CITY OF PASADENA
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101-1704

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this analysis, the associated "Master Application Form," and/or Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and supporting data constitute the Initial Study for the subject project. This Initial Study provides the assessment for a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Central Park Master Plan

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena, 117 E. Colorado Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Todd Holmes, Department of Public Works 6262-744-7329

4. Project Location:275 S. Raymond Ave, Pasadena CA

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena, 117 E. Colorado Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105

6. General Plan Designation: Open Space

7. Zoning: OS (Open Space)

8. Description of the Project: The Central Park Master Plan provides a guide for the revitalization of Central Park—one of Pasadena's oldest parks. Please see attached Master Plan for a detailed description of the project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project is located in the Central District of the city and it is surrounded by a mixture of commercial and medium to high density residential development.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	**X**
I find that the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment., but at least effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards , and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

_____ _____

Prepared By/Date Reviewed By/Date

Todd Holmes _____

Printed Name Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____

Adoption attested to by: _____

Printed name/Signature Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. " Potentially Significant Impact' is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 20, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 20 at the end of the checklist.

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant

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

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: April 26, 2007
Department requiring checklist: Public Works
Case Manager: Todd Holmes

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

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

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project site is in an area that offers views of Old Pasadena, but the project will not have an adverse effect on scenic vistas. The mass and size of the proposed elements are much smaller than the existing tree masses in the park. The largest structure proposed in the Master Plan is a single story restroom building, the same size as the existing restroom structure.

In accordance with section 17.61.030 of the City's Zoning Code, the design of this project, including its obstruction of any scenic vista or view, will be reviewed by the Design Commission. Although the project would not significantly impact a scenic vista, this regulatory procedure provides the City with additional layer of review for aesthetics, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to increase the aesthetic value of the project.

b. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The project site is not within the viewshed of the Angeles Crest Highway, and not along any scenic roadway corridors identified in the City's General Plan documents. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project consists of the renovation of portions of an existing city-owned park. The proposed project is within the height and mass limitations of the Zoning Code. The conceptual plans of the

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

proposed improvements have been reviewed by the Design Commission, Recreation and Parks Commission and the City Council. Detailed plans for major improvements such as the replacement of the restroom building will be submitted to the Design Commission and the Recreation and Parks Commission. The proposed Master Plan does not include the installation of any unsightly features, such as new utility nodes. Rather, the Master Plan provides for the park's electrical switchgear, irrigation pump, and backflow to be relocated to improve of the aesthetics of the park. Approval of the proposed project would not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impact.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project will not have a significant impact on light and glare because it will be required to comply with the standards in the zoning code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. Height and direction of any outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to Zoning Code requirements. Outdoor lighting included in the project will consist of pedestrian safety lighting, landscaping lights, and lighting for one lawn bowling court. The lighting for the lawn bowling court will be a "cutoff" type light fixture, identical to those found at tennis courts. This type of fixture minimizes direct glare and focuses light on the court. The lawn bowling court lights will only be used during park hours, therefore the lighting will not be on after ten p.m. The project is in an older, developed mixed use (residential and commercial urban area) with streetlights in place, and the proposed exterior lighting would be consistent with the surrounding area. These lights are not substantial sources of glare and are an aide to public safety.

The design of any proposed structures (i.e. the restroom building), including its finish, colors, and materials, will be reviewed for approval through the Design Review process. This regulatory procedure provides the City with an additional layer of review for aesthetics including light and glare, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to improve the project's building materials and lighting plans.

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. It has commercial recreation, park, natural and open space. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. Commercial Growing Area/Grounds is permitted in the CG (General Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the RS (Residential Single-Family),and RM (Residential Multi-Family) districts The use is also permitted within certain specific plan areas.

c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

5. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2003 AQMP, adopted on August 1, 2003. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the 5 percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

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

In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth.

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

The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations for the site. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the AQMP and the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan, and would have no associated impacts.

