

ATTACHMENT C

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

DRAFT 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:** Adoption of Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Pasadena
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** John Steinmeyer, (626) 744-6880
4. **Project Location:** The proposed Municipal Code Amendments will be Citywide.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Pasadena
6. **General Plan Designation:** Varied – Citywide
7. **Zoning:** Varied – Citywide
8. **Description of the Project:** The City is proposing amendments to the Pasadena Municipal Code (PMC) to establish provisions for the efficient water use for landscapes. The State of California has adopted legislation (AB1881) to establish the statewide Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The updated model ordinance, which was finalized on September 10, 2009, urges the efficient use of water by setting a stricter Maximum Applied Water Allowance for landscape irrigation. The legislation requires local agencies to adopt the State model ordinance, or be in compliance through their own ordinance that is at least as effective as the model ordinance by January 1, 2010. If local agencies did not act, the State Model Ordinance will become their de facto ordinance. The proposed code amendments are to comply with the State's requirements and also to develop programs to implement the adopted ordinance.

The City of Pasadena has recently amended its Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plans under the Utilities and Sewers Code (Title 13) of PMC in order to establish long-term water conservation standards for the City and its service territory. The City is also actively developing specific water conservation strategies for the Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan adopted by the City Council. The adoption of the State Model Ordinance will enable the City to address water conservation issues associated with landscapes and will complement the City's existing and proposed water conservation programs.

The City proposes to adopt the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance by codifying it into Title 13 of PMC with minor modifications. In addition, the City proposes to amend the Zoning Code

(Title 17) to incorporate the State-required review and approval procedure for new construction and rehabilitated landscape projects, which will be administered by the Planning Division. The proposed amendments to Title 17 will be subsequent to the adoption of the Model Ordinance, and is expected in early 2010.

The proposed City ordinance will apply to the following landscape projects: 1) public agency projects, private development projects, developer-initiated single-family and multi-family projects with new or rehabilitated landscape areas equal to or greater than 2,500 square feet requiring a building permit, plan check, or land use entitlement such as a Conditional Use Permit or Design Review; 2) homeowner-initiated single-family residential projects with new or rehabilitated landscape areas equal to or greater than 5,000 square feet requiring a building or landscape permit, plan check, or land use entitlement such as a Conditional Use Permit or Design Review; and 3) all existing landscapes that were installed before January 1, 2010 and are over one acre in size. Non-irrigated areas designated for non-development (e.g. open spaces and existing native vegetation) are not defined as landscape area; thus they will not be included in the aggregated size of landscapes.

The City will implement the ordinance through review and approval of landscape plans for new or rehabilitated landscapes, or through irrigation water conservation programs, including but not limited to irrigation audit, irrigation survey, or irrigation water use analysis, which will be administered for existing landscapes.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Varied – Citywide

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: The adoption of the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance is City-wide, and will change the regulations in various parts of the Municipal Code. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Approval by the City Council is required for the amendment to Title 13, and approval by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the amendment to Title 17.

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

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.	X
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.	
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.	

Prepared By/Date _____

John Steinmeyer
Printed Name

Reviewed By/Date _____

Denver E. Miller, Environmental Administrator
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

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

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: January 19, 2010
 Department requiring checklist: Water and Power, Planning and Development
 Case Manager: John Steinmeyer

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (explanations of all answers are required):

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

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will be only applicable to sizable landscapes associated with new construction or existing landscapes of more than one acre in size. The ordinance will not be applicable to non-irrigated open spaces and naturally vegetated areas, registered local, state, and federal historical sites, or ecological restoration projects that do not require a permanent irrigation system. There are no provisions that will result in adverse impacts to views of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Arroyo Seco, the San Rafael Hills, Eaton Canyon or other scenic vista. Therefore, the project would have no impact to scenic vistas.

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 surrounding area is undeveloped. The proposed code amendments will not be applicable to non-irrigated open spaces and naturally vegetated areas. Therefore, the project would have no impacts to a state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will not change the height and mass limitations established in the Zoning Code. Development projects that are subject to the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance will be required to submit a landscape plan for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator and/or the decision-making body prior to the issuance of any building permits. The project would not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impact.

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

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

WHY? The proposed Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance is not site specific and will not result in creating a new source of substantial light or glare. Furthermore, development projects that are subject to the proposed ordinance will be required to submit a landscape plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building permits.

4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. 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 proposed ordinance will provide additional water allowance for Special Landscape Areas, such as landscape areas dedicated solely to edible plants. Therefore, the project will not have conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

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:

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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 region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for 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 most recently adopted plan is the 2003 AQMP, adopted on August 1, 2003. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMD.

In addition to the region-wide 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.

The proposed code amendments do not have the potential to promote growth since they do not increase the height, density, gross floor area or other development standards that would lead to greater intensity of development. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the City's ability to implement its air quality plan.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will be applicable to existing landscapes of one acre or larger and new or rehabilitated landscapes that are associated with development that requires building permits or entitlements, and will not lead to greater intensity of the development. Therefore, the project would not generate an increase in new construction which would potentially lead to an air quality violation.

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)? ()

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? The proposed code amendments will be applicable to existing landscapes of one acre or larger and new or rehabilitated landscapes that are associated with development that requires building permits or entitlements, and will not lead to greater intensity of the development. The project will not result in a new increase in criteria pollutants as the amendments will not increase the overall development standards within the Municipal Code.

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

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will be applicable to existing landscapes of one acre or larger and new or rehabilitated landscapes that are associated with development that requires building permits or entitlements, and will not lead to greater intensity of the development. The project will not result in exposing new sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the amendments will not increase the overall development standards within the Municipal Code.

