

CORRESPONDENCE



East Arroyo Residents Association

P.O. Box 93828, Pasadena, CA 91109-3828

626-796-0324

Email: pasadenaeara@gmail.com

Sunday, June 01, 2008

Mayor Bill Bogaard
Vice-Mayor Steve Haderlein
Councilmember Jacque Robinson
Councilmember Margaret McAustin
Councilmember Chris Holden
Councilmember Victor Gordo
Councilmember Steve Madison
Councilmember Sid Tyler

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

08 JUN -2 PM 2:28

RECEIVED

Re: Statement from the East Arroyo Residents Association (EARA) regarding City Council certification of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)

Dear Council Members and Mayor Bogaard,

During recent discussions of the SEIR at the most recent Rose Bowl Operating Company (RBOC) meeting (May 1st, 2008) and by the Economic Development and Technology Committee (EDTech) of the Pasadena City Council (May 28th, 2008) the Linda Vista – Annandale Association (LVAA) voiced their opinion that the SEIR fails to adequately address traffic, transportation and air quality issues as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), does not adequately respond to the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32) regarding mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions, and underestimates the cumulative effects of other proposed projects in the greater Arroyo area.

While not specifically commenting on whether or not the City of Pasadena has any legal or procedural requirements to further address these issues prior to certifying the SEIR, the EARA respectfully requests that the City Council adopt a resolution to direct the RBOC, and/or other appropriate city agencies, to undertake an updated comprehensive transportation and traffic study of the greater Arroyo Seco area and that this study be completed prior to the start of the demolition or construction phases of ANY new projects in the greater Arroyo Seco area.

Regarding AB 32, Teresa Fuentes of the City Attorney's Office indicated during the May 28th, 2008 EDTech Committee meeting that AB 32 is an evolving area of law and that regulations are being developed by an outside agency to help cities comply with AB 32. The EARA respectfully requests that the City Council adopt a resolution that will require any future

6/2/2008
5.A.3

projects in the greater Arroyo Seco area to revisit AB 32 during the project review and approval process to ensure compliance with current AB 32 regulations.

The EARA is generally in support of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project and we look forward to continuing to work with Darryl Dunn and the RBOC as the project moves forward in the coming years.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and requests.

Respectfully,

Marilynne Kennedy,
EARA
President

Gordon Treweek
EARA
Arroyo/Rose Bowl Co-Chair

Neil Barry
EARA
Arroyo/Rose Bowl Co-Chair

CC: Acting City Manager Bernard Melekian
Office of the City Council and Mayor, Jana Stewart
Darryl Dunn, Rose Bowl General Manager

LINDA VISTA-ANNANDALE ASSOCIATION

Post Office Box 94364, Pasadena, California 91109

RECEIVED

June 1, 2008

'08 JUN -2 AM 11:35

Mayor Bill Bogaard and City Council Members
City of Pasadena
c/o City Clerk's Office

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

Re: City Council Meeting on June 2, 2008 --
Agenda Item No. 5A.(3): Rose Bowl Renovation Project and
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Council Members:

The Linda Vista-Annandale Association (LVAA) hereby submits the following additional comments to assist in your review of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR), and, your review of the Cover Memo dated as of June 2, 2008, from the City Manager's office summarizing the City Attorney's responses to questions of EdTech regarding the greenhouse gas analysis in the FSEIR.

1. In response to the first bullet point in the Cover Memo, the "legal landscape" regarding the regulation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) in the CEQA context is not shifting or unclear, even though GHC CEQA Guidelines are not yet available. For months, the State Attorney General's office has been challenging local governments to recognize that CEQA now requires local governments to disclose and evaluate significant impacts of proposed projects and adopt all feasible measures to mitigate those impacts, including cumulatively significant impacts such as increased greenhouse gas emissions.

- On Page 1 of the Attorney General's letter dated February 19, 2008, to cities in California, presumably including Pasadena, the Attorney General states the following:

As the Legislature recognized last year when it enacted Senate Bill No. 97, greenhouse gas emissions are the type of environmental effect that agencies must (emphasis added) address under CEQA. Throughout California, cities, counties and regional planning entities have begun to address global warming as an integral part of their planning efforts, as CEQA requires, even in the absence of regulatory thresholds of significance.

- Attached hereto, and incorporated by this reference, are copies of other relevant documentation issued by the State Attorney General's office, including the letter

referred to above, clarifying and detailing the Attorney General's position that current CEQA review of a project, to be legally adequate, must include current, feasible mitigation measures to reduce green house gas emissions. Included in these copies is a list of examples of project greenhouse gas reduction measures.

