

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The project site 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, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed 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?** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed 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 construction and operation of the proposed project would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, and the applicant is required to 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?** As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

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

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

**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 with current conditions runoff would discharge into the existing drainage infrastructure and not directly into any surface waters. Increased vehicular traffic and parking demands could increase the concentration of pollutants from automobile use in run-off from the site. Typical pollutants related to automobiles include oil, grease, rubber, metals and hydrocarbons. Additional urban pollutants can be generated from trash, leaf fall, and the application of pesticides associated with landscape maintenance.

Although pollutant concentrations may increase, overall storm water runoff quality would not be expected to significantly change from current developed conditions. All aspects of the project during construction and operation are required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES). In addition, the proposed project includes a parking lot greater than 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> and, therefore, in accordance with the City's Standard Urban Storm Water Management Plan (SUSMP) Ordinance and the County-wide NPDES Stormwater Permit, the applicant is required to submit and implement a SUSMP compliance plan that minimizes storm water pollution generated on-site in addition to a plan for implementing Best Management Practices. Compliance with the SUSMP ensures the project would not affect the beneficial uses of receiving waters and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- 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)?*

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact



**WHY?** The project would not install any groundwater wells, and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions at the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, the project could indirectly withdraw groundwater. However, the proposed water usage would be negligible in comparison to the overall water service provided by the Department of Water and Power. This minor amount of water use would not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies. Under normal operation the project will use approximately 1,562 gallons of water per day. Per the City's Water and Power Department, existing entitlements and sources can serve the proposed project.

As noted in response 8 b, over the past several years, Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) has been impacted by several factors that have restricted local and regional water supply. PWP's groundwater rights in the Raymond Basin have been curtailed in order to mitigate groundwater depletion experienced over the last half century. With respect to imported supplies, a decade-long drought has reduced the ability to replenish regional groundwater supplies; drought conditions in the American southwest have reduced deliveries of 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.

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).

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. In addition, the City anticipates statewide water demand reduction requirements beginning in 2009, as 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.

As a result, to meet these water policy goals, the current project must comply with the Water Conservation Plan and the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance and the City's goal to meet the 20x2020 goals by submitting a water-conservation plan limiting the water consumption to 80% of its originally anticipated amount. With submission of this plan, the project will not have any individual or cumulative impacts on water supply. This plan is subject to review and approval by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division before the issuance of a building permit. The applicant's irrigation and plumbing plans are also required to comply with the approved water-conservation plan.

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

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 project site is currently gently sloping and runoff onsite drains as sheet flow from northwest to southeast. The project site does not contain any discernable streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Development of the site will involve minor grading, but will not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area.

The drainage of surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant is required to submit a site drainage plan to the Building Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval. This required approval ensures that the proposed drainage plan is appropriately designed and that the proposed runoff does not exceed the capacity of the City's storm drain system. The proposed drainage of the site would not channel runoff on exposed soil, would not direct flows over unvegetated soils, and would not otherwise increase the erosion or siltation potential of the site or any downstream areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts from 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?** As discussed, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernable drainage course. The proposed minor changes to the site's drainage patterns are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. This ordinance requires 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.

Since the project does not involve alteration of a discernable watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates are required to not exceed pre-development rates, the proposed project does not have the potential to alter drainage patterns or increase runoff that would result in flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause flooding and would have no associated impacts.

The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek; the project is not located near either stream. The project will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The proposed project could increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces on-site. However, as discussed above in Sections 12.c) and 12.d), compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 12.a) and 12.c), the project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create run-off that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

**WHY?** As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated on-site are typical urban stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

The project, however, also has the potential to generate short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The County-wide MS4 permit requires construction sites to implement BMPs to reduce the potential for construction-induced water pollutant impacts. These BMPs include methods to prevent contaminated construction site stormwater from entering the drainage system and preventing construction-induced contaminants from entering the drainage system. The MS4 identifies the following minimum requirements for construction sites in Los Angeles County:

Sediments generated on the project site shall be retained using adequate Treatment Control or Structural BMPs; Construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be retained at the project site to avoid discharge to streets, drainage facilities, receiving waters, or adjacent properties by wind or runoff; Non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity shall be contained at the project site; and erosion from slopes and channels shall be controlled by implementing an effective combination of BMPs (as approved in Regional Board Resolution No. 99-03), such as the limiting of grading scheduled during the wet season; inspecting graded areas during rain events; planting and maintenance of vegetation on slopes; and covering erosion susceptible slopes.

