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

While the Project would not include any component that would cause a significant population increase, visitors, patients, and employees at the Hospital may use nearby parks. The proposed Project is a non-residential Project that would not directly increase the City's population. The proposed Project would generate approximately 60 new jobs, although most of these jobs would likely be filled by persons already residing in the community, or by persons who would commute from nearby communities to work at the Project. There is, however, a potential for an increase in park usage by new employees and Hospital patients and visitors. The City collects an impact fee of $3.09 per square foot of non-residential space. Payment of this fee would offset any impact on parks; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. Police Protection? ( )

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The Pasadena Police Department provides police protection in the City of Pasadena. Headquarters, at 207 North Garfield, are located approximately 1.0 mile north of the Project site. The proposed expansion of the Emergency Department would accommodate existing pent-up demand for Hospital services; thus, the proposed Project would not likely cause a substantial population increase requiring additional police protection.

While a small temporary increase in police protection calls may occur during construction phases when equipment would be susceptible to theft, this would not result in the permanent need for new or altered police protection services and would not affect standard acceptable service ratios or response times. Consequently, impacts to police protection services from the proposed Project would be less than significant.

e. Schools? ( )

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The proposed Project does not include a residential component. It is expected to create approximately 60 new jobs, and local employees or commuters from surrounding areas would likely fill jobs created by the Project. Because the Project would not be a substantial population generator, it would not cause a large increase in school-age children or cause the construction of any additional school facilities. Moreover, the Project applicant would be required to pay applicable school fees to the Pasadena Unified School District prior to occupancy, satisfying any requirements with respect to schools. Impacts to schools would be less than significant.

f. Other public facilities? ( )

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The Hospital expansion is proposed to accommodate an expected increase in emergency patients. The Project would not result in a significant population increase in the area, and consequently would not be expected to increase usage of other public facilities. No new or physically altered governmental facilities would be required, and no impact would occur.

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

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 proposed Project is a non-residential Project that would not directly increase the City's population. There is a possibility, however, for an increase in park usage given the expected increase in employees and patients associated with the proposed Project and given the close proximity (less than 1.0 mile) of the Project site to the previously mentioned four parks.

For non-residential projects, the City collects a park impact fee, which is used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. Though the Project includes the removal of an outdoor seating area, it also includes the construction of a staff courtyard just south of the ambulance bay. It is likely that employees who currently use the existing outdoor seating area would relocate to another outdoor area on the Hospital campus. The Project itself is not expected to result in any significant increases in existing neighborhood and regional parks such that substantial physical deterioration of such facilities would occur. Recreation impacts would be less than significant.

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 does not include the construction of any recreational facilities. As the Project is not a residential development, nor a population-inducing Project, it would not require the construction or expansion of any existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require any construction or modification to any recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

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 Traffic Impact Study for the Project[28] is available for review as part of the project file at the City of Pasadena, 175 North Garfield Avenue in Pasadena on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and on Fridays from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Data on patient visits to the Emergency Department at Huntington Memorial Hospital were used to analyze the number of visits during the 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. (AM

[28] *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007.

peak) and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. (PM peak) commuter hours during a typical midweek day. An overall midweek day peak-hour average of 4.85 (AM peak) and 8.82 (PM peak) patient visits occurred (Table 24). An overall daily (24-hour period) average of approximately 159 patient visits occurred during a typical midweek day.

Table 24
Existing and Future Patient Visits

Period	Existing	Increase by 50%	Future
Daily (24-hour period)	159	multiply by 1.50	239
AM Peak Hour	4.85	multiply by 1.50	7.28
PM Peak Hour	8.82	multiply by 1.50	13.23

Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, pages 25 and 26.

It is anticipated that annual patient visits would increase from roughly 60,000 that occur under existing conditions to approximately 90,000 annual patient visits (an approximate 50% increase) with the proposed Project. The existing number of midweek day patient visits was increased by 50 percent to derive future daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour traffic volume forecasts associated with the proposed Project. As indicated in the previously mentioned Table 24, the future daily patient visits would be 239, future AM peak hour patient visits would be 7.28, and future PM peak hour patient visits would be 13.23. The daily and peak hour traffic volume forecasts for the proposed Project were determined based on the numbers of patient visits and the trip rates listed in Table 25.

Table 25
Vehicle Trips Rates

Traffic Volume Forecasts Derived from Trip Rates		Trip Rates Based on Assumptions	
Daily	4.50 vehicle trips per patient visit	Ambulance	1.00 inbound vehicle trip(s) during daily and peak hours
AM Peak Hour	3.75 vehicle trips per patient visit 2.25 inbound vehicle trips, 1.50 outbound vehicle trips	Patient Visitor	1.00 inbound vehicle trip(s) during daily and peak hours
PM Peak Hour	3.75 vehicle trips per patient visit 2.25 inbound vehicle trips, 1.50 outbound vehicle trips	Other	Police, senior and/or disabled, employee, etc., inbound trip(s) during daily and peak hours

Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 20076.

As presented in Table 26, the proposed Project is expected to generate a net increase of 9 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 17 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the proposed Project is forecast to generate a net increase of 360 daily trip ends during a typical weekday (180 inbound trips and 180 outbound trips).

Table 26
Project Trip Generation Directly Attributed to Proposed Project (Net Increase)

Factor		Existing Use	Proposed Project	Net Increase
	Daily Trips	**716**	**1,076**	**360**
AM Peak Hour	*In*	*11*	*16*	*5*
	Out	*7*	*11*	*4*
	Total AM Peak Hour	**18**	**27**	**9**
PM Peak Hour	*In*	*20*	*30*	*10*
	Out	*13*	*20*	*7*
	Total PM Peak Hour	**33**	**50**	**17**

Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, Table 6-1.

The study area contains 11 study intersections that provide local access and define the extent of the boundaries for the Traffic Impact Study (Table 27).

