

**Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration
Attachment D**

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

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY

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

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Density Bonus Amendment
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: William Trimble
626/744-6774
4. Project Location: City of Pasadena
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena
6. General Plan Designation: All General Plan areas in which single-family, multifamily, and mixed-use development is permitted
7. Zoning: All zoning districts in which single-family, multifamily, and mixed-use development is permitted.
8. Description of the Project: California State Government Code Section 65915 mandates a local program to provide density bonuses, incentives and concessions, waivers, and uniform parking standards for development projects that meet certain requirements concerning the inclusion of very low-, low-, moderate- income housing units or senior housing units. The Density Bonus Amendment is an amendment to Title 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code (Zoning Code) specifying how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented in the City of Pasadena.

In summary, Government Code Section 65915 provides for the following:

Projects that include at least ten percent of the units for lower income households or five percent of the units for very low income households, or projects that include ten percent of the units for

moderate income households in a condominium project or planned development as defined by state law or senior housing projects are entitled to a density bonus and also from one to three concessions or incentives related to standards. The percentage of units to be added as a density bonus, from five to 35 percent, depends on the income level to which the units are affordable and the percentage of units that are affordable. The local jurisdiction shall establish a procedure for granting or denying requests for concessions or incentives. It shall also establish a procedure for waiving or modifying development standards that have the effect of precluding a project that meets the requirements for receiving a concession or incentive or a density bonus from being constructed at the density permitted by the statute or incorporating the concession or incentives to which the project is entitled. Certain findings may be made for denial of a request for concessions or incentives.

The statute establishes a bonus and entitles the project to an additional concession or incentive for providing a childcare facility that meets certain requirements. It also establishes a density bonus for applicants seeking a subdivision approval, if land is donated for affordable housing.

Finally, the statute establishes onsite parking ratios for all units in development projects that include the percentages of units necessary for a density bonus or concessions: one space for zero to one bedroom; two spaces for two or three bedrooms; two and one half spaces for four or more bedrooms. The ratios are inclusive of handicapped and guest parking.

9. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing for a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will then hold a public hearing to consider the proposed Amendment. With approval of the Amendment, the Council will hold first and second readings of an ordinance to implement the approval.
10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Citywide
11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None

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. | |

William Trimble 10/05/05
 Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige Sack 10/6/05
 Reviewed By/Date

William Trimble
 Printed Name

Jennifer Paige Sack
 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: | October 5, 2005 |
| Department requiring checklist: | Planning and Development Department |
| Case Manager: | William Trimble |

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 project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with state Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to City development standards or design guidelines.

To be eligible for a density bonus or the associated provisions, a project must be of at least five units, not including the density bonus units. Consequently, all projects benefiting from Government Code 65915 are subject to City of Pasadena design review. In accordance with Section 7.61.030 of the City's Zoning Code, the design of all projects qualifying for the density provisions will be reviewed by the Director of Planning and Development or by the Design Commission. This regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

Developers of qualifying projects may be eligible for concessions such as building height, setbacks etc. However, this analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place (e.g. Design Review) to ensure that future projects will not have a significant aesthetic impact.

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to City development standards or design guidelines.

See response 3a.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to City development standards or design guidelines.

See response 3a.

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to City development standards or design guidelines.

The design of projects benefiting from Government Code Section 65915, including finish, colors, and materials, will be reviewed for approval through the Design Review process. This regulatory procedure provides the City with an additional layer of review for aesthetics including light and glare, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to improve the project's building materials and lighting plans.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The most recently adopted plan is the 2003 AQMP, adopted on August 1, 2003. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

The 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.

The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to the base densities permitted either by the General Plan Land Use Element or by the Zoning Map, so projects benefiting from Government Code 65915 will be consistent with permitted densities. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they are compatible with all applicable air quality plans and standards.

b. *Violate any 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 |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|

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

WHY? See response 5a.

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)? ()*

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

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.

