

---

**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:** Pasadena Ice Rink Facility
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Pasadena, Planning and Development Department
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Brian M. Yanuaria, Assistant Planner (626) 744-4660
4. **Project Location:** The Project site is located east of the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel in East Pasadena, south of Orange Grove Boulevard, and north of Foothill Boulevard in Pasadena, California.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Pasadena, Parks and Natural Resources, 117 East Colorado Boulevard Pasadena, California 91105
6. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space (OS)
7. **Zoning:** Open Space (OS)
8. **Description of the Project:** The Project site is approximately 3.13 acres and is currently vacant land. The project involves the construction of a 65,000 square-foot, one-story "state of the art" commercial recreational Ice Rink Facility and required surface parking with approximately 143 spaces. Access to the on-site parking is via an existing driveway on Foothill Boulevard (which currently serves the PCC Community Education Center located southeast of the Project site) and through the existing PCC parking areas.  
  
The Facility would contain two (2) National Hockey League-sized ice rinks with about 400 and 100 seats respectively. Other amenities include a food preparation area, offices, skate rental, locker rooms, restrooms with showers, lobby/waiting area, a small retail shop and a small eating area.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Project site is located on City-owned property within the Eaton Wash area in the northeasterly quadrant of the City of Pasadena. The site is comprised of dedicated parkland located in a fully developed urban area, just north of Alameda Street. Land uses adjacent to the site include the proposed Eaton Wash Park and Off-Leash Dog Park along Orange Grove Boulevard to the north; Southern California Edison (SCE)-owned property and single-family residential to the east; City-owned vacant property, T.M. Goodrich Power Substation, Pasadena City College Community (PCC) Education Center along Foothill Boulevard to the south; Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel, settling basins of Eaton Wash, and single-family residential to the west. City-

owned property to the north and south of the Project site and the SCE-owned property to the east have been used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery for the past several years.

The City Council approved a Master Plan for Eaton Wash Park on January 9, 1995 and the Council approved a revision of the Master Plan on June 28, 2004 that expanded and redesigned the park to include the SCE property. There are two smaller parks for passive recreation in the vicinity of the site. A nursery and a Christmas tree farm are located on the SCE property north of Orange Grove Boulevard. Commercial buildings align the south side of Foothill Boulevard and the 210 Freeway runs northwest to southeast over the Boulevard.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Discretionary actions for the Project include the following:

- A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a major nonresidential development of more than 25,000 square feet,
- a CUP to establish a commercial recreational use in Open Space Zoning District,
- Management Agreement w/ the Facility operator and management, Pasadena Ice Skating Center, LLC, and
- A potential License Agreement with SCE to locate additional parking on SCE-owned land.

The Project will be reviewed by the following City bodies:

- Pasadena City Council
- Pasadena Community Development Commission (CDC)
- Pasadena Design Commission (Design Review)
- Pasadena Parks & Recreation Commission
- Pasadena Zoning Hearing Officer
- Pasadena Transportation Advisory Committee
- Others as necessary

The Project will be reviewed by the following agencies:

- Urban Forestry Advisory Committee
- Southern California Edison Company (approval for a possible Lease Agreement with SCE for the use of their property for additional parking spaces)
- California Public Utilities Commission
- Others as necessary

**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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	Population and Housing
	Agricultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DETERMINATION:** (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, significant impacts have been identified. However, identified impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance through the imposition of mitigation measures. With these mitigation measures, the level of impacts will be reduced to insignificance.

I find that the proposed Project DOES 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.	<b>X</b>
I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment. Analysis in the Initial Study shows that one or more impact areas will have a "Potentially Significant Impact" An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that were not analyzed in a previously approved EIR or Negative Declaration for the Project at hand.	
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.	