2. In response to the second and third bullet points in the Cover Memo, the Air Quality analysis in the FSEIR, in fact, is legally inadequate without inclusion of updated Traffic Analyses and current, feasible mitigation measures to reduce cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts.

- The use of, and reliance on, outdated Traffic Analyses in the FSEIR makes the Air Quality section of the FSEIR legally inadequate. The FSEIR also fails to adequately analyze the ever expanding cumulative impacts of currently proposed adjacent projects and increasingly intense use of the Rose Bowl and Arroyo Seco. Of great importance to LVAA is the current proposal to significantly increase Art Center traffic in our neighborhood and the cumulative traffic and air quality impacts of the Rose Bowl and Art Center projects. Please see LVAA's discussion of the use of outdated Traffic Analyses and Cumulative Impacts in its prior letter to the Council dated May 30, 2008.
- The FSEIR, in fact, does appear to use current air quality analyses standards, including the URBEMIS 2007 computer model, and does refer to AB 32. The FSEIR, in effect, then concludes that construction and operational air quality, including GHG, impacts from the project will be significant and unavoidable, and need not and cannot be feasibly mitigated. In this regard, the direction from the State Attorney General is clear: feasible mitigation measures to reduce cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts must be included now in project environmental analyses.

3. In response to the last paragraph of the Cover Memo, generalized and vague promises of future mitigation are legally inadequate, and, all mitigation language, to be legally sufficient, must be included in the FSEIR itself.

- California courts have held that generalized, vague future CEQA mitigation language is not legally adequate under CEQA. "Future" CEQA mitigation provisions can only be adequate if there is specific, detailed language that obligates the City to implement clear, specific and feasible mitigation measures which include clear, measurable goals and objectives.
- CEQA mitigation language, to be legally sufficient, must be included in the FSEIR itself. CEQA resolutions are intended to enable the City to take all required steps to properly certify the CEQA document, not to promise in a general manner some kind of future "mitigation" such as City compliance with all applicable laws, which compliance is required of Pasadena in any event.

We urge you to listen to our concerns, and direct that, before Certification of the FSEIR, feasible, specific current mitigation measures shall be included in the FSEIR to reduce greenhouse gas emission cumulative impacts on our neighborhood, including, but not limited to, traffic and air quality mitigations. In LVAA's prior letter to you dated May 30, 2008, LVAA made the following suggestion:

the City commit in the SEIR, as an overall mitigation measure, to the prompt adoption and implementation of a Rose Bowl/Arroyo Seco Green House Gas Emissions Reduction Plan which would include specific and detailed mitigation strategies to significantly reduce traffic and parking impacts, and, to significantly improve air quality.

LVAA reiterates this suggestion, adding that the SEIR mitigation language should include clear, measurable goals and objectives for the Green House Gas Emissions Reduction Plan to meet. Thank you in advance for your attention and positive response to our concerns and suggestion.

Norm Parker

Norm Parker,
LVAA President

cc: LVAA Board of Directors

Sapphos Environmental, Inc.,
Ms. Marie C. Campbell



[skip to content](#)

[HOME](#) [ABOUT US](#) [NEWS AND ALERTS](#) [PUBLICATIONS](#) [CONTACT US](#)
[CAREERS](#) [PERMITS/REGISTRATION](#) [SUBSCRIBE](#) [LINKS TO STATE SITES](#)

GLOBAL WARMING

[Home](#)

[Speeches & Op-Eds](#)

[Testimony](#)

[California Environmental Quality Act](#)

[California's Motor Vehicle Global Warming Regulations](#)

[Clean Air Act](#)

[Debunking Myths of the Auto Industry](#)

[Energy Efficiency](#)

[Global Warming Facts](#)

[Global Warming Contrarians and the Falsehoods They Promote](#)

[Global Warming's Unequal Impacts](#)

[Impacts in California](#)

[Improved Fuel Economy](#)

[National Environmental Policy Act](#)

[Public Nuisance Litigation](#)

[Press Releases](#)

[Resources](#)

[Contact Us](#)

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), signed into law by Governor Reagan in 1970, requires that state and local agencies disclose and evaluate the significant environmental impacts of proposed projects, and adopt all feasible measures to mitigate those impacts. This includes cumulatively significant impacts such as increased greenhouse gas emissions. A copy of every complaint filed under CEQA must be provided to the Attorney General.

