

Attachment 1

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

INITIAL STUDY

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

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: North Lake Specific Plan Amendments
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
Planning and Development Department
Community Planning Section
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-1704
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Patrice A. Martin, Senior Planner
(626) 744 - 3758
4. Project Location: The project proposes amendments to the North Lake Specific Plan, which is located in the City of Pasadena, northwest section of Pasadena, County of Los Angeles. Specifically, the North Lake Specific Plan area encompasses the Lake Avenue corridor from the Foothill Freeway (I-210) north to Elizabeth Street. The east/west boundaries of the specific plan area are defined by: 1) generally one-half to one block on either side of Lake Avenue between Elizabeth and Villa Streets; 2) the areas between El Molino and Wilson Avenues to the south of Villa Street; and 3) the areas between El Molina and Catalina Avenues near the intersection of Lake Avenue and Washington Boulevard.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena
Planning and Development Department
Community Planning Section
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-1704
6. General Plan Designation: Specific Plan
7. Zoning: CO SP-1A, CL-SP1B, RM-48 HL – 36 SP1, PS SP-1 (Zoning for entire Specific Plan area)
8. Description of the Project: As part of the Specific Plan Five Year Review process, this is the first series of amendments that are proposed which involve potential changes to density of residential

and mixed-use development, zoning designation, an increase in maximum permitted building height in certain portions of the Specific area, and land use modifications. There is no new construction proposed as part of this action; and the proposed amendments would not change the specific plan's General Plan allocation of 500 residential units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage. The proposed changes are as follows (see attached map), with affected portions identified by the respective street names.

North Lake Avenue – Ladera Street to Elizabeth Street:

Existing Zoning – CO SP1B (Commercial Office Specific Plan, House Building Type)

Proposed density – reduce density from 48 to 16 units for residential development.

Mountain Street to Claremont Street:

Existing Zoning - CO SP1B (Commercial Office Specific Plan, House Building Type) – Allows 48 units per acre

Proposed density – reduce density from 48 to 16 units for residential development.

Proposed Height – Reduce height from 36 to 30 feet for commercial and mixed-use development.

North Lake Avenue – Mountain Street to Orange Grove Boulevard.

Existing Zoning – CL SP1A (Commercial Limited, Specific Plan Village Building Type) – Allows 32 units per acre.

Proposed land use modification - No new residential development should be allowed to protect the commercial character of this segment of the corridor. Maintain commercial and allow mixed-use.

Proposed Height – Maintain height for commercial development at 30 feet and 42 feet for mixed-use.

Maple Street to Orange Grove Boulevard

Existing Zoning – CL SP1A (Commercial Limited, Specific Plan Village Building Type) – Allows 32 units per acre.

Proposed density - Increase density from 32 to 48 units per acre

Proposed Height – Maintain height for commercial development from 30 feet to 36 feet and extend it to Orange Grove Boulevard. Set 48 feet as the maximum for mixed-use development including housing.

North Lake Avenue (West of Lake, North side only) El Molino to Palm Terrace (No change Previously recommended in this segment)

Existing Zoning – CL SP1A (Commercial Limited, Specific Plan Village Building Type) – Allows 32 units per acre.

Proposed land use modification – Allow residential only, prohibit commercial and mixed use.

**North Lake Avenue – Washington (east of Lake Avenue, both north and south sides)
Mentor to Catalina**

Existing Zoning - CO SP 1A (Commercial Office Specific Plan, House Building Type) – Allows 48 units per acre
Proposed density – Reduce density from 48 to 32 units per acre.

Other Land Use Modifications

There are two land uses that are proposed to be modified as part of the amendment series, Work-Live and Second Hand Appliances.

Work-Live – The Specific Plan does not currently address this use. However, the Zoning Code does not allow this use in the CL (Commercial Limited) and CO (Commercial Office) districts. It is only allowed in the CG (Commercial General) district with a CUP. As proposed, the use will be allowed as a permitted use along Lake Avenue between Claremont Street and Mountain Street, the Lake/Washington node (Lake/Washington Intersection which extends north to Ladera Street, east to Mentor Avenue, south to Claremont Street, west to El Molino Avenue).

Second Hand Appliances - The Specific Plan does not currently address this use. The use is proposed to be allowed under the retail sales land use, which is currently allowed by the Zoning Code.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings): The North Lake Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse Number 95091045) provides the following description of the specific plan area:

The planning area encompasses 107.1 acres (exclusive of streets) and contains almost two million square feet of residential and non-residential uses. Residential uses comprise the largest amount of square footage of improved building area (over 43 percent) and the largest amount of acreage in the planning area (almost 45 percent)...

...Although residential land uses comprise the greatest amount of square footage of improved building space in the planning area, residential uses are primarily concentrated in the southern portion of the North Lake Specific Plan area between Villa and Maple Streets. There are some areas of residential development located between Elizabeth and Claremont Streets and to the east and west of the commercial development along Lake Avenue. The only remaining residential development along Lake Avenue is in the area north of Belvidere Street. The majority of residential units in the area are medium and high density developments, including some senior care facilities.

