have design features that will result in inadequate emergency access.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ()

WHY? When an applicant applies to construct any building the project will need to comply with the number of parking and loading spaces required by the Zoning Code. There are no changes proposed that would affect parking or the number of spaces required for future development projects.

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

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

WHY? When an applicant applies to construct any building the project will need to comply with Objective 3.2.2 of the City's 2004 Mobility Element ("Encourage Non-Auto Travel"). In accordance with the policies set by this objective, the PasDOT will make recommendations to improve the project's alternative transportation opportunities.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project, by itself, would not generate wastewater. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

- 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 project does not create any further demand on wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Regardless, any future project applicant must submit and implement an on-site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department; and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates.

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

WHY? This series of Zoning Code amendments are minor and propose no new development that could increase the need for water supplies. Any subsequent project proposed because of this amendment will be examined for its impact on the water supply in accordance with the City's standard development review procedures.

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

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 project consists of Zoning Code amendments and will not result in an increase in the demand for wastewater treatment. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyor are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not necessarily require any additional 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. All subsequent projects will be located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. They will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, this project and all subsequent projects would cause no impacts under this topic.

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% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The project, by itself, will have no impact on solid waste. Subsequent projects will be 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, subsequent projects will need to comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuse storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, this project and subsequent projects would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

20. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D).

a) The following document was used for analysis of the project's environmental effects:

- *General Plan and Final Program EIR*

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

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

- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. (Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.)
- c) Mitigation Measures. 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? The proposed amendments will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat 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 because the proposed amendments are not site specific but Citywide. No specific project is part of the proposed amendments and no new development is proposed.

One of the amendments will allow the construction of wireless telecommunication facilities in the OS district. Such facilities will be required to proceed through the minor conditional use permit process which will analyze any potential impact of the project. The standards for wireless telecommunication facilities will minimize any impacts because these facilities will be located on existing field lights or buildings thus reducing any potential impacts. The mechanical equipment associated with these facilities will be required to be underground in a vault. These amendments will also allow for the conversion of historically significant structures in the West Gateway Specific Plan area. This is intended to allow these buildings to be reused.

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? ()*

WHY? The project, by itself, does not involve any new construction. The project consists of amendments that are minor. It amends the Zoning Code such that wireless telecommunication facilities are a conditionally permitted use in the Open Space Zoning District. If a wireless facility is proposed, a review

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

including the specific impacts on the environment, will occur concurrent with discretionary case review. Regardless, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments will not contribute to any 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
Planning Division
175 N. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-1704

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Series I Zoning Code Amendments

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Pasadena

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Denver Miller

ADDRESS: 175 No. Garfield Ave. Pasadena, Ca 91109

TELEPHONE: 626 744-6733; dmiller@cityofpasadena.net

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Pasadena, County of Los Angeles
State of California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: These Zoning Code amendments include the following changes: an amendment that will conditionally permit Telecommunications Facilities within the OS (Open Space) Zoning District; amend the code to allow through a minor conditional use permit the conversion of historic structures to an office use within the West Gateway Specific Plan area; will modify the setback requirements to allow the Zoning Administrator to determine which street a commercial building should front upon when the lot is a double frontage lot; add karaoke bar to the definition of Commercial Recreation; allow up to 800 square feet for accessory structures in the RM-12 zoning district for parking purposes; and make the Hearing Officer the hearing authority for filming conditional use permits and minor use permits and minor variances. The amendments will make corrections to the Zoning Code that inadvertently dropped out in when the new Zoning Code was revised. These corrections include: adding back the provisions for lots divided by a zoning boundary; allowing attic space to be exempt from the FAR provisions in the single family and RM-12 districts, corrections to the East Colorado Specific Plan and fences on private driveways. A number of other corrections are proposed as well as codification of Zoning Administrator interpretations.

FINDING

On the basis of the initial study on file in the Current Planning Office:

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

Completed by:

Title: *[Signature]*

Date: *2/2/06*

Determination Approved:

Title:

Date:

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: February 2, 2006 through February 22, 2006

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: Yes No

INITIAL STUDY REVISED: Yes No

nd-mnd.doc