

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1000 SOUTH RAYMOND AVENUE

**ART CENTER COLLEGE OF DESIGN
MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN, ZONE CHANGE,
AND AMENDMENT TO THE SOUTH FAIR OAKS SPECIFIC PLAN**

PLN 2005-00148

October 20, 2005

City of Pasadena

Contact Person: Laura F. Dahl
City of Pasadena/ Planning Division
Planning and Development Department
Community Planning Section
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91109-1704

Contents

Section

I.	Project Information	3
	<i>Description of the Project</i>	4
	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting	4
	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	5
	Determination	5
	Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	6
II.	Environmental Checklist Form	
II.1	Background	7
II.2	Environmental Impacts	7
II.3	Aesthetics	7
II.4	Agricultural Resources	9
II.5	Air Quality	10
II.6	Biological Resources	14
II.7	Cultural Resources	17
II.8	Energy	18
II.9	Geology and Soils	19
II.10	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	22
II.11	Hydrology and Water Quality	26
II.12	Land Use and Planning	29
II.13	Mineral Resources	30
II.14	Noise	30
II.15	Population and Housing	32
II.16	Public Services	33
II.17	Recreation	36
II.18	Transportation/Traffic	36
II.19	Utilities and Service Systems	40
II.20	Earlier Analysis	43
II.21	Mandatory Finding of Significance	44

Attachments:

Mitigated Negative Declaration and Monitoring Program

APPENDICES

1 – CORRESPONDENCE - Letter from Eric C. Shen, Manager of Transportation Planning & Development, City of Pasadena, June 23, 2005, to Patrick Gibson, Kaku Associates).

2 - TRAFFIC STUDY - Traffic Study for 1000 South Raymond

Student Housing Project - Kaku Associates, March 2005.
3 - AIR QUALITY REPORT prepared by SAIC August 26, 2005

TECHNICAL REPORTS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.
Geotechnical Engineering Investigation
Proposed Student Housing, Art Center College of Design, South
Campus
950 South Raymond Avenue, Pasadena, California, February 2005

**CITY OF PASADENA
PLANNING DIVISION
HALE BUILDING
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91109-7215**

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: **Art Center College of Design
Master Development Plan, Zone Change, and
South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Amendment
PLN 2005-00148**

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: **City of Pasadena
Planning and Development Department
Community Planning Section
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101-1704**

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: **Laura F. Dahl, Senior Planner
626-744-6767**

4. Project Location: **The project is in the City of Pasadena, County of Los Angeles. The proposed project is located on the northeast corner of Raymond Avenue and Glenarm Street. Addresses are 950 and 1000 South Raymond Avenue. The Specific Plan Amendment is for the frontage of Raymond Avenue from California Boulevard to Glenarm Street and including the Glenarm Power Plant site. A zone change is proposed for the area governed by the Art Center College of Design Master Development Plan.**

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: **Art Center College of Design
1700 Lida Street
Pasadena, CA 91103
Contact person: John Gunn
The Hapsmith Company
310-577-0711**

6. General Plan Designation: **South Fair Oaks Specific Plan**

7. Zoning: **IG-SP2-HL56 (Industrial, South Fair Oaks Specific
Plan, Height Overlay of 56 feet)**

8. Description of the Project: **Art Center is proposing to construct a student dormitory with 124 units / 334 beds over a 450 space parking structure on their existing surface parking lot. The**

parking structure will have 3 levels of subterranean parking and one level at grade. The housing will be above the podium level and will be 5 stories adjacent to the light rail tracks and 3 stories along the Raymond frontage of the site. The proposed dormitory and underground parking structure are approximately 316,223 square feet.

The parking structure will serve the new student housing building at one space per two beds, and the south campus building at 3.1 spaces / 1,000 square feet.

The project will combine two sites:

- a) Existing parking lot with 145 parking spaces on 51,594 square feet, and
- b) Existing South Campus building which is approximately 93,410 square feet on a 55,000 square foot site.

See Exhibit 1.