See response 5a.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. There are no changes to the base densities permitted either by the General Plan Land Use Element or by the Zoning Map, so projects benefiting from Government Code 65915 will be consistent with permitted densities. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they are compatible with all applicable air quality plans and standards.

The provisions of Government Code Section 65915 do apply to multifamily residential development, which is considered a sensitive receptor. However, the permitted land uses are not proposed to change, and residents living in or near future projects will not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

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

WHY? Single-family and multifamily residential uses are not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." 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? ()*

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine if there may be an impact on biological resources. The City has an adopted Tree Protection Ordinance to ensure future development does not significantly impact trees on public or private property.

- 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? ()*

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

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. Since the Final EIR for the 2004 General Plan Land Use and Mobility Elements does not provide baseline biological resource information for 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 proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether it has an impact on biological resources. 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? ()*

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

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.

See response 6a.

- 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? ()*

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

WHY? See response 6a.

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

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

WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance".

See response 6a.

- 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? ()

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

WHY? See response 6a. Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans in Pasadena.

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? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they have an impact on cultural resources, including archaeological and paleontological resources.

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

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

WHY? See response 7a.

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

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

WHY? See response 7a.

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

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they have an impact on cultural resources.

In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ()

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they have an impact on energy.

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Future development projects will be reviewed to determine whether they have an impact on energy.

This analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place to ensure that future projects will not have a significant impact related to energy and water.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new

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

development or building floor area. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be required to obtain building permits and will be evaluated by the Building Division to ensure there are no significant soils/geology impacts.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

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

WHY? See response 9a.

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

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? This analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place to ensure that future projects will not have a significant impact related to sewer capacity and the disposal of wastewater.

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 project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance must comply with existing City regulations that monitor the use and transport of hazardous materials. These regulations have been developed to ensure there are no significant effects related to hazards and hazardous material. The ordinance also applies to residential development, which is typically not a use that is associated with hazardous materials.

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? See response 10a.

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? See response 10a.

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? See response 10a

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

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

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

WHY? No site in Pasadena is within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? See response 10a.

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

WHY? See response 10a. Further, future development projects built under the ordinance will continue to be required to obtain a building permit. This requires review by the Building and Safety Division and the Fire Department to ensure that all safety regulations are met.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be reviewed to ensure all water quality standards and water demands are met.

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

This analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impacts related to future projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place to ensure that future projects will not have a significant impact related to hydrology and water quality.

- 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)? ()*

WHY? See response 11a.

- 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? ()*

WHY? See response 11a.

- 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? See response 11a.

- 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? See response 11a.

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

WHY? See response 11a.

- 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? ()*

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

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. Also, see response 11 a.

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. Also see response 11a.

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. Future projects will be evaluated to determine if the project site is within a dam failure inundation pathway mapped on Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan, and to assess any mitigation measures that may be required. See response 11a.

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. See response 11a.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. *Physically divide an existing community?* ()

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

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

Implementation of State law will allow deviations from development standards to facilitate the construction of affordable housing projects. This could include a deviation from requirements such as building height and setbacks, parking, landscaping/open space etc. The density permitted will also increase with the density bonus provisions. There are no Zone Changes or General Plan Amendments proposed under this analysis, and such actions are not anticipated to result from implementation of the ordinance.

The analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place (e.g. Design Review) to ensure that future projects will not have a significant impact related to Land Use and Planning.

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. Section 65915(g)(1) states: "The granting of a density bonus shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, local coastal plan amendment, zoning change, or other discretionary approval," the project, which specifies how compliance with the Government Code Section is implemented, does not conflict with any applicable plan. See response 12 a.

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

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 within the City limits.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ()

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be reviewed to determine whether there would be a loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

However, 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. Zoning districts permitting residential and mixed-use projects are not permitted in the areas, so any resource would not be impacted.

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

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 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 response 13a.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. The construction of any development project must comply with noise regulations and 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). Regulations in the Municipal Code regarding ambient noise levels apply to stationary noise sources.

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

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

WHY? See response 14a.

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

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

WHY? See response 14a.

