

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? The subject site is a school; however, the proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste.

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

WHY? The project site is not located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA).

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 any airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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 any private airstrip.

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

WHY? The project is located within an urban area and will not change the logistical nature of the area. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

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

The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is not within, but is approximately one mile east of a portion of the Lower Arroyo Seco Flood Inundation Zone. If Devil's Gate Reservoir fails catastrophically, most of the water will be confined to the Arroyo Seco channel, and would impact the Rose Bowl and other developed areas both north and south of the 210 Freeway, not the project site.

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

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate P-2, Summary of Hazards Map (II), the project site is located within a half mile east of moderate and very high fire hazard zone. The project site is surrounded by urban development, and is bounded on the north, east and southwest by Multi-Family Residential zone (RM-16-1) and Single-Family Residential (RS-4) zone and developments consistent with these zoning districts. The project site is 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? The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollutant Discharge 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 site, whose surface waters would receive any discharge from the project. However, if there is water runoff from the site, this runoff may be discharged via Los Angeles County Flood Control Channels into the San Pedro Bay. The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water.

Pasadena has adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to help implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Because the proposed new buildings in the campus will add new buildings ranging in size from 17,000 to 21,000 square feet of gross floor area, each of these new buildings will be required to submit a plan for implementing Best Management Practices prior to issuing a building permit.

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

WHY? The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer system provided by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District and the City's Department of Public Works. Therefore, there will be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters. Moreover there is no known aquifer condition in the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the project.

Under normal operation with existing buildings in the school campus, water consumption is calculated to be approximately 10,561 gallons per day. With the net increase in building floor area of 46,779 square feet, the water consumption is projected to increase by approximately 4,678 gallons of water per day; however this is a conservative estimate as the number of employees and students will not increase.

The source of some of the water from the Pasadena Water and Power Department is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. The proposed new buildings will result in a net increase in building floor area by 46,779 square feet, which will in turn result in a net increase in water consumption by 4,678 gallons per day. If the project will consume a net increase in use of water over the existing, the project may have an indirect impact on the supply of groundwater.

However, during drought conditions, the project must 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 Water Division reviewed the proposed MDPA during the Pre-Application Conference review and indicated that water service can be provided to the project site without depleting current supply. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans shall comply with the approved water conservation plan. Based on the requirements to comply with this plan, there will be no impacts to groundwater supplies.

Further, as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the City of Pasadena and the State Water Conservation Coalition in 1991, the City through its Department of Water and Power has agreed to implement certain water conservation measures known as "Best Management Practices" (BMP). Among these is the draft "Landscape Water Management Ordinance" for new or rehabilitated landscaping areas greater than 2,500 square feet requiring a building permit.

- 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? After all new construction is completed, the project will cover approximately 38% of the site as compared to the present development, which occupies 31% of the site. Storm and other water runoff will therefore increase. Increased paving or building foot print will reduce water percolating into the soil to replenish the water table and will increase storm and irrigation water flowing into storm drain facilities.

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. According to the City's Department of Public Works, the applicant is required to submit a grading and drainage plan and hydrology study for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. Moreover, the project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The applicant shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading or construction 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.

Figure 4.5-1, Major Hydrologic Features, from the FEIR for the 1994 adopted Land Use and Mobility Elements shows reservoirs, debris basins, Flood Control Channels and County Storm Drain Facilities. The project site is located beyond 1000-foot distance from the Arroyo Seco Flood Control Channel. Figure 4.5-3, County Storm Drains Facilities, shows drainage boundaries, Flood Control Channels and the County

Storm Drain network within the City. The project site is likewise served by existing County Storm Drain facility that also connects to the Arroyo Seco Flood Control Channel.

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. The project site is approximately half a mile east of the Lower Arroyo Seco Flood Inundation Zone; however, even if the Devils Gate Reservoir fails catastrophically, most of the water will be confined to the Arroyo Seco channel, and would impact the Rose Bowl and other developed areas on the north and south of the 210 Freeway, and not the project site. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

- 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? The City of Pasadena contains two streams: the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek. The project site is located just east of the Lower Arroyo Seco stream, across Arroyo Boulevard. However, none of the proposed new construction within the campus will affect or substantially alter the course of this stream. There are no ravines or gullies on the site.

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

WHY? The project site is adequately served by existing storm water drainage systems. According to the City's Department of Public Works, the project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The applicant is required to submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading or construction 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.