Table 27
Traffic Study Intersections for Proposed Project

Number	Intersection	Control
1	Saint John Avenue and California Boulevard	Traffic signal
2	Pasadena Avenue and California Boulevard	Traffic signal
3	Pasadena Avenue and Bellefontaine Street	Traffic signal
4	Fairmount Avenue and California Boulevard	Stop sign*
5	Fairmount Avenue and Congress Street	Stop sign
6	Fairmount Avenue and Bellefontaine Street	Stop sign
7	Fair Oaks Avenue and California Boulevard	Traffic signal
8	Fair Oaks Avenue and Congress Street	Traffic signal
9	Fair Oaks Avenue and Bellefontaine Street	Traffic signal
10	Raymond Avenue and California Boulevard	Traffic signal
11	Arroyo Parkway and California Boulevard	Traffic signal

Note: *A traffic signal will be installed at the Fairmount Avenue and California Boulevard intersection as part of the Outpatient Services Pavilion Project located at the southwest corner of the Fair Oaks Avenue and California Boulevard intersection.
Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, Table 6-1.

The 11 study intersections were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization method of analysis, which determines volume-to-capacity ratios. The overall intersection volume-to-capacity ratio was subsequently assigned a Level of Service (LOS) value to describe intersection operations, which can vary from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition).

Potential trips of the proposed Project were combined with other known development projects (related projects) in the area. The relative impact of the added Project traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak hours was evaluated based on analysis of future operating conditions at the 11 study intersections, with and without the proposed Project. The overall intersection volume-to-capacity ratio and the assigned LOS values were used to evaluate the future volume-to-capacity ratio relationships and service level characteristics at each study intersection.

The significance of the potential impacts of Project generated traffic at each of the 11 study intersections was identified.[29] According to the City's Sliding Scale Method for calculating the level of impact due to traffic generated by the proposed Project, the significance of transportation impacts was judged based on the criteria presented in Table 28.

Table 28
City of Pasadena Intersection Impact Threshold Criteria

Final Volume-to-Capacity	Level of Service	Project-Related Increase in Volume-to-Capacity
0.000 -0.600	A	Equal to or greater than 0.06
> 0.600 -0.700	B	Equal to or greater than 0.05
> 0.700 -0.800	C	Equal to or greater than 0.04
> 0.800 -0.900	D	Equal to or greater than 0.03
> 0.900 -1.000	E	Equal to or greater than 0.02
> 1.000	F	Equal to or greater than 0.01

Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, Table 8-1.

Table 29 lists the volume-to-capacity ratio and LOS for existing conditions (2007) and for the Year 2013 for various conditions, including ambient growth (existing future conditions), with related projects (without the proposed Project), and with related projects and the proposed Project.

[29] City of Pasadena, *Transportation Impact Review Current Practice & Guidelines,* prepared by Transportation Planning & Development Division, Department of Transportation, August 28, 2005.

Table 29
Summary of Volume to Capacity Ratios and Levels of Service at Traffic Study Intersections
Morning and Afternoon Peak Hours

Intersection	Peak Hour	Year 2007 Existing		Year 2013 with Ambient Growth		Year 2013 with Related Projects		Year 2013 with Proposed Project		Change in VC	Significant Impact?
		VC[1]	LOS[2]	VC	LOS	VC	LOS	VC	LOS		
Saint John Avenue and	AM	0.742	C	0.800	C	0.814	D	0.815	D	0.001	No
California Boulevard	PM	0.679	B	0.731	C	0.655	B	0.656	B	0.001	No
Pasadena Avenue and	AM	0.821	D	0.886	D	0.729	C	0.729	C	0.000	No
California Boulevard	PM.	0.967	E	1.045	F	1.047	F	1.048	F	0.001	No
Pasadena Avenue and	AM	0.700	B	0.754	C	0.778	C	0.779	C	0.001	No
Bellefontaine Street	PM	0.792	C	0.855	D	0.908	E	0.910	E	0.002	No
Fairmount Avenue and	AM	0.396	A	0.422	A	0.498	A	0.499	A	0.001	No
California Boulevard	PM	0.480	A	0.514	A	0.624	B	0.625	B	0.001	No
Fairmount Avenue and	AM	0.313	A	0.332	A	0.361	A	0.363	A	0.002	No
Congress Street	PM	0.273	A	0.288	A	0.327	A	0.331	A	0.004	No
Fairmount Avenue and	AM	0.358	A	0.381	A	0.425	A	0.426	A	0.001	No
Bellefontaine Street	PM	0.344	A	0.366	A	0.430	A	0.431	A	0.001	No
Fair Oaks Avenue and	AM	0.609	B	0.664	B	0.760	C	0.761	C	0.001	No
California Boulevard	PM	0.694	B	0.756	C	0.887	D	0.889	D	0.002	No
Fair Oaks Avenue and	AM	0.371	A	0.404	A	0.523	A	0.524	A	0.001	No
Congress Street	PM	0.419	A	0.457	A	0.596	A	0.598	A	0.002	No
Fair Oaks Avenue and	AM	0.509	A	0.546	A	0.577	A	0.577	A	0.000	No
Bellefontaine Street	PM	0.625	B	0.673	B	0.729	C	0.729	C	0.000	No
Raymond Avenue and	AM	0.447	A	0.474	A	0.414	A	0.414	A	0.000	No
California Boulevard	PM	0.574	A	0.612	B	0.584	A	0.585	A	0.001	No
Arroyo Parkway and	AM	0.820	D	0.881	D	0.823	D	0.823	D	0.000	No
California Boulevard	PM	1.023	F	1.101	F	1.044	F	1.044	F	0.000	No

Notes: [1] VC = Volume-to-capacity ratio.
[2] LOS = Level of service.
Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, Table 8-2.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

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

The proposed Project would be required to contribute funds toward transportation improvements (e.g., physical mitigation measures, corridor improvements, and Intelligent Transportation System improvements) identified in the South Fair Oaks Avenue Specific/Redevelopment Plan. Table 30 illustrates the determination of the 1.6 percent (386 ÷ 24,040) share for the proposed Project, which is based on its portion of certain traffic trips of the South Fair Oaks Avenue Specific/Redevelopment Plan.