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?** The proposed project involves expanding on-site parking and adding club/lodge meeting space/storage. Therefore, the project would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** See response (g) above. 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, most of the City is in Zone X with some scattered areas in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project 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?*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**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, most of the City is in Zone X with some scattered areas in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**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 Section 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?*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project does not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community since the subject area is surrounded by an eclectic mix of uses including multi-family housing, surface parking, the existing private social club with ancillary tennis courts, and single-family residential uses. The proposed Master Plan will not significantly change the visual character of the street. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan will not 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?*

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The proposed project is a 20-year term Master Plan for the Valley Hunt Club located at 520 S. Orange Grove Boulevard. New development envisioned under the master plan includes: 1) new construction of a one-level subterranean parking garage with capacity for 58 cars, and replacement of the existing surface lot at Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive with a 41-space parking lot for a total of 99 cars at this location. Total parking on the campus would be 143 vehicle spaces; 2) temporary parking at the Caltrans property at the end of the Palmetto Drive cul-de-sac for 100 cars during construction of the parking garage; and valet service during the construction phase to facilitate circulation between the clubhouse and the temporary parking lot; 3) the construction of one 150 s.f. accessory structure (Swim Coaches Office); 4) construction of up to two, two-story multi-use structures totaling approximately 6,000 s.f.; 5) realignment of Tennis Court 7 setback with existing tennis courts along Palmetto Drive; 6) replacement of the existing plant nursery at approximately 1,000 s.f. of area; 7) upgrade and expansion of the snack bar @ 270 s.f.; 8) establishment of temporary tents on a seasonal basis.

The zoning designation for the Valley Hunt Club campus is PS (Public/Semi-Public) which permits the establishment and operation of institutional uses. Institutions are conditional uses within the PS zone. The proposed temporary parking lot would be, as an ancillary temporary use of the club, also located in the PS zone of the I-710 Long Beach Freeway. The Master Plan, which by definition is a master conditional use permit, will govern the use as a conditional use. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the requirements of Zoning Code and General Plan and there will be no conflict with applicable land use policy, plans, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project.

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

**WHY?** The project site is not identified in a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, nor would the effects of the project result in any such plans off-site being compromised.

**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?*

**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. The project is not near either of these areas.

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?*

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

<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 project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 14 a) of this document.

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

**WHY?** The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (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 generate noise levels in excess of standards.

The proposed temporary parking lot would generate noise levels within the normally acceptable noise range for low-density, single-family and multifamily residential zones (60-70 dBA). Furthermore, the parking lot would be a temporary use during the 6-12 months of construction of the parking garage at the North Parking Lot. The project would not expose persons to or generate excessive noise levels established in the Noise Element of the General Plan.

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

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

**WHY?** There is no activity associated with implementation of the proposed project that would expose the public to severe noise or vibration levels that would typically exceed the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) or Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines to protect human health and safety. The only vibrations that could be generated by the project would be from construction activities.



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

Such vibrations would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction. Furthermore, in accordance with PMC Section 9.36, construction 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). As such, project construction would not cause any significant vibration impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** See response to 15.a. The Valley Hunt Club is an existing institution operating at the subject location for over a century. Implementation of the Master Development Plan will allow for the accommodation of more on-site parking and better parking management, which will ultimately contain most of the existing intrusive noise sources such as circling cars and closing car doors from disturbing residents in the surrounding neighborhood. While the Master Plan envisions adding/improving Club facilities, the membership enrollment will not change. The Master Plan does not propose to add new members. Therefore, the demand for usage of Valley Hunt Club facilities will not increase beyond the existing levels. As usage of facilities and membership is expected to remain the same, so is the generation of noise levels at their existing levels. The existing operation and future operation is subject to the provisions of the Noise Ordinance, Section 9.36. Therefore, the project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project will lead to a periodic increase in ambient noise on a temporary basis as a result of construction activities. A construction related Noise Plan will be required as part of the Construction Staging Plan, which would require review and approval prior to the issuance of a grading permit. This plan will show the location of any construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be reduced by such methods as: temporary noise attenuation barriers, preferential location of equipment and use of current technology and noise suppression equipment. Furthermore, the project must adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction (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). As such, project construction would not cause any significant noise impacts.