The California Attorney General has filed numerous [comment letters](#) with agencies whose analysis under CEQA failed to properly analyze or mitigate a project's potential significant environmental impacts. In one instance, after sending a comment letter, the Attorney General sued San Bernardino County based on its failure to analyze increased greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the county's proposed general plan amendment. [See a copy of the complaint.](#) ↗ [PDF 2.5 mb / 15 pg] That case resulted in a [settlement agreement](#) ↗ [PDF 354 kb / 66 pg] in which the county agreed to adopt a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan. In other instances, the Attorney General has reached agreements with local agencies and private entities without having to file litigation:

- In September 2007, ConocoPhillips agreed to mitigate the increased greenhouse gas emissions from the company's planned refinery expansion in Rodeo (Contra Costa County). [See the settlement agreement.](#) ↗ [PDF 364 kb / 6 pg]
- In December 2007, the Attorney General reached an agreement with the Port of Los Angeles under which the port will conduct a comprehensive inventory of port-related greenhouse gases—tracking these emissions from their foreign sources to domestic distribution points throughout the United States. [See the agreement and attachments.](#) ↗ [PDF 51 kb / 10 pg]
- In March 2008, the Attorney General and Great Valley Ethanol entered into an agreement that requires the company to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a corn-based ethanol plant that it plans to build in Hanford. [Read the agreement.](#) ↗ [PDF 5.7 mb / 10 pg]
- In May 2008, the San Diego Airport Authority agreed to undertake a variety of innovative measures to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants at Lindbergh Field as part of its near-term and long-term development plans. [Read the agreement.](#) ↗ [PDF 633 kb / 16 pg]


As part of our efforts to work with agencies as they confront the challenge of addressing global warming in their CEQA documents, we have prepared a [Fact Sheet](#) listing various [mitigation measures](#) ↗ [PDF 193 kb / 21 pg] that local agencies may consider to offset or reduce global warming impacts. We also have prepared a [Chart of Modeling Tools](#) to Estimate Climate Change Emissions Impacts of Projects/Plans.

In April 2008, the Attorney General filed an amicus curiae brief in the California Supreme Court, supporting the South Coast Air Quality Management District in a case it has brought

SEARCH

THAT'S COOL!

Is your community a leader in the fight against global warming? If so, we'd like to hear about it. Send us a short description of the innovative things your town, city, or county is doing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move California to a low-carbon future. Anything from educational programs, to renewable energy and energy efficiency projects, to bike and pedestrian-friendly streets and paths. We'll feature some of the best examples in the coming months.

against the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), challenging a decision by the CPUC to allow the importation and use of very hot-burning liquid natural gas (LNG) in California. The CPUC claims that its decision to allow the use of LNG did not trigger its obligation under CEQA to consider the potential environmental impacts of its decision. But in the South Coast District's expert opinion, the hot-burning LNG will cause greater air pollution. The CPUC therefore was required to do an EIR before approving its use. [Read a copy of the brief.](#)  [PDF 185 kb / 50 pg]

HOME | ABOUT US | NEWS AND ALERTS | PUBLICATIONS | CONTACT US
CAREERS | PERMITS/REGISTRATION | SITE TOOLS | SUBSCRIBE | LINKS TO STATE SITES
ACCESSIBILITY | PRIVACY POLICY | TERMS AND CONDITIONS | © 2007 DOJ

State of California • Department of Justice
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Edmund G. Brown Jr.

News Release

February 19, 2008

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Gareth Lacy (916) 324-5500

Brown Challenges Local Governments To Plan For A Low-Carbon Future

LOS ANGELES--California Attorney General Edmund G. Brown Jr. today invited more than five hundred mayors, local planning directors, and county Supervisors to attend statewide workshops where they can learn practical ways to combat global warming by reducing dangerous greenhouse gas emissions.

"California must adopt the necessary changes that will encourage economic growth while reducing greenhouse gases," Attorney General Brown said. "This difficult transition from our current escalating dependence on fossil fuel, demands that cities and counties encourage maximum building efficiency and innovative land-use.

The Global Warming Solutions act, AB 32, requires California to cut greenhouse gas emission to 1990 levels by 2020, but the rules and market mechanisms will not take effect until 2012. Meanwhile, local government will make hundreds, if not thousands, of planning decisions that will have decades-long implications. Brown has called upon local officials to take action now to limit long-term greenhouse gas emissions. Encouraging local officials to meet with the attorney general's office, Brown said, "These workshops will launch the first statewide movement to reduce the negative impact of local planning decisions on global climate."

In 534 letters mailed statewide today, Brown invited public officials from all 58 California counties and nearly 200 cities to join the attorney general's office for regional conferences on climate change and the California Environmental Quality Act. The Act requires local agencies to analyze and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from projects with significant impact, including regional transportation and development plans.