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

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? Due to its geographical location and the prevailing off shore daytime winds, Pasadena receives smog from downtown Los Angeles and other areas in the Los Angeles basin. The prevailing winds, from the southwest, carry smog from wide areas of Los Angeles and adjacent cities, to the San Fernando Valley and to Pasadena in the San Gabriel Valley where it is trapped against the foothills. For these reasons the potential for adverse air quality in Pasadena is high.

Pasadena is located in a non-attainment area, an area that frequently exceeds national ambient air quality standards. However, the project itself is well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) land use, construction, and mobile emission thresholds for significant air quality impacts, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate and air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and would have no related significant impacts.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ( )

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). This basin is a non-attainment area for Ozone (O_3), Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10}), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and is in a maintenance area for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in O_3, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, CO, or NO_2 will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures.

As discussed is Section 5.b, the proposed project will not exceed the SCAQMD's Thresholds for Significance. The SCQAMD established these thresholds in consideration of cumulative air pollution in the SCAB. Thus, projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds do not significantly contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. Since the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, and the project would have no related significant impacts.

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

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook although the project is located near sensitive receptors it is not likely to generate any significant toxic air emissions.

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

The project consists of upgrades to the park facilities. The use will remain a park and no new long term air pollutants are expected to be generated onsite. Construction/installation of improvements onsite may generate a minor amount of equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. However, due to the limited scope of construction and minimal amount of diesel equipment that will be utilized onsite, no air pollutants would be generated at concentrations that could affect sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? This type of use is not shown on the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints." Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors, and would have no associated impacts.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project is a community park in a developed urban area. The park is used for recreational activities, festivals and similar uses that might occur in a City park. The proposed project is a Master Plan for the park that includes upgrades and aesthetic enhancement of the park. All trees in a public park are protected trees. Regardless, there are no trees proposed for removal. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the site; and the park does not contain any natural vegetation communities and does not otherwise contain habitat that could support special status species.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, and Eaton Canyon. The project is not located near any of these natural habitat areas.

The project is located in a developed urban area. The only vegetation present onsite is existing landscaping in the park. The project site and surrounding area do not include any vegetation that constitutes a designated natural community.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season.

The project site does not include any discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils, and thus does not include USACE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The project is located in a developed urban area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project is located in a developed urban area and does not involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will the project result in a barrier to migration or movement. Therefore, the project will have no impact to wildlife movement.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". All Trees on the site are public trees and all public trees are afforded protection in the ordinance. It is a violation of the ordinance to prune, remove, injure, or plant a public tree. Specifications for all work to be performed in the park will include provisions for the protection of all trees on the site. Limitations and restrictions will be placed on excavation and other construction activity in the vicinity of existing trees. No trees are proposed for removal. In any event, the project will comply with all requirements of the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, therefore no conflicts with local policies will occur, and there will be no impacts.

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

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

WHY? Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? Central Park has historic significance and it is located within the boundaries of the Old Pasadena National Register Historic District. The project proposes the demolition of a non-historic restroom structure and the rehabilitation of two historic structures: the El Centro de Acción Social building and the Lawn Bowler's Clubhouse. The Design Commission shall review the plans for this work as part of the applications for concept and final design reviews, in accordance with the *Design Guidelines for Historic Districts in the City of Pasadena, California (2002)* and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation*. Any negative impacts on historical resources from the proposed project will be mitigated to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed by the Design Commission during the design reviews.

Three areas of potential impact have been identified:

	Effect
1. Demolition of the non-historic restroom building.	Less than significant. This structure is not of historic significance.
2. Rehabilitation of the El Centro de Acción Social El Centro de Accion and the Lawn Bowlers' Clubhouse.	Less than significant, the rehabilitation is required to be reviewed by the Design Commission to ensure compatibility with all applicable plans and preservation regulations.
3. Compatibility of new restroom building with the historic resources on the site.	Less than significant. The new structure is required to be reviewed by the Design Commission to ensure compatibility with all applicable plans and preservation regulations.