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

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

WHY? See response 14a.

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

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

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

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

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

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena’s Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. Section 65915(g)(1) states: “The granting of a density bonus shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a general plan amendment, local coastal plan amendment, zoning change, or other discretionary approval,” the project, which specifies how compliance with the Government Code Section is implemented, does not conflict with any applicable plan.

Use of a density bonus in some development projects is anticipated in the City’s Land Use Element. Implementation of Government Section 65915 may therefore result in an increase in population. There are no Zone Changes or General Plan Amendments proposed under this analysis and such actions are not anticipated to result from implementation of the ordinance. Further, the Land Use Element of the General Plan does account for density bonus.

The analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City has regulatory procedures in place (e.g. Design Review) to ensure that future projects will not have a significant impact related to Population and Housing. This, in combination with the anticipated use of density bonus as outlined in the Land Use Element will result in less than significant impacts to Population and Housing.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. Further, future development projects will be subject to existing regulations that aid in reducing impacts that result from new construction (e.g. the Tenant Relocation Ordinance).

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

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

WHY? See response 15b.

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

a. Fire Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be required to pay all required impact fees to offset any potential impact on public services. Through the permit process, impact fees are paid to off-set the cost of an increase to services such as police, fire, parks, schools etc. Development impact fees are collected upon issuance of a building permit, to reduce any potential impacts to local services. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be required to pay all required impact fees to offset any potential impact on public services.

b. Libraries? ()

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

WHY? See response 16a.

c. Parks? ()

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

WHY? See response 16a.

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

d. *Police Protection?* ()

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

WHY? See response 16a.

e. *Schools?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be required to pay required fees to offset any potential impact on public services. The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

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

WHY? See response 16a.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

The analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City collects fees to offset the cost of any additional recreation needs that might result from proposed development. Any future development projects subject to the ordinance will be required to pay a Residential Impact Fee for recreational facilities.

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?* ()

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

The analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time. The City collects fees to offset the cost of any additional recreation needs that might result from proposed development.

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 project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. Housing projects continue to be reviewed by Planning and Department and Transportation Department staff to ensure that there are no significant impacts related to Traffic and Transportation. The analysis in this Initial Study relates to implementing State law and the direct impact related to future projects is too speculative to evaluate at this time.

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

WHY? See response 18a.

- 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? No development sites within Pasadena are 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 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? See response 18a.

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

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

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

WHY? See response 18a.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted.

State Government Code Section 65915 establishes requirements for the number of offstreet parking spaces to be provided by development projects that include specified percentages of affordable units or that are senior housing projects. Where there is a difference between the requirements in Section 65915 and in Chapter 17.46 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the state law controls. Although the ordinance resulting from the State law may permit development at a lower parking ratio than currently permitted under Chapter 17.46, the new ordinance still require sufficient amounts of parking. Therefore, the proposed ordinance would not result in any significant parking impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code Section 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. It does not conflict with policies or plans supporting alternative transportation. See response 18 a.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. There are no changes that would result in wastewater or solid waste impacts.

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

This analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impacts related to future projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time. Future development project will be required to be reviewed for compliance with all existing regulations. This includes review by the Water and Power Department, the Building Division and Public Works and Transportation Departments. Compliance with applicable regulations will aid in reducing any potentially significant impacts related to Utilities and Service Systems.

b. *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ()*

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

WHY? See response 19a.

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

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

WHY? See response 19a. All new housing is required to obtain building permits, and each project is reviewed by the Water and Power Department to ensure that existing facilities can serve the project, or if the developer must pay fees to upgrade or install new systems. The proposed ordinance does not pose an adverse impact upon utilities or storm water drainage facilities.

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

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

WHY? See response 19a.

e. *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? ()*

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

WHY? See responses 19a and 19c.

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

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

WHY? See response 19a. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years. The Solid Waste Division of the Pasadena Public Works Department has an active recycling program to reduce the metal, glass, plastics, newspapers and yard waste for disposal in approved landfills. This program serves single-family residences and some of the smaller multifamily projects.