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

WHY? The project will not substantially degrade water quality during construction or operation. Runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices, and the City's requirement that the project comply with the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), prior to issuance of any demolition, grading or construction permits. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. The project will be connected to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems so there will be no direct impact on groundwater quality.

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

WHY? The proposed MDPA does not include housing. In any case, according to the Summary of Hazards Map (II), Plate P-2 of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project is not located within a dam inundation area, but is located approximately half a mile east of the Lower Arroyo Seco Flood Inundation Zone. However, the 2002 Adopted Safety Element indicates that even if the Devils Gate Reservoir fails catastrophically, most of the water will be confined to the Arroyo Seco channel, and would impact the Rose Bowl and other developed areas on the north and south of the 210 Freeway, and not the project site.

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

WHY? The entire City of Pasadena is in Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map Community Number 065050. In Zone D the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations. According to the Summary of Hazards Map (II), Plate P-2 of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project site is not located within a dam inundation area, but is located approximately half a mile east of the Lower Arroyo Seco Flood Inundation Zone. However, the 2002 Adopted Safety Element indicates that even if the Devils Gate Reservoir fails catastrophically, most of the water will be confined to the Arroyo Seco channel, and would impact the Rose Bowl and other developed areas on the north and south of the 210 Freeway, and not the project site.

See responses to 9 Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides, and b soil erosion and the response to 11i below.

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? See response to 10h.

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? One of the components of the proposed MDPA includes the incorporation of an adjacent residential property (1066 South Orange Grove Boulevard) to the school campus. This is accompanied by a request for a zone change of the subject residential parcel from Multi-Family Residential, 14 units per acre (RM16-1) to Public, Semi-Public (PS), and General Plan Land Use Diagram Amendment to designate the residential parcel from Medium Density Residential to Institutional. The proposed amendments to the zoning map and General Plan Land Use Diagram will leave the condominium complex at 1066 South Orange Grove surrounded on all sides by the PS zoning designation and the Westridge School campus. Staff

recommendation is for approval of this request for zone change and amendment to the General Plan Land Use diagram based on findings in accordance with Section 17.74.070. paragraphs A and B:

1. **The proposed amendment is in conformance with the goals, policies and objectives of the General Plan.** The proposed zone change is consistent with the City adopted General Plan Objective 13.4 which states that the City should provide adequate support for businesses and institutions that serve the needs of the City's diverse residents and families, including schools. It also states the City should "Promote public and private schools, support quality education for all students." In addition, Policy 23.4 states that the City should support Specific Plans, master plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.
2. **The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of the City.** The proposed zone change would enable Westridge School to bring into consistency the entire ownership of its site into one zoning district and will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of the city.
3. **The site is physically suitable for the requested land use/development.** The proposed school use (Science Center) is conditionally permitted in the current zoning designation of Multi-family Residential (RM-16-1). The site provides sufficient size and suitable shape to allow its development with the proposed Science Center with appropriate building height and setbacks that will be compatible with the adjacent residential development, and the surrounding neighborhood.

Approval of the proposed master plan will include conditions of approval and development standards to respond to adjacent residents' issues and concerns (e.g., window placement to ensure privacy, building height, setback and encroachment plane to protect view to the north) expressed at a community meeting.

Although the existing single-family residence will be replaced by a new Upper School Science Center, the new building height, bulk and design will be reviewed by either Design and Historic Preservation staff, subject to call for review by the Design Commission and/or the City Council to ensure that it is compatible with the character and scale of the surrounding residential community.

The proposed Science Center is anticipated to be of less intensive use than what would be allowed under the zoning designation RM16-1. The proposed Science Center will be occupied during regular school hours, and not typically on evenings and weekends as it would be if it was a multi-family residential building. This parcel will not be used to provide parking spaces because the school's parking requirements will be met by the combined use of the existing parking lot at the north parking lot (53 spaces), the Madeline Court parking (5 spaces) and the future underground parking on State Street (109 spaces) for a total of 167 spaces. There will be no access to the new Science Center building from Orange Grove Boulevard, thus, will result in less traffic on South Orange Grove Boulevard street segment.

