

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

proposed drainage plan is appropriately designed and that the proposed runoff does not exceed the capacity of the City's storm drain system. The proposed drainage of the site would not channel runoff on exposed soil, would not direct flows over unvegetated soils, and would not otherwise increase the erosion or siltation potential of the site or any downstream areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts from changes to drainage patterns.

Although the project would change the site's drainage pattern, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. As discussed above, the project is subject to NPDES requirements, including the County-wide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. In accordance with these requirements, the applicant is required to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP. To comply with the SUSMP, the project must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. Complying with the City's SUSMP and implementing the required BMPs will ensure that the proposed project would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to drainage patterns.

- d. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? ()*

WHY? As discussed, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernable drainage course. The proposed minor changes to the site's drainage patterns are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required 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 the project does not involve alteration of a discernable watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates are required to not exceed pre-development rates, the proposed project does not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that would result in flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause flooding and would have no associated impacts.

- 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 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

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

would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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

WHY? As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these Stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

The project, however, also has the potential to generate short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The County-wide MS4 permit requires construction sites to implement BMPs to reduce the potential for construction-induced water pollutant impacts. These BMPs include methods to prevent contaminated construction site stormwater from entering the drainage system and preventing construction-induced contaminants from entering the drainage system. The MS4 identifies the following minimum requirements for construction sites in Los Angeles County:

1. Sediments generated on the project site shall be retained using adequate Treatment Control or Structural BMPs;
2. Construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be retained at the project site to avoid discharge to streets, drainage facilities, receiving waters, or adjacent properties by wind or runoff;
3. Non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity shall be contained at the project site; and
4. Erosion from slopes and channels shall be controlled by implementing an effective combination of BMPs (as approved in Regional Board Resolution No. 99-03), such as the limiting of grading scheduled during the wet season; inspecting graded areas during rain events; planting and maintenance of vegetation on slopes; and covering erosion susceptible slopes.

BMPs will minimize construction-induced water pollutants by controlling erosion and sediment, establishing waste handling/disposal requirements, and providing non-storm water management procedures.

Complying with the 4's construction site requirements will ensure that construction of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water 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? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

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

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community? ()

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar development on all sides, and the project consists of an infill development within a highly urbanized area. Monte Vista Grove Homes has been in this location since the early 1920's and is self contained within the neighborhood. No adverse impact will result.

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

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

WHY? The project is consistent with both the PS (Public and Semi-Public) zoning designation and the Institutional General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element.

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

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.

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? 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. The project is not located 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? The project consists of the net new addition of 50 residential units to an existing residential campus for retired church officials. The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment

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

noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

The project would also not expose persons to excessive noise. The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. According to Figure 2 of the City's Noise Element (2002) the project site lies between the 55 dBA and 65 dBA noise contours. This level of noise is within the "Clearly Acceptable" range for the proposed land use, as shown in Figure 1 of the City's Noise Element (2002). Therefore, the project would not expose future and current residents of the proposed homes to 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 sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

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 project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project 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.

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

WHY? The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (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

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

Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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 involves a net gain of 50 residential units for retired church officials which is consistent with the land use designations for the site (See Section 12 of this document). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. 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.

The project is in a developed area where the major infrastructure is in place. The project will result in the potential net gain of 100 persons in residential population, and 50 residential units 7,200 square feet of administrative, office and dining activity space. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will be the responsibility of the applicant. Since the project is in conformance with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations, this gain will not be significant.

In addition, based on the 2000-2005 Housing Element, there were 54,114 housing units and 97,403 jobs in the year 2000. This is a ratio of 1.8:1 and makes Pasadena a job-rich City. The proposed project is to add a net gain of 50 units to an existing campus for retired church officials of 92 units, bringing the total number of units available to 142. This addition will add to the supply of affordable housing for seniors in the City.

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

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

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

WHY? The project involves the demolition of 14 housing units and the construction of 64 housing units for a net gain 50 units. Building AQ (proposed for demolition) has no permanent residents living in it. For all other buildings (AR, AO and AM) Monte Vista Grove Homes will plan to relocate the residents on campus to an equal or larger apartment prior to demolition and construction. It is anticipated that there will be a one – two year delay between the time a decision is made to move forward with a phase and the actual time that demolition occurs. This will give the Campus ample time to relocate residents as existing apartment units become vacant.

This project conforms to the 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002; therefore this housing gain is within the housing forecast in this element. It is also within the range of housing forecast for Pasadena contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments.