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

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

WHY? See response 19a.

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. Future 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, if applicable future projects must comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240).

For larger projects, the applicant may be required to submit a program to the Public Works Department's Solid Waste Division for recycling solid waste. This program must be approved by the Solid Waste Division prior to the issuance of any building permits. The program must contain recycling for office paper, corrugated cardboard, mixed glass and green waste. Therefore, future development resulting from the ordinance would not cause any significant impacts related to solid waste.

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

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

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 project is an amendment to the City of Pasadena's Zoning Code to specify how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented. The project does not propose any new development or building floor area. It involves no changes to the zoning designation of property or to the locations where residential and mixed-use development is permitted. The proposed ordinance will allow the City of Pasadena to implement State law. The law does allow flexibility and relaxation of development standards to facilitate the development of affordable housing projects. This may include building setbacks and height, parking, landscaping/open space etc. There may be a change in population due to the density bonus provision, but density bonus is included in the analysis for the Land Use Element.

Any new construction that is built utilizing the ordinance will be reviewed case by case for any potential impacts to the environment and will be required to mitigate those impacts to a level that is less than

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

significant. There will be no impacts that would degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat of fish or wildlife species, or threaten any plant or animal community, either individually or cumulatively, as a result of the ordinance. This analysis relates to implementing State law and the direct impacts related to future projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time. Future development projects that may occur as a result of the ordinance will be subject to all applicable regulations and reviews to minimize any potential impacts (e.g. Design Review, the Tree Protection Ordinance etc.)

- 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? See response 21a.

- c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ()*

WHY? See response 21a.

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, Title 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |



City of Pasadena
Planning Division
175 N. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-1704

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Density Bonus Amendment

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Pasadena

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: William Trimble

ADDRESS: Planning and Development
City of Pasadena
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91109

TELEPHONE: 626/744-6774

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: California State Government Code Section 65915 mandates a local program to provide density bonuses, incentives and concessions, waivers, and uniform parking standards for development projects that meet certain requirements concerning the inclusion of very low-, low-, moderate- income housing units or senior housing units. The Density Bonus Amendment is an amendment to Title 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code (Zoning Code) specifying how compliance with Government Code 65915 is implemented in the City of Pasadena.

In summary, Government Code Section 65915 provides for the following:

Projects that include at least ten percent of the units for lower income households or five percent of the units for very low income households, or projects that include ten percent of the units for moderate income households in a condominium project or planned development as defined by state law, or senior projects are entitled to a density bonus and also from one to three concessions or incentives related to standards. The percentage of units to be added as a density bonus, from five to 35 percent, depends on the income level to which the units are affordable and the percentage of units that

are affordable. The local jurisdiction shall establish a procedure for granting or denying requests for concessions or incentives. It shall also establish a procedure for waiving or modifying development standards that have the effect of precluding a project that meets the requirements for receiving a concession or incentive or a density bonus from being constructed at the density permitted by the statute or incorporating the concession or incentives to which the project is entitled. Certain findings may be made for denial of a request for concessions or incentives.

The statute establishes a bonus and entitles the project to an additional concession or incentive for providing a childcare facility that meets certain requirements. It also establishes a density bonus for applicants seeking a subdivision approval, if land is donated for affordable housing.

Finally, the statute establishes onsite parking ratios for all units in development projects that include the percentages of units necessary for a density bonus or concessions: one space for zero to one bedroom; two spaces for two or three bedrooms; two and one half spaces for four or more bedrooms. The ratios are inclusive of handicapped and guest parking.

FINDING

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

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

 The proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, however there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program on file in the Planning Division Office were adopted to reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

 The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Completed by: William Trimble
Title: Senior Planner
Date: October 5, 2005

Determination Approved: *Janet P. [Signature]*
Title: *Sp. Planner*
Date: *10/6/05*

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: October 6, 2005 through October 26, 2005
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: Yes No
INITIAL STUDY REVISED: Yes No