

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASADENA
APPROVING THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL
ASSESSMENT (SCH NO. 2021030197) FOR THE CENTRAL PARK
APARTMENTS PROJECT, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the Central Park Apartments Project (the “project”) proposes the development of two parcels (identified as Assessor Parcel Number [APN] 5722-001-002), located at 86 South Fair Oaks Avenue, at the northeast corner of Fair Oaks Avenue at Dayton Street. The project site encompasses approximately 32,362 square feet (SF), and is currently in use as a surface parking lot with landscaping, outdoor furniture for the adjacent Green Hotel Apartments, and an advertising billboard. The project site is bordered by a one-story commercial building and the existing Green Hotel Apartments on the north, Castle Green on the east, Dayton Street on the south, and South Fair Oaks Avenue on the west. The project involves the redevelopment of the existing surface parking lot with the construction of a new 6-story plus mezzanine, approximately 93,355 gross square-foot mixed-use development, with approximately 11,400 square feet of commercial/retail uses (including four work/live units) and 84 apartments over four levels of subterranean parking. The Proposed Project would have a floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.89:1 and would provide a total of 195 (158 residential and 37 commercial) parking spaces, including replacement of existing parking serving the adjacent Green Hotel Apartments building.

The proposed project would require Design Review Approval from the City of Pasadena Design Commission. In addition, the applicant has applied for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map to allow for the potential to convert the apartments to condominiums, and applied for a Private Tree Removal for removal and relocation of Protected Trees.

The project is utilizing the State Density Bonus Law pursuant to Government Code § 65915 to allow for the increase in the residential base density from 64 units to 84 units (excluding four work-live units), eight of which would be reserved for Very Low Income residents. No other entitlement actions are required

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

or being requested by the project applicant, and the proposed project does not require discretionary approval from other public agencies; and

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

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21155.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the City prepared a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (the "SCEA") for the project. The Draft SCEA concluded that there was substantial evidence that the project might have a significant environmental impact on the following resource areas but that the mitigation measures identified in the SCEA would reduce such impacts to a level of insignificance: (1) Cultural Resources, (2) Noise and Vibration, and (3) Tribal Cultural Resources; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092, the City provided a public Notice of Completion and Availability ("NOA") of the Draft SCEA (State Clearinghouse No. 2021030197) on March 8, 2021 through mailing to all property owners within 500 feet of the Project. Copies of the Draft SCEA were also placed at the City's Planning and Community Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, and on the City's website; and

WHEREAS, the Draft SCEA was circulated, together with technical appendices, to the public and other interested persons for a 60-day public comment period, from Monday, March 8, 2021 through Thursday, May 6, 2021; and

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

WHEREAS, after reviewing the comments and the revisions to the Draft SCEA, the City concludes that the information and issues raised by the comments did not constitute new information requiring recirculation of the Draft SCEA, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088; and

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

WHEREAS, the Findings made in this resolution are based upon the information and evidence set forth in the SCEA and upon other substantial evidence provided in the record of the proceedings. The documents, staff reports, technical studies, appendices, plans, specifications, and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this resolution is based are on file and available for public examination during normal business hours in the Planning & Community Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101 and with the Director of Planning & Community Development, who serves as the custodian of these records; and

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

WHEREAS, the City Council, as the decision-making body for the lead agency with regard to this project, has independently reviewed and considered the contents of the SCEA and all documents and testimony in the record of proceedings prior to deciding whether to approve the SCEA; and

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

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

I. RESOLUTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF THE SCEA

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21155.2, the City Council finds that: (1) all potentially significant or significant effects required be identified in the initial study supporting the SCEA have been identified and analyzed; and (2) with respect to such significant effects, changes, alterations or mitigation measures have been required in or incorporated into the project that avoid or mitigate such effects to a level of insignificance.

The City Council certifies that: (1) it has reviewed and considered the SCEA, (2) the SCEA is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the City's local environmental guidelines, and

(3) the SCEA reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency. The City Council approves the SCEA based on the findings and conclusions herein.

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

II. RESOLUTION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITHOUT MITIGATION

The City Council finds that the proposed project will have no impact or a less than significant impact without mitigation on a number of environmental topics. For some of these topics, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements is assumed, as discussed in the SCEA, which would ensure that impacts remain less than significant. Environmental topics determined to be less than significant without mitigation are listed below. For each topic, the discussion begins with a delineation of the potential impacts evaluated in the SCEA, as specifically related to that topic, along with page citations as to where in the SCEA the relevant discussion is found, and is followed by an explanation of the substantial evidence in support of the SCEA conclusion that a significant impact would not occur.

a. Aesthetics

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (SCEA, p. 4.0-5)
- Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
- Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

Per the regulations provided in SB 743, for residential, mixed-use residential, and employment center projects on infill sites in Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), aesthetic impacts cannot be considered significant. Therefore, the discussion regarding aesthetic impacts was provided for informational purposes only. As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of aesthetics. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project site lies in an urbanized portion of Pasadena and is not in an area that offers views of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Arroyo Seco, the San Rafael Hills, Eaton Canyon, or Old Pasadena, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista.

The project site is not within the viewshed of the nearby scenic highways, Angeles Crest Highway or the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts on state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

The proposed project would obscure views of the existing Green Hotel Apartments from certain vantage points within Central Park to the south. However, the Green Hotel Apartments are already obscured by the trees located on or near the project site as well as within Central Park. The density of the existing tree canopy of Central Park as well as the tree canopy at the project site obstructs views of the existing Green Hotel Apartments and Castle Green from multiple angles. Furthermore, the portion of the Green Hotel Apartments between Castle Green and the proposed project would continue to be visible to the visitors of Central Park when looking immediately north across Dayton Street to the existing Green Hotel Apartment building. Views of Castle Green from Central Park would be unchanged. Therefore, views of the Green Hotel Apartments and Castle Green from Central Park would be altered; however, their primary elevations on East Green Street and South Raymond Avenue would remain unaltered and views of the south-facing façade of these two buildings would still mostly remain from within Central Park. Views during construction would be limited and temporary in nature, and would cease upon completion. Therefore, project construction would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or surroundings. In regard to long term operation the project, the proposed design is an architectural style that would blend with the variety of styles that currently characterize the surrounding area. Since the proposed project is consistent with the surrounding uses in terms of height, mass, use, and architectural style, the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or surroundings.

b. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (SCEA, p. 4.0-23)
- Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?
- Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of agricultural and forestry resources. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Natural Resources Agency. No impacts to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would occur as a result of the proposed project.