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

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

WHY? See 15.b

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 will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of the construction of 50 net new residential units for seniors and possibly could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities. Furthermore, the project applicant is required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to fire service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

The project will incorporate safety and security features, including fire sprinklers, alarm systems, and adequate access for emergency vehicles.

b. Libraries? ()

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 project is located approximately 0.87 miles from the Lamanda Park branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ()

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

WHY? The project is located within 0.54 miles of the nearest park, Eaton Blanche Park. According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged under the Quimby Act. The park mitigation fee will be \$19,743 per residential unit. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks.

However, the park impact fee for affordable housing units is \$756/unit. MVGH is a not for profit Multi-Level Retirement Community founded in 1924 to provide housing for low to moderate income qualified retirees of the Presbyterian Church USA. MVGH charges an entry fee of under \$8,000 and month fees ranging from \$233 - \$673 based on the square footage of the apartment rented. Residents are requested to make voluntary contributions to MVGH based on their monthly income. A means test is not done, nor is any qualified retiree turned away due to their inability to pay. The applicant is working with the Housing Department to submit the required documentation for the reduction in park fees.

d. Police Protection? ()

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of 50 net new units for seniors and 7,200 square feet of non-residential uses which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Police facilities. Furthermore, the project applicant is required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to police service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

The proposed site is in an area which has reported low crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The project will increase the need for police protection. However, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

e. Schools? ()

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

WHY? 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. The proposed project is the

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

addition of 50 residential units to an existing campus for retired Presbyterian Ministers, their spouses and other church officials. No increase in school-aged population is anticipated from this project.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

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

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes, and development fees this impact is not significant.

17. RECREATION.

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

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

WHY? The project is located 0.54 miles from the nearest park, Eaton Blanche Park. The proposed project is the addition of 50 residential units to an existing campus for retired Presbyterian Ministers, their spouses and other church officials, and expected to generate 100 residents (couples) at a maximum. However, in accordance with Ordinance #6252, 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?* ()

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

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

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a. *Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?* ()

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

WHY? The project is located along San Pasqual Street and is supported by a roadway network consisting of San Gabriel, Del Mar and El Nido. Of these roadways, San Gabriel Boulevard and Del Mar Boulevard are considered a principal Mobility/Multimodal Corridors identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

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

A traffic study was prepared for the project in May 2006, by Katz, Okitsu & Associates. This traffic study is available for review as part of the project file at the City of Pasadena, Hale Building, and 175 North Garfield Avenue Pasadena, CA 91109-7215 on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 to 5:00 and Friday from 8:00 to 12:00. The four Intersections studied were: San Gabriel Blvd, at Del Mar Blvd.; San Gabriel Blvd. at San Pasqual Street; El Nido Avenue at Del Mar Blvd.; and El Nido Ave. at San Pasqual Street. The project would add approximately 101 vehicle trip ends a day to traffic, including 3 trips in the AM peak hour and 8 trips during the PM peak hour. This constitutes a 1.2 and 2.2 percent increase to the average daily traffic (ADT) volume on San Pasqual Street and Randolph Avenue, respectively. Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately ten percent of the project's trip will utilize the future extension of Kinneloa Avenue. The project is subject to contributing a fair share to improve nearby transit stops at San Pasqual Street/San Gabriel Boulevard (both northbound and southbound) including funding the purchase and installation of bus benches and trash receptacles. The project is also subject to contributing \$5,000 to the Citywide Transportation Monitoring Program and \$2,200 for its fair share contribution to the Kinneloa Street extension. Funding for these improvements is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. These conditions are incorporated into the project as Mitigation Measures 1 and 2. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures, the project's potential to increase traffic would not be significant impact in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

Mitigation Measure: T1

Citywide Transportation Monitoring Program \$5,000
Funding of the improvement is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

According to the City's "Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines" August, 2005 the following are thresholds for impacts to any street segment by a development project (excluding ambient growth) and the required level of mitigation:

ADT* Growth on Street Segment	Required Traffic Mitigations
0.0 - 2.4% ADT Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Review and Conditions
2.5% - 4.9% ADT Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Study is required if existing count is greater than 2,000 VPD • Soft mitigation required
5.0% - 7.4 % ADT Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Study Required • Soft Mitigation Required • Physical Mitigation May Be Required
7.5% + ADT Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Study Required • Soft Mitigation Required • Extensive Physical Mitigation May Be Required • Project Alternatives May Be Considered
*ADT = Average Daily Traffic	

As identified in the project's traffic study the proposed project may increase vehicular traffic on street segments on San Pasqual Street by 1.2% and on Randolph Avenue, south of San Pasqual Street, by 2.2% over existing conditions. This is the lowest level of impact, requiring only City staff review. For Intersections, there were no significant impacts at any of the four study intersections as a result of the project.

