

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

INITIAL STUDY

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

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Zoning Code Amendments – Series I
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Denver Miller; (626) 744-6773
4. Project Location: The proposed Zoning Code Amendments will be City – wide.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena
6. General Plan Designation: Varied
7. Zoning: Varied
8. Description of the Project: These Zoning Code amendments include the following changes: an amendment that will conditionally permit Telecommunications Facilities within the OS (Open Space) Zoning District; modify the sign ordinance to allow for noncommercial signs in residential districts; will 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 karoake 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 were inadvertently dropped out 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.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Varied
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required. The proposed amendments are City-wide, and will change the regulations in various parts of the Zoning Code. Other public agencies whose

approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Approval by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission is required.

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.	

Denver Miller 1/1/06
Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige Saeki 2/2/06
Reviewed By/Date

Denver Miller
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:
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development
 Case Manager: Denver Miller

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

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

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of technical or procedural amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. Almost all of these amendments do not have the potential to have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. There is an amendment that will conditionally permit wireless telecommunications facilities (WTF) within the OS (Open Space) Zoning District. The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not change the height and mass restrictions established in the City's zoning code for WTF. It would allow a WTF only on light fixtures in public parks. The WTF will be allowed to be 15 feet higher than the pole they are located on. The Zoning Code amendments are not specific to an individual site and therefore it is too speculative to address the specific aesthetic impacts that a particular proposal may have. The aesthetic impact of any WTF will be evaluated for each proposed facility through the minor conditional use permit process. The MCUP process will impose conditions of approval to reduce any significant aesthetic impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not change the height and mass restrictions established in the City's Zoning Code. One amendment would allow WTF on light fixtures in public parks. The WTF will be allowed to be 15 feet higher than the pole they are located on. The site specific impacts of any WTF will be evaluated through the minor conditional use permit process.

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

WHY? See response 3 c.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not change the height and mass restrictions established in the City's Zoning Code. One amendment would allow WTF on light fixtures in public parks. The WTF will be allowed to be 15 feet higher than the pole they are located on. The impact of any WTF will be evaluated through the minor conditional use permit process. WTF do not emit light and therefore would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. The proposed amendments would not change lighting requirements established in the City's zoning code, would not change any development review standards, and would not revise any design guidelines. Therefore, the proposed amendments would have no negative impacts as a result of light or glare.

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? 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 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?* ()

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.

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

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 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.

The proposed amendments are primarily technical and procedural revisions that do not have the potential to promote growth since they are small changes to the Zoning Code that allow for such things as WTF in Open Space districts. These amendments do not increase the height, density, FAR or other development standards that would lead to greater intensity of development. These amendments would not interfere with the City's ability to implement its air quality plan.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments are for the most part minor, and do not result in the approval of a specific project that would violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

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

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS: The proposed amendments would not generate new construction except for WTF in the OS district. As proposed, such facilities would only be permitted to be located on light fixtures in public parks. While these facilities typically do not involve grading or the use of equipment that causes significant emissions, each WTF will be evaluated on a case by case basis through the required MCUP process. . .

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? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not result in an increase in criteria pollutants as the amendments are minor and don't result in changes in the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not result in exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the amendments are minor in nature and do not result in changes in the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. The Zoning Code amendments are minor in nature and will not result in objectionable odors. New projects will be reviewed in accordance with the City's Zoning Code and will be required to meet the performance standards for odors contained in 17.40.090.

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 proposed amendments are primarily technical and procedural revisions. While they apply to areas all over the City, there is no new development or changes to development standards that would affect sensitive species. The amendments do propose to allow WTF in the OS District. However, they can only be located on light fixtures in public parks, and an MCUP is required for each proposed facility. Any proposed WTF in the OS District will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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 only amendment that could result in new development is the provision to allow WTF in the OS District. However, they can only be located on light fixtures in public parks, and an MCUP is required for each proposed facility. Any proposed WTF facility in the OS districts will be reviewed through the MCUP process to adequately address any potential impacts to sensitive habitat or communities.