The project also includes an amendment to the South Fair Oaks Specific Plan to allow “college – traditional campus setting” and “dormitories” uses along Raymond Avenue from California Boulevard to Glenarm Street and on the Glenarm Power Plant site. However, no physical changes are currently proposed in this location.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Surrounding land uses include office and industrial to the east (Jacobs Engineering and Los Angeles Cold Storage), Utilities to the south and west (Glenarm Power Plant and Sub-station), Warehouse/Distribution to the north (US Postal Service Distribution Center.)
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The Planning Commission will review and make a recommendation to the City Council which will take an action on the Master Development Plan, Zone Change, and Specific Plan amendment. The City of Pasadena Department of Public Works, Department of Transportation, Building Division, and Fire Department will review the project. The architectural design of the project is subject to review and approval by the Design Commission.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would involve 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
X	Air Quality		Hydrology and Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use and Planning	X	Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources	X	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 DOES NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
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.	X
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment. Analysis in the Initial Study shows that one or more impact areas will have a "Potentially Significant Impact" An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that were not analyzed in a previously approved EIR or Negative Declaration for the project at hand.	
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.	

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Reviewed By / Date

**Potentially
Significant
Impact**

**Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated**

**Less Than
Significant
Impact**

No Impact

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. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 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

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

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: October 11, 2005
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development Department
 Planner assigned: Laura Dahl (626-744-6767)

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 has views of the mountains. This area contains structures ranging from 3 to 5 stories in height, which partially obstruct these scenic views. However, the project does meet the height and mass limitations of the Zoning Code.

The project does not substantially impact any scenic vista as defined in the 1994 final EIR for the Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City of Pasadena General Plan. In accordance with section 17.61.030 of the City's Zoning Code, the design of this project, including its obstruction of any scenic vista or view, will be reviewed by the Design Commission. Although the project would not significantly impact a scenic vista, this regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

The code amendment to allow the additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories") may result in these uses locating within the plan area in the specified locations. Any future projects that will be constructed as a result of the code amendment to allow colleges and dormitories will be subject to review, including Design Review and CEQA review. Permitting these uses will not result in a significant aesthetic 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 affect an Official State Scenic Highway or Los Angeles County Recommended Scenic Highway. The project site is located to the north of the Pasadena Freeway (State Route 110) which is an unofficial City-designated scenic corridor. It will not remove or damage any landmark-eligible trees,

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

stand of trees, rock outcropping or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value. The site is in a fully developed commercial/industrial district.

The site does not have structures that have been designated as historic resources. The proposed project would not impact nearby sites or structures, which are historic resources. The project is not part of a landmark district. (See also 7.a.)

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

WHY? The site is in a fully developed commercial/industrial district. The proposed development is within the height and mass limitations of the Zoning Code and is required to submit a landscape plan for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator and the Design Commission prior to the issuance of any building permits.

The design of this project will be reviewed for approval by the Design Commission. This regulatory procedure was established to ensure that the design, colors, and finish materials of development projects comply with adopted design guidelines and achieve compatibility with the surrounding area. Although the project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the site and surroundings, this regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

The code amendment to allow two new uses within designated areas of the South Fair Oaks Specific Plan will not result in a significant impact to light and glare. The uses are consistent with the surrounding urban area and the City's review process ensures that any future projects constructed for these uses would be aesthetically pleasing.

See also response 7 a.

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 will be required to comply with the standards in the Zoning Code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. The project is in an older, developed, commercial urban area with streetlights in place and multiple-story buildings. Height and direction of any outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to Zoning Code requirements. Two streetlights are being required by the Public Works Department. These lights are not sources of glare and are an aide to public safety.

The proposed project is 5 stories above podium parking and 56 feet in height. This height is within the 56 foot height limit permitted in the IG-SP-2 zoning district. The surrounding uses range from 36 to 72 feet in height. The proposed project may cast shadows on adjacent sites; however, no significant impact is expected to occur since this shadow pattern will not affect the adjacent uses. The proposed project will not affect either day or nighttime views. (see also 3.a.)

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

The code amendment to allow two new uses within designated areas of the South Fair Oaks Specific Plan will not result in a significant impact to light and glare. The uses are consistent with the surrounding urban area and any future projects that are constructed for these uses will be required to comply with all code requirements that regulate daytime and nighttime glare.

