

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 680 EAST COLORADO BLVD. PROJECT, AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the 680 East Colorado Boulevard project (the “Project”) proposes to demolish the existing structure on the site, and develop a six-level subterranean garage and an approximately 159,971 square foot, five-story commercial office building with approximately 522 subterranean spaces (155 of which serve the Playhouse District as public parking spaces). The ground floor of the structure would have approximately 14,407 square feet of retail use, provides all of its parking (367 spaces) onsite, and provides 155 public parking spaces. The Project incorporates a pedestrian corridor or paseo between the Pasadena Playhouse and the Arcade Lane Building, which would provide for future pedestrian line-of-sight between the historic Pasadena Playhouse and the Arcade Lane Building. The Project description never included a crosswalk on El Molino Avenue. The Project would be designed to qualify for a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (“LEED”) energy efficiency certification and would be developed in compliance with the City Green Building Ordinance (PMC 14.90). The Project requires approval of a Conditional Use Permit for construction over 25,000 square feet, two Minor Conditional Use Permits for construction over 15,000 square feet in a Transit Oriented District and for commercial

parking, Central District floor area increase of up to 10%, an Adjustment Permit to address issues related to the fact that the site straddles different zoning districts, including density averaging, and floor area ratio exceedance, and to address proposed height exceedance, reduced setbacks, and reduced loading spaces, a Tree Removal Permit, Design Review, and other subsequent discretionary approvals, from the City and other regional and State agencies; and

WHEREAS, the City of Pasadena is the lead agency for the Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA,” Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21000 *et seq.*), the State CEQA Guidelines (the “Guidelines,” 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000 *et seq.*), and the City’s local environmental policy guidelines; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 15063 of the Guidelines, the City prepared an Initial Environmental Study (the “Initial Study”) for the Project. The Initial Study concluded that there was substantial evidence that the Project might have a significant environmental impact on several specifically identified resources and governmental services, including: (1) Aesthetics; (2) Air Quality; (3) Geology and Soils; (4) Transportation and Circulation; (5) Noise and Vibration; and (6) Water Service; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Guidelines Sections 15064 and 15081, and based upon the information in the Initial Study, the City ordered the preparation of an environmental impact report for the Project (“EIR”). On July 6, 2007, the City prepared and sent a Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR and a copy of the Initial Study to

responsible, trustee, and other interested agencies and persons in accordance with Guidelines Sections 15082(a) and 15375; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Guidelines Section 15082, the City solicited comments from potential responsible and trustee agencies for a 30-day period, commencing on July 6, 2007, requesting details about the scope and content of the environmental information related to the responsible agency's area of statutory responsibility that should be studied in the EIR, as well as the significant environmental issues, reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that the responsible agency would have analyzed in the Draft EIR. The City received six comment letters in response to the NOP. In addition, two EIR scoping meetings was held by the City of Pasadena, on July 18, 2007, and in conjunction with the Planning Commission meeting on September 26, 2007; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092, the City provided a public Notice of Completion and Availability ("NOA") of the Draft EIR on October 16, 2008, through mailing to all property owners within 500 feet of the Project and to local neighborhood organizations. The NOA also gave notice of three public meetings: Transportation Advisory Commission on November 6, 2008; Design Commission on November 24, 2008; and Planning Commission on December 10, 2008, at which comments on the Draft EIR would be taken. Copies of the Draft EIR were also placed at the City's Planning and Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, the Pasadena Central Library, and on the City's website; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR was circulated, together with technical appendices, to the public and other interested persons for a 45-day public comment period, from October 16, 2008 through December 1, 2008, and was informally extended to December 10, 2008. During the comment period, the City held three duly noticed public meetings at which the public was given the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIR, as follows: Transportation Advisory Commission on November 6, 2008; Design Commission on November 24, 2008; and Planning Commission on December 10, 2008; and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period the City received written and oral comments on the Draft EIR, and consulted with all responsible and trustee agencies, and other regulatory agencies pursuant to Guidelines Section 15086; and

WHEREAS, based on public comment received, the City conducted further traffic studies and recirculated the traffic portion of the Draft EIR. The City provided a Notice of Availability on April 10, 2009 for a 45 day review period of the recirculated portion through May 25, 2009, and providing notice of a Planning Commission meeting on May 13, 2009, at which comments on the recirculated traffic portion could be made; and

WHEREAS, the City subsequently prepared written responses to all written comments received on the Draft EIR and made revisions to the Draft EIR, as appropriate, in response to those comments. The City distributed written responses to comments on the Draft EIR and Notice of Availability of the Final EIR on July 8, 2009, in

accordance with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and Guidelines Section 15088. The Planning Commission reviewed the Final EIR at a duly noticed public meeting on July 22, 2009. The written responses to comments were made available for a 95 day period of public review before the commencement of the City Council public hearing regarding the certification of the Draft EIR.