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

WHY? The proposed MDPA includes incorporating an adjacent residential parcel (1066 South Orange Grove Boulevard) to the school campus. The subject parcel is currently within the zoning district designated as Multi-Family Residential, 14 units per acre district (RM16-1), and is designated as Medium Density Residential in the General Plan Land Use Diagram. In order to incorporate the parcel into the master plan boundaries, a Zone Change and a General Plan Amendment are required. The proposed MDPA includes a request to change the zoning designation of the subject parcel from RM16-1 (Multi-family Residential, 14 units per acre) to PS (Public, Semi-public district), and to amend the General Plan Land Use Diagram from Medium Density Residential to Institutional, to establish consistency for the proposed use of the parcel from residential to a school-related use. The PS zoning district is intended to provide a specific base zoning district for large public or semi-public land uses that may not be appropriate in other base zoning districts.

The Master Plan provision of the Zoning Code provides the process through which a public, semi-public land use may be allowed to operate in a particular site, with the capability to tailor development standards and operational conditions so that the land use remains compatible with the surrounding land uses. The master plan will include conditions of approval that will address the unique and particular needs of the institutional land use while ensuring compatibility with the adjacent or surrounding land uses.

The proposed MDP is consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan Land Use Element in the following manner:

OBJECTIVE 7 – RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS: Preserve the character and scale of Pasadena's established residential neighborhoods.

The proposed MDPA will recommend development standards for the new science center at 1066 South Orange Grove Boulevard and other campus buildings that are in character and scale with the surrounding neighborhoods.

OBJECTIVE 13 – ADEQUATE SERVICES: Provide adequate support for businesses and institutions that serve the needs of Pasadena's residents and families.

Policy 13.4 – Education: Promote public and private schools, support quality education for all students.

The proposed MDPA is consistent with Policy 13.4 in that the school proposes to expand and improve the existing facilities within the campus to bring them up to the standards of excellence. The various components of the MDPA are proposed to meet the needs of students and school staff, and the needs of Pasadena's residents and families, in promoting quality education for all students.

OBJECTIVE 24 – EXISTING INSTITUTIONS: Provide long-term opportunities for growth of existing cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions in balance with their surroundings.

Policy 24.1 – Expansion: Recognize and support the expansion opportunities of existing regionally significant cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.

The proposed MDPA includes the addition of an adjacent residential parcel. The school proposes to use this site for a new science center.

Policy 24.3 - Support Planning: Support Specific Plans, Master Plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions."

The proposed MDPA will establish the school's development framework over a ten-year period. The proposed MDPA is consistent with this policy because it will be reviewed in its entirety, ensuring that the various components meet the needs of the school's students and staff, while promoting compatibility with the surrounding community.

The proposed Master Development Plan Amendment can be approved if findings for its approval can be made, including its consistency with the General Plan Land Use Element's goals, objectives and policies as identified above. Therefore, the proposed MDPA will have a less than significant impact on the City's land use policies and regulations, as contained in the General Plan Land Use Element, and applicable sections of the Zoning Code.

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

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

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

WHY? The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City's General Plan states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel and stone Eaton Wash, and Devils Gate Reservoir. The project is not near any of 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? There are no locally important mineral-resource recovery sites delineated by the City of Pasadena Land Use Element of the Comprehensive General Plan. The 1994 certified final EIR for this element states that there are two areas within Pasadena which contain aggregate for making Portland cement, one in the Arroyo Seco, the other in Eaton Canyon. These areas are zoned for Open Space uses and are not currently being mined. There are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan. The 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology shows no aggregate resources within the City of Pasadena.

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 will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Noise generated by construction activities may have a short-term impact and noise from air conditioning and heating systems may increase the existing level of ambient noise after construction. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. The proposed MDPA would not increase student enrollment or staff members, and no new school trips would be added to the surrounding street network.

Although the Noise Restrictions Ordinance does not regulate traffic noise, the adopted Noise Element has established acceptable noise levels within residential districts and schools. Figure 1 – Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use (page 6 of the Noise Element Objectives, Policies and Implementation) shows that acceptable noise levels in medium-density residential areas should not exceed 60 dBA where buildings are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.

The impact from construction noise will be short-term and limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays and not permitted on Sundays and holidays) in or within 500 feet of a residential area in accordance with City regulations. Prior to issuance of any permits, the applicant must submit a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transportation for review and approval prior to the issuance of any construction permits. This plan must show the impact of the various construction stages on the public right-of-way including street occupations, closures, detours, staging areas, and routes of construction vehicles entering and exiting the construction site. The plan must ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood.

The project must comply with the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A). According to the Noise Restrictions Ordinance the presumed ambient noise level is 60 dBA during the day (6a.m.-11 p.m.) and 50 dBA at night (11 p.m. to 6 a.m.) in Noise District 3 where the project site is located. The Noise Element of the City's General Plan (Figures 2 and 3) also show ambient noise levels in the subject area to be less than 60 dBA.

