

Initial Environmental Study

**Attachment 1**



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

---

**INITIAL STUDY**

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

**SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Project Title: **Chandler School  
Master Development Plan Amendment**
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: **City of Pasadena  
175 N. Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena CA 91101**
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: **Antonio Gardea, Associate Planner  
(626) 744-6725**
4. Project Location: **1005 Armada Drive,  
Located at the intersection with Prospect Boulevard  
and near the Mountain Street and Lincoln Avenue  
intersection  
Pasadena, Los Angeles County, CA**
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: **Chandler School  
1005 Armada Drive  
Pasadena, CA 91103-2802**
6. General Plan Designation: **Institutional**
7. Zoning: **PS  
(Public / Semi Public District)**
8. Description of the Project: The applicant is proposing an amendment to the Master Development Plan for Chandler School to construct a new 33,500 square foot, three-story building, and remodel of the existing gymnasium with a new south side stairway. The new middle school building would be 42 feet in height. The project anticipates an increase of 30 students for a maximum enrollment of 450 students over 15 years. Two existing buildings (music and middle school buildings) and a portion of the existing gymnasium would be demolished (total 16,100 square feet). In addition, a new two-level, 63-space parking structure would be constructed with a new elevator tower and pedestrian bridge connecting to the campus. Total height of the parking structure and tower would be 58 feet. The construction would take place on the southern and eastern portion of the school's campus.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Chandler School is surrounded by single-family residences to the north, south, and east in the Prospect Historic District. Directly west is open space, the Rose Bowl and Brookside Park. The site is bound by four streets: Armada Drive, Prospect Boulevard, Seco Street, and Rosemont Drive. The project site is located on the east rim of the Central portion of the Arroyo Seco, southeast of the Rose Bowl. The site slopes downward to the west, south, and southeast. The Arroyo Bank Slope forms a peninsular shape from the intersection of Armada Drive and Prospect Boulevard southward toward Brookside Park. Seco Street and Rosemont Drive surround the bottom of the slope at the lower edge of the school's campus. School access is provided along Armada Drive and Seco Street.

The Chandler School campus slopes downward from the Armada Drive frontage. The private school is divided into the primary or lower school (Kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade) and upper (middle) school (3<sup>rd</sup> grade through 8<sup>th</sup> grade) that are bisected by a play field. The lower school is housed in the buildings near Armada Drive and Prospect Boulevard facing homes in the Prospect Historic District. The upper school uses the buildings clustered near the Arroyo Bank. Access to the southern portion of the school (middle school) is from the parking area located along Seco Street. (See Vicinity Map & Existing Site Map)

Vicinity Map



## Existing Site Map



10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): An Amendment to the Chandler School Master Development Plan is required for the construction of new academic facilities. The City Council is the review authority for Master Development Plan Amendments with advisory review by the Planning Commission, Design Commission, and Historic Preservation Commission. The Urban Forestry Advisory Committee will also consider the request to remove trees in the public right of way. The Pasadena Department of Transportation, Pasadena Department of Public Works, Pasadena Fire Department, and Pasadena Building Division will review the project prior to issuance of Building Permits. No discretionary approvals from agencies outside of the City of Pasadena are known or expected to be necessary.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Geology and Soils		Population and Housing
	Agricultural Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality		Hydrology and Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use and Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities and Service Systems
	Energy		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<b>X</b>
I find that the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment., but at least effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards , and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

March 13, 2008  
Prepared By/Date

Jennifer Paige-Saeki  
Reviewed By/Date

Antonio Gardea  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: \_\_\_\_\_

Adoption attested to by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed name/Signature                      Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

## SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

**1. BACKGROUND.**

Date checklist submitted: March 13, 2008  
 Department requiring checklist: Current Planning Department, City of Pasadena  
 Case Manager: Antonio Gardea, Associate Planner

**2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

**3. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project site is a peninsular shape along the Arroyo Seco Bank that offers views of the San Gabriel Mountains and central section of the Arroyo Seco (Central Arroyo). The site and streets at the higher topography provide down slope (west) views of the Central Arroyo, Rose Bowl, and Brookside Golf course. At the base of the site, Seco Street and Rosemont Drive provide ridgeline (upslope) views of Arroyo Seco and surrounding hillsides. The existing multiple-story buildings are visible from the Prospect Boulevard Bridge, Seco Street, Rosemont Avenue, Brookside Park, and the fields south of the Rose Bowl. The proposed buildings would be at the furthest portion of the site toward the southwest on a level area at the top of the Arroyo Bank slope.