During the upcoming workshops--to be held from March to May in Oakland, Sacramento, Visalia, Los Angeles and Monterey--methods of modeling greenhouse gas emissions will be discussed in detail. Representatives of the Attorney General's Office and the Governor's Climate Action Team will brief the local officials about how government at all levels can reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Some of the questions that will be addressed at the workshops include:

- * How should cities and counties analyze the global warming-related impacts of development?
- * What mitigation strategies should local governments employ to reduce their CO2 emissions?
- * How can cities and counties undertake the required analysis efficiently and on limited budgets?

To date, the Attorney General has submitted formal comments to twenty three local jurisdictions throughout the state under CEQA, encouraging them to evaluate and avoid or reduce the increases in CO2 emissions caused by land use decisions. Attorney General Brown has also reached landmark agreements with San Bernardino County and ConcoPhillips on specific greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

Other local jurisdictions across California including Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sonoma, Santa Monica, Berkeley, Marin, Palo Alto, Chula Vista, Modesto and Healdsburg are also initiating measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The City of Berkeley, for example, is developing an innovative program that funds solar projects with public monies and allows the property owners to repay the city through property tax assessments. Other greenhouse gas mitigation strategies being employed across California are the following:

- * High-density developments that reduce vehicle trips and utilize public transit.
- * Electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations.
- * Transportation impact fees on developments to fund public transit service.
- * Regional transportation centers where various types of public transportation meet.
- * Energy efficient design for buildings, appliances, lighting and office equipment.
- * Solar panels, water reuse systems and on-site renewable energy production.
- * Methane recovery in landfills and wastewater treatment plants to generate electricity.
- * Carbon emissions credit purchases that fund alternative energy projects.

In addition, over one hundred and twenty California cities have joined the Cool Cities campaign which commits the local jurisdictions to take concrete steps including the development of greenhouse gas emissions inventories and a local Climate Action Plan to fight global warming.

In July 2007, Alameda County became one of twelve charter members of the Cool Counties initiative. Participating counties establish a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and regional plan to cut greenhouse gas emissions to 80% below current levels by 2050.

Recently, Attorney General Brown expanded the Department of Justice Website to provide information that can help local agencies join the fight against global warming: <http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa.php>

Brown sent letters to 534 local government officials: cities with populations greater than 50,000, 178 Mayors, 171 Planning Departments, 58 County Board of Supervisors Chairs or Presidents, 58 County Planning Agency Directors, 33 Councils of Government and 36 Air Quality Control Districts.

#

#

February 19, 2008

I write to you today about a myth, a challenge, and an opportunity. The myth is that there is no immediate need to address local contributions to global warming. The challenge is to take action today and at every level to address global warming. And the opportunity, particularly for local government, is to be an active force in the fight against global warming by asking the hard questions, seeking the best information, and making the sound decisions that will move California to a low-carbon future. As part of this opportunity, I invite you to attend one of a series of workshops that I will co-host with the Local Government Commission this spring.

The Myth

There no longer is serious debate that global temperatures are rising and that human activities play an important role. We already are seeing the effects – disappearing glaciers, shrinking snow pack, droughts, coastal erosion, bigger and more regular storms, and more extreme heat waves. But some continue to suggest that we can afford to wait to take action. That until all the prescriptive rules are in place at the state and federal level, we can proceed with business as usual. We do not have this luxury. The best available science tells us that the effects from global warming will intensify and spread if we do not take decisive, dramatic action today. As the chairman of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently declared: “If there’s no action before 2012, that’s too late. What we do in the next two to three years will determine our future.”

The Challenge

In California, we have recognized the urgent need to curb greenhouse gas emissions by committing to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. However, even under the aggressive timetable that the Governor and Legislature have set, most of the rules being developed to reach these targets will not take effect until 2012. A tremendous amount of local and regional planning will occur between now and then. We will experience the effects of the decisions made today well into the future. Our challenge is to ensure that the planning occurring now allows us to meet the goals we have set for ourselves.

Fortunately, local agencies have at their disposal an extremely powerful tool. CEQA requires public agencies to mitigate or avoid “significant effects on the environment” when it is feasible to do so. As the Legislature recognized last year when it enacted Senate Bill No. 97, greenhouse gas emissions are the type of environmental effect that agencies must address under CEQA. Throughout California, cities, counties, and regional planning entities have begun to address global warming as an integral part of their planning efforts, as CEQA requires, even in the absence of regulatory thresholds of significance.