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 1, Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use of this element, the proposed school MDP project should be located in an area with a clearly to normally acceptable ambient noise range of 50-70 dBA. Land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive include but are not limited to: residences, hotels, single room occupancy buildings, group care and convalescent homes, schools, churches, libraries, performance halls, parks and hospitals. The school is one of several land uses that is noise sensitive, and is surrounded by residences, which are also noise sensitive. In this regard, the proposed MDPA is compatible with the surrounding land uses in that both the project's land use and those in the adjacent areas are within the same range of acceptable noise levels.

Figure 2, Existing Noise Contours (2001) under the Noise Element's Policies, shows that the project site is located outside of the 60 dBA Noise Contour zone that follows the freeways, major streets and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority Gold Line alignment. Likewise, in Figure 3, Future Noise Contours, while the contour zones are projected to increase in land area coverage, the project site is anticipated to remain outside the 60 dBA contour zone.

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

WHY? The project is not located close enough to any light rail tracks or freeways to receive any impacts or effects from such uses.

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

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

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

WHY? The project may cause a significant periodic increase in ambient noise levels during the construction period of each proposed phase of the MDPA. These short-term temporary noise increases are discussed under 14.a. above. The MDPA is not anticipated to cause any significant impact on the ambient noise levels at the surrounding residential properties.

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

WHY? There are no airports or airport land use plans within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank.

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

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

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project is in a developed area where all major infrastructure is in place. The project will result in a net increase of 46,779 square feet with the demolition of four buildings and construction of three new buildings. The proposed new buildings are not intended to increase the school enrollment, but will upgrade or replace existing facilities that need updating. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will be the responsibility of the applicant. Since the project is generally in conformance with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations, this increase in building floor area will not be significant. There are no new roads or major infrastructure that is required for the project, therefore, there will be no impacts.

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

WHY? The project involves the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new science center, resulting in a net loss of one housing unit. Recent residential development city-wide has produced more housing units than the number being lost due to demolition. Therefore, the loss of one housing unit is within the housing forecast and is consistent with the City's 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, adopted in 2002. 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? ()*

WHY? The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people. On one hand, the loss of one single-family residence is not considered a substantial impact to the housing stock. As currently zoned (RM16-1), the subject parcel may be developed with multi-family residential up to six dwelling units. The request to change the zoning from RM16-1 to PS means there is reduction in potential five additional housing units in the City. This potential reduction, however, remains uncertain in the absence of any proposal to develop the site for multi-family residential use. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

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

a. *Fire Protection?* ()

WHY? The project site is located in a moderate wildfire hazard area according to the Summary of Hazards Map (II) Plate P-2 of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project is located approximately half a mile from either Fire Station #31 (135 South Fair Oaks Avenue) or Fire Station #39 (50 Avenue 64), and the Fire Department will continue to serve the project site.

Because the school campus is surrounded by Hillside development overlay to the north, east and southeast, Section 17.29.070 requires that the landscape plan be designed to ensure slope stability, fire safety and design quality. The plan must be approved by both the Zoning Administrator and the Fire Chief, therefore, impact on fire protection will be less than significant.

b. *Libraries?* ()

WHY? The project is located less than one mile from the nearest branch library, San Rafael branch library at 1240 Nithsdale Road, and also less than one mile away from the Allendale branch library located at 1130 South Marengo Avenue. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System. Moreover, the project (a school for 4th – 12th grade) has its own library facility in the campus and will not demand additional library resources.

c. *Parks?* ()

WHY? The project is located approximately half a mile east of the eastern edge of the Lower Arroyo Seco Park (across from Arroyo Boulevard), and less than one mile from the Allendale Park located at 1130 South Marengo Avenue. According to Parks and Natural Resources staff the City as a whole had 1.6 acres of parkland per 1000 residents in May 2002.

The project will not result in any substantial increase in the residential population or households. Thus, the project will not have a negative impact on parks.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed site is in an area which has reported low crime rates according to Police Department statistics. The proposed MDPA will maintain the current enrollment cap (502 students) and staffing (105 employees). The project will not need increased police protection and the proposed changes are within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

e. *Schools?* ()

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 project will not generate any additional employees and will not generate any additional new households with school age children.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes, and development fees will lower this impact to a level that 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?* ()

WHY? The project is located approximately half a mile east of the Lower Arroyo Seco Park, and less than one mile from the Allendale Park at 1130 South Marengo Avenue. As a school, the project site provides a campus that meets the students' and employees' needs for open space, parks and passive recreational facilities (e.g., athletic field, gymnasium, auditorium). The proposed MDPA does not propose an increase in student enrollment, or in the number of employees. Therefore, the project will not result in any increase in the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the city.