The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. The project site is located in the Central District Specific Plan (CDSP) Area, the project site is zoned CD-1 (Central District Specific Plan Sub-district 1, Old Pasadena Subdistrict) and has a General Plan Land Use designation of High Mixed Use. There are no agricultural uses within the project

site or surrounding area. Additionally, the City has no Williamson Act contract land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Pasadena has no timberland or timberland production land and has no land zoned for forest land. Therefore, no impact to forest land or timberland would occur as a result of the proposed project.

As discussed above, there is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a nonagricultural use.

c. Air Quality

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (SCEA, p. 4.0-30)
- Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
- Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to this aspect of air quality. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

A project may be inconsistent with the AQMP if it would generate population, housing, or employment growth exceeding forecasts used in the development of the AQMP. As discussed, the 2016 AQMP relies on local city general plans' and the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plans' (RTP) forecasts of regional population, housing and employment growth in its own projections for managing Basin air quality.

The proposed project involves the construction of a new 6-story plus mezzanine, approximately 93,355 gross square-foot mixed-use development, with approximately 11,400 SF of commercial/retail uses (including four work/live units) and 84 apartments over four levels of subterranean parking. While the project would provide new residences and employment opportunities in the City of Pasadena that could contribute to population growth, this contribution would be nominal. According to an employee density study prepared for SCAG in 2001¹, retail uses in Los Angeles County employ on average one employee per 511 SF of retail use. Thus, the proposed project is expected to employ approximately 23 persons (1 employee/511 SF / 11,400 SF). According to data provided by SCAG, the estimated population for the City of Pasadena on January 1, 2016 was 142,100.² Based on the SCAG average household rate of 2.5 persons per household for the City of Pasadena, the proposed project would generate an on-site population of approximately 220. In its 2020 RTP/SCS, SCAG projects that the City's population will increase to 155,500 by 2045—an increase of 13,400 persons relative to 2016. Assuming that all project employees would move to reside in the City, which is a conservative assumption given the connected nature of the region, the project would constitute 1.8 percent of projected City growth (employees + residents = 243, which is 1.8 percent of 13,400). Therefore, the level of population growth associated with the project was anticipated in SCAG's long-term population forecasts and would not exceed official regional population projections. The project would be consistent with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

Certain population groups, such as children, the elderly, and people with health problems, are particularly sensitive to air pollution. Sensitive receptors are

¹ Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), October 2001, *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, available online at: <http://www.mwcoq.org/uploads/committee-documents/bl5aX1pa20091008155406.pdf>

² Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), April 2020, *Demographics and Growth Forecast Technical Report*. Available online at: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocial_demographics-and-growth-forecast.pdf?1606001579

defined as land uses that are more likely to be used by these population groups and include health care facilities, retirement homes, school and playground facilities, and residential areas. As shown in Table 4.3-2 of the SCEA, *SCAQMD LST Screening Thresholds for Construction*, construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate emissions that exceed LSTs. (SCEA, p. 4.0-26). Localized air quality impacts related to CO hot spots would not occur. Impacts from pollutant concentrations would be less than significant. Additionally, long-term TAC emissions would be nominal. Overall, TAC emissions from construction and operational activities would be less than significant.

The SCAQMD's 1993 *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* identifies land uses associated with odor complaints to be agriculture uses, wastewater treatment plants, chemical and food processing plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Mixed-use projects involved residential and commercial uses are not identified on this list. Although odors from equipment may be generated during construction activities, these odors would be short-term and would only occur during the construction period. In addition, the project would have to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants that would cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. Biological Resources

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (SCEA, p. 4.0-37)

- Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of biological resources. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project is not located near any of these natural habitat areas and the project site and surrounding area do not include any vegetation that constitutes a plant community. Existing vegetation on-site is limited to ornamental trees and nonnative landscaping. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

exist in the project area as identified in local or regional plans or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. There are no federally protected waters or wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, on the site. No water features or other topographic depressions are present on the site that could support wetlands.

The project includes the removal of trees that have the potential to be nesting sites for birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) implements the United States' commitment to four treaties with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia for the protection of shared migratory bird resources. The MBTA governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. The US Fish and Wildlife Service administers permits to take migratory birds in accordance with the MBTA. The proposed project would comply with all applicable regulations of the MBTA.

The project site currently contains 21 trees, with an additional eight street trees in the adjacent the public right-of-way. Eight of the trees onsite and all of the adjacent street trees are protected under the City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance, the eight protected trees consist of two California fan palms, two Canary Island date palms, three Camphor trees, and one Indian laurel fig tree. The proposed project would include planting 38 new trees, including one 96" box tree, 10 – 60" box trees, 21 - 24" box trees and 6 – 36" box trees. Following the planting of these new trees, there would be a net gain of 21 new trees on the project site, and the proposed project would exceed the City's Replacement Tree Requirement for the trees removed. Further, tree removal activities under construction of the proposed project would be conducted in accordance with the removal procedures stipulated in the ordinance, which include acquiring a tree removal permit and giving adequate notice of tree removal activities. Therefore, with compliance with the City Tree Protection Ordinance the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. (SCEA, p. 4.0-43)

e. Cultural Resources

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? (SCEA, p. 4.0-43)
- Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (SCEA, p. 4.0-79)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of cultural resources. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project site is located within the boundaries of two historical resources, the Hotel Green and the Old Pasadena Historic District. The Hotel Green is individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and locally designated as a Historic Monument. The Hotel Green includes two adjoining buildings: the Castle Green and Green Hotel Apartments. The Old Pasadena Historic District is listed in the National Register. Properties and historic districts listed in the National Register are automatically included in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). Thus, the Hotel Green and Old Pasadena Historic District are also listed in the California Register and are historical resources as defined by CEQA. The potential impacts of the proposed project were assessed within the 86 South Fair Oaks Avenue Historical Resources Technical Report, October 2020, prepared by Historic Resources Group (HRG) and included with the SCEA as Appendix E. The analysis completed by HRG

concludes that the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5

While not anticipated, the potential for the recovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities cannot be precluded, as discussed in the SCEA. Human burials outside of formal cemeteries often occur in prehistoric archaeological contexts. Human burials, in addition to being potential archaeological resources, have specific provisions for treatment in Section 5097 of the California Public Resources Code. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the county coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. In the event that human remains are encountered during project construction activities, the proposed project would be required to comply with these regulations. Compliance would ensure that potential impacts to such resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

f. Energy

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (SCEA, p. 4.0-79)
- Would the project use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to energy. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The Project would comply with the applicable regulatory requirements for the design of new buildings, including the provisions included in the 2019 CALGreen Code and California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards, and the City of Pasadena Green Energy Building Standards.