There are several types of commercial uses within the planning area. These include: commercial retail uses including services, such as personal improvement services and maintenance and repair services; office uses, such as professional, medical and banking offices; eating establishments, bars and taverns; and vehicle/equipment sales, leasing and repairs. Many of the eating establishments in the area include drive-through/take-out restaurants which are located primarily north of Orange Grove Boulevard. Additionally, other eating establishments are scattered throughout the planning area. Commercial uses are primarily small to medium scale developments.

Several mini-malls are located throughout the planning area, the largest is the development containing the Food-4-Less located near Washington Boulevard. The majority of the other mini-malls contain approximately four to six businesses. There are no office towers or high density structures in the planning area.

The remaining uses in the area include institutional, industrial, mixed use, park/open space, and parking. The institutional category refers to uses such as the Fire Station (#33), the Santa Catalina Library, and several churches. These uses are scattered throughout the planning area. There is a limited amount of industrial use in the area which is located in the northern section of the planning area, primarily along Washington Boulevard. The mixed use category refers to the few residential units which remain in buildings which also include retail and other commercial uses. There are a few structures containing mixed uses near the Washington Boulevard and Lake Avenue intersection and one other structure just north of Villa Street. Currently there is one park in the planning area, Washington Park, located along Washington Boulevard and El Molino Avenue in the northwestern portion of the planning area.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Approvals from agencies outside of the City of Pasadena are not requested or required for the project.

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. | |

Prepared By/Date _____

Reviewed By/Date _____

Printed Name _____

Printed Name _____

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____

Adoption attested to by: _____
 Printed name/Signature Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
 - 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
 - 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
 - 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
 - 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
 - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
 - 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant
-

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: December 6, 2006
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development Department
 Case Manager: Patrice Martin (626) 744 - 3758

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

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

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project site is in an area that offers views of the San Gabriel Mountains. This area contains structures generally ranging from one to two stories in height, and a few structures at three stories in height. For those areas where the density and height will be reduced, setbacks on buildings will be more generous, building mass will be reduced, and the maximum density will be reduced. This will allow for more of the existing vista to be maintained than would be if existing zoning were maintained. For the aforementioned area and where density and height will be increased, Design Review will apply by staff and/or the Design Commission. One of the findings for design approval states that "future development should visually harmonize with its surroundings and not "unnecessarily block scenic views." Therefore, there will be no significant impacts to a scenic vista. Proposed land Use modifications will not have a significant impact.

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

WHY? The project does not substantially impact an official State Scenic Highway, L.A. County Recommended Scenic Highway or unofficial City Designated Scenic corridor. Changing the specific plan by itself will not necessarily result in the destruction of any landmark eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcroppings or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value. The City has ordinances protecting trees. Future projects built under the proposed density changes, height, and or land use modifications (proposed Specific Plan amendments) will be required to obtain building permits and meet all City requirements.

There are designated historic resources within the Specific Plan area, including landmark districts as well as adjacent to landmark districts. There is no new construction proposed as part of this action, and it would not significantly impact sites or structures, which are historic in nature.

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

WHY? Part of the purpose of the Specific Plan amendments is to respond to concerns that the existing densities and heights in certain places may result in a scale of development that detracts from the existing visual character. In certain areas where the density and height is proposed to be reduced, new projects will require more generous setbacks, less density, and lower height. For the area where density and height is proposed to increase, initial feedback from the community indicates that this area is appropriate, as it is closer to existing and surrounding higher densities surrounding the Lake Avenue Light Rail Station. Future projects built under the revised zoning and general plan designations will still be required to obtain building permits and meet all City requirements, including design review (if applicable). Therefore, there will be no significant impacts that would degrade the existing visual character, including the proposed land use modifications.

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

WHY? The project will not have a significant impact on light and glare because it does not affect the standards in the zoning code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. The light and glare in a neighborhood will not change as a result of the proposed density, height, and land use modifications. Height and direction of any future outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to Zoning Code requirements. Compliance with the setbacks required in this zoning district help reduce possible shade and shadow impacts to a level that is insignificant. For future projects requiring design review, the finish, colors, and materials, will be reviewed for approval through the Design Review process. Pasadena's City of Gardens Ordinance which applies to projects of three or more units requires appropriate yards to prevent intrusive shadows, such projects are subject to design review. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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 commercial growing 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).

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 densities and heights are within the allowable ranges within the Zoning Code and General Plan Land Use designations for the site. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. Furthermore, any future projects must comply with the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act and the regional AQMP. 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. Based on the General Plan allocation of 500 units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage, the 1994 Specific Plan EIR states that allocation meets 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. In addition, it further states that City's Trip Reduction Ordinance administered by the Public Works Department would facilitate the reduction of trips generated by any future projects. The proposed amendments would not change the specific plan's growth allocation. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any 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)?* ()

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. This series of Specific Plan Amendments do not propose any new construction and by itself will not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in O₃, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and/or NO₂. When specific projects are proposed, they will be reviewed for their compliance with this requirement.