Mitigation Measure: T2

Kinneloa Street Extension \$2,200
Funding of the improvement is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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

Because the project will contribute 10 trips on Kinneloa Avenue, the proposed project shall be conditioned to contribute a fair share of improvement costs associated with the Kinneloa Avenue roadway extension project as identified in the East Pasadena Specific Plan and included in the City's Capital Improvement Program. The estimated cost of the extension is \$1,387,000. The project's fair share is calculated by comparing the project's anticipated traffic on Kinneloa Avenue once the extension is in place. Due to the neighborhood-serving businesses on Foothill Boulevard, it is anticipated that 10 of the future project trips will utilize Kinneloa Avenue. Therefore, the project's Fair Share Cost of this extension is .00016% or \$2,200.

b. 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.

c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? ()

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the PasDOT and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. The project proposes to maintain its current access to the roadway stem, which consists of four driveways along San Pasqual Street. The driveway serving B Street serves as an exit, the driveway serving C Street serves as an entrance and the driveways serving A and D Streets allow two-way traffic. They will be adequate to handle the expected volumes of projected traffic. In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

d. Result in inadequate emergency access? ()

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the PasDOT and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes will meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards.

The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

e. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ()

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

WHY? Due to the increased intensity of land use, the project will increase the demand for parking. However, the project will comply with the number of parking and loading spaces required by the Zoning Code. According to Section 17.46.07 – Reduced Parking in Senior Citizens Housing Developments, the number of spaces on the campus can be reduced to not less than 0.50 spaces per dwelling unit provided that additional findings can be made for each of the following:

1. The extent of the parking problem in the neighborhood
2. The probability that the prospective residents will have an average of 0.50 vehicles per dwelling unit.
3. Prospective residents will be over 55 years of age.
4. Future, unexpected parking problems resulting from the proposed development can be corrected.
5. Alternate transportation is available for the residents of the development or public transportation is close by.

The above findings can be made for the proposed project.

The campus will have a total of 216 parking spaces. Of those 216, 11 stalls in front of the administration building are dedicated for staff and another 12 stalls along the west side of campus are dedicated for both staff and guest parking. The remaining 193 spaces are for the residents. The parking is located throughout the campus and located near the residents. Based on 0.50 vehicles per dwelling unit, at a 141 units the number of spaces required would be 71 spaces. Therefore there is adequate parking for both the residents and employees.

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

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

WHY? Objective 3.2.2 of the City's 2004 Mobility Element is to "Encourage Non-Auto Travel". In accordance with the policies set by this objective, the PasD OT has made the following recommendations to improve the project's alternative transportation opportunities:

Fund bus stop upgrades at the following locations:

- a. San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (northbound)
- b. San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (southbound)

These recommendations have been incorporated into the project as Mitigation Measure T-3. With the incorporation of this mitigation measure, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and would have no related significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure T3: Fund bus stop upgrades as shown below (total of \$7,000) at the following locations:

- a. San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (northbound)
- b. San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (southbound)

The project is near Del Mar, a principal mobility according to the 2004 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan.

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

The project is located near the bus routes MTA 267 and ARTS 60 and not near the light rail line from Downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena according to the adopted 2004 Mobility Element of the General Plan. In addition, MVGH has a 7 passenger van with a wheelchair lift which is used for regular transportation to medical appointments, shopping and regularly scheduled social excursions. A larger 17 passenger bus is used for longer regularly scheduled outings.

The project includes provisions for the use of bicycles in the placement of two bicycle racks on the campus.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of the addition of 50 net new units to a senior campus and as a result, would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to water/wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service areas of the water and wastewater service purveyors. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyors are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. The only water and wastewater improvements required for the project are on-site unit connections to the existing systems, which are subject to connection fees. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

The proposed project consists of 50 net new units and as a result, would increase the demand for both water and wastewater service. Per the City's Water and Power Department, this project is anticipated water demand 13,720 gallons per day (gpd). The City of Pasadena Water and Power, Water Division has stated that can serve water to this project. There is an 8 inch water main inside San Pasqual Street, 28 feet north of the south property line of San Pasqual Street, and an 8 inch water main in El Nido Avenue, 8 feet west of the west property line of El Nido Avenue.

Per the City's Public Works Engineering Division and/or the Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16, this project is anticipated wastewater demand is 10,040 gallons per day (gpd).

The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities.

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?* ()

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 project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 11, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

Further, the project applicant must submit and implement an on-site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department; and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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? The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. This project will result in an increase of approximately 13,720 gallons per day in water consumption. The current use consumes approximately 27,641 gallons of water per day. The net gain in water consumption would be 13,720 gallons of water per day. During periods of drought, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which reduces monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no significant impact under this topic.

