

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

existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, any projects that are subject to this ordinance must submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

*h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will not alter the way the existing open space and native vegetated areas to be maintained. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

**12. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

*a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act.

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

Compliance with the SQMP is ensured by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which is known as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Los Angeles County and 85 incorporated Cities therein, including the City of Pasadena, obtained an MS4 (Permit # 01-182) from the Los Angeles RWQCB, most recently in 2001. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP.

In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Pasadena has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. This ordinance requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP.

As urban development, projects that are subject to this ordinance would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. However, the project itself is intended to minimize unnecessary water runoff due to inefficient landscape irrigation. In addition, the proposed code amendments would not alter

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

any waste discharge requirements, and would not change any water quality-related plans or programs. As discussed, these pollutants are permitted by the County-wide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations. Therefore, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have no related significant impacts.

- b. *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? ( )*

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments would not involve installation of any groundwater wells, and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. New development projects that are subject to this ordinance would use the existing water supply system provided by Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) for their landscaping use, as well as for the indoor use. The source of some of this water supply is groundwater, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, new development projects that install new landscaping could indirectly withdraw groundwater, and the impacts of that water usage will be analyzed as the impacts of each new development project is analyzed. The amount of water use will be estimated and approved by the City's Water and Power Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. The proposed ordinance will ensure that the water for the new landscaping is used efficiently, and the ordinance itself does not increase the use of landscaping water.

Over the past several years, PWP has been impacted by several factors that have restricted local and regional water supply. A decade-long drought has reduced the ability to replenish regional groundwater supplies; drought conditions in the American southwest have reduced deliveries of imported water from the Colorado River, and a federal district court ruling restricted pumping activities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta; thereby, reducing water deliveries through the State Water Project. As a result, the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) has implemented its Water Supply Allocation Plan, which requires PWP to reduce its total water consumption by approximately 10% effective July 1, 2009. MWD will charge significant penalties if PWP's total water use exceeds this allocation.

PWP's groundwater rights in the Raymond Basin have also been curtailed in order to mitigate groundwater depletion experienced over the last half century. The Raymond Basin Management Board adopted a resolution in March 2009 to reduce Pasadena's pumping allocation in the Pasadena subarea of the Raymond Basin. Pasadena's rights will be reduced by 5% a year to a total of 30% within 6 years. The first reduction was in effect July 1, 2009.

In time, the water used to irrigate landscape percolates to the groundwater basin, thereby recharging the basin. According to Geoscience Support Services, Inc. in their Baseline Ground Water Assessment Report of the Raymond Basin dated February 2, 2004:

"A portion of water used for irrigation of lawns, gardens, golf courses and landscaped areas percolates into the aquifer system and contributes to Basin recharge. Return flow from applied waters can be calculated as a percentage of the volume of water delivered to customers, and ranges from approximately 10 to 12 percent. Return flow from applied waters is distributed throughout the Basin and may vary seasonally."

The Raymond Basin Management Board (Watermaster) does not credit the City of Pasadena with groundwater recharge due to landscape irrigation because it is considered to have minimal impact at its current level. (In contrast, recharge operations in the Arroyo Seco lead to direct increases in pumping rights from the Raymond Basin, because the City receives 60% credit of the amount spread there.)

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

With a reduction in volume of water being irrigated, less groundwater recharge is occurring in the long-term. Although the exact number of properties subject to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance as described in Section I of this document is still being accounted for, the number is limited. The return flow from applied waters is approximately 10 to 12 percent of those limited qualified properties. However, since the Raymond Basin Watermaster considers recharge from current levels of landscape irrigation *throughout the City* to be minimal, to the extent that the City does not receive *any* credit for such recharge, a reduction in recharge will not affect the Watermaster's analysis. Therefore, the overall effect on groundwater recharge reduction is less than significant.

In order to address the water supply issues, City Council directed PWP to develop a comprehensive water conservation plan with a variety of approaches and recommendations for achieving 10%, 20% and 30% reductions in water consumption as well as an analysis of the financial impacts on the Water Fund if those conservation targets were achieved. On April 13, 2009, Council voted to approve the Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan presented by PWP and to replace the Water Shortage Procedure Ordinance with a new Water Waste Prohibition and Water Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10).

The new Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10) became effective on July 4, 2009 and established thirteen permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. The proposed project, which is to mandate effective water use in landscapes, will amend PMC Title 13 to further enhance the effectiveness of the City's water conservation program.