In order to promote energy conservation, the City has adopted an amended California Green Building Standards Code per PMC Section 14.04.010. In conformance with the City's Building Code, the project would be designed to comply with the performance levels of an amended California Green Building Standards Code, which would reduce energy consumption compared to standard building practices.

The proposed project would be also consistent with goals and policies included in the 2020 Connect SoCal RTP/SCS, which focus on creating livable communities with an emphasis on reducing fossil fuel use by decreasing VMT, reducing building energy use, and increasing the use of renewable resources. The project site is well served by existing public transportation, including Pasadena Transit and METRO bus and rail lines. The proposed mix of retail and multi-family housing within a HQTa and Transit Priority Area is consistent with the numerous policies in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS that focus on locating new jobs and housing near transit, which would serve to reduce the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum based fuel associated with VMT. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans or violate state or federal energy standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would involve the use of energy during the construction and operational phases of the project. Energy use during the construction phase would be in the form of fuel consumption (e.g., gasoline and diesel fuel) to operate heavy equipment, light-duty vehicles, machinery, and generators for lighting, and electricity use to bring water to the site for fugitive dust

control. In addition, temporary grid power may also be provided to any temporary construction trailers or electric construction equipment. Long-term operation of the proposed project would require permanent grid connections for electricity and natural gas service to power internal and exterior building lighting, and heating and cooling systems.

The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not expected to be significant in relationship to the number of customers currently served by the electrical and gas utility companies. Supplies are available from existing mains, lines and substations in the area. Occupation associated with the project is not expected to significantly increase consumption of natural gas, particularly in light of redeveloped areas that would need to conform to the current performance standards of Pasadena Amended California Green Building Standards. Furthermore, in light of these requirements, the project is likely to include high efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows. The energy conservation measures would be prepared by the developer and shown on building plan(s) submitted to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. Installation of energy-saving features would be inspected by a Building Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. In addition, the project would be designed to meet the requirements of California Green Building Standards Code Tier 2 requirements which would further reduce energy demand. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not result in demand for electricity and natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Further, the Project would not use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner. Impacts would be less than significant. (SCEA, p. 4.0-81)

g. Geology and Soils

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- Would the project expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
 - Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - Landslides?
 - Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
 - Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is made unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?
 - Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
 - Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (SCEA, p. 103)
- ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required**
- iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2**

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of geology and soils. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

While the project site is located in the seismically active region of Southern California, based on *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation* prepared by Geotechnologies, Inc. (included in Appendix D of the SCEA) for the proposed project in July 2019, the project site is not within any potential fault rupture zones. The report reviewed the City of Pasadena's 2002 Safety Element and concluded that the potential for surface ground rupture at the subject site is considered low. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. In addition, structures developed under the proposed project would be required to comply with California Building Code (CBC) standards, which include specific structural seismic safety provisions, and therefore would have minimized risk of earthquake damage. The structures would also be subject to inspection during construction. Further, Program S3-1 of the Safety Element of the City General Plan states that the City will enforce the seismic design provisions for Seismic Zone 4 of the CBC. In general, compliance with CBC standards for seismically-induced ground shaking will ensure the proposed project would minimize the risk of exposure to hazards associated with seismic ground shaking and impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is not within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate 1-3 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Liquefaction and Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City.

The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate 1-3 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan. This Plate was developed considering the Earthquake-Induced Landslide areas as shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone maps for the City.

Construction of the proposed project may temporarily expose soils on-site to wind and/or water erosion. However, construction activities would be required to comply with regulations for controlling on-site erosion and fugitive dust. Further, in accordance with Clean Water Act and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, water erosion during construction would be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain, and protecting excavated areas from inundation with temporary barriers and/or berms.

Long-term operation of the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, as the majority of the project site would be covered by the proposed residential structures, aboveground parking lot, and associated paved surfaces. Soil erosion after construction would be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan as required by the grading plan. With the required compliance with SCAQMD rules, NPDES, and the City's Municipal Code, potential impacts associated with erosion during project construction and operation would be less than significant.

An acceptable degree of soil stability can be achieved from CBC-required incorporation of soil standards and treatments to address site-specific conditions. Overall, modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the CBC, would ensure the project would not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils. Additionally, the project site is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the CBC, would ensure the project would not cause any significant impacts related to unstable geologic units or expansive soils. In addition, the project would be required to connect to the existing sewer system. Therefore, soil suitability for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not applicable in this case. No impact would occur.

h. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project will generate carbon dioxide, which is the primary component of greenhouse gases (GHG). Thus, the project will contribute to global warming as described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In total, the project will generate approximately 1,667.47 metric tons of CO₂ during construction and 1,641.60 metric tons per year during operation (calculations provided in Appendix B, Combined CalEEMod Output Files, to the SCEA).

The City of Pasadena developed the Climate Action Plan (CAP) as a qualified greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction plan in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. The project applicant submitted a Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist Application Form in order to demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with the Pasadena CAP by incorporating applicable actions intended to ensure that the project contributes its fair share to the City's cumulative GHG reduction goals. Proposed sustainable development actions from the submitted CAP Consistency Checklist are listed and explained in Tables 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 of the SCEA (SCEA pages 4.0-87 through 91). Review of the Checklist demonstrates that the proposed project would have a less than significant GHG impact.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?
- Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?
- Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- For a project located in an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 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?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project does not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the small amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further, there are no records of the site having been used for storage of hazardous materials.

The project does not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; the closest schools are the Waverly School and St. Andrews Elementary School, both of which are approximately one-half mile away. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

The project site is not located on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List of sites published by California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA). The site was formerly used as a surface parking lot for the adjacent hotel, which is not a land use associated with hazardous materials. Searches conducted using the California State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker and the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor did not reveal any potentially hazardous sites within 1000 feet of the project site. The site is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist onsite.

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 Hollywood/Burbank (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.

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, 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.