The proposed parking lot would generate noise levels within the normally acceptable noise range for low-density single-family and multifamily residential zones (60-70 dBA). The parking lot would be located in the 65 dBA Noise Contour of the Noise Element of the General Plan. For example, a 65 dBA Ldn level describes an area as having a time-average constant sound level of roughly 65 dBA even though the area would experience individual sound events higher and lower than 65 dBA. Furthermore, the parking lot would be a temporary use during the 6-12 months of construction of the parking garage at the North Parking Lot. The project would not expose persons to or generate excessive noise levels significantly over the levels established in the Noise Element.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

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 10 miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the proposed 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?** New development envisioned under the master plan includes: 1) new construction of a one-level subterranean parking garage with capacity for 58 cars, and replacement of the existing surface lot at Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive with a 41-space parking lot for a total of 99 cars at this location. Total parking on the campus would be 143 vehicle spaces; 2) temporary parking at the Caltrans property at the end of the Palmetto Drive cul-de-sac for 100 cars during construction of the parking garage; and valet service during the construction phase to facilitate circulation between the clubhouse and the temporary parking lot; 3) the construction of one 150 s.f. accessory structure (Swim Coaches Office); 4) construction of up to two, two-story multi-use structures totaling approximately 6,000 s.f.; 5) realignment of Tennis Court 7 setback with existing tennis courts along Palmetto Drive; 6) replacement of the existing plant nursery at approximately 1,000 s.f. of area; 7) upgrade and expansion of the snack bar @ 270 s.f.; 8) establishment of temporary tents on a seasonal basis.

The proposed use is a modest intensification of the existing private tennis/swim club use which is consistent with the land use designations for the site (See Section 12 of this document). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the project is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. Thus, development of the proposed project would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace housing units, and would have no related impacts.

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

**WHY?** No persons currently reside on the project site and the project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts.

**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?*

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The project site is located in a low-fire hazard area according to the Fire and Flooding Hazards Map of the 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project is located approximately one mile from the nearest fire station located at 135 S. Fair Oaks Boulevard. The proposed project is an existing use in the City of Pasadena. The project will incorporate safety and security features, including fire sprinklers, alarm systems, and adequate access for emergency vehicles as required by the Municipal Code and Uniform Building Code. The proposed use will not increase demand for fire protection, police protection, and governmental services.

b. *Libraries?*

**WHY?** The project is located approximately 1.3 miles from the nearest branch library, the San Rafael Library. 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?*

**WHY?** The project is located within 0.5 miles of the nearest park, (Arroyo Seco). According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres

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

of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents. The proposed project will not lead to a substantial increase in residents or visitors of the City. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on parks.

d. *Police Protection?*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. New development envisioned under the master plan includes: 1) new construction of a one-level subterranean parking garage with capacity for 58 cars, and replacement of the existing surface lot at Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive with a 41-space parking lot for a total of 99 cars at this location. Total parking on the campus would be 143 vehicle spaces; 2) temporary parking at the Caltrans property at the end of the Palmetto Drive cul-de-sac for 100 cars during construction of the parking garage; and valet service during the construction phase to facilitate circulation between the clubhouse and the temporary parking lot; 3) the construction of one 150 s.f. accessory structure (Swim Coaches Office); 4) construction of up to two, two-story multi-use structures totaling approximately 6,000 s.f.; 5) realignment of Tennis Court 7 setback with existing tennis courts along Palmetto Drive; 6) replacement of the existing plant nursery at approximately 1,000 s.f. of area; 7) upgrade and expansion of the snack bar @ 270 s.f.; 8) establishment of temporary tents on a seasonal basis.

Since the club is not increasing membership or introducing new activities, there is no demand for new police services. Therefore, the proposed 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. The proposed project will not increase the residential population of the city. As a private social club, the Valley Hunt Club is not a use that generates an increased enrollment in schools. Based on the existing and proposed Master Development Plan, there will be no impacts on schools as a result of the project.

f. *Other public facilities?*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project's development would not result in additional maintenance of public facilities. With the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and development fees any potential impact is not significant.

**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?

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** Impacts associated with parks and recreation are related to significant increases in population or residential density per acre. The proposed Valley Hunt Club Master Development Plan project is not proposing additional housing units or increasing residential density on the project site. The club provides recreational opportunities in a private setting to its members, many of which are Pasadena residents. Therefore, there is no impact to existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities.