Because of the location at the top of the Arroyo Bank, views of the Central Arroyo and Brookside Park are provided from Chandler School and the adjacent streets. North of the project site, the Rose Bowl and Brookside golf course are visible along Armada Drive. The properties to the east, across Armada Drive, are at a similar elevation and as a result will not be visually impacted by the proposed buildings. Partial views of the Central Arroyo also exist along the Prospect Boulevard Bridge. The existing school buildings, including the stair tower and Seco Street parking lot are visible from the Prospect Boulevard Bridge but do not impede the partial views of the Central Arroyo Seco. The existing multiple-story structures and trees on the Chandler School campus do not obstruct the view corridors along Armada Street and from the Prospect Boulevard Bridge.

Limited views of Brookside Park and the Central Arroyo exist along Seco Street because the street slopes downward. The peninsular shape of the Arroyo Bank near the project site begins at the north along the easterly portion of the Central Arroyo, winds south and eastward along the school site, northeasterly along Seco Street and returns southwesterly along the rear portion of properties facing North Pasadena Avenue, Prospect Boulevard (south east of the Bridge), and Prospect Terrace. Views of the Central Arroyo from Seco Street are obstructed by the length and curvature of Seco Street. The Prospect Bridge also interrupts the views along Seco Street which appear from approximately midway along Seco Street from the topmost area at the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Mountain Street (northerly end). Because the proposed parking structure would be on the north side of the street, the partial views along Seco Street will not be adversely affected.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

The Rose Bowl, the surrounding Central Arroyo, and San Gabriel Mountains can be seen from Rosemont Avenue. Chandler School is located at the top of the Arroyo Bank and the middle school classrooms are currently visible above the ridgeline. Views of the Central Arroyo are to the north and west, away from the Chandler School campus. Thus, scenic views that occur along Rosemont Avenue will not be significantly adversely affected.

Chandler School is currently visible from the adjacent streets, Central Arroyo, Rose Bowl, Brookside Park, and surrounding neighborhoods. The natural appearance of the Central Arroyo and bordering ridgelines are interspersed with residential structures. The proposed buildings are architecturally similar to neighboring properties. The appearance of the Chandler School campus will change with a more prominent and enhanced entrance located along Seco Street. Although the project would not significantly impact a scenic vista, the project is subject to design review which provides an opportunity to incorporate conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

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

**WHY?** The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the view shed of the Angeles Crest Highway; and thus, would have no impacts to a state scenic highway. Because Chandler School is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), trees, shrubs, and groundcover may have to be removed to comply with Fire Department regulations and the Vegetation Management Plan prepared by the Fire Safety Consultant. The applicant's tree survey indicates that the site and surroundings include 191 trees, 91 private trees and 100 public trees. Of these trees, 30 private trees and five public trees (16% of existing trees) are recommended for removal. The majority of the trees (30 trees) subject to removal are on the southerly and easterly portion of the site where the parking structure would be located. Moreover, the pine trees being removed are densely spaced and replacement trees would be planted with adequate separation for fire prevention purposes. The spacing would ensure healthy growth and form. New landscaping is proposed that will be reviewed by the Fire Department and the Public Works Department. The proposed project would not damage any historic resource, landmark eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcroppings, or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value. Moreover, the applicant is required to comply with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. See also Section 7.a. of this document.