The City anticipates statewide water demand reduction requirements beginning in 2010, thereby directing the water conservation efforts already set in place by City Council. This program is a result of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan from April 30, 2009 ("20x2020"), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program. In addition, City Council endorsed the Urban Environmental Accords on September 18, 2006. Action 19 requires 10% reduction per capita of water consumption by 2015.

- c. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not site specific. Any projects that require a building permit will be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the existing drainage patterns. Future development projects are subject to NPDES requirements, including the County-wide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. In accordance with these requirements, each development project would be required to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP. To comply with the SUSMP, the development projects must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. Complying with the City's SUSMP and implementing the required BMPs will ensure that the any subsequent development projects would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to drainage patterns.

- d. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not site specific. Any projects that require a building permit will

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

continue to be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the existing drainage patterns. The projects' potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. The project will require post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process

- e. *Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?* ( )

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not site specific. Any projects that require a building permit are required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance to ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates do not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. This ensures subsequent development projects would not exceed the City's existing storm drain system.

- f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?* ( )

**WHY?** As discussed above, the proposed code amendments are not site specific nor tied to any particular projects. However, generally, only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated by land development are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

- g. *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or dam inundation area as shown in the City of Pasadena adopted Safety Element of the General Plan or other flood or inundation delineation map?* ( )

**WHY?** No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. The proposed ordinance does not involve the placement of housing in the city.

- h. *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?* ( )

**WHY?** No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, the proposed ordinance does not involve the construction of any new structures. Therefore, the project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and would have no related impacts.

- i. *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?* ( )

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 ordinance will regulate the efficiency of water used for new landscaping projects and, therefore, will not have the potential to cause flooding or levee or dam failure.

j. *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

**13. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

a. *Physically divide an existing community?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not related to a specific development project. These amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project will not have the potential to physically divide an existing community.

b. *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?* ( )

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

**WHY?** Any amendments to the Pasadena Municipal Code require that the City Council adopt a finding that the proposed amendments are consistent with the City's General Plan. The proposed code amendments are consistent with the goals and objectives (Goal 1.0, Objectives 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3) and in accord with the implementation strategies and policies (Strategies 100.0 and 200.0, Policies 101.0, 102.0, 103.0, 201.0, 202.0, and 203.0) of the Conservation element of the General Plan.

c. *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?* ( )

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

**WHY?** Currently, there is 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 in Pasadena.

**14. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a. *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?* ( )

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?** No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas are Eaton Wash, which, was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. There is no specific project associated with these code amendments therefore, there will be no impact.

*b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed code amendments would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also response 14.a above.

**15. NOISE.** Will the project result in:

*a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not site specific; therefore, it is not possible to identify specific noise impacts. However, many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. Therefore, the project would not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise or would not expose persons to excessive noise.

*b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, no adverse impact will result.

*c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ( )*

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

**WHY?** See response to 15.a.

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

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are not site specific and not related to a particular development project. There would be short-term noise due to construction activities of the projects that are subject to this Ordinance. However, they must adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment. (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels.

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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport (formerly the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport), which is located more than ten miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no private-use airports or airstrips within or near the City of Pasadena.

**16. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ( )

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project will not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ( )

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 are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project will not have any impacts on numbers of existing housing.

c. *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing.

**17. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Will the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. *Fire Protection?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. See also Section 11.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. *Libraries?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. *Parks?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are applicable to new or rehabilitated landscapes for parks. However, they are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project would not significantly impact park services.

d. *Police Protection?* ( )

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



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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes. Therefore, the project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. *Schools?* ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools.

f. *Other public facilities?* ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** These code amendments are technical and procedural updates on the existing permit and entitlement review process. and will not result in the need for any new public facilities.

**18. RECREATION.**

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?* ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will not increase residential population or workforce employees. Therefore, project will not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

b. *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?* ( )

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will affect recreational facilities, such as parks, golf courses, and community centers in need of a building permit, land use entitlement, or design review and having more than 2,500 square feet of new or rehabilitated landscapes. In addition, the amendments will affect recreational facilities with existing landscapes of one acre or more. However, they will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

**19. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a. *Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?* ( )

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 are technical and procedural updates to existing permit and entitlement review processes. Any individual projects that are subject to the amendments will be reviewed to determine its impacts on existing traffic load and street capacity.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to existing permit and entitlement review processes. Any individual projects that are subject to the amendments will be reviewed to determine any impact on the level of services.