Table 30
Trip Generation Forecast and Fair-Share Percentage of Proposed Project

Factor	South Fair Oaks Avenue Specific/Redevelopment Plan	Proposed Project
Net New Daily Trips	19,930	360
Net New Morning Peak Hour Trips	1,825	9
Net New Afternoon Peak Hour Trips	2,285	17
Total Trips	**24,040**	**386**
Fair-Share Percentage	**386 ÷ 24,040 = 1.6 percent**	

Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007.

Based on its portion of total trips generated, the Project's fair-share percentage is calculated to be 1.6 percent of the total identified improvement costs. The Project's fair-share percentage would be multiplied by the transportation improvement costs associated with the South Fair Oaks Avenue Specific/Redevelopment Plan to determine the Project's fair-share dollar contribution.

The proposed Project would not create any significant impacts at the 11 study intersections and, therefore, no direct traffic mitigation measures would be required or recommended for the study intersections. Transportation and traffic impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The Congestion Management Program (CMP) is intended to address the impact of local growth on the regional transportation system. A Traffic Impact Study[30] was prepared to determine the potential impacts on designated monitoring locations on the CMP highway system. The analysis has been prepared in accordance with procedures outlined in the *2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County*.[31] Five designated monitoring locations occur in the Project study area; two are at intersections, and three are located at freeways.

[30] *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007.

[31] *2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County*, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, adopted July 22, 2004.

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

CMP Intersection Monitoring Locations

- No. 119 Arroyo Parkway/California Boulevard; and
- No. 120 Pasadena Avenue-Saint John Avenue/California Boulevard

CMP Freeway Monitoring Locations

- No. 1056 Route 134 Freeway west of San Rafael Avenue;
- No. 1060 Interstate 210 (I-210) Freeway west of Routes 134-710; and
- No. 1061 I-210 Freeway at Rosemead Boulevard.

According to CMP Traffic Impact Analysis guidelines, if during either the morning or afternoon weekday peak periods (in either direction), the proposed Project would add 150 or more trips at *intersection monitoring locations* or would add 50 or more trips at *freeway monitoring locations,* additional examination of impacts would be required in a traffic impact assessment. The proposed Project would not add the requisite number of trips to trigger the requirement for this additional analysis; therefore, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways would not be exceeded. There would be no CMP level of service impacts.

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 proposed Project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft, because the Project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no impact on air traffic patterns.

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 City of Pasadena Department of Transportation has evaluated the Project and its impact on circulation. Its design has not been found to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the Project or in the vicinity of the Project. In addition, the Project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards; therefore, the proposed Project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have less than significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ( )	☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? One of the purposes of the proposed Project is to provide entry to the Emergency Department facility at the Huntington Memorial Hospital Emergency Department. Fairmount Avenue between California Boulevard and Congress Street Site would provide access for the proposed Project. The realigned segment of Fairmount Avenue (between the entry and exit points for the adjacent parking structures to the north and Congress Street to the south) would be divided into two drive aisles:

- One drive aisle would accommodate north-south vehicular traffic flow; and
- One drive aisle would provide a multi-lane entry to the Emergency Department facility.

Emergency vehicle and public traffic would use this segment of Fairmount Avenue to obtain access within the Project site. In addition, the realignment of Fairmount Avenue would also accommodate new overflow emergency vehicle parking that would be located in the multi-lane entry at the Emergency Department along the realigned portion of Fairmount Avenue.

An analysis of emergency vehicle maneuvering through the realigned segment of Fairmount Avenue (i.e., through the one-way southbound through travel lane, and into and out of the emergency vehicle drive aisle) was undertaken for single-unit, 26-foot to 27-foot fire vehicles. It was determined that access into and out of the realigned segment of Fairmount Avenue and the emergency vehicle drive aisle could be accommodated with head-in and head-out turning maneuvers.[32]

The Project would not eliminate a through-route or narrow a roadway. Proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes would meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards. The Project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and Project plans would be subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Consequently, impacts related to inadequate emergency access would be less than significant.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ( )	☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? California Boulevard, Pasadena Avenue, Bellefontaine Street, Fair Oaks Avenue and Fairmount Avenue, a two-way, privately owned road, provide immediate access to the Emergency Department and Huntington Memorial Hospital campus parking facilities, which are the following:[33]

- North Parking Garage;
- East Parking Garage;
- South Parking Garage;

---

[32] *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, page 8 and Appendix A.

[33] Huntington Hospital Facility Map, http://huntingtonhospital.com/textandcontent.cfm?id=3687, website accessed November 5, 2007.

- Congress Parking Lot; and
- Pasadena Avenue Lot.

The existing parking facilities at the hospital provide a total of 2,408 parking spaces. Table 31 provides a summary of the parking facilities at the Hospital.

Table 31
Parking Facilities

Parking Facility	Capacity	Occupancy Counts	Surplus
North Parking Garage	683	606	77
East Parking Garage	623	547	76
South Parking Garage	963	889	74
Congress Parking Lot	60	49	11
Pasadena Parking Lot	79	63	16
Total	**2,408**	**2,154**	**254**

Source: Parking study conducted by the Huntington Memorial Hospital, January 2007.

It is assumed that most of the visitors to the proposed Project would park in the East Parking Garage and the Congress Street parking, which are closest to the Emergency Department. The East Parking Garage has an average daily surplus of 76 spaces, and the Congress Street parking lot has an average daily surplus of 11 spaces, for a total of 87 surplus spaces. Campus-wide there is an average daily surplus of approximately 254 spaces.

The Zoning Code requires three parking spaces per bed that "a hospital facility is licensed to accommodate."[34] The proposed Project would not include the addition of permanent hospital beds; therefore, the addition of parking spaces is not required by code. The proposed Project would result in an annual increase in the number of patients visiting the Hospital campus (ultimately an annual increase of 30,000 patients). While it is difficult to predict the frequency or timing of patient visits associated with the Project (visits to the Emergency Department are usually unplanned), a 30,000-person annual increase would result in a daily average increase of approximately 82 patients and associated visitors. With a campus-wide average daily surplus of parking spaces of approximately 254 spaces, the increase of 82 patients and associated visitors would not result in inadequate parking. It is anticipated that existing parking on the Hospital campus would be adequate to serve the proposed Project. For this reason, impacts associated with parking capacity would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The Huntington Memorial Hospital campus is located near several multi-modal corridors such as:

[34] Pasadena Zoning Code, Title 17, Section 17.46.040, *Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required*, and Table 4-6 found within Section 17.46.040.

- Fair Oaks Avenue
- Raymond Avenue
- Arroyo Parkway
- Del Mar Boulevard
- California Boulevard
- Glenarm Street

Multi-modal corridors are being developed in the City of Pasadena to promote the efficient and convenient travel by all appropriate modes (e.g., pedestrian, bicycle, regional and local bus transit, light rail, vehicular). As stated in the Mobility Element of the *City of Pasadena General Plan Update*, the City's intent is to:

> *...create an environment where different modes of travel can co-exist and share the roadway, providing seamless connections and reinforcing each other to develop a balanced and efficient transportation system.*

The Project site supports the following alternative transportation modes:

- Pedestrian activity;
- Bicycling;
- Bus transit; and
- Metro Gold Line.

The Huntington Memorial Hospital campus is located to facilitate pedestrian activity. Existing pedestrian walkways are located throughout the Project site and connect to the Emergency Department facility and adjacent sidewalks in a manner that promotes walkability. The pedestrian walkways within the campus are landscaped and adorned to provide a pleasant walking environment. Additionally, the walkways are well lit and include a wayfinding signage program.

The existing City of Pasadena bicycle roadway network contributes to bicycle access to the Project site. There are eight Class II bike lanes or Class III bike routes[35] in the City's bicycle network located within an approximate 1.0-mile radius from the Project site. The following key bicycle routes are located near the Huntington Memorial Hospital campus:

North-South Bike Routes

- Saint John Avenue: Class II Bike Lane north of Del Mar Boulevard
- Pasadena Avenue: Class II Bike Lane north of Del Mar Boulevard
- Marengo Avenue: Class III Bike Route north of Del Mar Boulevard and Class II Bike Lane south of Del Mar Boulevard
- Los Robles Avenue: Class III Bike Route (Enhanced)

East-West Bike Routes

- Cordova Street: Class III Bike Route (Enhanced)
- Del Mar Boulevard: Class III Bike Route
- California Boulevard: Class III Bike Route west of Lake Avenue
- Glenarm Street: Class III Bike Route west of Marengo Avenue and Class II Bike Lane east of Marengo Avenue

Public bus transit service in the Project area is currently provided by:

[35] Class II bikeways are lanes on the outside edge of roadways reserved for the exclusive use of bicycles and are designated with special signage and pavement markings. Class III bikeways are roadways recommended for bicycle use and are designated with signs posted along roadways.

- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro);
- Foothill Transit Service; and
- Pasadena Area Rapid Transit Service.

Metro and Foothill Transit Service bus stops are provided along the west side of Fair Oaks Avenue adjacent the Project site. A summary of the existing transit routes is presented in Table 32.

Table 32
Existing Transit Routes

Route	Destination	Roadway Near Project Site
Metro 256	*City of Commerce to Altadena* via East Los Angeles, California State University, Los Angeles, El Sereno, Highland Park, Pasadena	California Boulevard
Metro 260	*Compton to Altadena* via Lynwood, Cudahy, Maywood, East Los Angeles, Monterey Par, Alhambra, Pasadena	Fair Oaks Avenue
Metro 361	*Compton to Altadena* via Lynwood, Cudahy, Maywood, East Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Alhambra, Pasadena	Fair Oaks Avenue
Metro 686	*Altadena to Pasadena* via Fair Oaks Avenue, Colorado Boulevard, Los Robles Avenue	Fair Oaks Avenue
Metro 686	Los Angeles to Pasadena	Fair Oaks Avenue
Metro 687	*Pasadena* via California Boulevard, Lake Avenue, Woodbury Avenue	Fair Oaks Avenue
Metro 804 (Gold Line)	*Los Angeles to Pasadena*	Fair Oaks Avenue (Fillmore Station)
ARTS 20	*Pasadena* via California Boulevard, lake Avenue, Woodbury Avenue	Fair Oaks Avenue
ARTS 51/52	*Pasadena* via Linda Vista Avenue, Fair Oaks Avenue, Jet Propulsion Laboratory	Fair Oaks Avenue

Note: *ARTS = Area Rapid Transit System.
Source: *Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project*, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007, Table 4-1.

The Project site lends itself to the use of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Gold Line Light Rail system. The Metro Gold Line Fillmore Street Station is located approximately two blocks east of the Project site at the Raymond Avenue/Fillmore Street intersection. The Metro Gold Line is a light rail transit line that runs east to west from East Pasadena to the Pasadena Civic Center area and north to south from the Pasadena Civic Center area to Union Station in Downtown Los Angeles. During the morning and afternoon peak commute hours, Metro Gold Line service provides six trains per hour in northbound and southbound directions. The Metro Gold Line provides six stations in the City of Pasadena:

- Sierra Madre Villa Station
- Allen Avenue Station
- Lake Avenue Station
- Memorial Park Station
- Del Mar Station
- Fillmore Street Station

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

The Mobility Element of the *City of Pasadena General Plan Update* emphasizes the use of alternative transportation. Because of its location, the Project site incorporates pedestrian activity, bicycling, bus transit, and the Metro Gold Line. The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and there would be no impacts.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The Project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage, and domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements. The Project would also generate medical-related wastewater similar to that currently generated by the Hospital Emergency Department. Wastewater currently generated at the Hospital is discharged into the sanitary sewer system and no special pretreatment is required.[36] Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater and would continue to treat wastewater generated by the proposed Project. The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.

Individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when connected to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There would be no unusual wastes in the Project's wastewater that could not be treated by County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. Wastewater treatment impacts would be less than significant.

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 Pasadena Water and Power Department is responsible for supplying water to the Project site. The Department of Public Works Engineering Division maintains the City's local sewer system. Flows from the local system are ultimately carried to trunk sewers operated by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles.[37]

The proposed Project would include the addition of 54,480 square feet to the existing Hospital to allow for a higher patient capacity and increased staff and thus, would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. However, the infrastructure to serve the Project site is already in place and currently serving the Hospital.

During Phase One of the construction of the proposed Project, relocation and connection staging of utilities would occur. Existing water and sanitary sewer lines located within Fairmount Avenue would be relocated

[36] Tom Romeyn, Huntington Memorial Hospital, Director of Facilities Services, personal correspondence, email dated November 8, 2007.

[37] Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004, page 195.

along the realigned portion of Fairmount Avenue and remain within the roadway. As the Project includes the removal of the 47 Congress Street medical office building, water usage and wastewater generation at that building would no longer occur. The proposed increase of water and wastewater service demand would be negligible when compared to total existing demand from the water and wastewater service purveyors.

Subject to connection fees, the only water and wastewater improvements required for the Project would be the provision of on-site unit connections to the existing systems; therefore, the proposed Project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off the Project site, and impacts would be less than significant.

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 would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The Project site is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. During Phase One of Project construction, the relocation of utilities and utility connection staging would occur. The storm drain located along Fairmount Avenue would be relocated to remain within that roadway after realignment. This realigned portion of the storm drainage system would connect with the existing storm drainage facility. Storm drains would also be installed to direct storm drainage from the building area toward Fairmount Avenue.

As the site is already developed with landscaping and buildings, the new construction associated with the Project would not significantly change the amount of stormwater runoff present on the site. Further, the Project applicant must submit and implement a site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department, and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak stormwater runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak stormwater runoff rates. The proposed Project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? The Project would require increased water usage, as the building expansion would accommodate an increase in patient capacity and staff. This increase in water usage would be partially offset by the loss of water usage at the medical office building that would be demolished as part of the Project. Existing water and sanitary sewer lines presently located within Fairmount Avenue would be relocated along the realigned portion of Fairmount Avenue and remain within the private road. The implementation of the proposed Project would not demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than a 500 dwelling unit project, and therefore would not trigger the requirement for the preparation of a water supply assessment as set forth in Sections 10910 to 10912 of the California Water Code.

Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project applicant would be required to satisfy City requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provision of adequate water facilities. All facilities would be

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

designed, installed, and maintained to meet water supply standards. Prior to development, the Project applicant would be required to obtain evidence that the Project's water demands can be met. Adherence to these conditions would result in less than significant impacts.

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? The Department of Public Works Engineering Division maintains the City's local sewer system. Flows from the local system are ultimately carried to trunk sewers operated by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles.[38] As previously discussed, the square footage that would be added to the existing Hospital building would result in higher patient capacity and the requirement for more staff, thereby increasing the demand for wastewater service. Patients visiting the proposed Project would be expected to have a high turnover rate and not have long-term stays. The City has a wastewater generation rate of 500 gallons per bed for surgical hospital uses, but the proposed Project would not add any permanent beds to the Hospital's total bed count. For the purpose of analysis, an alternative wastewater average daily flow rate for medical buildings was used to estimate flows generated.

The City's flow rate for medical buildings is 300 gallons per 1,000 square feet gross floor area.[39] With the demolition of the existing 5,100 square-foot medical office building, the wastewater from that building would no longer be discharged. As shown in Table 33, the new building addition would generate wastewater flows of approximately 16,344 gallons. Subtracting wastewater generation of the existing medical office building from the wastewater generated by the new building addition would result in an increase in wastewater generation from the Project site of approximately 14,814 gallons per day.

Table 33
Wastewater Generation

Use	Generation Rate	Square footage	Total Average Daily Flow (gallons)
Proposed Project	300 gallons per 1,000 square feet	54,480	16,344
Existing Medical Office Building	300 gallons per 1,000 square feet	5,100	1,530
Increase in Wastewater Generated at the Project Site			**14,814**

Source: City of Pasadena, Agenda Report, Public Hearing: *Amendment to the Schedule of Taxes, Fees and Charges to Establish a New Charge for Sewer Facilities and Direct the City Attorney to Prepare an Ordinance to Establish the Fee*, October 22, 2007.

[38] City of Pasadena, Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, certified 2004, page 195.

[39] City of Pasadena, Agenda Report, Public Hearing: *Amendment to the Schedule of Taxes, Fees and Charges to Establish a New Charge for Sewer Facilities and Direct the City Attorney to Prepare an Ordinance to Establish the Fee*, October 22, 2007.

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

The majority of the City's wastewater flows south of the I-210 Freeway are collected in various smaller trunk lines and flow out of the City's service area to be collected in the Los Angeles County Sanitation District trunk line.[40] Existing infrastructure for wastewater service is already in place in the Project area. The proposed Project would include the relocation of the sanitary sewer line and replacement of sewer connections simultaneously with the realignment of Fairmount Avenue. The relocated utilities in Fairmount Avenue would connect with the 8-inch sewer line in Congress Street. Wastewater discharged from the Project site would flow downstream in sewer lines ranging in size from 8 inches to 33 inches.