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

**WHY?** The proposed project consists of demolition of several academic buildings and construction of a new 33,500 square-foot, three-story building for the middle school and a two-story parking structure, elevator tower and bridge to connect the parking to the campus. Although the property is located within the Prospect National Register Historic District, all of the school's associated buildings are non-contributing to the district. The school campus has been changed with new buildings constructed over the course of several decades. Thus, the new building would not impact the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.

The subject site is in a developed hillside neighborhood, with single family residences to the north and east and to the south along Seco Street. Due to the relatively steep slope of the site there is limited development potential on the campus. The larger, middle school building is proposed to be setback approximately 150 feet from the Prospect Boulevard bridge. Because the building would be located



<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

south of the play field and primary school buildings, the buildings would not be visible from the surrounding residential neighborhood. The proposed middle school building would not be visible from Armada Drive and only partially visible from Prospect Boulevard. The construction of a new two-level parking structure would enhance the entryway to the school from Seco Street by removing a surface parking lot and installing new landscaping along the edge of the proposed structure. The proposed structures will not significantly impact the existing upslope (east) views from Seco Street.

The existing buildings onsite are visible from Brookside Park and Rosemont Avenue. The surrounding area includes an established residential neighborhood and areas developed for recreational purposes. Residential buildings are visible both above and below ridgelines in the Linda Vista neighborhood along the westerly area of the Central Arroyo. Residential buildings are visible along the easterly portion of the Central Arroyo to the north. Immediately south of the school site, residential buildings are visible along the edge of the Arroyo Bank slope, which are screened with vegetation. The existing buildings were designed to follow the contour of the slope with the music building placed at the higher elevation. Both existing buildings are set back a minimum of 20 feet from the Arroyo slope edge and are screened with a combination of tall evergreen and deciduous trees. The Chandler School buildings are all partially visible from various points along the jogging path that travels around the Rose Bowl perimeter.

A total of 30 trees would be removed to make space for the Chandler School expansion and implementation of a Vegetation Management Plan. The Vegetation Management Plan is a performance based solution to comply with fire prevention requirements. Instead of setting aside large defensible spaces along sloping areas as prescribed by the Wildland Urban Interface Code, this alternative allows for less rigid separations from existing trees. The Vegetation Management Plan requires the removal of five trees that are potential fire hazards (two private pine trees and three California pepper tree stump growths on City land). Trees are required to have horizontal spacing from groundcovers and shrubs as well as vertical spacing away from other trees and buildings. Because replacement trees would be planted on site, the tree removals are not a significant aesthetic impact.

The proposed three-story middle school building would be taller and closer to the slope than the existing buildings. Although the roof line of the proposed three-story building would be approximately four feet taller than the highest point of the existing roofline, the perception of height is diminished with distance from the school site.

Portions of the new middle school building are visible from the jogging path across Rosemont Avenue and project above the ridgeline. In general, properties within the Hillside Overlay Zone are required to maintain the natural appearance of existing ridges. Structures that appear silhouetted against the sky when viewed from the street or a park are discouraged. Surrounding residences are subject to design criteria that prevents the construction of structures above or below ridgelines. Despite this, the rooftops of the middle school buildings are currently silhouetted above the slope. The proposed three-story building is larger in scale than the surrounding residences. In relation to the overall context, there are a number of residences with portions of the building visible from Brookside Park and the jogging path along the perimeter of the Rose Bowl.

Mitigation Measures A1 and A2 are proposed that will regulate colors, materials and the use of landscaping to reduce the ridgeline impacts to a less than significant level. With muted earth tone colors and proper placement of increased mature landscaping, the visibility of the new structure will be reduced:

MM A 1 – In order to minimize the aesthetic affect of the larger building mass along the Arroyo Seco ridgeline, the proposed structures shall incorporate dark exterior colors, including muted earth tones, for the building walls, windows, roof, and fences. An approved color palette shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director prior to issuance of building permits for the project.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

MM A 2 – In order to screen the new middle school building from views along Brookside Park and Rose Bowl jogging path, the site layout shall include landscaped areas along the slope edge in concert with the goals and objectives of the Central Arroyo Seco Master Plan. A Final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director and the Fire Department prior to the issuance of Building Permits. The plan shall clearly indicate the sizes and types of proposed plantings and the estimated rate of maturity for the trees proposed.