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 site has 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. No impact is expected.

b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no Williamson Act contract land and has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the CO (Office Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), OS (Open Space) and PS (Public-Semi Public) Zoning Districts. The proposed project would not conflict with any agricultural zoning and would not preclude the use of commercial nurseries in any allowed zones.

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? ()*

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

WHY? The Clean Air Act (CAA) defines National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six criteria pollutants that have adverse effects on human health. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) is designated as nonattainment for carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM-10) and fine particulate matter (PM-2.5), and both the 1-hour and 8-hour ozone (O₃) standards because the area exceeds the established limits. The State of California, as permitted by the Clean Air Act, has also established California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are generally stricter than the federal standards.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the local regulatory agency that regulates air emission sources in the SoCAB. As such, the SCAQMD is responsible for creating attainment plans, called the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), for those pollutants which the SoCAB is designated to be in "non-attainment" of the NAAQS. The AQMP considers measures, such as rule development for stationary sources and roadway improvements to ease congestion, designed to reduce emissions and resulting ambient concentrations, while still allowing economic growth and construction of new projects. The emissions resulting from the proposed project, as detailed under sections (b), (c), and (d) below, are predicted to be below all applicable significance criteria at the local level, and are not considered regionally significant. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with installation and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP, and are predicted to be less than significant.

The proposed change of use to allow two new uses in the plan area, is consistent with the urban uses in the area. This proposed change in land use designation, in and of itself, would not generate any air pollutants and would have no related impacts. Future development of any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), however, could generate air pollutants from construction and operation. However, since there are currently no plans to develop and of these uses, the specific air quality impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for impacts to air quality.

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

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

WHY? Emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project are discussed below.

The evaluation of air quality impacts involves both the construction and operational phases of the proposed project. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook prepared by SCAQMD (SCAQMD, 1993) provides various criteria and significance thresholds for emissions generated during construction and operational phases of a proposed project in the SoCAB. SCAQMD emission significance thresholds for criteria pollutants are presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1. SCAQMD Construction and Operational Air Emissions Significance Thresholds

<i>Project Phase</i>	<i>SCAQMD Pollutant Emission Thresholds (lbs/day)</i>				
	<i>VOC</i>	<i>NO_x</i>	<i>CO</i>	<i>SO_x</i>	<i>PM₁₀</i>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Construction	75	100	550	150
Operation	55	55	550	150

Source: CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, 1993.

Construction Emissions

The construction phase of the proposed project would occur during a period of 18 months, tentatively slated to start in May 2006 and end in October 2007. It is anticipated that construction of the underground parking structure shall take approximately eight months and construction of the dormitories an additional 10 months. Construction activities would include the grading, digging, and hauling of soil, and various building activities, such as cement foundation construction, framing, finish carpentry, and painting. Emissions would be generated from earth moving, including fugitive dust and tailpipe exhaust from the use of fossil fuel powered equipment such as trucks hauling materials to and from the site, backhoes and drills used for excavation, water trucks used for dust control, concrete pavers, and cranes for the building construction. In addition, commuting emissions due to vehicular travel by construction employees to and from the proposed site would also be generated during the construction phase.

Emissions of criteria pollutants from construction activities were estimated using the URBEMIS2002 model developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Emissions calculations and assumptions for each construction activity are detailed in the URBEMIS2002 results report included in Appendix 3. A summary of the emissions from construction activities associated with the construction of the proposed project is presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Estimated Construction Emissions

Construction Activity	Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)				
	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO₂	PM₁₀
Site Grading (Material Hauling)	2.18	39.49	8.11	0.71	1.11
Building Construction - Garage (May-December 2006)	0.35	0.20	4.17	0.00	0.06
Building Construction - Housing (January-October 2007)	65.25	1.45	17.43	0.01	0.11
Maximum Daily Emissions (2006)*	2.18	39.49	8.11	0.71	1.11
Maximum Daily Emissions (2007)**	65.25	1.45	17.43	0.01	0.11
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds ⁽¹⁾	75	100	550	150	150

(1): CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, 1993.

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

* Maximum daily emissions for 2006 would result from hauling excavated material to a disposal site, which is assumed to occur during the first two months of the construction phase (May-June 2006).

**Maximum daily emissions for 2007 would result mainly from architectural coating operations, which are assumed to occur during the last four months of the construction phase (July-October 2007).