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? As discussed in Section 19.b) of this report, the proposed project consists of 10,040 gal/day, and as a result, would increase the demand for wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service area of the wastewater service purveyor. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyor are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no significant related impacts.

As discussed in Section 19.b) of this report, the proposed project consists of 50 net new residential units and approximately 7200 s.f of non-residential uses, and as a result, would increase the demand for wastewater service. Per the City's Public Works Engineering Division and/or the Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16, this project is anticipated wastewater demand is 10,040 gallons per day (gpd).

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

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 project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic

The City Council approves franchises to specific solid waste collection firms who collect solid waste. These firms are to keep records showing that the firms are reducing the amount of solid waste taken to land fills.

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

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

WHY? In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is 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, the project complies with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuse storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

In accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the applicant must submit a Construction Waste Management Plan, if the project meets any of the following thresholds;

1. Residential additions of 1,000 or more gross square feet;
2. Tenant improvements of 3,000 or more square feet;
3. New structures of 1,000 or more gross square feet;
4. Demolition 1,000 or more gross square feet; and
5. All City public works and construction projects, which are awarded pursuant to competitive, bid procedure established by Chapter 4.08 of the Pasadena Municipal Code).

The proposed project meets threshold Nos. 1, 2 and 3. The proposed project is phased over a 20 year period.

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).

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. (Identify and state where they are available for review.) No program EIR, tiering, or other process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

- 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.

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 Aesthetic 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.

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 proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project is a net increase of 79,110 square feet of development (50 units and 7,200 square feet of non-residential) over a 20 year period. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality, public services, recreation, traffic, and utility impacts, etc. impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. As discussed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, all project impacts will be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. No evidence exists suggesting that the project will substantially contribute to any cumulative impacts. A transportation study was prepared and conditions of approval were found to be appropriate to

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

reduce the traffic to a level of less than significant. Cultural resources were reviewed and appropriate mitigation measures were applied. Biological Resources were reviewed.

There are 422 trees on site of which 62 are protected by the Tree Ordinance. Out of those 62 trees only one protected tree is proposed to be relocated, because of its location where a new building will be built. A total of 52 non-protected trees will be removed, and 113 new trees will be planted. This impact was also reduced to a level of less than significant. 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.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- Document
- 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.
 - CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
 - East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
 - Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
 - Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
 - 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
 - 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
 - Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
 - Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
 - Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
 - Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
 - Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
 - North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
 - Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended
 - Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005
 - Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
 - Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
 - Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
 - 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.
 - South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
 - 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
 - Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
 - Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005
 - Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
 - West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
 - Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MONTE VISTA GROVE HOMES 2889 San Pasqual Street

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for Monte Vista Grove Homes Master Development Plan located at 2889 San Pasqual Street has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – Public Resources Code, Section 21000 *et seq.*), the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15074 and 15097) and the City of Pasadena CEQA Guidelines. The mitigation measures included herein are considered conditions of approval for the project. A master copy of this MMRP shall be kept in the office of the Zoning Administrator and shall be available for viewing upon request. A copy also will be available at the office of the Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator.

The new residential mix would include 141 independent living units with no additions to the assisted living or nursing home. The project includes the demolition of four single-story multi-family buildings totaling 14 units; conversion of one residential unit to a wellness facility and reconverting a unit from an office to a residential unit; addition of approximately 7,200 square feet of administrative offices, dining and activity space to the existing 37,250 square feet of non-residential square feet; addition of five new single-story units to existing buildings; and adding four new two-story multi-family buildings with 58 units for a net gain of 49 units. The project will increase its parking supply from 142 to 216 spaces for a net increase of 74 spaces. In addition a six-foot wall will be built along the western edge of the project.

This MMRP includes mitigation measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Matrix on the following pages that correspond to the final Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project. The matrix lists each mitigation measure or series of mitigation measures by environmental topic. For each mitigation measure, the frequency of monitoring and the responsible monitoring entity is identified. Mitigation measures may be shown in submittals and may be checked only once, or they may require monitoring periodically during and/or after construction. Once a mitigation measure is complete, the responsible monitoring entity shall date and initial the corresponding cell, and indicate how effective the mitigation measure was.

If any mitigation measures are not being implemented, the City may pursue corrective action. Penalties that may be applied include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) a written notification and request for compliance; (2) withholding of permits; (3) administrative fines; (4) a stop-work order; (5) forfeiture of security bonds or other guarantees; (6) revocation of permits or other entitlements.

Monitoring Program Cost:

I HEREBY AGREE TO PAY THE CITY MONITORING FEES, AND IMPLEMENT THESE MITIGATION MEASURES, AT A MINIMUM, IN THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT.