The proposed middle school building would be constructed ten feet closer to the Arroyo Slope Bank than the existing buildings. Consequently, two mature ash trees and a protected pepper tree (that were planted to screen the existing building) would be removed. Several of the pine trees would be relocated adjacent to the building and three California Sycamore trees, *Platanus racemosa*, would be planted in place of the pepper and ash trees. In conjunction with the three new Sycamore trees, four existing ash trees and two pepper trees on City property would screen a portion of the proposed building along the slope edge. Because other trees of similar size remain within the general vicinity, the removal of these trees causes a negligible visual change.

The project will meet the City’s standards for engineering, site design, and suitability, in compliance with the City’s grading ordinance, landscape regulations, historic preservation ordinance, and City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance. To ensure further compatibility with the neighboring residences and surrounding terrain, the applicant shall implement the mitigation measures with regard to colors, materials (including the roof), and landscaping. Based upon the topographical conditions, location of existing surrounding residences, new and mature landscaping of the area contiguous to the school, and the context of the school site, the proposed building will not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impact. Replacement of the existing buildings will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

**WHY?** The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare. The project is in a developed residential area with streetlights in place, and the proposed exterior lighting will be consistent with the surrounding area and existing school lighting. During evening hours, vegetation and low walls within the parking structure will shield vehicle headlights to prevent glare onto adjacent properties. Outdoor lighting includes pedestrian safety lighting, landscaping lights, and three (3) new streetlights along Armada Drive, as required by the Public Works Department. Two mitigation measures are included to prevent light and glare from affecting night-time views. The project does not propose any lighting for nighttime events, sporting activities, or outdoor recreation courts. In addition, the final plans will indicate all exterior light sources associated with project to ensure that the project will not adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

MM A 3 - The construction materials for the new structure, including windows, shall be of a non-reflective nature. The final colors and materials shall be reviewed and approved by Design staff and shall comply with all conditions of approval of Design Review.

MM A 4 – Exterior lighting shall be directed downwards and the light source shall be shielded from view of adjacent properties.

**4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. Chandler School is located in the western portion of the City adjacent to the Arroyo Seco. The Arroyo Seco is comprised of developed parklands, natural and open space. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. Commercial Growing Area/Grounds is permitted in the CG (General Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the RS (Residential Single-Family), and RM (Residential Multi-Family) districts. The use is also permitted within certain specific plan areas. The project would have no impact to any land zoned for agricultural use and there are no Williamson Act contracts within Pasadena.

c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

**5. AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies methods to improve air quality and help achieve the air quality standards. These methods include regulations for

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

stationary-source pollutants; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The SCAQMD adopted the most recent version of its AQMP in June of 2007. This plan is SCAB's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and is designed to achieve the five percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act. The AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments. The proposed project anticipates modest staff increases over 15 years and does not affect population forecasts. Thus, the amendment to the Chandler School Master Plan is consistent with employment and population forecasts and thereby is consistent with the AQMP.

The City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth. Since the project is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations for the site, the project is within regional growth expectations. Thus, the proposed project is consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan, and would have no associated impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The SCAQMD has developed significance thresholds that correspond to the air quality standards for the SCAB. These thresholds are described in Chapter 6 of the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (1993) and shown in Table 5.1 of this report.