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

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will be applicable to existing landscapes of one acre or larger and new or rehabilitated landscapes that are associated with development that requires building permits or entitlements, and will not lead to greater intensity of the development. The project will not result in objectionable odors. New development projects will be reviewed in accordance with the City's Zoning Code and will be required to meet the performance standards for odors contained in Section 17.40.090.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments will be applicable to existing landscapes of one acre or larger and new or rehabilitated landscapes that are associated with development that requires building permits or entitlements, and will not lead to greater intensity of the development nor requires the development to provide greater area of landscaping. The project will not require or result in habitat modifications and, therefore, will not affect sensitive or special status species.

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

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

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

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. Said EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The code amendments will not be applicable to non-irrigated open space or ecological restoration projects that do not require a permanent irrigation system. Therefore, the project would not affect biological resources or sensitive natural communities within the City.

- 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? ()*

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 code amendments will not be applicable to non-irrigated open space such as natural wetlands that do not require a permanent irrigation system. Therefore, the 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 vast majority of Pasadena is a developed urban area and does not involve the dispersal of wildlife. There has been a native plant nursery in the upper Arroyo in the Hahamongna Watershed Park area near the land leased by the U.S. Forestry Service from the Metropolitan Water District. The code amendments will not be applicable to non-irrigated open space, ecological restoration projects that do not require a permanent irrigation system, or plant collections as part of botanical gardens and arboretums open to the public. Therefore, there will be no impacts to wildlife or its habitat.

- 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." The implementation of the proposed code amendments will be in addition to the existing Tree Protection Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The code amendments will not be applicable to registered local, state, or federal historical sites, including designated landscapes. Therefore, the project will not impact the significance of any historical resource.

- 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? The proposed code amendments are not site-specific. They would have no impact to archaeological resources since each development proposal that may be subject to the amendments will be reviewed for potential impacts. The proposed amendments will not encourage or require additional ground disturbance unless otherwise required for the development. Therefore, no impacts to archeological resources would result.

- 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site-specific. Each development project subject to these amendments will be reviewed for potential impacts. Therefore, the project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature directly or indirectly, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are Citywide and are not site specific. Because there are no cemeteries in Pasadena, any landscape projects will not be part of a formal cemetery and will not be known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during landscape projects. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the construction 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 project would not result in disturbing human remains.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments do not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. Projects are required 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? The purpose of the code amendments is to promote the efficient use of potable water without waste and to reduce water use to the lowest practical amount. It also includes incentives for landscape areas irrigated with recycled water and water features using recycled water. The project will not result in development projects that would promote the use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This 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;

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

- 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.

The proposed code amendments are Citywide and are not site specific. The project sites may be within the potential rupture zones; however, landscapes would affect only the topmost soils of the ground. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the project.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking? ()*

WHY? See 9.a.i.

iii. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ()*

WHY? The proposed code amendments are Citywide and are not site specific. The project sites may be within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone. However, landscape and irrigation plans for development projects that are subject to the amendments will be prepared by licensed landscape architects and reviewed by the licensed professional. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by seismic induced ground failure.

iv. *Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides? ()*

WHY? The proposed code amendments are Citywide and are not site specific. Landscape and irrigation plans for projects that are subject to the amendments will be prepared by licensed landscape architects and reviewed by licensed professionals. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are Citywide and are not site specific. Ordinarily, landscapes would affect only the topmost soils of the ground. One of the purposes of these amendments is to promote landscaping to enhance the environment by cleaning air and water, preventing erosion, offering fire protection, and replacing ecosystems lost to development. In order to implement the goals, landscape

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

plans for development projects that are subject to the amendments will be reviewed by licensed professionals. The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c. *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ()*

WHY? The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain. As shown on Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable.

The proposed code amendments are not site specific, and development projects that are subject to the amendments may be located within a sloping area of the San Rafael Hills, Arroyo Seco, or foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. However, the code amendments will not encourage development of existing open space and existing native vegetated areas. In addition, the review and approval of the landscape and irrigation plans for new projects will ensure that the projects will not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils.

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan Pasadena is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. The project would have no expansive soil-related impacts and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for expansive soil-related impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site specific and are Citywide. These amendments will not impact the ability of the City to review a project to determine if the soil is incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

10. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- a. *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

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

WHY? The code amendments will be applicable to landscapes that are associated with new development projects. The new development projects themselves will generate Carbon Dioxide, which is the primary component of Greenhouse gases (GHG). However, the proposed ordinance will require the landscape portion of these projects to use less water, which will reduce GHG emissions associated with transporting water to Pasadena. The code amendments are not site specific, and each new development project will be reviewed analyzed the amount of CO₂ it will generate during construction and for operations. If its incremental effect is found to be cumulatively considerable, an Air Quality study may be prepared for that new development project.

b. *Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

WHY? The proposed ordinance will reduce the amount of water used for landscaping in new development projects, which will reduce GHG emissions associated with transporting water to Pasadena. As such, the proposed ordinance will be consistent with AB32, the ARB Scoping Plan and the ARB Early Action Strategies.

11. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? ()*

WHY? The proposed code amendments do not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The code amendments will not require additional landscapes, but it rather will require the City agency to review and approve the landscape and irrigation plans prior to the construction. Any development projects that are subject to the amendments must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments do not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material. In addition, the proposed code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazard-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed code amendments do not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools. In addition, the project would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ()*

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site specific. Any development projects would be reviewed to determine whether they are on a list of hazardous materials sites. The project would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing hazardous material sites.

e. *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Pasadena Fire Department maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Department is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency. The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir.

The proposed code amendments would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any