1. Demolition of non-historic restroom building.

The restroom building is approximately 300 s.f. in size and it is located directly north of the Lawn Bowling Clubhouse. It is a simple stucco building with no distinguishing features. The location of this building directly in front of the historic clubhouse detracts from the aesthetic appeal of the latter building. The restroom structure is deteriorated and difficult to maintain. The quality of the building and fixtures is below the current standard for park facilities.

Mitigation: none required.

2. Rehabilitation of the El Centro de Acción Social El Centro de Accion and the Lawn Bowlers Clubhouse.

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

To achieve compatibility with the existing building and surrounding historic district, the building materials used in the rehabilitation of the existing buildings shall be appropriate in architectural style, scale, texture, and color. In addition, the significant character-defining features of the existing buildings shall be preserved. The Design Commission (or Planning Director) shall review the plans for the rehabilitation of the El Centro de Acción Building and the Lawn Bowler's Clubhouse, as part of the applications for concept and final design reviews. Design review of exterior work to properties in the park is required by the municipal code, and no mitigation is required to supplement the requirements of the code.

Mitigation: none required.

3. Compatibility of the new restroom building with the historic resources on the site.

The design of the new restroom structure must be architecturally compatible with, yet visually differentiated from, the existing historic structures in the park, and also be compatible with the surrounding historic district otherwise the project has the potential to impact the historic resources and their aesthetics. The City's design review process—which requires application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings to the design—will address the visual relationships between new construction and the historic building. These relationships include the rooflines, massing, architectural compatibility, solid-to-void proportions, transitions in scale, sightlines, materials, and finishes.

Mitigation: none required.

b. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain undisturbed surficial soils. The site is a city park and it has been entirely developed with associated structures and facilities. If archaeological resources once existed on-site, it is likely that previous grading, construction, and modern use of the site have either removed or destroyed them. Consequently, surficial soils on the project site are devoid of archaeological resources.

Development of the proposed project would involve minor grading to establish building pads and develop onsite infrastructure. However, the proposed grading would not encroach into undisturbed soils. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts to archaeological resources.

c. *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project site lies on the valley floor in an urbanized portion of the City of Pasadena. This portion of the City does not contain any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to contain paleontologicial resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? There are no known human remains on the site. The project site is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project does not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. The proposed intensity of the project is within the intensity allowed by the Zoning Code and envisioned in the City's approved General Plan. Further the project will comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24).

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ( )	☐	☐	☒	☐

Why? The proposed project will not create a high enough demand for energy to require development of new energy sources. Construction of the project will result in a short-term insignificant consumption of oil-based energy products. However, the additional amount of resources used will not cause a significant reduction in available supplies.

The long-term impact from increased energy use by this project is not 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 of the project will not result in any increase in the consumption of natural gas. This project will result in the increased consumption of 24 net kilowatt-hours of electrical energy per day. This increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards.

This project will result in no increase in water consumption.

9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

These Alquist-Priolo maps show only one Fault Zone in or adjacent to the City of Pasadena, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. This fault is located primarily south of City limits, however, the southernmost portions of the City lie within the fault's mapped Fault Zone. The 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan identifies the following three additional zones of potential fault rupture in the City:

- The Eagle Rock Fault Hazard Management Zone, which traverses the southwestern portion of the City;
- The Sierra Madre Fault Hazard Management Zone, which includes the Tujunga Fault, the North Sawpit Fault, and the South Branch of the San Gabriel Fault. This Fault Zone is primarily north of the City, and only the very northeast portion of the City and portions of the Upper Arroyo lie within the mapped fault zone.
- A Possible Active Strand of the Sierra Madre Fault, which appears to join a continuation of the Sycamore Canyon Fault. This fault area traverses the northern portion of the City as is identified as a Fault Hazard Management Zone for Critical Facilities Only.

The project site is not within any of these potential fault rupture zones. The closest mapped fault zone, the Raymond (Hill) Fault Zone, is more than one mile south of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. No related significant impacts would result from the proposed project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ( )	☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY?