As shown on the General Plan Safety Element Plate P-2, the project site is not located in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. The project site is located within an urbanized area and the surrounding area is 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 wildland fires. No impacts would occur. (SCEA, p. 4.0-95 through 96)

j. Hydrology and Water Quality

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
- Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- Would the project 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?
- Would the project impede or redirect flood flows?
- In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to this aspect of hydrology and water quality. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

Pasadena lies 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). Compliance with the SQMP is enforced by application of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the NPDES. Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. 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 the SQMP. The County adopted the latest MS4 permit in November 2012 (most recently amended in 2018), which requires all new development to include low-impact development (LID) techniques in lieu of the SQMP. The proposed development meets the City's SUSMP requirement thresholds (i.e., a commercial addition greater than 5,000 SF, housing project with over 10 units) and the applicant is required to submit and implement a SUSMP compliance plan. The proposed project must comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge BMPs set forth by the City, the SWRCB, and the proposed project's approved USMP. Compliance with existing regulations and the approved SUSMP would reduce the potential for the proposed project to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff impacts, and operational water quality impacts would therefore be less than significant.

The project would use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power (PWP). The source of some of this water supply is groundwater 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 PWP and would not change the amount of water that PWP withdraws from the Raymond Basin.

Through compliance with the above requirements, the project would not have any individual or cumulative impacts on water supply. Plans regarding water use of the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the PWP 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 and the City's requirements for efficient landscape irrigation and drought tolerant plant material as required by Chapter 17.44, Landscaping, of the

Zoning Code. Compliance with existing City requirements would result in less than significant impacts on groundwater supplies.

The project site does not contain any streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Development of the site would involve excavation and grading, but would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area as a majority of the site would be paved similar to existing conditions. As the majority of the site would remain impervious, drainage patterns would remain similar to existing conditions and drainage outfall locations would remain. 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.

As discussed in the SCEA (p. 4.0-97), the proposed project is subject to NPDES requirements, including the countywide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. The applicant has integrated rainwater harvesting drainage structures into the overall plan for drainage, which demonstrates compliance with the City's SUSMP. Complying with the City's SUSMP ordinance and implementing the required BMPs/LID techniques would ensure that the proposed project would result in less than significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to drainage patterns, and would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

Since the project does not involve alteration of a discernable watercourse and post-development runoff discharge rates would not exceed predevelopment rates, the proposed project would 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 result in less than significant impacts. (SCEA, p. 135)

The proposed project has the potential to generate short-term water pollutants during construction, including sediment, trash, construction materials, and equipment fluids. The countywide 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 contaminates from entering the drainage system. The MS4 identifies the following minimum set of BMPs for construction sites in Los Angeles County. Complying with the MS4's construction site requirements as well as the City's SUSMP ordinance and LID requirements would ensure that construction of the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality.

The City is not located near any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean so as to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site would not be susceptible to mudflow due to its relatively flat geography and distance from hillside soils. No impact would occur in this regard. (SCEA, p. 4.0-102)

The proposed project would comply with applicable water quality control plans. Additionally, the project site would be constructed on a site previously developed with a surface parking lot and would not increase the amount of impervious surface. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any other water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plans.

k. Land Use and Planning

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project physically divide an established community?
- Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to land use and planning. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The site currently consists of a surface parking lot, and the proposed project would construct new residential, retail, and shared public and private open space uses. The proposed project would not physically divide an existing community but, rather, would facilitate the development of a new community within the area. Further, development included in the proposed project would be compatible with existing surrounding uses, as similar development including residential apartments a hospital, and various retail establishments are located to the north and east of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

The primary land use planning documents that govern the project site are the City's General Plan, the Central District Specific Plan, and the Pasadena Zoning Code. The paragraphs below evaluate the project's consistency with these documents.

The General Plan Land Use Element designates the project site High Mixed Use. This designation is intended to support development of multi-story buildings with a variety of compatible uses including work/live units and ground floor retail and restaurant uses with office and/or residential uses above. Development of the proposed project which would include 84 apartments, four live/work units, and 11,400 SF of commercial/retail uses, and would be consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

The Central District Specific Plan (CDSP), adopted in 2004, promotes new development that balances the needs of residential and commercial uses while preserving the quality of life in the area in terms of existing air quality, traffic, safety, and sense of community. The vision for the CDSP Area, as stated in the Land Use Element, is to build upon the existing strengths as a vibrant downtown with a mix of uses, walkable areas with shopping, entertainment, restaurants, offices, and housing connected by multiple modes of transit. Within the Central District there are a number of distinct neighborhoods (or sub-districts) with unique identities including Old Pasadena, the Civic Center, Pasadena Playhouse, and South Lake. The project site is within the Old Pasadena sub-district, identified as the historic core of the City, which has developed into a vibrant retail and entertainment destination. The Central District is served by three Metro L Line (formerly Gold Line) stations (Del Mar, Memorial Park, and Lake) creating a myriad of

opportunities for higher-density, transit-oriented development, served by multimodal linkages, and pedestrian and open space amenities. The proposed project would be consistent with these goals by replacing an existing surface parking lot with a new mixed-use development that would provide residential, retail and recreational uses. Development would include 84 residential dwellings, four live-work spaces, supporting retail, and a subterranean parking structure. The proposed project also supports alternative modes of transportation as it is within close proximity to and would be served by multiple public transit services, such as the Metro Gold Line and Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System. The proposed project would therefore be consistent with the relevant goals of the CDSP.

The project site is zoned CD-1 (Central District Specific Plan Sub-district 1, Old Pasadena Subdistrict) and has a General Plan Land Use designation of High Mixed Use. A mixed-use building is an allowable use within both the CD-1 zone and the High Mixed Use land use designation, subject to certain restrictions enumerated in the Central District Specific Plan (CDSP), such as the requirement of commercial uses on the ground floor and the exclusion of residential uses on the ground floor. The proposed project would be consistent with the requirements of the CDSP Sub-district 1, Old Pasadena Subdistrict.

I. Mineral Resources

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project 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?
- Would the project 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? (SCEA, p. 143)

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of mineral resources. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

No active mining operations exist within the City. Two areas in the City of Pasadena may contain mineral resources: 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 these areas. In addition, the project site is located in an area designated as MRZ-3, indicating that the area may contain mineral deposits but there is not sufficient information to determine the significance of these resources, and the General Plan does not identify any mineral resource conservation areas within the City. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of an available known mineral resource with value to the region. As such, no mineral resources impacts would occur.

m. Noise

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project result the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to these aspects of noise. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

In order to determine existing noise levels in the project site vicinity, four peak hour weekday morning 15-minute noise measurements (Leq[15] dBA) were taken on and near the project site on December 10, 2019. Based on the results of the ambient noise measurements, it was determined that transportation related noise sources are the primary contributor to the noise environment in each of the monitoring locations. On-site sources of noise consist of activities associated with the existing parking lot and residential uses. Based on measurement results summarized in Table 4.13-1 of the SCEA (p. 4.0-107), the project site experiences noise levels ranging between 68.0 and 55.8 dBA Leq.