WHEREAS, after reviewing the responses to comments and the revisions to the Draft EIR, particularly those made after the recirculation of the traffic section, the City concludes that the information and issues raised by the comments and the responses thereto did not constitute new information requiring further recirculation of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (the "Final EIR" or "EIR") is comprised of: the Draft EIR (which includes the recirculated traffic section) and numbered State Clearinghouse No. 2007071020; the comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR set forth in the Final EIR dated July, 2009; technical appendices; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Final EIR and the Project on October 12, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the findings made in this resolution are based upon the information and evidence set forth in the Final EIR and upon other substantial evidence that has been presented at all public meetings regarding the Project and in the record of the proceedings. The documents, staff reports, technical studies, appendices, plans,

specifications, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this resolution is based are on file and available for public examination during normal business hours in the Planning and Development Department and with the Director of Planning, who serves as the custodian of these records; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that agencies and interested members of the public have been afforded ample notice and opportunity to comment on the Final EIR and that the comment process has fulfilled all requirements of State and local law; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, as the decision-making body for the lead agency, has independently reviewed and considered the contents of the Final EIR and all documents and testimony in the record of proceedings prior to deciding whether to certify the Final EIR and approve the Project; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

I. RESOLUTION REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the City Council certifies that: (1) the City Council has reviewed and considered the Final EIR prior to approving the Project, (2) the Final EIR is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the City's local environmental guidelines, and (3)

the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency. The City Council certifies the Final EIR based on the findings and conclusions herein.

The City Council finds that the additional information provided in the staff report, in the comments (and any responses thereto) received after circulation of the Draft EIR and recirculation of the traffic section of the Draft EIR, in the evidence presented in written and oral testimony presented at public meetings, and otherwise in the administrative record, does not constitute new information requiring further recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA. None of the information presented to the City Council after circulation of the Draft EIR or recirculation of the traffic section of the Draft EIR has deprived the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial environmental impact of the Project or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative that the City has declined to implement.

II. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ANALYZED IN THE EIR

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project were found to be less than significant in the Initial Study, did not require the imposition of mitigation measures, and therefore did not require study in the EIR: (1) Agricultural Resources; (2) Biological Resources; (3) Cultural Resources; (4) Energy; (5) Hazards and Hazardous Materials; (6) Hydrology and Water Quality; (7) Land Use and Planning; (8) Mineral Resources; (9) Population/Housing; (10) Public Services; (11)

Recreation; and (12) Utilities and Service Systems (wastewater, solid waste, and dry utilities such as gas and electricity) (see Initial Study).

With regard to Cultural Resources, the Initial Study imposed standard mitigation measures to protect possible archaeological and paleontological resources, which are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. No further potentially significant effects were identified in the Initial Study, and thus the EIR does not include a cultural resources chapter. Nonetheless, the EIR does mention cultural resources, particularly in the context of the aesthetics analysis, and concludes that there are no potentially significant cultural resources from the Project. (See EIR, pp. 4.1-8 to 4.1-11, 8-29 to 8-31, 8-75.)

With regard to Land Use and Planning, the analysis on pages 23-24 supports the conclusion that there was no potentially significant impact (although the wrong box was checked on page 23 of the Initial Study). Nonetheless, the EIR does analyze land use impacts and consistency with the General Plan and Specific Plan, and concludes that there no potentially significant land use impacts from the Project. (See *id.* at pp. 8-24 to 8-27.)

III. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

The City Council finds that mitigation measures have been identified in the Final EIR which will reduce the following potentially significant environmental impacts to below a level of significance.

a. AESTHETICS

i. Potential Significant Impacts

Impact AES-1: The Project could result in indirect aesthetic impacts on adjacent historic landmarks and landmark-eligible structures due to potential incompatibility of design and scale. (EIR, p. 4.1-8.)