As shown in Table 2, maximum daily emissions in 2006 would occur during the first two months of construction as a result of trucks hauling soil away. Maximum daily emissions in 2007 would occur during the last three months of the construction phase due to architectural coating operations. These temporary and short-term emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with the construction of the proposed student housing would be temporary and less than significant.

Operational Emissions

Emissions from the operation of the proposed student housing would include emissions from area sources such as natural gas for water and heating, landscape maintenance equipment and consumer products (i.e., air fresheners, automotive products, household cleaners, and personal care products). In addition, vehicular emissions due to travel by the students to and from the proposed housing complex would also be generated during the operational phase. Emissions of criteria pollutants from operational activities were also estimated using the URBEMIS2002 model developed by the ARB. Emissions calculations and assumptions for the operational activities are detailed in the URBEMIS results report included in Appendix 3. A summary of the emissions associated with the operation of the proposed student housing is presented in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Estimated Operational Emissions

<i>Operation</i>	<i>Pollutants (lbs/day)</i>				
	<i>VOC</i>	<i>NO_x</i>	<i>CO</i>	<i>SO₂</i>	<i>PM₁₀</i>
Area Sources (including Natural Gas)	0.17	1.26	1.09	0.00	0.00
Commuting	11.02	10.86	118.53	0.09	8.48
Maximum Daily Emissions	11.19	12.12	119.62	0.09	8.48
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds (1)	55	55	550	150	150

(1): CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, 1993.

As shown in Table 3, operational maximum daily emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

MITIGATION REQUIRED

The developers of the Art Center student housing project shall comply with the following:

1. *Painting and architectural coatings shall not exceed 3,476 square feet per day. Duration of the painting shall be at least 74.8 days.*

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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 proposed project site is located in the SoCAB, which is designated as a non-attainment area for O3, PM-10, and CO (CAAQS only). As discussed in section (b) above, construction and operational emissions would be below the SCAQMD significance thresholds for all criteria and precursor pollutants. In addition, the cumulative impact to localized concentrations of CO is analyzed in section (d) and found to be less than significant.

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

WHY? The SCAQMD defines sensitive receptors as facilities where sensitive population groups (children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill) are likely to be located. These include schools, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals and medical clinics. A field canvas determined the following sensitive receptors to be located within one mile of the proposed student housing:

- Kids Klub Daycare Center;
- Huntington Memorial Hospital;
- Blair High School;
- Allendale Elementary School;
- Aria Montessori School;
- Westridge School for Girls;
- Sequoyah School;
- Waverly School;
- Mayfield Junior and Senior School; and
- C J Rowe Christian Academy.

In order to evaluate the project significance and assess the localized CO impacts on sensitive receptors that are located adjacent to congested roadways, the screening procedures as outlined in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook were used to determine the project's potential to create a CO hotspot.

According to the traffic study prepared for this proposed project, the cumulative plus project impacts would reduce the level of service (LOS) from C to D at the intersection of South Raymond Avenue and California Boulevard, a highly industrial neighborhood. For this reason, further investigation as to potential to create a carbon monoxide hot spot was required. All other intersections remained at current LOS.

The nearest identified sensitive receptor is the Kids Klub Daycare Center located approximately 900 feet north of California Street on the east side of South Raymond Avenue. Ambient "no project" background concentrations of CO for the proposed site were taken from the 2004 Air Quality summary available from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Data from the nearest monitoring

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

station, West San Gabriel Valley (station no. 088), was used. The maximum 1-hour and 8-hour average concentrations of CO are 7 ppm and 3.4 ppm, respectively. Neither of these concentrations exceeds the federal or state air quality standards.

Table 5-4 of the CEQA guidance document presents estimated CO concentrations at various distances from the intersection stop line. However, Table 5-4 did not include distances greater than 200 ft, and as a conservative approach these values were used for this analysis. For arterial roads, such as the streets being analyzed, the SCAQMD estimates 1-hour CO concentrations to increase 0.9 ppm when LOS degrades from C to D. Thus the project impact was estimated to be a maximum of 1 ppm, 1-hour average. The SCAQMD's persistence factor of 0.8 was used to estimate a maximum CO increase of 0.7 ppm, 8-hour average. After implementation of the proposed project, CO concentrations at the nearest sensitive receptor are predicted to be 7.9 ppm, 1-hour average, and 4.1 ppm, 8-hour average. Thus, the impacts are considered to be less than significant, as these levels are below the applicable ambient air standards of 35 ppm (federal) and 20 ppm (state), 1-hour averages, and 9.0 ppm, 8-hour average.