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

WHY? The project site has an existing athletic field that will remain in the campus. The proposed MDPA does not include nor require construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an impact on the environment.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project is located on a street (Madeline Drive) that is not identified as a Principal Mobility Corridor, a Multimodal Corridor, or a de-emphasized street per the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. Orange Grove Boulevard borders the project site to the west, and is classified as a Minor Arterial in the Mobility Element of the General Plan Update (November 2004). Between the I-210 Freeway

and Columbia Street (one block south of the project site), Orange Grove Boulevard is also designated as a De-emphasized Corridor.

The six study intersections (listed in the table below) were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method of analysis, which determines the Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) ratios on a critical lane basis. The overall intersection V/C ratio is assigned a Level of Service (LOS) value that describes the intersection operation, varying from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). Applying the City of Pasadena's threshold criteria indicates that the proposed master plan amendment is not expected to create any significant impacts at the study intersections; therefore, no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended for the study intersections.

Intersection	Peak Hour	Year 2007 Existing LOS	Year 2017 w/ Proposed MDPA LOS	Significant Impact?
Orange Grove Bl/ Bellefontaine St.	AM	A	B	NO
	School PM	A	A	NO
Orange Grove Bl/ Madeline Drive	AM	A	A	NO
	School PM	A	A	NO
Orange Grove Bl/ State Street [unsignalized intersection]	AM	B	C	NO
	School PM	A	A	NO
	AM	F	F	NO
	School PM	B	B	NO
Orange Grove Bl/ Columbia St	AM	C	D	NO
	School PM	A	B	NO
Pasadena Avenue/ Glenarm Street	AM	B	B	NO
	School PM	A	B	NO
Pasadena Avenue/ Madeline Drive [unsignalized intersection]	AM	A	A	NO
	School PM	A	A	NO
	AM	A	A	NO
	School PM	A	A	NO

With no increase in the current enrollment cap (502 students) and with the same number of staff members (105) and the removal of one single-family residence in the project site, the proposed project is expected to generate a net decrease of one vehicle trip (one fewer outbound trip) during the forecast morning peak hour (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.), and a net decrease of one vehicle trip (one fewer inbound trip) during the school afternoon peak hour (2:00 to 4:30 p.m.). The proposed project is forecast to generate a net decrease of 10 daily trip ends during a typical weekday, 24-hour period (5 fewer inbound trips and 5 fewer outbound trips).

The existing peak hour intersection Level of Service in all six intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better) during all peak periods. Application of the City of Pasadena significance criteria concludes that the proposed MDPA would not have a significant impact at any of the six analyzed intersections during the morning and afternoon peak hours. Therefore, no intersection mitigation measures are required for the proposed project.

Based on current enrollment (502 students) and number of employees (105), the school generates a total of 1,798 daily trips, including approximately 397 trips in the morning peak hour, and 276 trips during the afternoon peak hour, and a total of 1,245 daily trip ends.

A Street Segment Impact Analysis was also conducted in the Traffic study, where the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of four street segments were analyzed. The street segment analysis compares the projected average daily traffic (ADT) volumes at each study street segment with the existing ADT volumes. Application of the City's threshold criteria to the "Existing with Project" indicates that the proposed project is not expected to create a significant impact at any of the four study segments. A summary of Average Daily Trips in the subject street segments is shown in the table below:

Location	Dir	[1] Existing Weekday ADT Volume	Proposed Master Plan Amendment		[4] Existing with Project ADT Volume [1] + [3]	[5] Percent ADT Growth [3]/[4]
			[2] Total Project Distribution	[3] Daily Project Trip Ends		
1 Orange Grove Bl between Orange Grove Circle & Arlington Drive	NB SB	10,172 12,759	2.0% In 2.0% Out	0 0	10,172 12,759	0.0% 0.0%
Total Location 1		22,931		0	22,931	0.0%
Orange Grove Bl between State St & Columbia St	NB SB	10,868 12,126	3.0% In 3.0% Out	0 0	10,868 12,126	0.0% 0.0%
Total Location 2		22,994		0	22,994	0.0%
State St east of Orange Grove Bl	EB WB	487 728	3.0% In 3.0% Out	0 0	487 728	0.0% 0.0%
Total Location 3		1,215		0	1,215	0.0%
Madeline Dr west of Pasadena Av	EB WB	131 245	3.0% In 3.0% Out	0 0	131 245	0.0% 0.0%
Total Location 4		376		0	376	0.0%

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

WHY? In accordance with CMP Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) requirements, it is necessary to conduct a regional analysis to quantify potential impacts of the proposed project on the CMP freeway monitoring locations and CMP arterial intersection monitoring stations.