The project site is not within a Liquifaction Hazard Zone or Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of 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. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic related ground failure.

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

WHY?
The project site is not within a Landslide Hazard Zone as shown on Plate P-1 of 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. Therefore, the project will have no impacts from seismic induced landslides.

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

WHY? Construction of the project will require minimal grading with no import or export of material. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions.

Any displacement of soil will be controlled by the City's grading ordinance, Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, and any other applicable building regulations and standard construction techniques; therefore there will be no impact.

Water erosion during construction will be minimized by limiting construction to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. Soil erosion after construction will be controlled by implementation of an approved landscape and irrigation plan. This plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator (or the appropriate staff) for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Construction may temporarily expose the soil to wind and/or water erosion. Erosion caused by strong wind, excavation and earth moving operations will be minimized by watering during construction and by covering earth to be transported in trucks to or from the site.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The proposed project is not located on known unstable soils or geologic units, and therefore, would not likely cause on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Modern engineering practices and compliance with established building standards, including the California Building Code, will ensure the project will not cause any significant impacts from unstable geologic units or soils.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan 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.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project will 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, and the proposed project would have no associated impacts.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The 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 is no evidence that the site has been used for underground storage of hazardous materials.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project does not involve hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material.

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

WHY? 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. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

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

WHY? The 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 is not known or anticipated to have been contaminated with hazardous materials and no hazardous material storage facilities are known to exist onsite.

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

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

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

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

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

The construction and operation of the proposed project would not place any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? As shown on Plate P-2 of the 2002 Safety Element, the project site is not in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. In addition, the project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, and the project would have no associated impacts.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

Pasadena is within the greater Los Angeles River watershed, and thus, within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater achieves compliance with

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

receiving water limitations. Thus, stormwater generated by a development that complies with the SQMP does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards.

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

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

None of the proposed uses are point source generators of water pollutants, and thus, no quantifiable water quality standards apply to the project. As an urban development, the proposed project would add typical, urban, nonpoint-source pollutants to storm water runoff. As discussed, these pollutants are permitted by the County-wide MS4 permit, and would not exceed any receiving water limitations. Furthermore, the proposed development does not meet the City's SUSMP requirement thresholds, and thus, water pollutants generated from the development are considered negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The project will not result in any increase in water consumption. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin.

During drought conditions, the project must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code).

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

WHY? The project site is currently virtually flat and runoff onsite drains as sheet flow from north to south. The project site does not contain any discernable streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Development of the proposed improvements will involve minor grading, but will not alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area, nor will run off from the site be increased.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? As discussed, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering a discernable drainage course. The proposed minor changes to the site's drainage patterns are not expected to cause flooding. Regardless, the project's potential to cause flooding would be eliminated through the required compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance. This ordinance requires post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Compliance with this SUSMP requirement will be ensured through the City's drainage plan review and approval process.

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project could increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surfaces onsite. However, as discussed above in Sections 11.c) and 11.d), compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance would ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates to not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. Therefore, the City's existing storm drain system can adequately serve the proposed development.

Similarly, as discussed above in Sections 11.a) and 11.c), the project would generate only typical, non-point source, urban stormwater pollutants. These pollutants are covered by the County-wide MS4 permit, and the project, through the City's SUSMP ordinance, is required to implement BMPs to reduce stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? As discussed above, the proposed development will not be a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban

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

stormwater pollutants. Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure these stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality.

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

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project involves the renovation of an existing park. Therefore, the project would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an existing community? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community because it is open space.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project is consistent with both the OS (Open Space) zoning designation and the OS General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 2004 Land Use Element. The project does not propose to change the use of the site and will not conflict with any applicable land use policies or regulations.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas are Eaton Wash, which, was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. The project is not near these areas.