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

WHY? The proposed project would not result in any sources of significant odors.

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 subject site is in a fully developed urban area, identified as the South Fair Oaks Specific Plan area. Mostly paved, it has no landscaping or habitat subject to review by the Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Construction of a student housing building in this location will not affect any special status species identified in local or regional plans, regulations, or policies.

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Biological Resources. The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding urban area and no particularly sensitive biological resources exist in the project vicinity. Since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific biological resource impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for impacts to biological resources.

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

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? ()

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

WHY? The California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service do not identify the subject site (or any area within the South Fair Oaks Specific Plan boundaries) as a riparian habitat or sensitive natural community—nor is it identified as a riparian habitat or sensitive natural community in any local or regional plans, policies, and regulations.

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? ()

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

WHY? See responses 6 a. and 6 c.

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? ()

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

WHY? See response 6.a.

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

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

WHY? The City has a tree protection ordinance and the removal of any protected specimen, native, or landmark tree requires a formal approval—based on criteria— which coincide with design review of the new construction. The site, presently developed with a paved parking lot and three freestanding buildings, has 19 trees. The site contains no trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 “City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance” or trees designated as landmarks. The project is not in the Hillside Development Overlay District or the Lower Arroyo. As such the proposed development will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

The proposed change of use to allow two new uses in the plan area, are consistent with the urban uses in the area. This proposed change in land use designation, in and of itself, would not conflict with the City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance and would have no related impacts. Future development of any of the proposed additional uses (“Colleges- traditional campus setting” and “dormitories”), however, could impact protected trees. However, since there are currently no plans to develop and of these uses, the tree impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future

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

development projects will be subject to City regulations, including the City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance, and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for impacts.

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

WHY? *There are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.*

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

WHY? There are no known buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site having a significant historic value to the City which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered by the proposed development.

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Cultural Resources. The proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding urban area and no known cultural resources exist in the project vicinity. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific cultural resource impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for impacts to cultural 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 on the project site. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

There are no buildings (and/or structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects) scheduled for demolition (relocation, removal or significant alteration) on the project site, which are of significant archaeological value to the City.

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

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

WHY? There are no records of any significant paleontological resources in the City of Pasadena. Therefore, there are no known paleontological resources affected by the project. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

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

WHY? There are no known human remains on the site. If any remains are encountered during project implementation the Los Angeles County Coroner will be contacted.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. *Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?* ()

WHY? 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 be engineered to 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. With these provisions, the project will comply with adopted Energy Element of the General Plan (1983).

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

WHY? The proposed project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources. Construction of the project will result in a short-term insignificant consumption of oil-based energy products. However, the additional amount of resources used will not cause a significant reduction in available supplies.

Energy. The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. Occupation of the project will result in an

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

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. This project will result in the increased consumption of approximately 1,687 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day. This increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards. The energy conservation measures will be prepared by the developer and shown on a building plan(s). This plan will be submitted to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. Installation of energy-saving features will be inspected by a City Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Water This project will result in an increase of approximately 32,515 gallons per day in water consumption. However, this impact will be mitigated during drought periods by the applicant adhering to the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which restricts water consumption to 90% of expected consumption during each billing period. Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Division Code Enforcement Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

The code amendment to allow two new uses within the Specific Plan area are administrative changes and will not require any energy use. Future development projects that may result from the code amendment will be evaluated to ensure that all energy demands can be met. The proposed uses are consistent with other uses permitted in the developed, urban area.

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

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

A geotechnical report was prepared for the Art Center South campus on February 25, 2005 by Geotechnologies, Inc.