M. Helen Barry
APPLICANT *for*

Dec 6, 2027
DATE

Yonder Vista Grove Homes

Monitoring Checklist for mitigation measures

Project Address: Monte Vista Grove Homes Master Development Plan - 2889 San Pasqual
 Case # PLN2006-00039 Tidemark Case #

Decision Maker / Effective Date: City Council
 Planner: Carol Hunt Hernandez

MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST

MITIGATION MEASURE	RESPONSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION PARTY	MONITORING PERIOD	MONITOR / REPORTER / MONITORING AGENCY	DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE		
				ACTION / REPORTS	EFFECTIVENESS	SIGN-OFF / DATE
TRANSPORTATION						
Measure Transportation - 1 Contribute \$5,000 to the Citywide Transportation Monitoring Program - Funding of the improvement is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.	Applicant		Transportation Department			
Measure Transportation - 2 Contribute \$2,200 to Kinneloa Street Extension. Funding of the improvement is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.	Applicant		Transportation Department			
Measure Transportation - 3 Fund bus stop upgrades for a total of \$7,000 at the following locations: a) San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (northbound); and b) San Pasqual Street and San Gabriel Boulevard (southbound)	Applicant		Transportation Department			



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

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Monte Vista Grove Homes Master Development Plan

PROJECT APPLICANT: Steinberg Architects

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Gladys Maldonado

ADDRESS: 523 West 6th. Street, Suite 245
Los Angeles, CA 90014

TELEPHONE: (213) 599-4344

PROJECT LOCATION: 2889 San Pasqual Street

City of Pasadena
County of Los Angeles
State of California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- The demolition of five single-story multi-family buildings totaling 14 units;
 - Conversion of one residential unit in Building AE to a wellness facility;
 - Reconverting a unit in Building AG from an office to a residential unit;
 - Demolition of one single-story common area building;
 - Addition of approximately 7,200 square feet of administrative offices, dining, an activity space to the existing 37,205 square feet of non-residential square feet;
 - Addition of five new single-story units to existing buildings;
 - Addition of four new two-story multi-family buildings for a net gain of 49 units.
 - Increase the parking supply from 142 to 216 spaces for a net increase of 74 spaces.
-

FINDING

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

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

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: Carol Hunt Hernandez
Title: Planner
Date: September d22, 2006

Determination Approved:
Title:
Date:

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: August 21, 2006 through September 9, 2006
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: Yes No
INITIAL STUDY REVISED: Yes No



NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research

From: City of Pasadena

For U.S. Mail:

P.O. Box 3044

Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address:

1400 Tenth Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

Planning & Development Dept.

175 N. Garfield Avenue

Pasadena, CA 91101-1704

To: Los Angeles County Clerk
Business Filing & Registration
12400 E Imperial Hwy Rm 1101
Norwalk, CA 90650
Attn: J. Bance Baker

Contact: Carol Hunt Hernandez
Phone: (626) 744-6768

SUBJECT: Filing Notice of Determination in compliance with §21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse):

Project Title: Monte Vista Grove Homes Master Development Plan

Project Location: 2889 San Pasqual Street, Pasadena, Los Angeles, CA

Project Description:

- The demolition of five single-story multi-family buildings totaling 14 units;
- Conversion of one residential unit in Building AE to a wellness facility;
- Reconverting a unit in Building AG from an office to a residential unit;
- Demolition of one single-story common area building;
- Addition of approximately 7,200 square feet of administrative offices, dining, an activity space to the existing 37,205 square feet of non-residential square feet;
- Addition of five new single-story units to existing buildings;
- Addition of four new two-story multi-family buildings for a net gain of 49 units.
- Increase the parking supply from 142 to 216 spaces for a net increase of 74 spaces.

A Copy of the Negative Declaration (or Mitigated Negative Declaration) is available for review at the Pasadena Permit Center at the above referenced address.

This is to advise that the City of Pasadena Lead Agency or Responsible Agency has approved the above described project on _____ (date approved) and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project will will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the Provisions of CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures were were not made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan was was not adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations was was not adopted for this project.

6. Findings were were not made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA (Section 15091).

This is to certify that the Final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the Negative Declaration/Mitigated Declaration, is available to the General Public at: The City of Pasadena Permit Center, 175 N. Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101.

<i>Signature (Public Agency)</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Title</i>
----------------------------------	-------------	--------------

Date received for filing:

Date received for filing at OPR (if applicable):

Authority Cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code.

Reference: Sections 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

Updated per the State CEQA Guidelines as Amended through September 7, 2004