Impact AES-2: The Project would introduce a new 72-foot tall structure plus 15-feet of appurtenances to a site currently occupied by a two-story building. This change would substantially alter the visual character of the site and its surroundings. (Id. at p. 4.1-11.)

Impact AES-3: The Project would result in new sources of light and glare and create new shadows on and around the project site. This would be due to the increased height and scale of development, as well as the larger proportion of glazing and potentially reflective metal materials, in contrast with the existing development on the site. (Id. at p. 4.1-14.)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

AES-3 Building Material Specifications. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications for all building materials to the Planning Division for review and approval. All structures facing any public street or neighboring property shall use minimally reflective glass and all other materials used on the exterior of buildings and structures shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare. The use of glass with over 25% reflectivity shall be prohibited except as expressly approved by the Design Review Commission.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The Project would not directly affect surrounding designated or eligible existing historic resources. However, the Project would be two- to four times taller than the principal Playhouse structure and the other structures within the Playhouse Historic District (“Playhouse District”) across El Molino Avenue, and two- to three times taller than the Arcade Lane buildings. In addition to the difference in scale and height, the Project’s contemporary architecture departs from the Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival styles of the Playhouse District. (EIR, p. 4.1-8.) The initial designs for the Project take these factors into consideration, and the Playhouse District Design Guidelines acknowledge a “unique design eclecticism” that includes “contemporary designs” in the district. (Id. at p. 4.1-9.) The Project will require review and approval by the Design Commission, which must consider the Playhouse District Design Guidelines. With guidance from those Guidelines, and the required approval by the Design Commission, the Project will have less than significant aesthetic impacts. (Id. at pp. 4.1-9 to 11.)

The existing building on the site is one story and unadorned, and not considered to be of high aesthetic value. Nonetheless, replacement with the Project will substantially change the visual character of the site. (EIR, p. 4.1-11.) The Playhouse District is comprised of a myriad of disparate architectural styles and building types, but nonetheless has some uniformity with regard to massing and proportion. (Ibid.) With regard to massing, the Project has utilized modulation strategies that make it compatible with the Playhouse District and with its place on Colorado Boulevard. (Id. at p. 4.1-12.)

With regard to architecture and materials, the Project has incorporated overarching strategies that enable it to relate to the diverse settings in which it is located, and proposes to use materials that will fit within its surroundings and meet current energy codes. In any event, the Project will be subject to Design Review, where architecture, materials, scale, massing, color, lighting, landscape, and other design concepts will be finalized and will ensure that the Project meets the City's criteria for a design that does not result in a significant adverse impact. (Id. at p. 4.1-13.)

The Project would introduce new sources of light and glare, which could have a significant impact depending on the design and type of lighting. Potential sources of increased lighting include the spillover of interior light onto the street from interior lighting and exterior lights and signage during the nighttime hours. The ingress and egress points for the proposed subterranean garage would also be lighted, and headlights of vehicles exiting the structure at night would cast light onto roadways and surrounding properties. (EIR, p. 4.1-14.) However, the Project must comply with the Zoning Code regulations for outdoor lighting, sign lighting, architectural accent lighting, and also must comply with any Design Commission requirements for lighting, and therefore its lighting impacts are less than significant. (Ibid.) The glare impacts from the Project will be reviewed by the Design Commission as well, but in order to ensure that the impacts from glare are less than significant, mitigation measure AES-3 imposes on the Project a prohibition on the use of glass with over 25% reflectivity unless

specifically approved by the Design Commission. With implementation of that mitigation measure, glare impacts are less than significant. (Id. at pp. 4.1-15 and 16.)