Adjacent to and partially in the City of Pasadena are two faults, considered active, the Sierra Madre primarily north of the City and the Raymond Fault primarily south of the City. The 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan considers the Sierra Madre Fault to be in a Fault Hazard Management Zone and the Raymond Fault to be in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Within the south west quadrant of the

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

City, the Eagle Rock Fault is considered potentially active. The proposed project is 6 miles south of the Sierra Madre Fault, 3 miles south of a potentially active strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, 0.5 miles north of the Raymond Fault and 0.1 miles north of the Eagle Rock Fault.

The potential exists for people and property to be exposed to the hazards of seismic activity in most of California. This project will not increase the potential occurrence of earthquakes. The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because the new structure shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and is 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.

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Geology and Soils. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific geology and soils impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for geology and soils related impacts.

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. Any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. At a minimum the earthquake-resistant design and materials of new projects must meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the California Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements. 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.

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? A geotechnical report was prepared for the Art Center South campus on February 25, 2005 by Geotechnologies, Inc. This report concludes that due to the dense nature of the underlying soils and the depth to groundwater, the liquefaction potential for the subject site is considered to be remote.

According to Plate P-1 of the Cities Safety Element of the General Plan (as based on the State's Seismic Hazard Zone Maps) or Plate 1-3 of the Technical background Report to the Cities Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is not in an area subject to liquefaction.

The site is relatively flat. Existing City Municipal Code and Building Code regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact.

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

Due to these codes and inspections there will be no increased exposure to seismic ground failure including liquefaction.

- 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? A geotechnical report was prepared for the Art Center South campus on February 25, 2005 by Geotechnologies, Inc. This report concludes that the probability of seismically-induced landslides occurring on the site is very low due to the general lack of slope geometry across the site.

According to Plate P-1 of the City's Safety Element of the General Plan (as based on the State's Seismic Hazard Zone Maps), the project site is not in a Landslide Hazard Zone. According to the Slope Instability Map (Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan) the project is not in an area of slope instability. According to these same sources there is not any known historic evidence of landslides on the project site or adjacent properties. Existing City regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact. In addition the Seismic Hazard map does not show this project to be located in an area where there is geologic evidence of past landslides.

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Geology and Soils. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific geology and soils impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for geology and soils related impacts.

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

WHY? Excavation and Grading Construction of the project will lead to 0 cubic yards of fill and 53,000 cubic yards of cut with a total of 53,000 yards being exported. Approximately 2.45 acres of land will be graded after excavation. The project will cover approximately 90% of the site as compared to the present surface parking lot use, which occupies 100% of the site. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions.

The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Appendix Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation therefore there will be no impact. The applicant must have an approved site to receive any exported cut earth.

If a detailed geotechnical and foundation investigation is required for planned structural facilities it should be performed by California licensed geologists and engineers and at a minimum contain the following information:

1. The characteristics of the soil materials below the construction site.
2. The most appropriate type of foundation for the proposed structure.
3. The static and dynamic design criteria for the recommended foundation type.

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

4. The estimated foundation settlement rate.
5. The necessary subgrade preparation for the foundation.
6. The lateral pressures for retaining walls.
7. The design slopes for cut and fill sections.
8. The suitability of on-site soils for use as backfill.

Erosion According to the Final Environmental Impact Report certified for the adoption of the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements, the natural water erosion potential of soils in Pasadena is low, unless these soils are disturbed during the wet season. Both the Ramona and Hanford soils associations, which underlay much of the City, have high permeability, low surface runoff and slight erosion hazard due to the gravelly surface layer and low topographic relief away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains.

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 Design Review Commission staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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

Any project, which involves more than 250 cubic yards of cut or fill should have an erosion and sediment transport control plan as part of the applicant's grading plan. The grading plan must be approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits.