To assist in this effort, my office has compiled and regularly updates a document that may be helpful for agencies in carrying out their obligations under CEQA. The most recent version, available at <http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa.php>, lists examples of mitigation measures that may be appropriate for a broad range of projects – from specific developments to general plans and regional plans. The document also provides links to sources of information on global warming impacts and mitigation measures. I encourage you to take a look.

The Opportunity

Many agencies have questions about how to address global warming through the CEQA process. These may include: “How do we prepare an inventory of baseline greenhouse gas emissions?” “How do we model future emissions?” “What kinds of mitigation must we consider?” While each agency initially must answer these questions for itself, we can learn from each other.

With these questions in mind, my office and the Local Government Commission will host a series of workshops entitled “CEQA and Climate Change: Partnering with Local Agencies to Combat Global Warming.” Speakers will include myself and members of my office, leaders from the Governor's Climate Action Team, and modeling experts from around the State. The material covered at each workshop will be similar, but will be tailored to highlight innovative approaches in each region. We aim to provide concrete tips for addressing global warming in CEQA documents, and to foster discussion about experiences so far. Workshop dates are:

March 20, Oakland
April 3, Sacramento
April 24, Visalia

May 15, Los Angeles
May 23, Monterey

Information about the workshops and registration is available at www.lgc.org.

I look forward to working together as we create a low-carbon future in California.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General

State of California • Department of Justice
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Edmund G. Brown Jr.

News Release

March 19, 2008

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Gareth Lacy (916) 324-5500

Brown Challenges Local Government to Lead Global Warming Fight

OAKLAND--California Attorney General Edmund G. Brown Jr. today met with more than two hundred local officials, challenging them to "take the lead" in the fight against global warming.

"Climate change threatens our way of life," Attorney General Brown said. "In the absence of national leadership, local government must take the lead in bringing about a low-carbon future."

At the request of Attorney General Brown, scientists, local planners and elected officials convened at a one-day workshop at the State Office Building at 1515 Clay Street in downtown Oakland to discuss specific steps that can be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California.

This is the first in a series of five local workshops that will take place in Sacramento, Visalia, Los Angeles and Monterey. Representatives of the Attorney General's Office and the Governor's Climate Action Team will brief local officials about how government at all levels can reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Brown addressed the local officials, stressing the urgent need to combat climate disruption by setting greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets. Mary Nichols, Chair of the California Air Resources Board, discussed local government's key role California's plan to fight global climate change.

During today's workshop, local government will learn how to model greenhouse gas emissions and to design emissions inventories that can improve local planning decisions. Other topics on the agenda included:

- How cities and counties should analyze the global warming-related impacts of planning and land use decisions
- Mitigation strategies local governments should employ to reduce emissions
- How cities and counties can efficiently analyze emissions

The Global Warming Solutions Act, AB 32, requires California to cut greenhouse gas emission to 1990 levels by 2020, but the rules and market mechanisms will not take effect until 2012. Meanwhile, local government will make hundreds, if not thousands, of planning decisions that will have decades-long implications. Brown has called upon local officials to take action now to limit long-term greenhouse gas emissions.

To date, Attorney General Brown has submitted nearly thirty comment letters, under the California Environmental Quality Act, on local projects that have the potential to emit large quantities of greenhouse gas emissions. The Act, signed into law by Governor Reagan in 1970, requires state and local agencies to evaluate significant environmental impacts of proposed projects and adopt all feasible measures to mitigate those impacts.

As a result of Brown's comment letters, local governments are taking action to reduce greenhouse through planning and land use decisions. The City of Berkeley, for example, is preparing to fund solar projects with public monies and allow property owners to repay the city through property tax assessments.

Other greenhouse gas mitigation strategies being employed across California include:

- High-density developments that reduce vehicle trips and utilize public transit.
- Electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations.

- Regional transportation centers where various types of public transportation meet.
- Energy efficient design for buildings, appliances, lighting and office equipment.
- Solar panels, water reuse systems and on-site renewable energy production.
- Carbon emissions credit purchases that fund alternative energy projects.

In addition, over one hundred and twenty California cities have joined the Cool Cities campaign which commits the local jurisdictions to take concrete steps to fight global warming including the development of greenhouse gas emissions inventories.

In July 2007, Alameda County became one of twelve charter members of the Cool Counties initiative. Participating counties inventory their greenhouse gas emissions levels and create a plan to cut emissions 80% below current levels by 2050.