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Environmental Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prepared by Brian M. Yanuaria  
Assistant Planner  
Planning & Development Department

\_\_\_\_\_  
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. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 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: February 17, 2005  
 Department requiring checklist: Planning and Development Department  
 Planner assigned: Jennifer Paige-Saeki

**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 a developed urban area, which has distant views of the mountains. This area contains structures and mature trees ranging from 1 to 2 ½ stories in height. The proposed Project does not substantially impact any scenic vista as defined in the 1994 final EIR for the Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City of Pasadena General Plan.

The design of this Project, including any obstruction of any scenic vista or view, will be reviewed by the Design Commission. Any negative impacts from the proposed creation of an aesthetically offensive site will be mitigated to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed by the Commission during this review. Further, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required for the Project. The CUP will evaluate all development issues such as height, setbacks, and parking to ensure the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding area and that there will be no impacts to a scenic vista.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project does not substantially impact an Official State Scenic Highway, L.A. County Recommended Scenic Highway, or unofficial City Designated Scenic corridor. The proposed project would not result in the destruction of any landmark eligible trees, stand of trees, rock outcropping or natural feature recognized as having significant aesthetic value.

The Project site does not contain any onsite trees. Directly to the west of the Project site, there are approximately 15 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance" as detailed in the table listed below under response 6e.

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

No trees are proposed for removal. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

These reviews will encourage landscaping that is aesthetically pleasing, well maintained, compliments the overall design of the site, and compatible with the site and surrounding area and that will include the conservation and protection of the remaining native trees located on the site and new landscaping and trees throughout the Project site. Any negative impacts caused by the proposed destruction of trees will be reduced to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed during this review to preserve recognized aesthetic natural features.

The proposed site has not been designated as an historic resource or has structures that have been designated as historic resources. The proposed project would not impact nearby sites or structures, which are historic resources. The project is not part of a landmark district.

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

                
 
                 
 
                 

**WHY?** The design of this project will be reviewed for approval by the Design Commission, which advises the City Council on proposed public buildings and park plans. The Zoning Hearing Officer will review the site plan, landscape plan, and proposed use prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any negative impacts from the proposed creation of an aesthetically offensive site will be mitigated to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed by the Commission through the review process required to establish the use. Approval of the proposed Project would not lead to any demonstrable negative aesthetic impacts.

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 performance standards in the Zoning Code that regulate glare and outdoor lighting. The height and direction of any outdoor lighting and the screening of mechanical equipment must conform to the Zoning Code requirements. The Project is located in a developed urban area with streetlights in place. These lights are not sources of glare and are an aide to public safety.

Exterior and interior lights and reflective building materials may be potential sources of light and glare. Use of reflective materials shall conform to Zoning Code requirements and to evaluations of exterior cladding and materials through the City's design review process. These standards limit reflective glass to no more than 20 percent of any building surface visible from a street. Any outdoor security lighting shall be indirect or diffused or

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

shall be directed away from or shielded from residential districts within 100 feet of the Project. Outdoor security lighting may not result in an illumination level exceeding 1-foot candle in nearby residential districts.

Since a CUP is required for the Project to ensure the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding area, no significant impact is expected to occur. Furthermore, the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channel to the west and the SCE-owned property to the east provides a buffer between the new Ice Rink Facility and the nearest adjacent residential property.

**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. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than retail plant nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and conditionally in the CL (Limited Commercial) and IG (Industrial) OS (Open Space) Zoning Districts.

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? ( )*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY?** The Project must comply with the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act and the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and Southern California Association of Governments. The AQMP contains measures to meet federal and state requirements. The City of Pasadena is also part of the West San Gabriel Valley Planning Council, which adopted the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan.