Approximately 1,165 feet of sewer pipeline downstream of the Project site is considered deficient, based on wet flow design criteria.[41] These reaches of sewer are along and north of State Street.[42] Deficiencies are based on design criteria and not operational deficiencies; therefore, no upgrades to the existing sewer infrastructure in the area are planned. In October 2007, the Pasadena City Council approved the establishment of a new sewer facility fair-share fee of $6.19 per gallon per day to offset a project's contribution to sewer deficiencies in the City.[43] While the proposed Project would increase wastewater demand, a portion of this increased demand would be offset by the demolition of the 47 Congress Street medical office building, as it would no longer house patients and staff who would generate wastewater flows. The payment of the City's fair share fee for sewer facilities would ensure that the Project's impacts to the City's sewer infrastructure would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? A private hauler that disposes of waste in local landfills currently serves the Hospital. The proposed Project would increase the waste stream at the Hospital; however, waste disposal would still be handled by the existing hauler and transported to the same landfills. Pasadena is served by the nearby Scholl Canyon landfill and the Puente Hills landfill, both of which are operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. The Scholl Canyon landfill is permitted to accept a maximum of 3,400 tons of solid waste per day,[44] and Puente Hills landfill is permitted to accept a maximum of 13,200 tons of solid waste per day.[45] Due to permit tonnage limitations, these landfills may close early on some days, and waste destined for a landfill that closes early is rerouted to other landfill facilities operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles.[46]

Based on a solid waste generation of 0.0108 tons per square foot of hospital uses per year[47] the proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 1.61 tons[48] of solid waste per day. When landfills close early

---

40 City of Pasadena, Master Sewer Plan, January 2007, page 3-13.

41 Yannie Wu, City of Pasadena Department of Public Works, Associate Engineer, personal correspondence, email dated November 1, 2007.

42 Ibid.

43 City of Pasadena, Agenda Report, Public Hearing: *Amendment to the Schedule of Taxes, Fees and Charges to Establish a New Charge for Sewer Facilities and Direct the City Attorney to Prepare an Ordinance to Establish the Fee*, October 22, 2007.

44 California Integrated Waste Management Board, Solid Waste Information System, www.ciwmb.ca.gov, site accessed September 17, 2007.

45 California Integrated Waste Management Board, Solid Waste Information System, www.ciwmb.ca.gov, site accessed September 17, 2007.

46 Los Angeles County Sanitation District, District Facilities, http://www.lacsd.org/info/solid_waste/open_districts_facilities.asp, site accessed September 17, 2007.

47 California Integrated Waste Management Board, *Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates*, http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/Institution.htm, site accessed September 17, 2007.

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

on days when permit tonnage limitations are met, waste would be rerouted to another landfill. Thus, it is anticipated that landfills operated by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles would be able to accommodate waste generated by the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

WHY? In 1992, the City of Pasadena adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act, which requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50 percent or better diversion rate for solid waste. Chapter 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, *Solid Waste Collection Franchise System*, regulates the City's source reduction program. As described in Section 8.61.175, *Required Recycling Diversion Rates,* each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50 percent on both a monthly and annual basis.

Chapter 8.62, *Waste Management Plan for Certain Construction and Demolition Projects within the City of Pasadena*, contains plan considerations and review requirements for projects, as well as thresholds for requiring the plans. According to Section 8.62.030, *Application of Chapter to Covered Projects*, the proposed Project is a "covered project" for the following reasons:

- Tenant improvements of 3,000 square feet or more of gross floor area; and
- Demolition of 1,000 square feet or more of gross floor area.

The Waste Management Plan would be listed as a condition of approval on all building or demolition permits issued, as stated in Section 8.62.030 (B).

The proponent of the proposed Project would be required to comply with the recycling system of the applicable solid waste franchise and thus, would meet solid waste diversion regulations of Pasadena and California; moreover, a Waste Management Plan would be completed as part of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would comply with local, State, and Federal statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and a less than significant impact would occur.

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D).

a. **Earlier Analysis Used.** No program EIR, tiering, or other process can be used for analysis of the Project's environmental effects.

[48] (0.0108 tons/sq. ft/yr × 54,480 sq. ft of hospital uses = 588 tons/yr) = 588 tons/year ÷ 365 days = approximately 1.61 tons per day.

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

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 the forgoing analysis, the Project site is located within an urbanized area, and the proposed Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed Project would not have a significant aesthetic impact because of strict compliance with City zoning and design standards. The proposed Project would generate emissions of NO_x exceeding District thresholds during construction of the proposed Project. In addition, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ generated during construction would exceed LSTs. Emissions in excess of standards would result in significant impacts to the sensitive receptors located in the East Patient Tower of the Hospital; however, with implementation of mitigation, Project-related emissions would not exceed significance thresholds, and the impacts to sensitive receptors would be reduced to a less than significant level. As the Project site is already developed, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources. Additionally, compliance with City and State standards and programs for stormwater and water quality would make certain that no significant impacts to water resources would occur.

The Project site is fully developed and does not contain habitat for fish or wildlife species. Vegetation present on the Project site is limited to ornamental landscaping. The development of the proposed Project would not result in the loss of any habitat and accordingly would not reduce the habitat or a fish or wildlife species or cause a population of any species to drop. While the Project would result in the removal of trees protected by Ordinance 6896, *City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance,* compliance with the Ordinance and obtaining a permit for removal would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

The "Design and Historic Preservation Review" for the Project conducted by City staff determined that the building proposed for demolition did not contain any significant historical value. In addition, the Project would not result in any significant impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources. For this reason, the Project would not eliminate important examples of a major period of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

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. As the Project site is fully developed, the construction of the proposed Project would not contribute to any cumulative biological impacts. Construction and operation of the Project would result in the emission of pollutants in a

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

Basin that is currently in non-attainment for ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}; however, with incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project would not exceed the District's thresholds and would not significantly contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Increased traffic would occur in the immediate Project vicinity as a result of the Project; however, the payment of fair share fees would serve to reduce the Project's cumulative impact associated with traffic. The Project would not result in substantial increased burdens associated with housing, public services, recreation, or utilities, and would therefore, not contribute to significant cumulative impacts for any of these topics. Impacts associated with cumulative impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation provided in this Initial Study.

c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?* ( )