The proposed project would generate short-term air pollutants from construction activities and long-term air pollutants from typical vehicle trips. Potential air emissions were calculated using the "URBEMIS 2002 Air Emissions From Land Development" model (URBEMIS model) using the following assumptions:

- The project consists of 33,500 square feet of new academic facilities (17,400 net new building area).
- The proposed project would generate 74 trip ends per day.
- Construction is anticipated to start in March 2009 and be completed in October 2010.
- Demolition of the existing facilities will take two months and involve the following equipment; a crawler tractor, an excavator, and a rubber tired loader.
- Grading of the 3.7-acre site will take one month and involve the following equipment; a crawler tractor, an excavator, and two rubber tired loaders.
- Construction of the proposed structure will take 19 months, which includes two months to apply architectural coatings. Construction is expected to involve the following equipment; one bore/drill rig, a crane, a rough terrain forklift, a tractor, and a trencher.

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

Table 5.1 presents the estimated air quality emissions of the proposed project as calculated by the URBEMIS model.

Table 5.1 - Project Air Emissions/AQMD Threshold Comparison Matrix				
	Area Plus Operational Emission Threshold (max. lbs/day)	Project's Area and Operational Emissions (max. lbs/day)	Daily Construction Emission Threshold (max. lbs/day)	Project's Construction Emissions (max. lbs/day)
ROG*	55	4.31	75	19.58
NOx	55	5.92	100	27.69
CO	550	50.90	550	15.84
SO <sub>2</sub>	150	.05	150	.01
PM <sub>10</sub>	150	7.69	150	54.60
PM <sub>2.5</sub>		1.50		12.85

\*ROG (Reactive Organic Gas) through a series of chemical reactions with NOx forms ground level ozone.

As shown in Table 5.1, the proposed project would not exceed the Thresholds of Significance established by the SCAQMD. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a violation of an air quality standard, and would have no significant related impacts.

The project will generate Carbon Dioxide, which is the primary component of Greenhouse gases (GHG). Thus, the project will contribute to global climate change as described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In total, the project will generate 650.95 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> during construction and 905.38 tons per year for operations.

*c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ( )*

**WHY?** The South Coast Air Basin is a non-attainment area for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). As shown in Section 5.b, the proposed project will not exceed the SCAQMD's Thresholds for Significance. Thus, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

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

**WHY?** According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook the project is considered a sensitive receptor and is located near sensitive receptors (single-family residential homes, park areas, and athletic facilities). The proposed project would not generate substantial air pollutants that would affect sensitive receptors in the surrounding area.

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

**WHY?** This type of use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, and would have no associated impacts.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

*a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? ( )*

**WHY?** There are no designated natural communities in the City. The best available City-wide documented biological resource is the Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements. Within the City's boundaries, the natural habitat areas identified are the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, a Coastal Sage Scrub Community, exists in the upper Arroyo Seco, north of the 210 (Foothill) freeway.

The project is located in the central portion of the Arroyo Seco. In 2003, the city approved the Arroyo Seco Master Plans (ASMP), which identifies habitat restoration as a goal for the Arroyo Seco. Through the Central Arroyo Master Plan, Coastal-sage scrub, a native plant community has been identified along the sloped edge of Rosemont Avenue. The Arroyo Seco Master Plans call for enhanced planting along this Central Arroyo slope edge which is City parkland. The sage scrub plant community consists of shrubs with soft, feathery leaves approximately four feet in height. The ASMP include plant palettes to be used for restorations plantings; trees are not associated with the sage scrub plant community. Existing Arroyo trees are pruned minimally to provide wildlife habitat. Moreover, City policy is to leave dead wood on Oak trees, tree trunks and large branches in place for habitat purposes.

The area immediately to the east along the top of the Arroyo Bank Slope is Chandler School property. The plantings consist of non-native shrubs, invasive volunteer plants, weeds, and ground covers, primarily tall fescue "Meadow Grass". The Zoning Code requires that the landscape plan emphasize the use and management of native and drought-tolerant plants. Accordingly, the applicant intends to replace the existing shrubs and ground covers along the Seco Street slope. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plants or animal species on or near the site that would be adversely affected by the proposed construction.

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

**WHY?** The habitat in the project region has been disturbed and degraded by development and use of the Central Arroyo for recreational purposes. As such, the native plant community in the project area includes various scattered oaks, ornamental trees, non-native shrubs, annuals (mostly non-native), succulents, forbs, groundcovers, and invasive plants due to surrounding residential uses. No designated sensitive natural communities would be impacted by this project.