The following CMP intersection monitoring stations closest to the project site are:

<u>CMP Station</u>	<u>Intersection</u>
No. 119	Arroyo Parkway / California Boulevard, and
No. 120	Pasadena Avenue-Saint John Avenue / California Boulevard

The CMP TIA guidelines require that intersection monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak periods. As no additional student enrollment is proposed, the proposed project would not generate any additional trips, and would not result in any new trips on the CMP system, and no further traffic analysis is required.

The following CMP freeway monitoring locations in the project vicinity have been identified:

<u>CMP Station</u>	<u>Intersection</u>
No. 1056	Route 134 Freeway west of San Rafael Avenue
No. 1060	I-210 Freeway west of Routes 134-710
No. 1061	I-210 Freeway at Rosemead Boulevard

The CMP TIA guidelines require that freeway monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project will add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak periods. The proposed project will not add 150 or more trips (in either direction), during either AM or PM weekday peak hours to the CMP freeway monitoring location. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to freeway CMP highway system is required.

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

WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

d. 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 Department of Transportation and the proposed use 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 improve circulation and safety for the site and surrounding neighborhood.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ()

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Department of Transportation and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. 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, the Building Division and the Fire Department.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ()

WHY? The proposed MDPA includes the conversion of a surface parking lot (91 parking spaces) to an underground parking structure (109 parking spaces), and retention of two other surface parking lots (53 + 5 = 58 parking spaces). The MDPA proposes to maintain the current enrollment cap (502 students) and staffing (105 employees). The zoning code requires a total of 123 parking spaces based on the enrollment and number of employees. The school currently provides a total of 149 parking spaces. The proposed MDPA will provide a total of 167 parking spaces. The project will exceed the Code's minimum parking requirements (by 44). Therefore, the proposed project will not result in inadequate parking capacity.

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

WHY? The project is located near the following bus route: MTA Line 256, a local north-south line that travels from Commerce to Altadena. This line provides service to the Del Mar and Allen Avenue Metro Gold Line stations. This line travels along South Orange Grove Boulevard and California Boulevard.

The project will be conditioned to provide a minimum of 10% of the required vehicle parking (123) for bicycle parking in the campus' parking lots, equivalent to 12 bike spaces.

Public transportation services within the vicinity of the project site is currently provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), Foothill Transit Service, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) Commuter Express, and the Pasadena Area Rapid Transit Service (ARTS). The Metro Gold Line travels within the median of the I-210 Freeway and in the Metro right-of-way between

Raymond Avenue and Arroyo Parkway in the project vicinity. The Del Mar and Fillmore Street stations are located within approximately one mile of the Westridge School campus.

Pursuant to the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance (Ordinance #573), Westridge School shall be required to maintain operation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. TDM strategies have been identified in the Traffic Study to reduce parking demand and automobile dependency, to promote alternative travel modes, with focus on carpooling opportunities for students, faculty and staff.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater and individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County Sanitation District fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are no unusual wastes in the project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by the L.A. County Sanitation District.

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

WHY? The project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities. The Water Division indicated in the Predevelopment Plan Review for the project that water service is available at the project site, and Pasadena Water and Power will review existing water services and any additional services requested for the proposed new buildings when final plans are submitted for building permits. Any new service will be installed at the Pasadena Water Rate Ordinance in effect at the time of application and installation.

Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. The additional 46,779 square feet of net new school-related buildings is projected to generate an additional 3,508 gallons per day of wastewater. The Department of Public Works indicated that a sewer flow analysis is waived because there is no plan to increase the student enrollment. At the same time, the proposed new buildings are required to be connected to the public sewer by a method specified by the Department of Public Works.

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

WHY? The project will not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. 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. The project development will not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system.

Further, the project must have an on-site drainage plan approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any on-site improvements needed to provide drainage or to connect the project with the existing City drainage system are the responsibility of the applicant.

