

**ATTACHMENT C
ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY**

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

FINAL 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: Conditional Use Permit #4663 (Installation and Operation of La Salle High School Athletic Field Lights)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena, Planning and Development Department
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: John Steinmeyer, Senior Planner, (626) 744-6880
4. Project Location: 3880 East Sierra Madre Boulevard, Pasadena, CA
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: La Salle High School, 3880 East Sierra Madre Boulevard, Pasadena, CA
6. General Plan Designation: Institutional
7. Zoning: PS
8. Description of the Project: The installation of four (4) light poles (80 feet in height) to provide night time lighting on an existing high school football field.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Surrounding land uses include single family residential development to the north and south; a church to the west; and the La Salle High School campus to the east.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Building Department (building permit); Department of Public Works.

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.	

John Steinmeyer 7/24/06
Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige Sack 7/24/06
Reviewed By/Date

John Steinmeyer
Printed Name

Jennifer Paige Sack
Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: 7/24/06

Adoption attested to by: John Steinmeyer Jennifer Paige Sack
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
-

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: April 14, 2006
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development Department
 Case Manager: John Steinmeyer

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

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 residential developments to the north and west of the project site have views of the San Gabriel mountains. The light poles are approximately 80 feet in height by two feet in diameter. The poles are topped with two rows of lights that create a rectangle area of a maximum of 12 feet by three feet. The exterior of the poles and lights is a natural steel finish, gray in color. The nearest residential properties to the south of the project site (Canfield Road) are located approximately 35 feet from a light pole. The nearest residential properties to the west of the project site (Hastings Ranch Road) are located approximately 450 feet from a light pole. The nearest residential properties to the north of the project site (East Sierra Madre Boulevard) are located approximately 270 feet from a light pole.

The poles would be visible in the foreground of the views from the residential developments to the north and west of the project site. However, due to their distance from the viewpoints, their narrow design, and the gray color that on typical day will generally blend with the colors of the mountains, the impact on the views will be less than significant.

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

WHY? The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway, and not along any scenic roadway corridors identified in the City's General Plan documents. The project would not negatively affect any historic structures, landscape features, or vegetation that contribute to the views along any corridor. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.

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

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

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

WHY? The light poles are approximately 80 feet in height by two feet in diameter. The poles are topped with two rows of lights that create a rectangle area of approximately 12 feet by three feet. The exterior of the poles and lights is a natural steel finish, gray in color. The nearest residential properties to the south of the project site are located approximately 35 feet from a light pole. The nearest residential properties to the west of the project site are located approximately 450 feet from a light pole. The nearest residential properties to the north of the project site are located approximately 270 feet from a light pole.

The poles would be visible in the vicinity of existing residential and institutional development. The existing neighborhood is in an urban area. The project is located on an institutional property on an existing athletic field with other metal features (e.g., bleachers, fencing) that are compatible with the proposed poles. Due to the poles' narrow design, neutral gray color, the sky, and existing variety of urban features in the vicinity, the impact on the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings will be less than significant.

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

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

WHY? An illumination study (prepared by Musco Lighting) was submitted on behalf of the applicant to show the existing nighttime illumination in the vicinity and the estimated illumination that would exist at the time when the lights are operating at full capacity. The levels of illumination are measured in horizontal footcandles. ~~According to the applicant, the amount of nighttime illumination that exists along most points of the sidewalk on Canfield Road, the closest residential street to the proposed project, ranges from .01 to .02 foot candles. The illumination that exists directly under typical street lights, at ground level, or a full moon on a clear night, for example, is approximately 3.0 footcandles.~~

According to Section 17.40.080 (Outdoor Lighting) of the Zoning Code, Lighting shall be energy-efficient, and shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site, and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. No lighting on private property shall produce an illumination level greater than one (1.0) footcandle on any property within a residential zoning district except on the site of the light source.

The Expanded Blanket Grid 3 illumination map shows the estimated nighttime illumination of the lights at full capacity, in the vicinity of the project. The nearest residential properties to the south of the project site (on Canfield Road) are located approximately 35 feet from a light pole. The map shows that the maximum illumination that would occur at the northern property line of the rear yards would range from .01 to 1.16 .64 foot candles. The maximum illumination that would occur within the building footprint of any existing residential use would be .13 .06 footcandles.

Based on the illumination study, the project would increase the amount of nighttime illumination ~~in the rear portions of the yards of~~ on some of the residential properties on Canfield Road. However, ~~the study shows that~~ because none of the estimated footcandle measurements would exceed 1.0 foot candle standard established by the Zoning Code. In addition, the lights will have visors to reduce diffused light and help direct illumination onto the athletic field. Therefore, the impact of light or glare from the project is expected to be less than significant.