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

Pasadena is located in a developed urban area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat. Any proposed WTF facility in the OS districts will be reviewed through the MCUP process to determine its potential impacts. See response 6 c.

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? Pasadena is a developed urban area and these Zoning Code Amendments do not involve the dispersal of wildlife. The proposed amendment to allow WTF's in the OS district will only allow the facility to be located on top light fixtures in public parks. Therefore, there will be no impacts to wildlife or their habitat.

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. The amendments are primarily technical or procedural revisions that will not impact the Tree Protection Ordinance. The amendment to allow WTF's in the OS district will require an MCUP for each

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

new facility. The MCUP review process includes a review of any potential impacts to trees. WTF will only be permitted on light poles in public parks, and it is not anticipated this would result in any conflict with the Tree Protection Ordinance. All trees in public parks are protected trees under the ordinance.

- 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 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.

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? These amendments will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource. In fact, it will allow identified historical resources within the West Gateway Specific Plan area to be adaptively reused as office uses through the minor conditional use permit process.

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

WHY? The proposed Code Amendments would have no impact to archaeological resources and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for archaeological resource impacts. Any proposed WTF facility in the OS districts will be reviewed through the MCUP process to determine its potential impacts including impacts on trees and other biological resources.

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor in nature. The amendment to allow WTF's in the OS District and will require each facility to be reviewed through the MCUP process to determine its potential impacts. WTF will only be permitted on light poles in public parks, and it is not anticipated this would result in any grading or construction activity that would impact paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not directly or secondarily destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code Amendments are City-wide and minor in nature. The proposed amendments include a provision to conditionally permit WTFs in Open Space Zoning Districts. These applications will be reviewed on a case by case basis to determine if they will impact the location of human remains. The WTF's will only be permitted to be located on light poles in public parks; therefore there are no anticipated impacts.

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 Zoning Code Amendments do not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. Projects are required 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 Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments are minor and do not result in projects that will encourage the use of non-renewable 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.* ()

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

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

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

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 directly or secondarily result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed Zoning Code Amendments are minor in nature and will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of known fault.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?* ()

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

WHY? See 9.a.i.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. These amendments are not specific to a site, but are Citywide. There are no specific projects associated with the amendments. Any future development projects must continue to be reviewed to ensure there are no seismic related risks.

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?* ()

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

WHY? These Zoning Code Amendments are City-wide and are minor in nature. Projects will be reviewed on a case by case basis to determine that they meet the building code and other requirements that ensure that they are safe. The proposed amendments will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments include a variety of amendments as described on Page 1 of this document. When an applicant applies to construct any building, the specific impacts on soil erosion will be reviewed. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation therefore there will be no impact.

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?* ()

<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 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.

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 Pasadena 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. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would have no expansive soil-related impacts and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for expansive soil-related impacts.

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? ()*

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific but are Citywide amendments. These amendments include minor changes to the code as detailed on Page 1 of this document. These amendments will not impact the ability of the City to review a project to determine if the soil is incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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? The proposed Zoning Code amendments as described on Page 1 and do not change the mechanisms by which the City regulates the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. All new projects would be continued to be reviewed for such impacts.

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? The project does not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not alter the way

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

subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazard-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling 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? The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

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 proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific thus there can't be a determination that a project will be located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials site. Any proposed project would be reviewed to determine whether they are on a list of hazardous materials sites. The proposed amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing hazardous material sites.

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? Pasadena is 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. Therefore, the proposed amendments 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? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed amendments 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? ()*

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? These amendments would not result in any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, any future applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are minor in nature and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed amendments are not site specific and do not amend the Zoning Code in such a way to violate any water quality standards. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter any waste discharge requirements, and would not change any water quality-related plans or programs.

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)? ()

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

WHY? The project would not install any groundwater wells, and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Code Amendments would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies. Any project that is the result of these amendments will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power.

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

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