The project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Regulation Ordinance (Ordinance 6837) that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), Los Angeles Region. This ordinance enables the City to be part of the municipal storm sewer permit issued by the Los Angeles Region to the County of Los Angeles. The applicant is required to submit to the Department of Public Works a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading or construction permits.

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

WHY? According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there is a sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. 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 4,678 gallons per day in water consumption (a conservative estimate as no new students or employees will be added to the school population). The current use consumes approximately 10,561 gallons of water per day. However, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance during periods of drought, thereby reducing monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. The impact will be reduced to a level that is not significant. Further, the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department has reviewed this project and determined that the City can serve it.

The project does not affect any of the local groundwater recharge spreading grounds.

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

WHY? See responses to 19 a. and b.

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

WHY? The project 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 as of July 2003 had a 22-year capacity, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and is within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. The net increase in the school's total building floor area is projected to generate an additional 187 pounds per day of solid waste.

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

WHY? The project will comply with applicable statutes and 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, the project meets the following thresholds:

1. New structures of 1,000 or more gross square feet;
2. Demolition 1,000 or more gross square feet.

The applicant is required to submit a Construction and Demolition Recycling and Waste Assessment Plan prior to issuance of a grading permit. Monthly reports must be submitted throughout the duration of the project, and a Summary Report with documentation must be submitted prior to final inspection by the Department of Public Works. Therefore, impact will be less than significant.

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). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 18 at the end of the checklist.

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review: None.
- 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: None.
- 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: None.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Sections 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts on 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 on historical, archeological, 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 on Water Quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

The project will not have any significant impact on Biological Resources because the project is in a developed urban area, and is outside any natural habitat area in the City of Pasadena. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site. The development projects within the scope of the proposed Master Development Plan Amendment will not remove or disturb any significant vegetation on the site as to impact any habitat that may exist within the project site (school campus) or in the surrounding areas. There are no designated natural communities on or near the project site. While the project site's western boundary is about a half mile east of the Lower Arroyo Seco area, it is located in a developed urban area, and there are no known existing riparian habitat or other sensitive natural plant communities, nor known naturally occurring wetland habitat within or near the project site, nor does it involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will it result in a barrier to migration or movement.

The project involves removal of one Native tree (28-inch Coast Live Oak) and five Specimen trees consisting of: two Victorian Box (*Pittosporum undulatum*), two Jacaranda (*Mimosifolia jacaranda*) and one Olive (*Olea europaea* tree). Thirty-eight (38) other non-protected trees are proposed to be removed, consisting of non-protected species or are protected species that have not reached their protected sizes. A mitigation measure has been included that will require the project to comply with the Federal Migratory Treaty Act (see Response 3 d), which will reduce potential impacts to nesting migratory bird that could result from the removal of 44 trees.

The Tree Protection Ordinance allows removal of a protected tree if the proposed project includes a landscape design that will result in a tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed within a reasonable time after completion of the project. The application includes the proposed removal of 38 other trees located in various parts of the campus, which are not protected by the Tree Ordinance, but nonetheless, will be replaced by far more new trees and landscaping that will exceed the tree canopy that will be removed.

The proposed MDPA proposes to demolish the following four structures. These buildings and structures have been preliminarily reviewed by Design and Historic Preservation staff at the Pre-application Conference (PAC) and it was determined that:

1. Gertrude Hall Building (SMUD Lecture Hall): This building is located approximately 150 feet east of South Orange Grove Boulevard on the south side of Madeline Drive (West) and is adjacent to the Administration Building. It is a one-story building with a large gable roof enclosing one principal space. It was designed to relate to the Tudor revival style of the administration/Classroom Building directly to the east. It was designed by George Vernon Russell in 1955, a notable architect whose works include the University Library, the University Commons and the Geophysics Building at the California Institute of Technology, and the University of California, Riverside campus. The building was named after Gertrude Hall who was an assistant to three headmistresses over her 25-year tenure at the school.
2. Gertrude Hall Classroom Building: Built in the same year as the SMUD Lecture Hall (1955), this building is its sister building, designed together by the same architect. It is located immediately to the south of the Gertrude Hall Building (SMUD) and the two form a concrete paved courtyard between them. The building is a single-story with a rectangle plan with a single large gabled roof. The interior is comprised of several classrooms and faculty offices. This pair of buildings was designed in a modern Tudor Revival style to provide a visual complement to the 1923 Administration by Marston Van Pelt and Maybury.