The proposed project would introduce a new residential/commercial mixed-use development on the project site. Existing offsite noise-sensitive uses near the project site and proposed new residential uses on-site may periodically be subject to noise associated with operation of the proposed project. The proposed project would cause a noise impact if operational noise levels would exceed existing ambient noise levels by more than 5 dB at the project's property line and the property lines of nearby noise-sensitive receptors in accordance with PMC Chapter 9.36. The City of Pasadena's Transportation Data Management System shows that Dayton Street between Fair Oaks Avenue and Raymond Avenue has a traffic volume of approximately 70 vehicles during the A.M. peak hour, and 118 vehicles during the P.M. peak hour.³ It takes a doubling of traffic volume to increase noise levels by 3 dB(A). The project's addition of approximately 52 A.M. peak hour trips and 73 P.M. peak hour trips would not increase in traffic volumes enough to cause a significant audible increase in traffic noise.

The Pasadena Municipal Code requires that noise generated by mechanical equipment not exceed 5 dB(A) above ambient noise levels at adjacent property lines. HVAC equipment is only anticipated to result in an increase of 3.1

³ City of Pasadena, Transportation Data Management System. Available at: <https://pasadena.ms2soft.com/tcds/tsearch.asp?loc=Pasadena&mod=>

dB(A). This is below the Pasadena Municipal Code threshold of a 5 dB(A) increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, on-site HVAC noise would result in a less than significant impact.

Parking noise typically generates noise levels of approximately 60 dB(A) at 50 feet. Parking from the project would occur in subterranean parking. However, as cars enter the subterranean parking from within the project site, noise generated from parking related impacts may occur at nearby receptors. At approximately 60 feet from the subterranean parking entrance, there would be an increase of approximately 4.5 dB(A) when vehicles enter the parking levels of the project and receptors are exposed to parking noise. This is below the Pasadena Municipal Code recommended threshold of a 5 dB(A) increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, parking noise would result in a less than significant impact.

Project construction (i.e., demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating) would be required to comply with PMC Section 9.36.070, which limits the permitted hours for construction activity to be between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM during the weekday and between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Therefore, construction noise would not impact nearby residential receptors or medical office patients during recognized hours of sleep. However, according to PMC Section 9.26.080, the operation of powered construction equipment is prohibited if such equipment emits noise at a level in excess of 85 dBA when measured within a radius of 100 feet from the source. As shown in Table 4.13-2, construction would increase ambient noise levels to up to approximately 83.6 dBA Leq at 100 feet from the source, which is less than the 85 dBA maximum allowed under PMC Section 9.36.070. Construction noise impacts would be temporary and less than significant. (SCEA, p. 4.0-108)

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airports are the El Monte Airport and the Hollywood Burbank Airport (formerly the Bob Hope Airport), which are located approximately 5.4 miles east and 12 miles northwest of the project site, respectively. Therefore, noise impacts related to airports would not occur.

n. Population and Housing

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project 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)?
- Would the project displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to population and housing. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

Based on the community's current household demographics (e.g., an average of 2.5 persons per household for the City of Pasadena), the construction of 88 dwelling units would result in an increase in up to approximately 220 net permanent residents in the City of Pasadena. The proposed increase in housing units and population would be consistent with the SCAG forecast of 8,800 additional households and approximately 13,400 persons in the City of Pasadena between 2016 and 2045. The operational-related population growth impacts would be within SCAG's regional projections and therefore population growth generated from operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Further, the Land Use Element of the Central District Specific Plan Area stipulates a development capacity of 4,272 residential units and 2,112,000 SF of commercial development. The proposed project involves development of 88 residential units and 11,400 SF of supporting commercial use. Therefore, development included under the proposed project would be consistent with the

development capacities established for the Central District Specific Plan Area and impacts to population growth would be less than significant.

The project site is occupied by a surface parking lot, so no displacement of existing housing would occur with the development of the proposed project, and no impact would occur.

o. Public Services

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:
 - Fire protection
 - Police protection
 - Schools
 - Parks
 - Libraries

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to public services. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

The proposed project would not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and would not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of 84 residential units, 4 work/live units, and approximately 6,200 square feet of restaurant and commercial space, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Fire Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Fire Department facilities. Nor does the project require alteration of any facilities (including the fire station almost directly across the street from the project). Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services.

The proposed project would not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and would not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of 84 residential units, 4 work/live units, and approximately 6,200 square feet of restaurant and commercial space, which could increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department. However, the project itself is not large enough to require the development of additional Police facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. A fee is collected by the City's Building Official for PSUD on each residential unit constructed, as well as a fee for non-residential development. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools.

The project is located approximately 50 feet from the nearest park, (Central Park). According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1,000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1,000 residents.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged in accordance with Pasadena Municipal Code Section 4.17.050 for parkland acquisition, capital improvements and maintenance. If affordable housing is built on the site, as in the proposed project, the residential impact fee is \$ 13,735.49 per studio to \$25,424.99 for a five or more-bedroom unit, or \$ 1,016.85 per unit for affordable housing units. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks.

The project is located approximately 0.50 miles from the nearest branch library (Pasadena Public Library – Central Branch). The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services and no new or expanded library facilities would be needed.

p. Recreation

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- 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?
- 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?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to recreation. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The project is located approximately 50 feet from the nearest park, Central Park. The proposed project is expected to generate 213 residents and would result in a proportional increase in the use of neighborhood and regional parks. However, in accordance with Ordinance No. 6252, the City collects a park impact fee for each residential unit constructed and on each residential addition over 400 sq. ft. in size. These fees are used to fund land acquisition and capital improvements. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

q. Transportation

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?
- Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to transportation. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

On November 2014, the City of Pasadena City Council adopted a resolution to replace the City's transportation performance measures with five new Transportation Performance Measures and new thresholds of significance to determine transportation and traffic impacts under CEQA. The new performance measures and CEQA thresholds are consistent with the City's adopted General Plan and Senate Bill 743 and include vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, vehicle trips (VT) per capita, proximity and quality of the bicycle network, proximity and quality of the transit network, and pedestrian accessibility. The new measures support the City's vision of creating a community where people can circulate without cars, which relies upon an integrated multimodal transportation system that provides choices and accessibility for everyone in the City.