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 growing areas. Commercial Growing Area/Grounds is permitted in the CG (General Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the RS (Residential Single-Family), and RM (Residential Multi-Family) districts. The use is also permitted within certain specific plan areas.

- 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).

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

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

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

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMD.

In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth.

The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations for the site. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan, and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high.

Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. However, the project itself is well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) land use, construction, and mobile emission thresholds for significant air quality impacts, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate and air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and would have no related significant impacts.

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)?* ()

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 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.

As shown in Section 5.b, the proposed project will not exceed the SCAQMD's Thresholds for Significance. The SCAQMD established these thresholds in consideration of cumulative air pollution in the SCAB. Thus, projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds do not significantly contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Since the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

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

WHY? According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook the project is not located near sensitive receptors and is not likely to generate any significant toxic air emissions.

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

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

WHY? This type of use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." 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?*

()

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

WHY? The project is in a developed urban area. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site.

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?* ()

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The project is not located near any of these natural habitat areas.

The project is located in a developed urban area. The only vegetation present onsite is landscaping. The project site and surrounding area do not include any vegetation that constitutes a plant community.

c. *Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ()*

WHY? Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season.

The project side does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The project is located in a developed urban area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat.

d. *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ()*

WHY? The project is located in a developed urban area and does not involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will the project result in a barrier to migration or movement. Therefore, the project will have no impact to wildlife movement.

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

WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". The site contains no trees protected by this ordinance or

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

trees designated as landmarks. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would have no related impacts.

- f. *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*
()

WHY? Currently, there 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.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?* ()

WHY? There are no known buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site having a significant historic value to the City which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered by the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

WHY? There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. The site has been developed with institutional uses since the 1940s. If archaeological resources once existed on-site, it is likely that previous grading, construction, and modern use of the site have either removed or destroyed them. Consequently, surficial soils on the project site are devoid of archaeological resources.

The development of the proposed project would involve minor excavation to establish footings for the light poles. However, the proposed grading would not encroach into undisturbed soils. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to archaeological resources.

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

WHY? The project site lies on the valley floor in an urbanized portion of the City of Pasadena. This portion of the City does not contain any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to contain paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? There are no known human remains on the site. The project site is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. 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 project does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan. Further the project will comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include lighting conservation features.

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

Why? (*Oil-based products.*) The proposed project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources.

(*Energy.*) The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the local electrical company. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. This consumption will be lessened by adherence to the performance standards of California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code Title 24.

(*Water.*) This project will not result in an increase of water consumption.

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

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

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ()

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena's General Plan, the San Andreas Fault is a "master" active fault and controls seismic hazard in Southern California. This fault is located approximately 21 miles north of Pasadena.

The County of Los Angeles and the City of Pasadena are both affected by Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Pasadena is in four USGS Quadrants, the Los Angeles, and the Mt. Wilson quadrants were mapped for earthquake fault zones under the Alquist-Priolo Act in 1977. The Pasadena and Condor Peak USGS Quadrangles have not yet been mapped per the Alquist-Priolo Act.

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This fault is located primarily south of City limits, however, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the following three additional zones of potential fault rupture in the City:

- The Eagle Rock Fault Hazard Management Zone, which traverses the southwestern portion of the City;
- The Sierra Madre Fault Hazard Management Zone, which includes the Tujunga Fault, the North Sawpit Fault, and the South Branch of the San Gabriel Fault. This Fault Zone is primarily north of the City, and only the very northeast portion of the City and portions of the Upper Arroyo lie within the mapped fault zone.
- A Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, which appears to join a continuation of the Sycamore Canyon Fault. This fault area traverses the northern portion of the City as is identified as a Fault Hazard Management Zone for Critical Facilities Only.

The project site is not within any of these potential fault rupture zones. The closest mapped fault zone, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, is 10 miles south of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

WHY? See 9.a.i. Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking.

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

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? ()*

WHY?

The project site is not within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Liquefaction and Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic related ground failure.

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? ()*

WHY?

The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

WHY? (Excavation and Grading) Construction of the project will lead minor excavation to provide footings for the light poles. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions. Therefore there will be less than significant impact.

Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind and/or water erosion. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations will be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site.

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? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain. As shown on Plate 2-4

of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The proposed project is not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not likely cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, will ensure the project will not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils.

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? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential.

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? ()*

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

WHY? The project will not create any 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? ()*

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

WHY? The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances. Further there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of 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? ()*

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

WHY? The project does not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material.

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

<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 project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste.. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

- d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ()*

WHY? The project site is not located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA). The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist onsite.

- 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? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, 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? The project site is not 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? The construction and operation of the proposed project would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.