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 project includes the provision of private recreational facilities. The Valley Hunt Club maintains tennis courts and a swimming pool for the exclusive use of its members. These existing recreational facilities are not considered part of the project as their number and size is not increasing or expanding. The proposed project does not involve, and would not require, the construction or expansion of off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

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

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

**WHY?** The project is located along South Orange Grove Boulevard at Palmetto Drive and is supported by a roadway network consisting of South Orange Grove Boulevard and California Boulevard. Neither of these roadways are Principal Mobility/Multimodal Corridors, however, they are de-emphasized streets, as identified in the 2004 Adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. The temporary parking lot that will be used only during construction (located at the end of Palmetto Drive) and the permanent addition of the underground parking garage will not add vehicular trips to the street system, but will instead provide a more efficient parking program. The project will result in an increase in on-site parking which will reduce Club related vehicle circulation on the neighborhood street and overflow parking which currently impacts the neighborhood.

The proposed project will not increase vehicle trips to the Valley Hunt Club, will not increase the number of special events, nor will the membership increase with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to the traffic load and capacity of the street system and it will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or ordinance that measures effectiveness for the circulation system.

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

b. *Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. As stated above in response 19a, the proposed project will not increase vehicle trips to the Valley Hunt Club, will not increase the number of special events, nor will the membership increase with implementation of the proposed project. Thus, due to the scope of the project, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, the project would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an established level of service standard, and would have no related significant impacts.

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?*

                                                                

**WHY?** The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed 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)?*

                                                                

**WHY?** The project will not modify the existing design of the street system along Palmetto Drive or Orange Grove Boulevard. Thus, there will not be changes that will cause hazardous traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

                                                                

**WHY?** As stated above in response 19d, the project will not modify the existing design of the street system along Palmetto Drive or Orange Grove Boulevard. Ingress and egress for the Valley Hunt Club will utilize existing driveways. The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Significant  
Unless  
Mitigation is  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No Impact

The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

**WHY?** The proposed project will increase off-street parking to meet the parking demand of the Valley Hunt Club. The new on-site parking areas are intended to address the parking demands of the Club and to alleviate the occurrence of overflow parking in the adjacent residential neighborhood. Based on the fact that the number of existing parking spaces on-site will be supplemented by the construction of a subterranean parking garage and that the Valley Hunt Club is not expanding its membership rolls or operations, there will be no impacts related to insufficient parking capacity. The project will alleviate and improve parking impacts over current conditions. Off-street parking will be expanded to meet the operational average daily peak parking demand which is a higher number of parking spaces than the Zoning Code requires and what the Parking Study determined was necessary.

Currently the Club provides a total of 106 visitor parking spaces in two separate surface parking lots. The north parking lot is on the corner of Palmetto Drive and South Orange Grove Boulevard. Access to the lot is primarily from Palmetto Drive but there is a driveway on Orange Grove Boulevard which is open during some events. The second lot is on Orange Grove Boulevard between California Boulevard and Palmetto Drive. Access to this lot is from Orange Grove Boulevard. A ten space employee lot is accessed from Palmetto Drive at a mid-block location.

The project proposes a temporary parking lot containing 100 spaces that will be located at the end of Palmetto Drive. This lot will only be in use during construction and a condition of approval will be made part of the Master Plan Amendment that allows the temporary parking for a maximum of 12 months (or the end of construction of the parking- should that come sooner). The new parking garage at the Club site will be accessed internally via the existing driveways serving the North Parking Lot. No additional ingress/egress to the property is proposed. The new parking garage will provide an additional 43 parking spaces at the Club site.

Added parking will reduce the existing overflow vehicle movements onto the residential streets surrounding the Valley Hunt Club. The new parking spaces provided for employees and patrons of Valley Hunt Club would be a significant benefit to the adjacent neighbors currently affected by Valley Hunt Club overflow parking on Palmetto Drive. The proposed new underground parking in conjunction with the existing parking inventory will result in 143 on-site spaces upon completion, exceeding the average peak daily demand identified in the parking study (dated September 2010) of 134 vehicle spaces.

Pursuant to the Zoning Code, Clubs and Lodges are required to provide ten (10) parking spaces per 1,000 square feet used for assembly purposes. The Clubhouse has 7,726 square feet of area that falls under this classification—dining room, occasional dining areas, assembly rooms, cocktail areas. Therefore, a total of 77 parking vehicle spaces are required for the clubhouse use and operation (7,726 sq. ft. / 1,000 sq. ft. x 10 spaces = 77 parking spaces). Fitness Centers are required to provide five (5) parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. In this instance, eight parking spaces are required (1,500 sq. ft. / 1,000 sq. ft x five spaces = 8 spaces). A total of 89 vehicle spaces are therefore currently required. New ancillary buildings will bring the required minimum number of parking spaces up to 119 off-street vehicle spaces. Completion of the development envisioned under the Master Plan will provide a total of 143 off-street vehicle parking spaces, an overage of 24 spaces over the code required minimum. Hence, in meeting the actual peak parking

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

demand for club activities, which exceeds the number required by the zoning ordinance, there will no impact to parking capacity and parking conditions will improve.