The City established Transportation Impact Analysis Current Practice & Guidelines to implement the transportation performance measures and CEQA thresholds. These guidelines identify projects with 50 or more residential units and/or 50,000 square feet or more of nonresidential use as having communitywide significance and must consider the City's CEQA thresholds. As a result, the project was required to undergo a transportation analysis to determine whether the project would exceed the transportation review thresholds described above. The Travel Demand Forecasting Model calculation results for the proposed project determined that the project would not cause a significant impact to any of the metrics as outlined in the City's Traffic Transportation Impact Analysis Current Practice and Guidelines. The transportation analysis also concluded that the project would not cause a decrease in the percentage of existing citywide service population within a quarter mile of Level 1 and 2 transit or bike facilities. Furthermore, the analysis also concluded that the project would not decrease the Citywide Pedestrian Accessibility Score.

Additionally, the proposed project lies within 0.25 miles of the Del Mar L Line (formerly known as the Gold Line) Metro Station and encourages bike use through providing end-of-trip bicycle storage. Therefore, the project will not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and will encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.

Section 15064.3(b)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* refers to evaluating transportation impacts using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for land use projects. The City's *Transportation Impact Analysis Current Practice & Guidelines* were prepared to reflect this requirement. The CEQA transportation analysis (included as Appendix G) utilized a CEQA threshold of an increase of the existing Citywide VMT per capita of 22.6. The analysis concluded an incremental change (existing plus project) of 16.2, which is below the significant impact cap.

The project has been evaluated by the Pasadena Department of Transportation (PasDOT) and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design has been found not to be hazardous to 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.

The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the PasDOT and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. 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.

The project must comply with all State and local 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 would be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

r. Utilities and Service Systems

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project 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?
- Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- Would the project 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?
- Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to utilities and service systems. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

The proposed project consists of 84 residential units, 4 work/live units, and 6,200 square feet of residential and commercial space, and as a result, would increase the demand for water and wastewater service.

The City's Department of Public Works, Engineering Division maintains the local sewer system. Flows from the local system are currently carried to the trunk sewers operated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District. An existing 18-inch vitrified clay pipe sewer main is located in Fair Oaks Avenue.

Under normal operation the proposed project would generate approximately 18,886 gallons of wastewater per day, while the proposed project would use approximately 24,261 gallons of water per day. No existing sewer deficiencies were identified in the City's Master Sewer Plan. In addition, no deficiencies have been identified in the County Sanitation Districts' collection and treatment facilities serving the City. Wastewater is currently treated at the Whittier Narrows Reclamation Plant, San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, and the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant. The design capacities of these facilities are based on regional growth forecasts adopted by SCAG. All expansions of the District's facilities must be sized in a manner consistent with SCAG's regional growth forecast. As previously discussed, the proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan land use designation, which forms the basis of SCAG's regional forecast. As Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16 treats the City's wastewater, the proposed project would be subject to a sewer connection fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. Connection of the main sewer lines would occur during construction and would not result in environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the SCEA.

As previously stated, the proposed project would generate the need for approximately 24,261 gallons of water per day. The proposed project would be

subject to several PMC requirements designed to reduce water consumption. In conformance with the California Green Building Program (CALGreen), the City has adopted an amended California Green Building standards Code (PMC 14.04.500) for all new construction and tenant improvements. In conformance with this Ordinance, the project would be designed to meet the California Green Building Standards Code Tier 2 Requirements (PMC 14.04.504, Section 307.2). In addition to the mandatory measures of Tier 2, compliance with specific prerequisites and as many additional elective measures to achieve an equivalent 50 LEED points is also required to achieve Tier 2 status (PMC 14.04.558), which would reduce water use through various water conservation measures. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to the Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plans Ordinance (PMC 13.10), which imposes mandatory water conservation measures during Level 1 (least restrictive) through Level 4 (most restrictive) water supply shortages; the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (PMC 13.22); and Landscaping Ordinance (PMC 17.44); to further reduce water demand and any corresponding requirement for new water facilities. In addition, since the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the project site, the growth associated with the project has already been accounted for in PWP's latest Urban Water Management Plan. Further, more than 75 percent of planting material utilized in this project is identified by WUCOLS (Water Use Classification of Landscape Species) as needing "Low" or "Very Low" amounts of irrigation water, indicating that an overwhelming majority of plants will be drought tolerant. The project would use a drip irrigation system with a weather-based irrigation controller. (Refer to the CAP Consistency Checklist Supporting Docs, p. 8-9 (Landscape Plan - Ground Floor Tree Locations, Landscape Plan - Ground Floor Planting Locations) for additional information about landscape and irrigation systems, included in Appendix D of the SCEA.) Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to exceed PWP's available supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

No deficiencies have been identified for the water mains and treatment facilities that currently serve the project area. In addition, as a priority project for the City's Water System identified in the current Capital Improvement Program, new and replacement water distribution mains would be installed at various locations throughout the City, which would be funded, in part, by development

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

fees. The proposed project would also be required to pay fees to connect to the existing water mains available to serve the site. Overall, as existing wastewater and water facilities are available to serve the proposed project and no new wastewater or water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required.

Project water would be provided by PWP. Based on known present uses of the site for surface parking, it is reasonably and conservatively assumed that minimal water uses currently occur on the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would introduce new water use requirements to the site, and would increase the amount of water delivered to the Project Site by PWP. However, land uses associated with the proposed project are consistent with land uses anticipated in the current Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for this area of Pasadena. As such, the proposed project would introduce water usage rates consistent with land uses anticipated in the UWMP and associated water supply planning documents for the area.

Further, during periods of drought, this project would 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.

The proposed project under normal operation would generate approximately 18,725 gallons of wastewater per day.⁴ However, the proposed increase to wastewater service demand is negligible in comparison to the existing service area of the wastewater service purveyor. Wastewater from the City is currently treated by the County Sanitation Districts' Whittier Narrows Reclamation Plant, San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant, and the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant. No deficiencies have been identified in these wastewater treatment facilities. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to a County Sanitation Districts' sewer connection fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. In order to cover current and future infrastructure costs for sewer facilities located in the City, the proposed project may also be subject to

⁴ Calculated as 80 percent of anticipated water usage minus water used for landscaping and in the parking structure.

a Sewer Facility Fee Charge as specified under PMC 4.53, if it is determined that there is an increase in the average daily flow compared to existing conditions.

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 2030. The Scholl Canyon Landfill has a maximum daily capacity of 3,400 tons and a total remaining capacity of 9,900,000 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2020).