Cumulative Impacts

Planned and pending developments in the site vicinity are listed in Table 3-1 of Section 3.0, Environmental Setting. Projects within a ½ mile radius of the site which could contribute to area aesthetic impacts include approximately 1,256 dwelling units and 461,687 square feet of commercial development. Such development includes both demolition of existing uses and new developments that could cumulatively increase the urbanized nature and intensity of the project vicinity. However, the City's General Plan, Urban Design Concepts, Design Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance provide a variety of standards, regulations and guidelines specifically intended to ensure that visual impacts from new development projects are minimized and that projects are designed and constructed in accordance with the City's aesthetic vision. These policy and regulatory documents, combined with the City's Design Review process, ensure that cumulative aesthetic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Accordingly, the incremental effect of the Project does not contribute to a cumulatively considerable aesthetic impact. (Id. at p. 4.1-16.)

b. AIR QUALITY

i. Potential Significant Impacts

Impact AQ-1: Reactive organic gas emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (EIR, p. 4.-6.)

Impact AQ-2: Operation of the Project would generate air pollutant emissions. (Id. at p. 4.2-9.)

Impact AQ-3: Long-term mobile emissions associated with the Project would incrementally increase carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at heavily congested intersections in the area. (Id. at p. 4.2-9.)

Impact AQ-4: Emissions generated by the long-term operations of the Project could contribute to the inability for the air basin to reach attainment. (Id. at p. 4.2-11.)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

AQ-1(a) ROG Control. The following shall be implemented to minimize daily ROG emissions related to the application of architectural coatings:

- Low VOC architectural and asphalt coatings shall be used on site and shall comply with AQMD Rule 1113-Architectural Coatings.

AQ-1(b) Ozone Precursor Control. The following shall be implemented during construction to minimize emissions from construction equipment:

- Equipment engines should be maintained in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer's specifications;
- Lengthen construction periods during the smog season so as to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating simultaneously; and
- Use new technologies to control ozone precursor emissions as they become available.

AQ-1(c) Fugitive Dust Control. The following shall be implemented during construction to minimize fugitive dust emissions:

- Water trucks shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movements damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will require twice daily applications (once in late morning and once at the end of the workday). Increased watering is required whenever wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Grading shall be suspended if wind gusts exceed 25 mph.
- Soil with 5% or greater silt content that is stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- All material excavated or graded shall be treated with soil binders or shall be sufficiently watered at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
- All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 20 mph averaged over one hour) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- All material transported off-site shall be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- Face masks shall be used by all employees involved in grading or excavation operations during dry periods to reduce inhalation of dust which may contain the fungus which causes San Joaquin Valley Fever.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The air quality analysis conforms to the methodologies recommended in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (“SCAQMD”) CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993). Quantitative pollution emissions estimates for the Project were calculated using URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4), which was developed by the California Air Resources Board to evaluate construction emissions, area emissions and operational emissions associated with new development. (EIR, p. 4.2-4.) The URBEMIS program calculates construction emissions based on demolition (Phase I), grading (Phase II), building construction (Phase III) and architectural coating (Phase IV). (Id. at p. 4.2-6.) Air pollutant emissions generated by construction of the Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for NO_x, CO, SO₂, or PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}. (Id. at pp. 4.2-6 and 7, Tables 4.2-5 and 4.2-6.) However, reactive organic gases (“ROG”), which are released

primarily during the finishing phase of construction upon application of paints and varnishes, are expected to exceed SCAQMD thresholds. (Ibid.) Use of Low VOC coatings as required by mitigation measure AQ-1(a) would reduce the maximum daily emissions of ROG of 39.2 lbs/day, which is below the SCAQMD threshold. Although mitigation is not required for other pollutants, recommended mitigation measures AQ-1(b) and (c) would further reduce construction related emissions of fugitive dust and ozone precursors to the greatest extent feasible. (Id. at pp. 4.2-8 and 9.)

Operational emissions of the Project were analyzed based on the land use type and square footage, as well as the estimated average daily vehicle trips. While Project operations will increase air emissions, overall emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds, and are less than significant. (EIR, pp. 4.2-10 and 11, Table 4.2-7.)

Since the Project is in a high vehicle density area, its potential to create carbon monoxide "hot spots" was analyzed. Exceedance of CO standards is most likely to occur at those locations with significant traffic congestion, meaning LOS operations of E or F. Based on the LOS criteria and the results of the traffic study, there are no intersections in the Project area that would require a CO hotspot analysis. All intersections in the Project area are expected to operate at LOS D or better for existing plus pending projects and ambient growth plus the Project. Further, the Project is in an area that is in attainment for CO, and levels are decreasing, due to more stringent motor vehicle emissions regulations. (EIR, pp. 4.2-10 and 11.)