Attorney General Brown frequently updates the California Department of Justice Website to provide information that helps local agencies join the fight against global warming:
<http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa.php>

#



The California Environmental Quality Act
Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), local agencies have a very important role to play in California's fight against global warming – one of the most serious environmental effects facing the State today. Where local agencies undertake projects directly, they can and should design sustainable projects from the start, incorporating global warming related considerations into their projects at the earliest feasible time. Further, local agencies can encourage well-designed, sustainable private projects by analyzing and disclosing to the public the environmental benefits of such projects in any required environmental documents. And where projects as proposed will have significant global warming related effects, local agencies can require feasible changes or alternatives, and impose enforceable, verifiable, feasible mitigation measures to substantially lessen those effects. By the sum of their decisions, local agencies will help to move the State away from “business as usual” and toward a low-carbon future.

This document provides information that may be helpful to local agencies in carrying out their duties under CEQA as they relate to global warming. Included in this document are various measures that may reduce the global warming related impacts of a project. As appropriate, the measures can be included as design features of a project, required as changes to the project, or imposed as mitigation (whether undertaken directly by the project proponent or funded by mitigation fees). The measures set forth in this package are examples; the list is not intended to be exhaustive. Moreover, the measures cited may not be appropriate for every project. The decision of whether to approve a project – as proposed or with required changes or mitigation – is for the local agency, exercising its informed judgment in compliance with the law and balancing a variety of public objectives.

The first section of this document lists examples of measures that could be applied to a diverse range of projects where the lead agency determines that the project under consideration will have significant global warming related effects. In general, a given measure should not be considered in isolation, but as part of a larger set of measures that, working together, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of global warming.

The second section of this document lists examples of potential greenhouse gas reduction measures in the general plan context. This section is included both to suggest how the measures set forth in the first section could be incorporated into a general plan, as well as to identify measures that are general plan specific. The measures in the second section may also be appropriate for inclusion in larger scale plans, including regional plans (*e.g.*, blueprint plans) and in specific plans. Including these types of measures at the larger planning level, as appropriate, will help to ensure more sustainable project-specific development.

The third section provides links to sources of information on global warming impacts and emission reduction measures. The list is not complete, but may be a helpful start for local agencies seeking more information to carry out their CEQA obligations as they relate to global warming.

The endnotes set forth just some of the many examples of exemplary emission reduction measures already being implemented by local governments and agencies, utilities, private industry, and others. As these examples evidence, California at every level of government is taking up the challenge, devising new and innovative solutions, and leading the charge in the fight against global warming.

(1) Generally Applicable Measures

Energy Efficiency¹

- Design buildings to be energy efficient. Site buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping and sun screens to reduce energy use.²
- Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in buildings.
- Install light colored “cool” roofs, cool pavements, and strategically placed shade trees.³
- Provide information on energy management services for large energy users.⁴
- Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems.⁵
- Install light emitting diodes (LEDs) for traffic, street and other outdoor lighting.⁶
- Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting.
- Use solar heating, automatic covers, and efficient pumps and motors for pools and spas.⁷
- Provide education on energy efficiency.⁸

Renewable Energy

- Install solar and wind power systems, solar and tankless hot water heaters, and energy-efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning. Educate consumers about existing incentives.⁹
- Install solar panels on carports and over parking areas.¹⁰
- Use combined heat and power in appropriate applications.¹¹

Water Conservation and Efficiency¹²

- Create water-efficient landscapes.¹³
- Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.
- Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation in new developments and on public property. Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water.
- Design buildings to be water-efficient. Install water-efficient fixtures and appliances.
- Use graywater. (Graywater is untreated household waste water from bathtubs, showers, bathroom wash basins, and water from clothes washing machines.) For example, install dual plumbing in all new development allowing graywater to be used for landscape irrigation.¹⁴
- Restrict watering methods (*e.g.*, prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.
- Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles.
- Implement low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Retaining storm water runoff on-

site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.)¹⁵

- Devise a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and location. The strategy may include many of the specific items listed above, plus other innovative measures that are appropriate to the specific project.
- Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives.¹⁶

Solid Waste Measures

- Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas.
- Recover by-product methane to generate electricity.¹⁷
- Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.¹⁸

Land Use Measures

- Include mixed-use, infill, and higher density in development projects to support the reduction of vehicle trips, promote alternatives to individual vehicle travel, and promote efficient delivery of services and goods.¹⁹
- Educate the public about the benefits of well-designed, higher density development.²⁰
- Incorporate public transit into project design.
- Preserve and create open space and parks. Preserve existing trees, and plant replacement trees at a set ratio.
- Develop “brownfields” and other underused or defunct properties near existing public transportation and jobs.
- Include pedestrian and bicycle-only streets and plazas within developments. Create travel routes that ensure that destinations may be reached conveniently by public transportation, bicycling or walking.²¹

Transportation and Motor Vehicles

- Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Use low or zero-emission vehicles, including construction vehicles.
- Promote ride sharing programs *e.g.*, by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride sharing vehicles, and providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides.
- Create car sharing programs. Accommodations for such programs include providing parking spaces for the car share vehicles at convenient locations accessible by public transportation.²²
- Create local “light vehicle” networks, such as neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) systems.²³
- Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (*e.g.*, electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling

stations).