For major projects not subject to the Hillside Grading Ordinance, an erosion and sediment control plan should include the following measures if applicable:

Confine construction to the dry season (April 16th to October 14th), whenever possible; If construction needs to be scheduled for the wet season (October 15th to April 15th of the following year), ensure that structural erosion and sediment transport control measures are ready for implementation prior to the onset of the first major storm of the season: Locate staging areas outside major streams (such as the main Arroyo Seco or Eaton Wash streambed) and drainage ways; Keep slope lengths and gradients to a minimum; Discharge construction runoff into small drainages at frequent intervals to avoid buildup of large potentially erosive flows; prevent runoff from flowing over unprotected slopes; keep disturbed areas to the minimum necessary for construction; keep runoff away from disturbed areas during construction; Stabilize disturbed areas as quickly as possible, either by vegetative or mechanical methods; Direct flows over vegetated areas prior to discharge into public storm drainage systems; Trap sediment before it leaves the site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences; Make removal and disposal of all project construction-generated siltation from off-site retention ponds the responsibility of the contractor; Use landscaping and grading methods that lower the potential for down-stream sedimentation. Modified drainage patterns and longer flow paths, encouraging infiltration into the ground, and slower storm-water conveyance velocities are examples of effective methods; and Control landscaping activities carefully with regard to the application of fertilizers, pesticides or other hazardous substances. Provide proper instruction to all landscaping personnel on the construction team.

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

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?* ()

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

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.

According to State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map (Pasadena Quadrangle) and the Seismic Hazards Map (Plate 1-3) and Slope Instability Map (Plate 2-4) of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project is not in an area with slope instability. In addition the Seismic Hazard map does not show this project to be in an area where there is geologic evidence of past landslides.

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

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

WHY? A Geotechnical Engineering Investigation was prepared for the Art Center of Design South campus in February 2005. Ten exploratory borings were drilled ranging in depth from 50-80 feet. Fill materials under the site were predominantly silty sands, and clays. Fill thickness ranged from 5 to 7 ½ feet. Native soils consist of sands and silty sands with occasional layers of sandy silts. This is consistent with the Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan which identifies the project site as underlain by stream channel deposits of gravel, sand and silt (Plate 2.1). This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential.

The project must be reviewed and approved by the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. Compliance with all City regulations will ensure no impacts related to expansive soil.

e. *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?* ()

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena allows septic tanks to be used for only specified areas in the hillsides per regulations found in Ordinances 3881 and 4170 and codified in Pasadena Municipal Code. The proposed project is not in any of these specified areas. New construction must be hooked up to a sewer if it is available. If the sewer is at a higher elevation than the project, the sewage is to be pumped up to the sewer.

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?* ()

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

WHY? Art Center College of Design is a private fine arts college that uses some solvents and hazardous materials in small quantities. Existing precautions are in place for the safe storage and disposal of these materials. Existing regulations are adequate to ensure that any hazardous materials on the site, such as asbestos and/or lead-based paint, are safely remediated. The project must adhere to local, as well as State and Federal regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further there is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

The Glenarm Power Plant located south and west of the site has high pressure underground gas lines near the intersection of State Street and Fair Oaks Avenue. There is also an underground vault near the intersection of Glenarm Street and Fair Oaks Avenue. Ammonia is used on the Power Plant site and stored in storage tanks.

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous materials. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific geology and soils impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for geology and soils related impacts.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ()

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

WHY? See response 10 a.

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

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

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

WHY? The project does not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste. It is within one-quarter mile of Blair High School. (see also Section 10.a.)

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? ()

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

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

WHY? The project 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? ()

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

WHY? The project site is not within an 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? ()

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

WHY? The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

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

WHY? To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans, including a construction staging and management plan, for 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 Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan (Plate 3-1), the project site is not within any of these dam inundation areas.

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

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

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? According to the Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan as shown on Plate 4-2, Wildfire Hazard Map, the project site is in an area of low fire hazard. The project (and Specific Plan boundary) is in an urban area and is not adjacent to wildlands.

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 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 site, this runoff may be discharged via Los County Flood Control Channels into the San Pedro Bay.

The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water. Further, Pasadena has adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to help implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

The proposed code amendment to allow two new uses in the plan area will not result in a significant impact to Hydrology or Water Quality. However, since there are currently no plans to develop any of the proposed additional uses ("Colleges- traditional campus setting" and "dormitories"), the specific impacts of such a future development are, at this time, too speculative to evaluate. However, any future development projects will be subject to City regulations and CEQA review, and will be accordingly analyzed for Hydrology and Water Quality related impacts.

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 provided by the Public Works Department. 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 the project will use approximately 32,515 gallons of water per day. The source of some of the water from the Pasadena Water and Power Department is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin.