

disaster, the Fire Marshall is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency.

The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project area is not within any of these dam inundation areas.

There are no areas in the City designated as eligible for flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA).

*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?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate 4-2, Wildfire Hazard Map, the project site is in an area of low fire hazard.

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

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

**WHY?** The project will not by itself violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The act of changing the zoning will have no affect on the water quality. Any future projects based on the proposed zoning must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations.

There are no bodies of water near the project, whose surface waters would receive any discharge from the project. However, if there is water runoff from the future development sites, this runoff may be discharged via Los Angeles County Flood Control Channels into the San Pedro Bay.

Future projects will likely consist of multi-family development. The residential uses allowed under the proposed zoning are not point source generators of water pollutants. As an urban development, future projects would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. These pollutants are permitted by the County-wide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations. Furthermore, futures projects must meet the City's SUSMP requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have no related significant impacts.

The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water.

*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?** The project is a zone map amendment and does not propose any specific development project that would install groundwater wells, or otherwise directly withdraw groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions at the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

Future development will continue to use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, future projects could indirectly withdraw groundwater. However, the proposed water usage would be negligible in comparison to the overall water service provided by the Department of Water and Power. This minor amount of water use would not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies.

During drought conditions, future projects will need to comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) the project shall only consume 90% of expected consumption. To ensure compliance with this ordinance, the applicant shall submit a water conservation plan limiting the project's water consumption to 90% of expected consumption. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans shall comply with the approved water conservation plan.

- 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?** By changing the zoning and the land use designation in the project area drainage patterns will not be changed, streams will not be altered, and erosion rates will not increase. How future projects may affect erosion, drainage, and stream courses and they will be reviewed at the time a specific development is proposed. For future projects, the drainage of surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. The applicant shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena Comprehensive General Plan, most properties in the City are not normally subject to flooding.

- 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?** Changing the zoning and General Plan land use diagram from one residential zoning category to another will not by itself have an effect on drainage patterns. Any future projects constructed must continue to meet applicable standards, including compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. This ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water

runoff rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process.

Since future projects would not involve alteration of a discernable watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates are required to not exceed pre-development rates, proposed projects would not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that would result in flooding. Therefore, proposed projects would not cause flooding and would have no associated impacts.

The City of Pasadena contains two streams, the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek. The project area is not located near either stream. Therefore the project will not alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

e. *Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?* ( )

**WHY?** The proposed project, by itself, will not increase runoff. Future projects allowed by this project could increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces onsite. However, as discussed above in Sections 11.c) and 11.d), compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 11.a) and 11.c), the project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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

**WHY?** The project will not by itself degrade water quality. For future projects, runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. Future projects will most likely connect to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems. The environmental review of future projects proposed under the new zoning and land use designations will assess any impacts on groundwater quality.

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

**WHY?** According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project area is not located in a dam inundation area.

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

**WHY?** The entire City of Pasadena is in Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map Community Number 065050. In Zone D the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations.

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?** According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. For future multi-family projects, an on-site drainage system will convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

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.

**12. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The project will not physically divide an existing community. The project does not include the construction of, nor will it allow the construction of any project that would physically divide the community. The project proposes to reduce residential density, which will have no dividing effect.

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 land use map designates the southern portion of the study area as Medium-High Density Residential (0-32 dwelling units / acre) and the northern portion of the study area as Medium-Density Residential (0-16 dwelling units / acre). Given, the General Plan provides for a range of densities, it can be inferred that the General Plan goals and policies could be met at a range of densities, not solely at maximum build out.

This project calls for zoning that reduces the density to ranges allowed in the General Plan Land Use Diagram; maintains the permitted types of uses called for in the Land Use Diagram; implements policies in

the General Plan that seek preservation of Pasadena's character, scale, and residential neighborhoods; and allows for continued housing growth.

The proposed re-zoning and general plan amendment would allow for a balanced implementation of the General Plan goals and objectives. Specifically, this zone change and general plan amendment helps implement objectives one, five, and seven. These objectives seek to support the preservation of Pasadena's character, scale, and residential neighborhoods.

While the zone change is in compliance with the land use plan, policies and regulations the project includes a general plan amendment. The General Plan Land Use Map, as described in the preceding paragraphs, allows for a broad range of densities. For instance the land use designation for the southern section of the study area is 0-32 units/acre. The proposal to revise the General Plan map will assist in refining and narrowing this broad density range (in the previously mentioned case, to 0-16 units/acre), and is necessary to establish consistency with the proposed zoning revisions

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

**WHY?** There are no Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in Pasadena.

**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? ( )

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 2004 Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City's General Plan states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel and stone: Eaton Wash, and Devils Gate Reservoir. The project is not near these areas.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? ( )

**WHY?** The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

**14. NOISE.** Will the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ( )

**WHY?** Changing the zoning and General Plan land use designation from one type of residential zoning to another will not by itself increase the noise in an area. However, future projects constructed under this new zoning may increase the level of noise in the surrounding area. The increase is expected to be less than significant, as projects are required to adhere to the adopted noise regulations for residential areas.

The uses allowed by the proposed zoning do not include stationary noise sources. The only long-term noise generated by future projects would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

It is too speculative at this time to predict what projects may be constructed in the future. However, all projects must adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. Traffic and parking plans for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that projects would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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

**WHY?** The project is not located near any light rail tracks or freeways.

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

**WHY?** See response to 14.a. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The project does not involve construction and will not increase ambient noise levels

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

**WHY?** The project will not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. The affected properties will be down zoned and will remain residential. There is no construction proposed as part of the code revisions.

- 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 within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank.

- 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?** The project is not within the vicinity of the Police Heliport or the Fire Camp in the Arroyo Seco.

**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?** There are approximately 250 existing units in the study area. The zone change and general plan amendment will allow for the construction of approximately 48 units without the workforce housing overlay and approximately 90 units with the overlay. The existing zoning pattern would allow for the construction of 190 more units. The proposed zone change provides for a balanced increase in population growth, allowing for 48 to 90 more units to be built but less than the 190 units allowed by the present zoning. The addition of 48 to 90 units is not a significant increase in population and is consistent with the growth projected in the Land Use Element.

Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. Thus, development of the proposed project would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** This project does not call for the demolition of any buildings, neither directly or indirectly. Furthermore, the zoning code allows for the reconstruction of non-conforming buildings in the event of an involuntary destruction by a catastrophic event.

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

**WHY?** This project does not call for the direct removal or displacement of people. The zone change and general plan amendment allows for continued housing growth on the majority of the lots within the project area. The density in specific areas is proposed to be reduced, but Multi-Family development will still be permitted in the project area. Density increases are also proposed as an incentive for future projects to provide workforce housing to serve members of the community that may be in need of housing.

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

a. Fire Protection? ( )

**WHY?** Changing the zoning and the general plan designation so that a possible addition of 90 units could be constructed, in comparison to the 190 units permitted under the present zoning, will not affect the provisions of public services. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows greater density than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on public services.

b. Libraries? ( )

**WHY?** See response 16 a.

c. Parks? ( )

**WHY?**

d. Police Protection? ( )

**WHY?** See response 16 a.

d. Schools? ( )

**WHY?** See response 16 a..

e. Other public facilities? ( )



WHY? See response 16 a.

**17. RECREATION.**

- a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?* ( )

**WHY?** Changing the zoning and general plan designation so that a possible addition of 90 units could be constructed, in comparison to the 190 units permitted under the present zoning, will not affect the provisions of public services. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows more than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on public services. In addition, the City collects a park impact fee for each residential unit constructed and on each residential addition over 400 sq. ft. in size. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project contains no recreational facilities nor does it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

**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 project area currently consists of approximately 250 housing units. The existing zoning would allow for an additional 190 additional units, or a total of approximately 440 units. Staff's recommended strategy would allow for approximately 48 more units, or a total of approximately 300 units. The optional overlay would allow for approximately 90 more units, or a total of approximately 340 units. The study area consists of approximately 14 acres of land bisected by North Los Robles Avenue – a principal arterial and multi-modal corridor – and is bordered by Mountain Street – identified as a collector street in the 2004 Mobility Element of the General Plan.

The 2004 Mobility Element reviewed the traffic impacts if this area were built out at 32 unit/acre. The traffic study found that by 2015 the Level of Service at Los Robles and Mountain would not change. Since the project area is well served with a principal arterial and a collector street and the traffic study for the 2004 Mobility Element reported that no significant change in LOS would occur at a density of 32 unit/acre, the traffic created by down zoning this area to allow for no more than 24 units/acre will not have a significant

effect on traffic. It is too speculative to determine what future projects will be built in the project area, but new residential projects are required to be reviewed by the Transportation Department to ensure that there will be less than significant traffic effects as a result of a project.

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 18 a.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? ( )

**WHY?** The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project 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?** Changing the General Plan and Zoning from one type of residential zone to another will not increase hazards or incompatible uses. There is no new development proposed, rather changes to the permitted density within the existing residential areas.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ( )

**WHY?** Changing the General Plan and Zoning from one type of residential zone to another will not result in inadequate emergency access. There is no new development proposed as part of this project that would result in inadequate emergency access.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity (vehicle or bicycle)? ( )

**WHY?** Changing the General Plan and Zoning from one type of residential zone to another will not result in inadequate parking capacity. The Zoning Code currently establishes the minimum number of vehicle and bicycle parking spaces required for development projects. Future building projects will continue to be required to comply with all City regulations.

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

**WHY?** The zone change and general plan amendment will have no effect on adopted policies, plans, or programs dealing with alternative transportation. There are no proposed changes to these plans.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The project area currently consists of approximately 250 housing units. The existing zoning would allow for an additional 190 additional units, or a total of approximately 440 units. Staff's recommended strategy would allow for approximately 48 more units, or a total of approximately 300 units. The optional overlay would allow for approximately 90 more units, or a total of approximately 340 units. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows more than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on wastewater treatment. Future individual projects will continue to be reviewed for compliance with waste water treatment requirements. It is too speculative at this time to evaluate future projects.