- Increase the cost of driving and parking private vehicles by, *e.g.*, imposing tolls and parking fees.
- Build or fund a transportation center where various public transportation modes intersect.
- Provide shuttle service to public transit.
- Provide public transit incentives such as free or low-cost monthly transit passes.
- Promote “least polluting” ways to connect people and goods to their destinations.²⁴
- Incorporate bicycle lanes and routes into street systems, new subdivisions, and large developments.
- Incorporate bicycle-friendly intersections into street design.
- For commercial projects, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. For large employers, provide facilities that encourage bicycle commuting, including, *e.g.*, locked bicycle storage or covered or indoor bicycle parking.
- Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points.²⁵
- Work with the school district to restore or expand school bus services.
- Institute a telecommute work program. Provide information, training, and incentives to encourage participation. Provide incentives for equipment purchases to allow high-quality teleconferences.
- Provide information on all options for individuals and businesses to reduce transportation-related emissions. Provide education and information about public transportation.

Off-Site Mitigation

If, after analyzing and requiring all reasonable and feasible on-site mitigation measures for avoiding or reducing greenhouse gas-related impacts, the lead agency determines that additional mitigation is required, the agency may consider additional off-site mitigation. The project proponent could, for example, fund off-site mitigation projects (*e.g.*, alternative energy projects, or energy or water audits for existing projects) that will reduce carbon emissions, conduct an audit of its other existing operations and agree to retrofit, or purchase carbon “credits” from another entity that will undertake mitigation.

The topic of offsets can be complicated, and a full discussion is outside the scope of this summary document. Issues that the lead agency should consider include:

- The location of the off-site mitigation. (If the off-site mitigation is far from the project, any additional, non-climate related benefits of the mitigation will be lost to the local community.)
- Whether the emissions reductions from off-site mitigation can be quantified and verified.
- Whether the mitigation ratio should be greater than 1:1 to reflect any uncertainty about the effectiveness of the offset.

End (1)

LINDA VISTA-ANNANDALE ASSOCIATION

Post Office Box 94364, Pasadena, California 91109

RECEIVED

May 30, 2008

'08 MAY 30 AM 11:26

Mayor Bill Bogaard and City Council Members
City of Pasadena
c/o City Clerk's Office

CITY OF PASADENA
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Re: City Council Meeting on June 2, 2008 --
Agenda Item No. 5A.(3): Rose Bowl Renovation Project and
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Council Members:

The Linda Vista-Annandale Association (LVAA) hereby submits the following comments to assist in your review of the Rose Bowl Stadium Renovation Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR.)

1. Use of a Supplemental EIR (as opposed to a Subsequent, or new, EIR), at least as to Traffic and Transportation and Air Quality, is inadequate and insufficient under CEQA.

- As to Traffic and Transportation, the SEIR is a multi-tiered document, based on all the traffic data and studies relied on for the NFL EIR certified in 2005. The SEIR concludes that since no increase in Displacement events at the Rose Bowl is part of the proposed project, the traffic data and studies in the NFL EIR need not be updated in any manner as traffic will not be increased. For its part, the NFL EIR incorporates and relies on the traffic data and studies prepared in approximately 2003, with some updating, from the Final Master Environmental Impact Report for the Arroyo Seco Master Plan Project dated March 12, 2003. Thus, the primary traffic impact analyses relied on in the SEIR are, basically, over five (5) years old, and out of date.
- The underlying Traffic and Transportation data for the SEIR is inadequate on the basis of the passage of time, and, therefore, must be completely restudied in a Subsequent or new EIR. The applicable rule, followed by Pasadena, is set forth in *Trip Generation 7th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Traffic Access and Impact Studies for Site Development: A Recommended Practice*. The rule is that new Traffic Impact Analyses are needed generally when a new development is proposed to occur in an area where the previous traffic study is more than two (2) years old and roadway conditions have significantly changed.