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

WHY? This series of Specific Plan Amendments do not propose any new construction and by itself will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Any future project must comply with the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act and the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and Southern California Association of

Governments. The AQMP contains measures to meet the federal and state requirements. The City of Pasadena is also part of the West San Gabriel Valley Planning Council, which adopted the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. The proposed amendments to the North Lake Specific Plan would not adversely impact any sensitive receptors.

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

WHY? This series of Specific Plan Amendments do not propose any new construction and by itself will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No new land uses that are anticipated to generate odors would be permitted by right. Furthermore, the proposed amendments would not change the way future proposed developments are reviewed for potential odor 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?* ()

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 area where the amendment would apply.

b. *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ()

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

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.

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? In a Specific Plan area of this size, there likely are trees that would require protection under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance (no.6896). Projects built under the proposed density, height, and land use modifications will continue to be required to comply with this ordinance. Furthermore, this series of amendments will not remove any protected trees or change the City's tree protection ordinance. Tree removal applications are not a part of this application. The project is not in the Hillside Development District or the Lower Arroyo.

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? Within the Specific Plan area there are a number of historic resources that are within a Landmark District. There are Landmark Districts which are adjacent to the Specific Plan area including but not limited to Bungalow Heaven and Historic Highlands. This series of amendments will not by itself cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as stated in the Specific Plan Final

EIR. There are no historic resources (structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects) scheduled for demolition (relocation, removal, or significant alteration) within the Specific Plan area which are of historic significance. Any such specific future project would be required to undergo its own evaluation prior to building permit issuance and would remain subject to the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 17.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). Therefore, the proposed amendments will not result in any significant impacts to the adjacent landmark districts or historic resources.

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 in the project area, as stated on the Specific Plan Final EIR. Any project submitted under the proposed changes in density, height, and land use modifications will continue to be subject to all City requirements.

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.

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 any future proposed project within the Specific Plan area. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project construction at that time, 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 high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

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

Why? According to the Specific Plan Final EIR, the construction of any proposed project in the future will require a short term increase in the use of fuel and/or energy. However, the additional amount of resources used will not cause a significant reduction in available supplies. 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 electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. Occupation of any future projects will result in an insignificant increase in the consumption of natural gas. 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. Installation of energy-saving features will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? According to the Specific Plan EIR, the potential already exists under the current zoning for people and property to be exposed to the hazards of seismic activity in California. This project (proposed amendments) will not increase the potential occurrence of earthquakes. The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because any new structure that may be proposed under the new densities 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.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

WHY? See 9.a.i.

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.

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 proposed amendments including changes in density, height, and land uses will not increase the risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic-related ground failure anymore than the existing density, height, and land uses.

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? As stated in the Specific Plan Final EIR, and according to the Seismic Hazard Map of the 1994 General Plan, the project area in which the amendments are proposed, is located in an area where slopes have low slope stability. Any slope instability concerns for future development projects will be controlled by existing City regulations, therefore there will be no significant impact from mud or earth slides.

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

WHY? The proposed amendments do not involve any new construction and will not increase the loss of topsoil or increase soil erosion. For future projects built under the proposed amendments, water erosion during construction will be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. Soil erosion after construction will be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. This plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or the appropriate staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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 amendments will not have an effect on soil stability or create any of the above hazards. Projects built under the proposed amendments may require a geological study to determine if the soil is stable enough to support the planned project without being graded and the soil compacted to specified standards per applicable codes. All future projects submitted under the proposed amendments are required to comply with CEQA and other local regulations.

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan 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? ()*

WHY? Any future projects built under the proposed amendments, will be required to connect to the existing sewer system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? ()*

WHY? Any new projects proposed under the new amendments must comply with the applicable residential zoning requirements, which do not allow for uses or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of residential structures and landscaping. Further, any new project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further there is no evidence that the project area 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? ()*

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? ()*

WHY? Longfellow School is within the northeastern portion of the Specific Plan area. The proposed amendments will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste. The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. 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 proposed amendments would not create nor result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Further, the Specific Plan EIR states that the occupation and use of the Specific Plan (which would include the amendments) would not pose a significant threat to public health nor expose people to potential health hazards.

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. 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 proposed amendments are located within an urban area. Adherence to building, zoning and fire codes will ensure that future projects proposed under the amendments will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Pasadena Fire Department maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Department is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency. The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir.

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

WHY? As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

WHY? Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Los Angeles County and 85 incorporated Cities therein, including the City of Pasadena, obtained an MS4 (Permit # 01-182) from the Los Angeles RWQCB, most recently in 2001. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP.

In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Pasadena has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance

requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP.

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

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

- b. *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? ()*

WHY? Future projects will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer provided by the Public Works Department. Therefore, there will be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters.

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

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

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

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