☐	☒	☐	☐

WHY? As discussed in the earlier analysis, the proposed Project would generate emissions of NO_x exceeding District thresholds during construction of the proposed Project. In addition, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ generated during construction would exceed LSTs. Emissions in excess of standards would result in significant impacts to the sensitive receptors located in the East Patient Tower of the Hospital; however, with implementation of mitigation (**AIR-1** through **AIR-4**), Project-related emissions would not exceed significance thresholds, and would not cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings. The building at 47 Congress Street that would be demolished as part of the proposed Project has asbestos in its exterior window putty and roof mastic. The implementation of mitigation measure **HAZ-1**, which requires the Project applicant to retain a registered asbestos abatement contractor to supervise demolition activities and handle all asbestos containing material, would ensure that the asbestos would not cause any adverse effects on human beings. The Project site is not subject to any flooding hazards and would not expose any persons to related risks. Although patients in the proposed expansion would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, the Project is required to adhere to strict seismic standards required by the UBC, CBC, Alquist Act and SB 1953, which would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. The Project would generate noise levels up to a maximum of 88.6 DBA during construction. When building attenuation is taken into consideration, patients within the East Patient Tower could be exposed to noise levels up to 68.6 dBA, which is within the "normally acceptable" range identified for hospital uses. Mitigation measures **NOISE-1** through **NOISE-3**, which would require to construction contractor to adhere to established hours for construction activity and to install temporary sound barriers during construction activities, would further reduce noise levels associated with the Project. During the long-term operation of the Project, noise levels would within acceptable ranges and would not result in any adverse effect on human beings. As demonstrated in the preceding analysis, with implementation of mitigation measures, there are no environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The implementation of air, noise, and asbestos mitigation, coupled with existing regulatory requirements, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alfred E. Alquist Hospital Facilities Seismic Safety Act 1983, Health and Safety Code, Division 107 Statewide Health Planning and Development, Part 7, Facilities Design Review and Construction, Chapter 1, Health Facilities, updated January 1, 2007.
2	California Department of Conservation, Seismic Hazard Maps, Pasadena quadrangle maps released March 25, 1999.
3	California Integrated Waste Management Board, Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/Institution.htm, site accessed September 17, 2007.
4	California Integrated Waste Management Board, Solid Waste Information System, www.ciwmb.ca.gov, site accessed September 17, 2007.
5	City of Pasadena, Agenda Report, Public Hearing: Amendment to the Schedule of Taxes, Fees and Charges to Establish a New Charge for Sewer Facilities and Direct the City Attorney to Prepare an Ordinance to Establish the Fee, October 22, 2007.
6	City of Pasadena, Design and Historic Preservation Review, Darrell Cozen, data provided via email, dated August 8, 2007.
7	City of Pasadena, Energy Element of the General Plan, adopted 1983.
8	City of Pasadena, Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004.
9	City of Pasadena, Huntington Hospital Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion, Pre-Application Conference for Master Development Plan Amendment, prepared by Freeman White, no date.
10	City of Pasadena, Land Use Element of the General Plan, adopted 2004.
11	City of Pasadena, Master Sewer Plan, January 2007.
12	City of Pasadena, Pasadena Plan Submittal Requirements, Permit Center, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Regulation Thresholds (SUSMP), http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/permitcenter/plansubreq/susmp.asp, site accessed September 17, 2007.
13	City of Pasadena, Revised Noise Element of the General Plan, Existing and Future Conditions, December 2002.
14	City of Pasadena, Safety Element of the General Plan, adopted 2002.
15	City of Pasadena, Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, adopted 1975.
16	City of Pasadena, Sewer Master Plan, January 2007.
17	City of Pasadena, Transportation Impact Review Current Practice & Guidelines, prepared by Transportation Planning & Development Division, Department of Transportation, August 28, 2005.
18	Department of Toxic Substances Control, CORTESE list, http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm, site accessed September 17, 2007.
19	Final Traffic Impact Study, HMH Emergency Department Expansion Project, City of Pasadena, California, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, October 10, 2007.
20	Huntington Hospital Facility Map, http://huntingtonhospital.com/textandcontent.cfm?id=3687, website accessed November 5, 2007.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
21	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County, adopted July 22, 2004.
22	Los Angeles County Sanitation District, District Facilities, http://www.lacsd.org/info/solid_waste/open_districts_facilities.asp, site accessed September 17, 2007.
23	Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended. Chapter 8.52, City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance. Chapter 8.61, Solid Waste Collection Franchise System. Chapter 8.62, Waste Management Plan for Certain Construction and Demolition Projects within the City of Pasadena. Chapter 8.70, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Control Ordinance. Chapter 9.36, Noise Restrictions Title 17, Zoning.
24	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, FERO Environmental Engineers, Inc., July 10, 2001.
25	South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993.
26	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District, Planning and Development, codified 1998.
27	Southern California Association of Governments, City Projections, http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/index.htm, site accessed August 29, 2007.
28	Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, Growth Management Chapter, June 1994.
29	State of California, California Seismic Safety Commission, Homeowners' Guide to Earthquake Safety, 2005 Edition, pages 7 and 38
30	State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2007, with 2000 Benchmark, Sacramento, California, May 2007.
31	State of California, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development Facilities Development Division, Seismic Retrofit Program - SB1953, http://www.oshpd.state.ca.us/fdd/SB1953/index.htm, site accessed September 30, 2007.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Huntington Memorial Hospital Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion
100 West California Boulevard

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for Huntington Memorial Hospital Master Development Plan Master Development Plan Amendment for the Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion, located at 100 West California Boulevard, has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – Public Resources Code, Section 21000 *et seq.*), the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15074 and 15097) and the City of Pasadena CEQA Guidelines. A master copy of this MMRP shall be kept in the office of the Zoning Administrator and shall be available for viewing upon request. A copy also will be available at the office of the Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator.

The proposed project consists of two major components: an amendment to the Huntington Memorial Hospital Master Development Plan, and the development of the **Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion Project**. The proposed Master Development Plan Amendment would allow the development of the proposed Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion Project, including the revision of the Master Development Plan site plan, increase in the allowable floor area to accommodate the Expansion, and establishment of a height limit for the Expansion. Specifically, the project includes: demolition of the medical office building at 47 Congress Street, utility connection staging, and the realignment of Fairmount Avenue between California Boulevard and Congress Street; construction of the new 22,120 square-foot Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion addition, with 1,170 square-foot first-floor renovation, 16,180 square-foot second level addition, 16,180 square-foot third level addition, and roof level addition; renovation of the existing Emergency Department; and build out of the radiology and computed tomography (CT) scan rooms on the ground floor.