- In fact, roadway conditions in the Arroyo Seco and Linda Vista-Annandale area over the past five (5) years have significantly increased. Events and scheduled and unscheduled activities of all sizes and descriptions in the Arroyo Seco and in the Linda Vista-Annandale neighborhood area, including such operations as the Rose Bowl, Art Center, Golf Courses, youth sports, Aquatic Center, Kidspace, and Brookside Park, all pour, on a cumulative basis, more and more traffic onto all the roadways associated with the Arroyo, and onto Linda Vista Ave and Lida, and, all adjacent and feeder streets. This traffic, which clearly has increased significantly on an annual basis in LVAA's view, continues to travel at higher and higher rates of speed on all these roadways.
- As to Transportation and Traffic, and, as to Air Quality, the SEIR is out of date based on new information, that is, California's new AB 32 regulatory framework discussed in 2. below.

2. The SEIR does not adequately respond to AB 32 (the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.)

- In various announcements, letters to Cities, and Court cases (including the recent San Bernardino County case in which the County of San Bernardino, in the General Plan Update context, agreed with the State Attorney General to develop and adopt a Green House Gas Emissions Reduction Plan), the California State Attorney General's office has urged and all but directed the following as to the proper application of CEQA to proposed Projects of all descriptions under CEQA: CEQA requires that state and local agencies disclose and evaluate the significant environmental impacts of proposed projects, and adopt all feasible measures to mitigate those impacts. including cumulatively significant impacts such as increased greenhouse gas emissions. In various workshops around the state, including one held on May 15, 2008, in Los Angeles, no doubt attended by Pasadena representatives, local governments learned how to model greenhouse gas emissions and to design emissions inventories that can improve local planning decisions, such as this proposed Rose Bowl Project. Other topics on the agenda included:
 - How cities and counties should analyze the global warming-related impacts of planning and land use decisions
 - Mitigation strategies local governments should employ to reduce emissions
 - How cities and counties can efficiently analyze emissions.
- Pasadena has adopted a number of public policies supporting responsible environmental action in the form of a "Green and Sustainable" City, including the City's Green City Action Plan of 2006, and, a Proclamation in

September, 2006, endorsing both the United Nations Urban Environmental Accords, and, the U.S. Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement.

- The failure of the City in this SEIR to include all feasible measures to mitigate Rose Bowl greenhouse gas emissions in conformity with the intent and purposes of AB 32 and the directives of the State Attorney General means that this SEIR is inadequate as a matter of CEQA law. Further, this failure of the City means that Pasadena is acting intentionally in an inconsistent manner with its own "Green" public policies, rendering them illusory.
- LVAA suggests that the City commit in the SEIR, as an overall mitigation measure, to the prompt adoption and implementation of a Rose Bowl/Arroyo Seco Green House Gas Emissions Reduction Plan which would include specific and detailed mitigation strategies to significantly reduce traffic and parking impacts, and, to significantly improve air quality.

3. The SEIR does not adequately consider and mitigate the Cumulative Effects of other Projects in process, including the Art Center College of Design Lida campus expansion.

- The SEIR inadequately and incorrectly asserts, among other matters, that the proposed Rose Bowl Project will not increase traffic impacts (See 1. above.) Therefore, the further assertion that other proposed projects in and around the Linda Vista-Annandale area will have no cumulative impacts, when analyzed together with the proposed Rose Bowl project, is inadequate and incorrect.
- The cumulative project impacts of the Rose Bowl project, the Art Center College of Design expansion project, the All Saints Children's Center project on the Linda Vista Elementary School site, and, the Chandler School expansion project, must all be analyzed, and, cumulative impacts, particularly traffic impacts, reduced to below levels of significance. Very important in this connection is the need to reduce cumulative construction impacts, including noise and truck traffic impacts, from all of these projects, which may be under construction concurrently, to below levels of significance.

4. Serious and significant flaws in the City's review process of the SEIR should be corrected before the SEIR is considered by the City Council.

- Even though the Transportation Advisory Commission made extensive comments on the underlying NFL EIR, TAC has been afforded no opportunity at all to participate in the SEIR Scoping process, or, to review and comment on either the Draft SEIR, or, the Final SEIR. The

Transportation Advisory Commission should be permitted the opportunity to review the Final SEIR and advise the Council before final Council action.

- Even though the Planning Commission made extensive comments on the underlying NFL EIR, and, was included in the SEIR Scoping process, the Planning Commission has been afforded no opportunity at all to review and comment on either the Draft SEIR, or, the Final SEIR. The Planning Commission should be permitted the opportunity to review the Final SEIR and advise the Council before final Council action.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Norm Parker

Norm Parker,
LVAA President

cc: LVAA Board of Directors

Sapphos Environmental, Inc.,
Ms. Marie C. Campbell