Waste generated at the project site would be required to comply with AB 939. Passed in 1989, this regulation requires every city in California to divert at least 50 percent of its annual waste by the year 2000. The City of Pasadena has 37 solid waste diversion programs, including composting, household hazardous waste, public education programs, recycling, source reduction, and special waste materials such as tires and concrete/asphalt/rubble (CalRecycle 2013), including the City's Pay-As-You-Throw program that offers reduced costs for households that recycle more and throw away less mixed waste. For 2010, the State estimated that Pasadena generated as a whole 584,840 tons of waste. Of this total, 152,881 tons were disposed in a landfill and 431,959 tons were diverted, yielding a diversion rate of just over 73 percent for Pasadena. Further, the City has adopted the Zero Waste Strategic Plan that provides a philosophy and design framework that promotes reuse, recycling, and conservation programs, and emphasizes sustainability by considering the entire life-cycle of products, processes, and systems (City of Pasadena 2014). The Plan aims to get the City as close as possible to zero waste by 2040. Additionally, in accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the applicant must submit a Construction Waste Management Plan to reduce construction waste.

s. Wildfire

i. Potential Impacts Evaluated

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

ii. Proposed Mitigation – None Required

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

As noted above and explained below, the SCEA analysis determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to wildfire. As such, findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2 are not warranted.

iv. Supporting Explanation

According to Plate P-2 from the City's 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is in a low fire hazard zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause an impairment to an adopted emergency response plan or

emergency evacuation plan. In the event a fire begins during construction or operation of the project, the nearest fire station is the City of Pasadena Fire Station No. 31, located approximately 130 feet from the project site. Being in a developed urban area, there are several fire protection facilities in the project vicinity that could respond to an emergency at the site. The project site is located in a dense urban area that would not require the installation of infrastructure such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities that may exacerbate the fire risk. The risk of wildfire or the resulting runoff and drainage changes as a result of wildfire are very low.

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

The City Council finds that mitigation measures have been identified in the SCEA that will reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts identified below to below a level of significance. For each environmental topic within this category, the discussion below begins with a delineation of the potential impacts evaluated in the SCEA, as specifically related to that topic, along with page citations as to where in the SCEA the relevant discussion is found, and is followed by presentation of the mitigation measure(s) identified in the SCEA for that topic, and then provides an explanation of the substantial evidence in support of the SCEA conclusion that the impact would be reduced to a level less than significant within implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

a. CULTURAL RESOURCES

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5? (SCEA, p. 75)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

Pasadena General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure

4.1:

If cultural resources are discovered during construction of land development projects in Pasadena that may be eligible for listing in the California Register for Historic Resources, all ground disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be halted until the find is evaluated by a Registered Professional Archaeologist. If testing determines that significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; and provide a comprehensive final report including site record to the City and the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University Fullerton. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until Planning Department approves the report. (SCEA, p. 4.0-79)

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources which meet the criteria for historical resources, or resources which constitute unique archaeological resources. Archaeological site indicators can include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements (e.g., slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles); and locally darkened midden soils. Midden soils may contain a combination of any of the previously listed items with the possible addition of bone and shell remains, and fire-affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include but are not limited to: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

The ground surface on the project site is almost completely obscured by paving, which makes it impossible to definitively identify the presence of

archaeological or buried historical resources without conducting invasive ground investigations. Though no records of previously recorded archaeological or buried historical resources were identified, in the event that any of these resources are discovered during construction of the project, particularly during excavation for the subterranean parking garage, impacts could be potentially significant. In the unlikely event that archaeological or buried historical resources are discovered during construction, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-1 from the City of Pasadena General Plan EIR, as reiterated above, would apply as implemented by the General Plan's Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program (MMRP). As required by Mitigation Measure 4-1 of the City's General Plan EIR, in the event that an unanticipated discovery is encountered, the find must be assessed by a professionally qualified archaeologist to determine if the find may be significant. If determined to be of significance, the materials would be recovered, evaluated, documented, and repositied with a reputable research institution or museum, consistent with General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4-1 and the corresponding MMRP. With the implementation of General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4-1 the potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

b. NOISE

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project expose persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (SCEA, p. 145)

ii. Proposed Mitigation

MM NOI-1: Prior to approval of grading plans and/or prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, and to the satisfaction of the City of Pasadena, the applicant shall retain a Professional Structural Engineer with experience in structural vibration analysis and monitoring for historic buildings and a Project Historical Architect with similar experience as a team to ensure project construction-induced vibration levels do not expose

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

the existing Green Hotel Apartments or the restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue to vibration levels of 0.12 ppv in/sec or greater. The Professional Structural Engineer/Project Historical Architect team shall perform the following tasks:

- Review the project plans for demolition and construction;
- Survey the project site and the existing Green Hotel Apartments and restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue, including photographic and/or videographic documentation and geological testing, if required; and
- Prepare and submit a report to the Director of Planning and Community Development to include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - Description of existing conditions at the existing Green Hotel Apartments and restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue, including photographic and/or videographic documentation;
 - Vibration level limits based on building conditions, soil conditions, and planned demolition and construction methods to ensure vibration levels would be below 0.12 ppv in/sec, the potential for damage to the existing Green Hotel Apartments and restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue;
 - Specific measures to be taken during construction to ensure the specified

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

vibration level limits are not exceeded;
and

- Prepare and submit a monitoring plan to be implemented during demolition and construction that includes post-construction and post-demolition surveys of the existing Green Hotel Apartments and restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue. The plan should include, but not be limited to, monitoring instrument specifications, instrument calibration certificates, list of exact monitoring locations, data collection protocol, alarming and alerting protocol, reporting protocol, and maintenance and service outage protocol. Any of the measures can be removed when no longer necessary to achieve the 0.12 ppv in/sec threshold of structure damage at the existing Green Hotel Apartments and restaurant building at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue.
- Examples of measures that may be specified for implementation during demolition or construction include, but are not limited to
 - Prohibition of certain types of impact equipment;
 - Requirement for lighter tracked or wheeled equipment;
 - Specifying demolition by non-impact methods, such as sawing concrete;

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

- Phasing operations to avoid simultaneous vibration sources; and
- Installation of vibration measuring devices to guide decision making for subsequent activities. Monitoring shall be conducted, at minimum, during all ground-disturbing significant impact construction activities (i.e., demolition, shoring excavation, and foundation work). Warning thresholds, as specified in the monitoring plan, shall be below the specified vibration limits to allow the Contractor to take the necessary steps to reduce vibration, including but not limited to halting/staggering concurrent activities, utilizing quieter or lower-vibratory techniques, or reducing the speed or intensity of equipment. A monitoring record that documents all alarms and includes information regarding compliance with these vibration measures shall be provided to the City of Pasadena upon request.

MM NOI-2: To the satisfaction of the City of Pasadena, in the unanticipated event of discovery of vibration-caused damage, the Professional Structural Engineer and the Project Historical Architect shall document any damage to the existing Green Hotel Apartments and/or restaurant building located at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue caused by construction of the project and shall recommend necessary repairs. Until the conclusion of vibration causing activities, a report from the Professional Structural Engineer or Project Historical Architect shall be submitted every 90 days to the City of Pasadena

documenting the presence or absence of damage, and, if needed, the status of any required repairs. The project applicant shall be responsible for any repairs associated with vibration-caused damage as a result of construction of the project. Any such repairs shall be undertaken and completed as required to conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 Code of Federal Regulations 68), and shall apply the California Historical Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 8) and other applicable codes.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

The Federal Transit Administration provides ground-borne vibration impact criteria with respect to building damage during construction activities. Peak particle velocity (PPV), expressed in inches per second, is used to measure building vibration damage. Construction vibration damage criteria are assessed based on structural category (e.g., reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber). FTA guidelines consider 0.12 inch/sec PPV to be the significant impact level for buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage. Structures or buildings constructed of reinforced concrete, steel, or timber have a vibration damage criterion of 0.5 inch/sec PPV pursuant to FTA guidelines.

Groundborne vibration generated by construction activities associated with the proposed project would affect both on- and off-site sensitive uses located in close proximity to the project site. Vibration velocities during construction could range from 0.003 to 0.644 0.089 inch/sec PPV at 25 feet from the source activity, with corresponding vibration levels (VdB) ranging from 58 VdB to 87 VdB at 25 feet from the source activity, depending on the type of construction equipment in use.

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

It should be noted that pile driving and equivalent methods are prohibited by the Municipal Code; further, jackhammers will not be used during construction of the proposed project.

Vibrational impacts can potentially damage buildings that are near the construction site. The receptors identified to be assessed for vibration impacts are the Green Hotel Apartments located to the north of the project site, the Castle Green located east of the project, a three-story red brick building located at 103-115 South Fair Oaks Avenue located west of the project, and a restaurant building located at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue. Based on the FTA guidance presented in Table 5 in Appendix F of the SCEA, a vibration level of 0.12 PPV in/sec is used in this analysis as the threshold to determine potential significant vibration impacts to the existing Green Hotel Apartments, Castle Green, and the restaurant building located at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue.

The vibration velocities predicted to occur at the Green Hotel Apartments, located 15 feet to the north of the nearest project site boundary would be 0.124 in/sec PPV. This exceeds the FTA 0.12 in/sec PPV threshold. Castle Green is approximately 73 feet from the project site; at this distance, vibration impacts are anticipated to be 0.044 in/sec PPV and would not exceed the FTA threshold. The building located at 103-115 South Fair Oaks Avenue, at a distance of 80 feet, is estimated to have vibration levels of 0.016 in/sec PPV and would also not exceed FTA thresholds. The restaurant building located at 84 South Fair Oaks Avenue is estimated to have vibration levels of 0.191 in/sec PPV and would also exceed the FTA threshold of 0.12 in/sec PPV. **Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2** would reduce potential vibration impacts to associated with construction activities to a less than significant level by requiring that proper construction techniques be utilized to reduce vibration exposure of adjacent buildings to less than 0.12 in/sec and, in the unanticipated circumstance in which adjacent buildings sustain damage during construction activities, requires that repairs be made in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

c. Tribal Cultural Resources

i. Potential Significant Impacts Evaluated

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 2024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

ii. Proposed Mitigation

MM TCR-1: During grading and excavation, a monitor meeting the satisfaction of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation shall be present. Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4-1 in the Pasadena General Plan EIR, if Native American artifacts are found, all ground disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be halted until the find is evaluated by a Registered Professional Archaeologist. If testing determines that significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon data as applicable, and other

special studies; and provide a comprehensive final report, including site record to the City and the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Department approves the report. Subsequently, the find shall be turned over to the tribe of the resource's origin. In addition, any cultural resources found shall be treated in accordance with regulatory requirements. Grading and excavation may continue around the isolated area of the find so long as the activities do not impede or jeopardize the protection and preservation of any cultural resources as determined by the Registered Professional Archaeologist.

iii. Findings Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21155.2

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

iv. Supporting Explanation

The proposed project is subject to compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which requires consideration of impacts to "tribal cultural resources" as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as part of the CEQA process and requires the City to notify any groups (who have requested notification) of the proposed project who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. Two tribes (the Gabrieleno Band of Missions Indians – Kizh Nation and the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe) requested formal notification of all projects within the City. Accordingly, the City notified the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and Gabrielino-Tongva of the proposed project under AB 52 in order to provide an opportunity to consult on tribal cultural resources and other matters of concern.

As described in Section 5 of the SCEA, there are no known prehistoric or historic archaeological sites on the project site. However, it is possible that intact and previously undiscovered prehistoric archaeological deposits are present at

subsurface levels and could be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. In the event that such deposits of previously unknown tribal cultural resources, significant effects may occur to that resource, if the resource is disturbed, destroyed, or otherwise improperly treated. As such, Mitigation Measure TCR-1 is provided in the event that resources are uncovered during construction. Mitigation Measure TCR-1 requires a qualified Native American monitor meeting the satisfaction of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to be present during grading and excavation activities at the project site. Mitigation Measure TCR-1 further requires the proper handling and treatment of any significant resources would be less than significant.

IV. RESOLUTION REGARDING ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The City Council hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP") attached to this Resolution as Attachment #1, and incorporated herein. This MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures analyzed in the SCEA that are applicable.

V. RESOLUTION REGARDING CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which these findings are based are located at the City of Pasadena, Planning & Community Development Department at 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101 and with the Director of Planning & Community Development, who serves as the custodian of these records.

VI. RESOLUTION REGARDING NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Staff is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the Clerk of the County of Los Angeles within five working days of final approval, as may be further modified by any conditions of approval imposed by the City Council.

CEQA Findings - Central Park Apartments

Adopted at the _____ meeting of the City Council on the _____ day
of _____, 2022 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Mark Jomsky, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

/s/ Theresa Fuentes
Theresa E. Fuentes
Assistant City Attorney