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

WHY? The City's 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

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

The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). A construction related traffic plan is also required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

The proposed building is approximately 200 feet from the Gold Line light rail tracks. This light rail system has been designed to limit excessive ground-borne vibration to surrounding land uses, and no significant vibration levels are experienced outside of the railway's right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed project will not be significantly impacted by ground-borne vibration or noise.

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

WHY? The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment. (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise will be limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ( )	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport (formerly the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport), which is located more than 10 miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

a. *Fire Protection? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10.h) of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

b. Libraries? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

c. Parks? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project is a public park and thus is a non-residential project that would not directly increase the City's population.

d. Police Protection? ( )

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of modifications to an existing public park which will not increase the demand on the Pasadena Police Department.

e. *Schools? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? This project will not create a need for new or altered school facilities.

f. *Other public facilities? ( )*

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project's development will not result in the additional maintenance of public facilities.

17. RECREATION.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ( )*	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project is a non-residential project that would not directly increase the City's population. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

WHY? The project includes recreational facilities and will result in the reconstruction of recreational facilities. The proposed redevelopment of recreational facilities would not have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts. The proposed project does not involve, and would not require, the construction or expansion of off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

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

WHY? The project is bounded by Fair Oaks Avenue., Raymond Ave, Del Mar Blvd. and Dayton St. and is supported by a roadway network consisting of Colorado Blvd and Arroyo Parkway. The proposed modifications to the park will not increase the capacity of the park nor will they result in any change in the existing use of the park. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to the traffic load and capacity of the street system.

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

WHY? The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) adopted their most recent Congestion Management Program (CMP) in 2004. This CMP identifies level of service (LOS) E or better as acceptable for the designated CMP highway and road system. The CMP further states, "a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C [volume to capacity ratio] = 0.02), causing LOS F (V/C > 1.00). If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C = 0.02)."

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

In addition to CMP thresholds, the City's "Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines" August, 2005 states that the following changes in LOS due to a project are considered a significant traffic impact:

Intersection Capacity Analysis (ICU)

Current ICU	Change due to project
A	0.060
B	0.050
C	0.040
D	0.030
E	0.020
F	0.010

The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. Thus, due to the size of the project, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, according to PasDOT, the project would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an establish level of service standard, and would have no related significant impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project will not alter or create any circulation systems and so it will not be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

WHY? The project does not involve the elimination of a through-route and does not involve the narrowing of a roadway. No roadways, access roads or drive lanes are proposed. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project consists of the renovation of an existing park with no increase in capacity, which would neither increase the demand for parking nor eliminate any existing parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to parking.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? Objective 3.2.2 of the City's 2004 Mobility Element is to "Encourage Non-Auto Travel". The project is located adjacent to downtown bus routes and near the light rail line from Downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project would generate wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project consists of minor alterations to an existing park, and as a result, will not increase the demand for water and wastewater service. No new water or wastewater improvements will be required for the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by

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

existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. As discussed in Section 11, the project would involve only minor changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

The City of Pasadena through Ordinance 6837 adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan recommended by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. This ordinance enables the City to be part of the municipal storm sewer permit issued by the Los Angeles Region to the County of Los Angeles. The City Council is committed to adopting any changes made to the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation by the California regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project consists of the renovation of an existing park and would not increase the demand for water. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient water supplies, and would cause no related impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project consists of the renovation of an existing park and would not increase the demand for wastewater service. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS. Not applicable to this project.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

b.

☐	☐	☒	☐

WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetics or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to archaeological, or paleontological resources. ,As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

The project site is a contributor to a National Register Historic District, and proposes the demolition of a non-historic restroom structure and the rehabilitation of two historic structures, the El Centro d Acción Social building and the Lawn Bowler's Clubhouse. Mitigation Measures CR1 and CR2 are detailed in Section 7 of this document. The project's compliance with these mitigation measures will reduce the potential impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? The proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. As discussed in Section 5.c. of this document, the project's contribution to the cumulative air quality scenario is not considerable. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

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

	☐	☐	☐	☒

WHY? As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

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

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

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