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (“AQMP”) produced by the SCAQMD aims to incorporate all feasible air quality control measures while balancing costs and socioeconomic impacts. The SCAQMD has designated two key indicators of consistency with air quality policies. The first criterion requires that the Project not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. The second criterion requires that the project not exceed the assumptions made in preparing the AQMP. As discussed above, air pollutant emissions are less than significant, or can be mitigated to less than significant levels, and therefore the Project is consistent with the first criterion. (EIR, p. 4.2-12.) The Project is an office building and would not directly add to population, and therefore does not exceed the assumptions made in preparing the AQMP. Accordingly, the Project is consistent with the AQMP. (Ibid.)

Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gases (“GHG”) are almost exclusively related to cumulative impacts. The primary concern is whether the Project will conflict with state goals set forth in AB 32 for reducing GHG emissions. Three types of analyses were used to determine whether the Project would be in conflict with any of the state’s goals. (EIR, p. 4.2-13.) The Project does not pose any apparent conflict with the list of early action strategies for addressing GHG emissions as listed by the California Air Resources Board. (Id. at pp. 4.2-14 to 16.) Temporary Project construction greenhouse gas emissions would be

approximately 386 metric tons of CO₂/yr, based on URBEMIS 2007 estimates, and operational emissions generated by the Project would be an estimated 5,203 metric tons of CO₂E/yr (including emissions from vehicle trips, space heating and indirect emissions from use of electricity). The Project would not be classified as a major source of greenhouse gas emissions. Nonetheless, the EIR recommends the following as priority design features, and the City Council likewise adopts them as recommendations:

- **Sustainable Site Credit 4.2.** For commercial or institutional buildings, provide secure bicycle racks and/or storage (within 200 yards of a building entrance) for 5% or more of all building users (measured at peak periods), and provide shower and changing facilities in the building, or within 200 yards of a building entrance, for 0.5% of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) occupants. (1 point)
- **Sustainable Site Credit 4.3.** Provide low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles for 3% of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) occupants and provide preferred parking for these vehicles; OR provide preferred parking for low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles for 5% of the total vehicle parking capacity of the site. For the purposes of this credit, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles are defined as vehicles that are either classified as Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) by the California Air Resources Board or have achieved a minimum green score of 40 on the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE) annual vehicle rating guide. "Preferred parking" refers to the parking spots that are closest to the main entrance of the project (exclusive of spaces designated for handicapped) or parking passes/spaces provided at a discounted price.
- **Water Efficiency Credit 3.2.** Employ strategies that in aggregate use 30% less water than the water use baseline calculated for the building (not including irrigation) after meeting the Energy Policy Act of 1992 fixture performance requirements. Calculations are based on estimated occupant usage and shall include only the following fixtures (as applicable to the building): water closets, urinals, lavatory faucets, showers and kitchen sinks. (2 points)
- **Energy and Atmosphere Credit 2.** Use on-site renewable energy systems to offset building energy cost. Calculate project performance by expressing the energy produced by the renewable systems as a percentage of the building annual energy cost and using the table below to determine the number of points achieved. Use the building annual energy cost calculated in EA Credit 1 or use

the Department of Energy (DOE) Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) database to determine the estimated electricity use.

% Renewable Energy Points

2.5% (1 point) or

7.5% (2 points) or

12.5% (3 points) (EIR, pp. 4.2-16 and 17.)

About 72 percent of the project GHG emissions are estimated to come from vehicle trips. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC-2(a) would require the applicant to conform to the provisions of the City of Pasadena's Transportation Management Ordinance and thereby decrease vehicle trips as much as feasibly possible. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that Project emissions alone would substantially add to the global inventory of greenhouse gas emissions. (Id. at p. 4.2-18.)

It should also be noted that the global climate change would not be expected to have a substantial impact on the Project. The Project location would not be affected by minor changes in sea level and the Project would not require a substantial volume of water resources so any changes in available water resources (resulting from climate change) would not have a substantial effect on the viability of the Project. (Ibid.)