Master Plan Parking Calculations			
Use	Square Footage	Parking Ratio	Required Vehicle Spaces
Clubhouse	8,126	10/1,000 sf	77
Sports Center Lounge	400	10/1,000 sf	4
Sports Center	1,500	5/1,000 sf	8
Building 1	1,500	10/1,000 sf	15
Building 2	1,500	10/1,000 sf	15
<b>TOTAL SPACES REQUIRED BY ZONING CODE</b>			<b>119</b>
<b>IDENTIFIED PEAK PARKING DEMAND</b>			<b>134</b>
<b>MASTER PLAN TOTAL SPACES PROVIDED</b>			<b>143</b>

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

WHY? The project is not proposing any changes to the location of a bus stop; therefore, no conflicts with adopted policies supporting transit service are expected.

Bicycle parking will be required per Title 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. Thus, no conflicts with adopted policies supporting bicycle transportation are anticipated. The exact location and number of bicycle parking spaces will be further reviewed and analyzed by the Transportation Department and Zoning during plan check.

20. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

WHY? The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed 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?



Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

**WHY?** The proposed project consists of some new buildings and expanded facilities which would increase the demand for water and wastewater service. However, the proposed increase to water/wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service areas of the water and wastewater service purveyors. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyors are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. The only water and wastewater improvements required for the project are on-site unit connections to the existing systems, which are subject to connection fees. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have less than significant 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 project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 13, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

Further, the project applicant 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in any stormwater drainage improvements and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

**WHY?** The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. This project will result in an increase of approximately 600 gallons per day in water consumption. The current use consumes approximately 962 gallons of water per day. The net gain in water consumption would be 600 gallons of water per day. During periods of drought, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which reduces monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no significant impact under this topic.

As noted in the response to 8b, 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. In addition, the City anticipates statewide water demand reduction requirements beginning in 2009, as 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.

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?*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** New development envisioned under the master plan includes: 1) new construction of a one-level subterranean parking garage with capacity for 58 cars, and replacement of the existing surface lot at Orange Grove Boulevard and Palmetto Drive with a 41-space parking lot for a total of 99 cars at this location. Total parking on the campus would be 143 vehicle spaces; 2) temporary parking at the Caltrans property at the end of the Palmetto Drive cul-de-sac for 100 cars during construction of the parking garage; and valet service during the construction phase to facilitate circulation between the clubhouse and the temporary parking lot; 3) the construction of one 150 s.f. accessory structure (Swim Coaches Office); 4) construction of up to two, two-story multi-use structures totaling approximately 6,000 s.f.; 5) realignment of Tennis Court 7 setback with existing tennis courts along Palmetto Drive; 6) replacement of the existing plant nursery at approximately 1,000 s.f. of area; 7) upgrade and expansion of the snack bar @ 270 s.f.; 8) establishment of temporary tents on a seasonal basis.

The new buildings and expanded facilities will result in an increase in water demand. However, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service area of the wastewater service purveyor. In addition, the facilities currently maintained by the service purveyor are adequate to serve the proposed increase in demand. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related significant impacts.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic.

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

**WHY?** In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable solid waste franchise's recycling system, and thus, will meet Pasadena's and California's solid waste diversion regulations. In addition, the project complies with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance (PMC Section 8.62) and design requirements for refuge storage areas (PMC Section 17.64.240). Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

**21. EARLIER ANALYSIS.**

The project has not been the subject of earlier adopted analyses under CEQA.

**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?** The project is in a developed urban area. There is no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site. In addition, the project site does not contain any locally designated species of trees, native trees or individual trees considered important to Pasadena, and there are no designated natural communities, habitats or migration routes in the project area. There will be no significant impact to any cultural resource. There are no records of any significant paleontological resources in the City of Pasadena. Furthermore, there are no known prehistoric or archeological sites on the project site nor any known significant buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the project site.

As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 12 of this document, the proposed project 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 proposed project 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.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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 project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative [air quality, noise, traffic, and utility impacts, etc.] impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, except for cumulative air quality conditions (i.e. the SCAB is a non-attainment basin) 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 8b, 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).

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. In addition, the City anticipates statewide water demand reduction requirements beginning in 2009, as 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.

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 project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Although users of the proposed project 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 proposed 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