*c. Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ( )*

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

**WHY?** Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season.

The project site does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

*d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project is located near the "Western Hillside" habitat area and may provide linkage for migratory wildlife to the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River systems. However, the project will not interfere with the natural open space or established wildlife corridors. Rather, the proposed school expansion will add additional building space within an area of existing suburban development. There are no established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors situated within the subject site. The proposed project will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, ~~nor will it interfere with the movement of any native or migratory wildlife.~~

The project site contains a number of mature trees that are part of the site's landscaping. The project requires removal of 30 trees, including three protected trees (*Magnolia grandiflora* - Southern Magnolia tree, *Jacaranda mimosifolia* - Jacaranda tree, and a *Schinus molle* - California Pepper tree) and 27 non-protected trees. Because the site is located near a habitat area and given the number and size of trees proposed for removal, a mitigation measure (MM BIO 1) is included that requires the applicant to comply with the Federal Migratory Bird Act. With adherence to the mitigation measure, the project will not interfere with the movement of any migratory wildlife species or with migratory wildlife corridors.

MM BIO 1 - Construction of the project shall comply with the provisions of the Federal Migratory Bird Act and disturbance or removal of existing vegetation shall take place outside of the breeding bird season of March 1 to August 31 to avoid take of migratory birds (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). If the project cannot avoid the breeding season, nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to demolition or removal of trees. Active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for Raptors). No work shall occur within the buffer zone until all young have fledged the nest as confirmed by the site biologist, which will not likely occur until the end of the breeding season. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". According to the tree survey submitted by the applicant, 30 trees would be removed, 27 non-protected trees and three protected trees (a California pepper tree and a southern magnolia tree). The following table lists the tree removals and relocations

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

(Table 6.1 - Tree Removals). The total canopy area subject to removal is approximately 10,000 square feet. On October 10, 2007, the Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC) approved removal of one *Araucaria heterophylla*, Norfolk Island Pine tree in the public right of way along Seco Street. Other public tree removals recommended as part of the VMP would have to return to the UFAC for consideration.

Tree #	Survey #	Genus & Species	Common Name	Spread	Area
1	25	<i>Fraxinus velutina</i>	Arizona Ash	40	1256
2	26	<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>	Chinese Pistache	20	314
3	27	<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>	Chinese Pistache	22	380
4	28	<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Canary Island Pine	18	254
5	31	<b><i>Schinus molle</i></b>	<b>California Pepper</b>	35	962
6	32	<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>	Evergreen Ash	25	491
7	33	<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>	Evergreen Ash	20	314
8	48	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	American Sweet Gum	22	380
9	49	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	American Sweet Gum	16	201
10	59	<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Canary Island Pine	17	227
11	61	<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Canary Island Pine	16	201
12	62	<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Canary Island Pine	14	154
13	64	<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Canary Island Pine	18	254
14	65	<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>	Chinese Pistache	20	314
15	66	<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Monterey Pine	15	177
16	67	<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Monterey Pine	16	201
17	69	<i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i>	Lemon-scented Gum	18	254
18	70	<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Monterey Pine	13	133
19	73	<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Monterey Pine	16	201
20	74	<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Monterey Pine	21	346
21	112	<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>	Blue Gum	16	201
22	113	<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>	Blue Gum	15	177
23	122	<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Southern magnolia	15	177
24	123	<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Southern magnolia	18	254
25	125	<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Southern magnolia	25	491
26	127	<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Southern magnolia	26	531
27	128	<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Southern magnolia	20	314
28	130	<b><i>Magnolia grandiflora</i></b>	<b>Southern magnolia</b>	24	452
29	132	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i>	Chinese Evergreen Elm	24	452
30	63	<b><i>Jacaranda mimosifolia</i></b>	<b>Jacaranda</b>	18	254

*Protected trees Italicized & Bold*

The site contains 20 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". Three protected trees are proposed for removal. The applicant is required to comply with the Tree Protection Ordinance and is requesting removal based on replacing the existing tree canopy. Furthermore, the protected California Pepper tree is an invasive tree species that the City would recommend removal to further the habitat restoration goals of the Central Arroyo Seco Master Plan. The protected Magnolia tree is subject to removal to accommodate safe vehicular ingress and egress from the proposed parking structure.