Cumulative Impacts

The South Coast Air Basin is a non-attainment area for federal and state standards for ozone and PM₁₀. Any growth within the Los Angeles metropolitan area contributes to existing exceedances of ambient air quality standards when taken as a whole with existing development in the region. However, every new development project is evaluated independently for its adverse effects to air quality. Emissions

associated with the Project, in combination with other development throughout the South Coast Air Basin, would incrementally contribute to the degradation of regional air quality. Adding the Project to the cumulative projects list (Table 3-1), the Project would account for approximately 26% of the total cumulative square footage. While, this represents a large figure for overall development, the Project does not have a significant air quality impact after mitigation. Increased emissions associated with cumulative development could potentially hinder the attainment of State and Federal air quality standards if numerous individual projects cannot fully mitigate associated emissions. However, the City will evaluate each development contained in the cumulative project list and impose mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. Further, the Project is consistent with the AQMP, which accounted for additional growth in the area. Thus, the project would not add an incremental effect to a cumulative impact and its impacts are not cumulatively considerable. (EIR, p. 4.2-13.)

c. NOISE AND VIBRATION

i. Potential Significant Impacts

Impact N-1 Project construction would temporarily generate intermittent high noise levels and could generate groundborne vibrations on and adjacent to the site. (EIR, p. 4.3-6.)

Impact N-2 Project-generated traffic would incrementally increase noise levels on area roadways. (EIR, p. 4.3-8.)

Impact N-3 Operation of the proposed project would generate noise levels that may periodically be audible to existing uses near the Project site. (EIR, p. 4.3-9.)

Impact N-4 The Project would be constructed in an environment where ambient noise levels may be disturbing to employees. (EIR, p. 4.3-10.)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

N-3 Rooftop Ventilation. Parapets shall be installed around all rooftop ventilation systems.

N-4 Noise Exposure. The proposed project shall incorporate closed windows and a fresh air supply via a mechanical ventilation system so that windows may remain closed. Exterior glass shall be capable of attenuating noise of 20 decibels.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

iv. Supporting Explanation

Construction Impacts

Noise impacts are a function of the type of activity being undertaken and the distance to the receptor location. Nearby noise-sensitive land uses, including the multi-family residential building located approximately 150 feet northwest of the Project site, across Colorado Boulevard, and the multifamily residential building located approximately 100 feet east of the site, may be exposed to temporary construction noise during development of the Project. In addition, groundborne vibrations during project construction could adversely affect the Arcade Building (eastern site boundary), which is eligible for protection as a historic resource, and the Pasadena Playhouse

(located across El Molino Avenue from the project site), which is a designated historic resource. Given the distance from the site to the multifamily residences (100 to 150 feet) combined with the City's time restrictions on construction activities, and municipal code requirements prohibiting noise in excess of 85 dBA within 100 feet of the equipment, noise levels during construction activities would not be expected to exceed allowable levels at the multi-family residential buildings. Since no significant impacts are expected, no further mitigation is required. (EIR, pp 4.3-6 and 7, see also Table 4.3-4.)

The applicant has submitted a shoring plan which avoids the use of vibratory equipment. (EIR, p. 4.3-7, see also Appendix D). Construction procedures include drilling and backfilling of soldier piles to reduce groundborne vibrations. This process is common throughout the world and in particular adjacent to old structures. The Building Department and City Engineer will review the shoring and basement construction plans to ensure that the structures on adjacent properties would not be adversely affected. Implementation of the construction measures indicated in the Excavation Plan (Appendix D) would reduce the potential for adverse impacts related to vibrations to local historic buildings to less than significant, and no further mitigation is required. (EIR, p. 4.3-7.)

Operational Impacts

Development of the Project would increase the amount of vehicle trips to and from the site, which would increase traffic noise on area roadways, and therefore could increase noise at neighboring uses. The highest noise level increase due to the Project would be 0.2 dBA, which is generally not an audible increase, and is below a level of significance. Furthermore, both the existing and future noise environments on all analyzed street segments would continue to be within the compatibility guidelines of 65 dBA CNEL ("clearly acceptable") for multi-family residential uses. (EIR, pp. 4.3-8 and 9, Table 4.3-5.)