c. *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed code amendments would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

d. *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to existing permit and entitlement review processes and are not related to a specific project that will result in an increase in hazards due to a design feature. No changes to such standards are proposed under these amendments, and any development projects will continue to be evaluated to ensure there are no design features that may cause a hazard.

e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?* ( )

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to existing permit and entitlement review processes. Any individual projects that are subject to the amendments will be reviewed to determine any impact on the level of services. See also response 18 d.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?* ( )

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

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

**WHY?** Any development projects with an increase in gross floor area and/or change in use will need to comply with the number of parking spaces required by the Zoning Code. The proposed code amendments are for landscapes of development projects, and will not change parking requirements of the Zoning Code.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are for landscapes of development projects. There is no change proposed in the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance or other programs supporting alternative modes of transportation.

**20. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments would not generate wastewater since the project is technical and minor changes to the permit and entitlement review procedures and monitoring programs. The water used for landscapes will be percolated into the ground or drained into the storm water drain. Therefore, the project would not affect wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

- b. *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments will not create any further demand on wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and would have no associated impacts.

- c. *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are intended to minimize water runoff due to inefficient landscape irrigation. Therefore, the project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Regardless, any future projects subject to the Ordinance must submit and implement an on-site drainage plan that meets the approval of the Building Official and the Public Works Department; and the City's SUSMP ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates.

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

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 are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes and will not result in an increase in water use. Rather, the amendments will establish regulations to ensure that new landscaping projects use water efficiently, thereby reducing the amount of water used for landscaping.

e. *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? ( )*

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to existing permit and entitlement review processes for landscapes, which do not require wastewater services. Thus, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments would not require any additional solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts.

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments are technical and procedural updates to the City's existing permit and entitlement review processes and will not result in any generation of solid waste. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

**21. EARLEIR ANALYSIS.**

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

a) The following document was used for analysis of the project's environmental effects:

- *General Plan and Final Program EIR*

These documents are available for review at the Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Thursday and from 8:00-12:00 p.m. every Friday and the City Clerk's Office Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and every other Friday during the same hours.

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,

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

and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.)

c) Mitigation Measures. None.

**22. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

a. *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed code amendments would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetic or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 12 of this document, the code amendments would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the code amendments would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 12, 14 and 15 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project? ( )*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed code amendments would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative geological and hydrological impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. As discussed in Section 5.c. of this document, the project's contribution to the cumulative air quality scenario is not considerable. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

As noted in the response to 12b, in September 2008, Council directed PWP to develop a comprehensive water conservation plan with a variety of approaches and recommendations for achieving 10%, 20% and 30% reductions in water consumption as well as an analysis of the financial impacts on the Water Fund if those conservation targets were achieved. On April 13, 2009, Council voted to approve the Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan presented by PWP and to replace the Water Shortage Procedure Ordinance with a new Water Waste Prohibition and Water Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10).

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

The new Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plan Ordinance (PMC 13.10) became effective on July 4, 2009 and established thirteen permanent mandatory restrictions on wasteful water use activities. The proposed project, which is to mandate effective water use in landscapes, will amend PMC Title 13 to further enhance the effectiveness of the City's water conservation program.

The City anticipates statewide water demand reduction requirements beginning in 2010, thereby directing the water conservation efforts already set in place by City Council. This program is a result of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan from April 30, 2009 ("20x2020"), and the current work being done by the California Department of Water Resources, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other state agencies to implement the Governor's 20x2020 Water Conservation Initiative Program. In addition, City Council endorsed the Urban Environmental Accords on September 18, 2006. Action 19 requires 10% reduction per capita of water consumption by 2015.

With a reduction in volume of water being irrigated, less groundwater recharge is occurring in the long-term. Although the exact number of properties subject to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance as described in Section I of this document is still being accounted for, the number is limited. The return flow from applied waters is approximately 10 to 12 percent of those limited qualified properties. Therefore, the overall effect on groundwater recharge reduction is less than significant.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** As discussed in Sections 5, 11, 12, and 19 of this document, the proposed code amendments would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Although residents of the City would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 13 Land Use and Planning, 15 Noise, 16 Population and Housing, 17 Public Services, 18 Recreation, 19 Transportation/Traffic and 20 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

Therefore, the project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

## INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
2	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
3	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
4	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
5	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
6	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004
7	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
8	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
9	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
10	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
11	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
12	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
13	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
14	Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended
15	Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005
16	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
17	Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
18	Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
19	Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002.
20	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
21	State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
22	Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
23	Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005
24	Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
25	West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
26	Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code