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



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

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

**7. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

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

**WHY?** Chandler School is within the boundaries of the Prospect National Register Historic District. The property and all of its associated buildings are listed as non-contributing to the district. Furthermore, there are no buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site that are eligible for landmark designation or for listing in the National Register which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered. The project will not impact any buildings identified as contributing to the Prospect National Register Historic District.

A Certificate of Appropriateness is required because the Master Plan contemplates demolition of non-contributing buildings and new construction within a National Register Historic District. In addition, Design Review by the Design Commission is required because the project involves new construction in excess of 25,000 square feet. Staff is recommending that the Certificate of Appropriateness and design review processes be combined and be conducted by the Design Commission to avoid duplicative review. Both the Historic Preservation Commission and Design Commission will provide advisory comments on the Master Plan to the City Council. A mitigation measure is included that will require the design of the new buildings to be reviewed for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation which would require the buildings to be compatible with the historic district but differentiated as new construction. Based on this the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and the projects impacts will be less than significant impacts:

MM CR 1 - The design of the new buildings shall be reviewed for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation which would require the buildings to be compatible with the historic district but differentiated as new construction.

*b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ( )*

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

**WHY?** There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. The project site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. The site has been previously excavated and during construction of the parking lot and buildings any archeological resources would have been encountered. Because the proposed grading would not encroach into undisturbed soils, the proposed project would have no impacts to archaeological resources.

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The project site, consistent with most of the City of Pasadena, is underlain by Pleistocene epoch sediments derived from the San Gabriel Mountains. Surface soils within these materials do not contain any unique geologic features and are not known or expected to contain paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

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

WHY? The project site is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. If human remains are encountered during project construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ( )

WHY? The project does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The project will comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24).

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

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

Energy: The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. This project will result in the increased consumption of 238 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day. This increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards. Measures to meet these performance standards may include high efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

Water: This project will result in an increase of approximately 161 gallons per day in water consumption. Chandler School currently consumes approximately 5,030 gallons of water per day. The net gain in water consumption would be 161 gallons of water per day. However, this impact will be mitigated during drought periods by the applicant adhering the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which restricts water consumption to 90% of expected consumption during each billing period.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	------------------

Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

In December of 2007, the City of Pasadena adopted a finding that a projected water shortage existed within the City, and adopted Water Shortage Plan I pursuant to Pasadena Municipal Code 13.10.040. Unless the finding and Plan are withdrawn prior to construction, the project must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). To ensure compliance, the applicant shall submit a water conservation plan limiting the project's water consumption to 90% of its originally anticipated consumption. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans shall comply with the approved water conservation plan. Through this reduction of its water supply needs, the project's incremental effect to a cumulative water supply impact is reduced to less than cumulatively considerable.

**9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

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

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

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

The Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is shown on the Alquist-Priolo maps within or adjacent to the City of Pasadena. The Raymond Fault is located primarily south of City limits. However, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the following three additional zones of potential fault rupture in the City:

- The Eagle Rock Fault Hazard Management Zone, which traverses the southwestern portion of the City;
- The Sierra Madre Fault Hazard Management Zone, which includes the Tujunga Fault, the North Sawpit Fault, and the South Branch of the San Gabriel Fault. This Fault Zone is primarily north of the City, and only the very northeast portion of the City and portions of the Upper Arroyo lie within the mapped fault zone.
- A Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, which appears to join a continuation of the Sycamore Canyon Fault. This fault area traverses the northern portion of the City as is identified as a Fault Hazard Management Zone for Critical Facilities Only.