Existing uses near the Project site may periodically hear noises associated with operation of the Project, including noise that is typical of commercial developments such as conversations, doors slamming, and the like, as well as noise associated with rooftop ventilation and heating systems, delivery trucks, and trash hauling. Delivery and trash pick-up area would be located within a semi-enclosed area with no direct line-of-sight to sensitive receptors and accessed from El Molino Avenue, and therefore are not expected to produce potentially significant noise impacts. Further, noise generated by refuse collection is not allowed to occur between 5 PM and 7 AM by Pasadena Municipal Code Section 8.60.205 (Times of Solid Waste Collection). General parking lot noise would be reduced due to the placement of most of these activities within the proposed subterranean parking garage. Therefore, potentially significant noise impacts from Project operations will be less than significant. Nonetheless, to ensure a less than

significant impact, mitigation measure N-3 requires screening around rooftop ventilation systems. (EIR, pp. 4.3-9 and 10.)

The existing noise levels at the Project site exceed the Clearly Acceptable noise level allowed by the General Plan at office uses by about one dBA as measured along El Molino Avenue. To ensure that this impact is reduced to below a level of significance, mitigation measure N-4 requires that the Project incorporate closed windows, a ventilation system, and noise attenuating glass so that noise within the offices at the Project will not reach potentially significant levels. (EIR, p. 4.3-10.)

Cumulative Impacts

Traffic noise impacts associated with cumulative development within the City would incrementally increase noise levels along roadways and could potentially subject sensitive receptors to noise exceeding City standards. The largest possible increase in noise would be an increase of 1.2 dBA CNEL on El Molino Avenue between Colorado Boulevard and Green Street assuming buildout of cumulative development. However, the estimated noise increase resulting from cumulative development in the City would not exceed thresholds for area roadway segments. Therefore, noise level increases due to cumulative traffic increases would not be considered significant, and the Project's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable. In any event, cumulative development would be required to comply with the Land Use/Noise Compatibility Matrix contained in the City's Noise Element, which would ensure an acceptable noise environment for City residents. (EIR, pp. 4.3-10 and 11.)

d. GEOLOGY

i. Potential Significant Impacts

Impact GEO-1 Seismically-induced ground shaking could destroy or damage proposed structures, resulting in a loss of property and risk to human health. (EIR, p. 4.4-5.)

Impact GEO-2 The Project includes construction of a five story building atop six levels of subterranean parking. Various design considerations are necessary to ensure that the Project is constructed in manner that reduces the potential for adverse effects from differential settlement, corrosive soils, and collapsible soils. (Id. at p. 4.4-6.)

Impact GEO-3 The Project involves excavation for six levels of subterranean parking and is estimated to require 63,000 cubic yards of cut, which would be exported. Excavation and soil transport could result in dispersal of soil by air and water. (Id. at p. 4.4-7.) This impact is discussed in the air quality section below.

ii. Proposed Mitigation

GEO-2 Adherence to Geotechnical Recommendations. The applicant shall implement, adhere to, and comply with, all recommendations contained in the Geologic and Soils Engineering Report prepared for the project site by MacTec, 2006 or as superseded by any subsequent updates, including the excavation plan included in Appendix D. The plans shall be reviewed by the Building Department for conformance with the recommendations.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The Project will have to comply with current building code requirements that address the risks presented with seismically-induced ground vibrations. The 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the 2001 California Building Code (CBC) require that the design and construction of new structures be engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration that may occur at this site. (EIR, p. 4.4-5.) While it is impossible to reduce the probability of a powerful earthquake with high ground acceleration to zero, the potential for structural failure due to seismic ground shaking would be considered less than significant through implementation of the most recent industry standards (UBC and CBC) for structural design. (Id. at p. 4.4-6.) The structural risks present from onsite soils conditions are addressed in the geotechnical report, which recommends removal of silt and clay layers during the excavation with foundations deepened in natural sand layers. The geotechnical report includes recommendations for shoring during construction to reduce the potential for collapse. The geotechnical report recommends vibratory equipment as part of the shoring process; however, because of the potential for adverse effects to adjacent structures, an excavation plan was submitted that supersedes this recommendation. (Id. at p. 4.4-6, see also Appendix D.) The geotechnical report also contains recommendations related to the design of spread footings that will distribute the load of the structure and reduce risks from settlement. The normal building permit and plan check process includes provisions for adherence to CBC and UBC requirements regarding structural design. Finally, the geotechnical