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

**WHY?** The project area currently consists of approximately 250 housing units. The existing zoning would allow for an additional 190 additional units, or a total of approximately 440 units. Staff's recommended strategy would allow for approximately 48 more units, or a total of approximately 300 units. The optional overlay would allow for approximately 90 more units, or a total of approximately 340 units. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows more than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on wastewater treatment. However, any individual project built after the new zoning is in place will be analyzed to determine if new treatment facilities are required. There is no construction proposed as part of the code revisions, and future projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time. It is not anticipated that the expansion of existing facilities or new facilities would be required as the General Plan EIR provides for a greater intensity of development that proposed.

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

**WHY?** The project will not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Any future projects would be infill in nature, located in a developed urban area, where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins.

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

**WHY?** The project area currently consists of approximately 250 housing units. The existing zoning would allow for an additional 190 additional units, or a total of approximately 440 units. Staff's recommended strategy would allow for approximately 48 more units, or a total of approximately 300 units. The optional overlay would allow for approximately 90 more units, or a total of approximately 340 units. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows more than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on wastewater treatment. The Final EIR for the 2004 General Plan Update verified that water supply could meet demand if the City was built to the maximum density allowed by the General Plan.

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

**WHY?** See responses to 19 a. and b.

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

**WHY?** The project area currently consists of approximately 250 housing units. The existing zoning would allow for an additional 190 additional units, or a total of approximately 440 units. Staff's recommended strategy would allow for approximately 48 more units, or a total of approximately 300 units. The optional overlay would allow for approximately 90 more units, or a total of approximately 340 units. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of the current land use designation; a land use designation which allows more than the proposed project. In comparison to the analysis in the 2004 General Plan EIR, the proposed project will decrease the impact on solid waste disposal. The Final EIR for the 2004 General Plan Update verified that landfill capacity could meet demand if the City was built to the maximum allowed density permitted by the General Plan.

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

**WHY?** The project's change in the allowable housing density will have no affect on the area's compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**20. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.**

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063( c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 18 at the end of the checklist.

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. A copy of the Final Program EIR and the General Plan is available for review at the office of Planning Division, located at 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91109. Interested parties may call this office at (626) 744-4009.
- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. The proposal is for a zone change and general plan amendment in the subject area from a higher density residential zone to a lower density residential zone, and a General Plan amendment from Medium-High Density Residential (0-32 unit per acre) and Medium Density Residential (0-16 units per acre) to reflect the appropriate Medium Density Residential (0-16 units per acre) and Low-Medium Density Residential (2 units per lot).

The proposed zone change and General Plan amendment has been reviewed for consistency with the policy, goals, and objectives of the General Plan. The policy statements are contained in the Revised 2004 Land Use Element of the City's General Plan, a document that was adopted in conjunction with the Program EIR that analyzed and identified potential impacts on various items in the checklist list above.

- c) Mitigation Measures. Since the proposed zone change and General Plan amendment have been determined not to have a significant impact on any of the environmental items in the checklist, there is no need for any mitigation measures.

**21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- a. *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ( )*

                                                                

WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

There is no physical development proposed as part of the Zone Change and General Plan Amendment. Future projects are too speculative to evaluate at this time, however such projects will be required to be reviewed to ensure there are no significant impacts. Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

- b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project? ( )*

**WHY?** The proposal to change the zoning designation and to amend the General Plan Land Use map does not involve any new construction. The 2004 General Plan EIR reviewed the potential impacts of a higher density than what is proposed by this project. Any mitigation measures that would be required by that EIR will still be effective even if the project is approved. Since the project lowers the density from that proposed in the previously adopted EIR, this project will not increase the severity of or create new impacts that are cumulatively considerable which have not already been studied and mitigated. Any future projects within the study area that could cause an environmental impact would be subject to CEQA review.

The project involves no new construction and does not have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

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

**WHY?** As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

W:\Community Planning\Zone Changes\Garfield Heights - Adena\Environmental\Initial Study - Draft 1.doc

## INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- | #  | Document   |
|----|--|
| 1  | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 2004 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.  |
| 2  | Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Maps- the official Los Angeles and Mt. Wilson, quadrant maps were released in 1977.  |
| 3  | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993   |
| 4  | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001  |
| 5  | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983   |
| 6  | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002  |
| 7  | Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004  |
| 8  | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.   |
| 9  | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868   |
| 10 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004   |
| 11 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004   |
| 12 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002  |
| 13 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854   |
| 14 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997   |
| 15 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994  |
| 16 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002   |
| 17 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975  |
| 18 | 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.  |
| 19 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998   |
| 20 | 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 |
| 21 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations n Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837  |
| 22 | Transportation, Housing, and Child Care Survey: A Report Describing the Results and Findings of a Survey of Employees in the City of Pasadena, Child Care Planning Associates for the City of Pasadena, April 11, 1990   |
| 23 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896  |
| 24 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001  |
| 25 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code   |

U://MyDocuments/wordfile/IS/ISREF.doc7.29.03