While the two buildings named after Gertrude Hall were designed by a noted architect, they are of undistinguished architecture and do not meet any of the criteria for historic or architectural significance. The Historic Survey forms for these two buildings indicate no significant characteristic or historic value to make them eligible for any level of significance. Because staff

finds that these buildings are not eligible for any level of historic or architectural significance, staff recommended to Design Commission that their demolition be approved. The Design Commission concurred with staff finding at its advisory review of the proposed master plan on June 11, 2007.

3. Raney Classroom Building: Built in 1962, this two-story building was designed by noted architects Henry Eggers and Walter Wilkman. It is located immediately north of the existing parking lot on State Street. The building is a long single-loaded row of classrooms, which are accessed directly from the exterior. The north side has a two-story porch that forms a colonnade on the ground floor and a covered porch on the second floor. An exterior stairs at one end of the building provides direct access of the second-floor classrooms from the outside. The use of exterior covered walkways was an example of the "California Style" school developed by Eggers and Wilkman and others in that era. Eggers and Wilkman designed numerous building in Pasadena, such as the Dreyfuss residence, the Library at the Polytechnic School, and the Elementary School buildings at Chandler School.

Although designed by noted architects, the building's design is undistinguished and does not meet any criteria for historic or architectural significance. The Historic Survey for this building indicates no significant characteristic or historic value to make it eligible for any level of significance. The Design Commission concurred with staff's finding that this building is not eligible for any historic or architectural designation at its advisory review of the proposed master plan on June 11, 2007.

4. 1066 South Orange Grove Boulevard residence: This single-family residence was originally built in 1907 in the Arts and Crafts style. The architect and builder are unknown. Building Permits in the City's records indicate that the building has been significantly altered over the years, most significantly from 1953 to 1956 when the porch was rebuilt and a new garage and kitchen/service wing were constructed, and changes to the interior were made. Due to numerous alterations, this residence does not meet any of the criteria for historic or architectural significance. The Design Commission concurred with staff's finding that this building is not eligible for any historic or architectural designation at its advisory review of the proposed master plan on June 11, 2007.

Furthermore, the Design Commission concurred with staff recommendation to include a condition of approval that new construction shall be subject to design review in accordance with the city-wide threshold in the municipal code, where construction over 5,000 square feet is reviewed by the Director of Planning and Development (with a possible call for review by the Design Commission and/or City Council) and construction over 25,000 square feet is reviewed by the Design Commission (with a possible call for review by the City Council). The proposed three new buildings (new Upper School Science Center, new Middle School and new Lower School) will be reviewed to ensure that the architectural design, orientation and massing of these buildings will be compatible with the adjacent administrative building, the overall context of the campus, and will not detract from the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. If applicable, any exterior rehabilitation work on the existing Library (Phase II) and on the east side of the Marjorie Braun Science Building (Phase III) will be done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures. The proposed MDPA, however, indicates no exterior renovation on any other building in the campus.

There are no buildings proposed for demolition on the project site which are of significant archaeological value to the City. However, there will be digging into undisturbed soil for the proposed underground parking garage. Two mitigation measures have been added (see responses 7b and 7c) that will reduce any potential impacts to archeological and paleontological resources to less than significant level.

Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and object 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 has the potential to contribute to cumulative air quality, biological resource, hydrology, noise, population, housing, and traffic impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, except for cumulative air quality conditions (i.e., SCAB is a non-attainment basin) and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. As discussed in Section 5.c. of this document, the project's contribution to the cumulative air quality scenario is not considerable. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

The proposed MDPA will maintain the current enrollment level at 502 students and the staffing level of 105 employees, and will not increase the number of vehicle trips in a significant manner, and will not result in a significant impact on mobile emissions. Likewise, project emissions during construction will not exceed the threshold for construction emissions.

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 occupants (students and school staff) of the new buildings 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 Section 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 die to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
2	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Maps- the official Los Angeles and Mt. Wilson, quadrant maps were released in 1977.
3	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
4	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
5	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
6	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
7	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 1994
8	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
9	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
10	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
11	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
12	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
13	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
14	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
15	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
16	Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
17	Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
18	Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002.
19	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
20	State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
21	Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations n Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
22	Transportation, Housing, and Child Care Survey: A Report Describing the Results and Findings of a Survey of Employees in the City of Pasadena, Child Care Planning Associates for the City of Pasadena, April 11, 1990
23	Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
24	West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
25	Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code