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

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

Monitoring Program Cost:

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

APPLICANT

2/18/08
DATE

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix

Huntington Memorial Hospital Emergency Department and Vertical Expansion
100 West California Boulevard

Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring Timing	Responsible Monitoring Entity	Mitigation Measure Complete?	Effectiveness
Impact 1 – Air Quality				
AIR – 1: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Construction Contractor shall provide evidence to the City of Pasadena showing that the following measures are being implemented to reduce air pollutants generated during Project construction: • Maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications and during smog season (May through October). No construction equipment shall be left idling for more than five minutes (per California law): • The application of water on disturbed soils three times per day; • Stabilizing graded site surfaces upon completion of grading when subsequent development is delayed or expected to be delayed more than thirty days, except when such delay is due to precipitation that dampens the disturbed surface sufficiently to eliminate visible fugitive dust emissions; • The Construction Contractor shall prevent Project-related trackout	Prior to issuance of permit for demolition	Building Division, Planning and Development Department		

Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring Timing	Responsible Monitoring Entity	Mitigation Measure Complete?	Effectiveness
onto paved surfaces and cleanup Project-related trackout or spills on publicly maintained paved surfaces at the end of each day; and, • All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 15 mph averaged over a one-hour duration.				
AIR - 2: During construction activity, the Construction Contractor shall be required to adhere to District Rule 431.2, which requires the use of diesel fuel with sulfur contact of 15 parts per million (ppm) or less by weight.	Periodically during construction (at least once per month)	Building Division, Planning and Development Department		
AIR - 3: The Construction Contractor shall ensure that all off-road heavy-duty construction equipment utilized during construction activity will be California Air Resources Board Tier 3 Certified or better.	Periodically during construction (at least once per month)	Building Division, Planning and Development Department		
AIR - 4: During construction activity, the Construction Contractor shall be required to use only low-polluting paints and coatings as defined in SCAQMD Rule 1113.	Prior to construction	Building Division, Planning and Development Department		
Impact 2 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
HAZ – 1: Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project applicant shall retain an asbestos abatement contractor registered with the Division of Occupational Safety and Health. The	Prior to the issuance of a permit for demolition of the structure at 47 Congress Street	Building Division, Planning and Development Department		

Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Monitoring Timing	Responsible Monitoring Entity	Mitigation Measure Complete?	Effectiveness
asbestos abatement contractor shall be present on the Project site during the demolition of the medical office building located at 47 Congress Street and shall perform all portions of the work handling the asbestos containing materials. Any abatement or removal of asbestos containing materials shall be performed in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations.				

Disclosure Pursuant to the City of Pasadena Taxpayer Protection Act Pasadena City Charter, Article XVII

I. Does the value of this application/project ***have the potential*** to exceed $25,000? ☒ Yes ☐ No **(Applicant *must* mark one)**

II. Is the application being made on behalf of a non-profit 501(c) organization? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If yes, please indicate the type of 501(c) organization: ☒ 501(c)(3) ☐ 501(c)(4) ☐ 501(c)(6)

Applicant's name: Huntington Memorial Hospital Date of Application: _____

Owner's name: Huntington Memorial Hospital Contact phone number: (626) 397-5555
(for questions regarding this form)

Project Address: 100 West California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91105

Project Description: Emergency Department Expansion

_____

III. Applicant and Property Owner must disclose all joint owners, trustees, directors, partners, officers and those with more than a 10% equity, participation or revenue interest in owner and/or project. If any of these are an organization/entity, include the name of the organization/entity **and** the first and last names of all parties of interest of that organization/entity. *(List all parties below and use additional sheets as necessary, or provide all parties on an attachment)* **Please print legibly.** Have any additional sheets or an attachment been provided? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Names of Owner(s), Trustees, Directors, Partners, Officers of Owner/Project	Names of Owner(s), Trustees, Directors, Partners, Officers of Owner/Project (continued)	Those with more than a 10% equity, participation or revenue interest in Owner and/or Project
See attached		None

I hereby certify that I am the owner or designated agent and that the statements and answers contained herein, and the information attached, are in all respects true, accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Owner or Designated Agent: _____ Date: 10/15/07

For Office Use Only

Type of Application: ☐ Variance (all types) ☐ Adjustment Permit ☐ Sign Exception ☐ Temporary Use Permit ☐ Expressive Use Permit ☐ Conditional Use Permit (excluding Master Plan) ☐ Master Plan Amendment ☐ Planned Development ☐ Other

Assigned Planner: _____ PLN#: _____

Attached Address: _____ ☐ No Attached Address

Appealed: Yes ☐ No Appeal PLN# _____ Application Withdrawn

Final Decision: Approved Denied Decision Date: _____ Decision Maker: _____
(Name and Title, or Name of Commission/Committee)

Votes in favor *(please print)*:

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

HUNTINGTON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
2007
(as of 5/01/07)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

James P. Blitz, M.D.
Jack F. Brent
Teresa L. Caldwell
Suzanne V. Crowell
Kalman Edelman, M.D.
Reed S. Gardiner
Armando L. Gonzalez, F.A.I.A.
Julia S. Gouw
Brian E. Henderson, M.D.
Leighton Hull
Steven Katz, M.D.
Ellen Lee
Harvey Lenkin
Leonard M. Marangi, *Treasurer*
Allen W. Mathies, Jr., M.D., *President Emeritus*
Lois S. Matthews, *Chairman*
Paul L.H. Ouyang, *Secretary*
Stephen A. Ralph, *President*
James F. Rothenberg, *Vice President*
John C. Siciliano
Rosemary B. Simmons
Jaynie Studenmund
Jon R. Yasuda

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Leonard M. Marangi, *Treasurer*
Lois S. Matthews, *Chairman*
Paul L.H. Ouyang, *Secretary*
James F. Rothenberg, *Vice Chairman*

EMERITUS

Verne Orr