The Project will result in the construction of an Ice Rink Facility of approximately 65,000 square feet in size. This growth is within that allowed by the Land Use Element of the City's adopted General Plan and by the Zoning Code. The Project would not impact the Federal Clean Air Act, the California Clean Air Act or the AQMP. As a condition of approval, the City may be required to complete an Air Quality Study for the Project prior to the issuance of a building permit. In addition, grading plan will be submitted to the Building and Public Works Department for review and approval. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards and any potential negative impacts caused by the proposed Project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

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

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

**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 does meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) land use threshold for significant air emissions, according to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. As a condition of approval, the City may be required to complete an Air Quality Study for the Project prior to the issuance of a building permit. In addition, grading plan will be submitted to the Building and Public Works Department for review and approval. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards and any potential negative impacts caused by the proposed Project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

Further, the Project is subject to the Trip Reduction Ordinance for nonresidential development projects, which exceed 25,000 square feet of gross floor area. The requirements of the Ordinance will lower the emissions from vehicles by reducing the expected number of vehicle trips per day generated by the Project. Under this Ordinance, the City will be required to prepare and submit a Transportation System Management (TSM) Plan showing how the trips will be reduced. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Department, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Project would generate a net increase of 60 vehicle trips (27 inbound and 33 outbound) during the weekday PM peak commuter hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a net increase of 630 weekday daily trip ends (approximately 315 inbound and 315 outbound).

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

The Project is expected to generate a net increase of 192 vehicle trips (147 inbound and 45 outbound) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a maximum net increase of 868 weekend daily trip ends assuming a sold out performance and a hockey tournament (approximately 434 inbound and 434 outbound). This condition is only anticipated to occur once or twice a year during a weekend.

According to the Transportation Department this increase will not be significant based on the fact it will not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at nearby local intersections. Because there are no significant traffic impacts, the traffic study finds that no traffic mitigation measures are required at any of the study intersections.

**CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS:** According to the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 91 Project emissions during construction will not exceed the district threshold for construction emissions.

**MOBILE EMISSIONS:** Using the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 97 for Estimating Mobile, Energy and PM10 Emissions, the Project's mobile emissions will not exceed the district's threshold for air emissions.

**Comment [P&D1]:** Page: 8  
Usually if the Project does not meet the size threshold for causing a potential significant impact the emissions are not calculated. John do you want the emissions calculated anyway?

- 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 Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and fine particulates matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Projects that contribute to a significant cumulative increase in NO<sub>2</sub> or PM<sub>10</sub> will be considered to be significant and require the consideration of mitigation measures. This Project does not meet the size threshold in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook's screening table 6-2 for potential significant operational emissions or table 6-3 for potential significant quarterly construction emissions.

According to the City of Pasadena listing of Projects of Community-wide Significance, dated January 1, 2004, there are three (3) Projects of community-wide significance within 1/2 mile of the proposed Project. Those Projects include the Sierra Madre Villa Tech Campus with 350,000 square feet of research & development office space and 2,000 parking spaces; SMV/BRE Residential with 188 residential units; and Madre Villa Estates with 28 single-family residential subdivision. This Project will not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in NO<sub>2</sub> and/or PM<sub>10</sub> during construction and/or operation.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** According to Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the Project will not generate any significant toxic air emissions. Residential uses are considered sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, according to Figure 5-1 in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Project's location is within close proximity to single-family residential neighborhoods, PCC and Eaton

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

Wash Park. The Project itself will not significantly raise existing levels of pollutants. A commercial recreation facility (such as the ice rink facility) is not a use that will generate significant pollutants. While no impacts are identified, two Mitigation Measures have been added to ensure proper maintenance of construction equipment, and monitoring to ensure the Project is in compliance with SCAQMD rule 403 and 1113 regarding the control of fugitive dust emissions, and architectural coatings.

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** This type of use is not shown on the 1993 updated SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints."

**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? (x)*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project is located in a developed urban area and is currently vacant. There are no known unique, rare or endangered plant or animal species or habitats on or near the Project site. The Project site has been used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery for the past several years. As a part of Eaton Wash, the site once was thriving with vegetation, insect and animal life. Periodic flooding created an alluvial scrub habitat similar to that found in Eaton Canyon to the north of the Project site. The construction of the concrete flood control channel and settling basins in 1941 left the Project site virtually denuded of vegetation. No trees are proposed for removal. In addition, the Project will prevent tree destruction through signage, barriers and trail delineation and may include the reintroduction of native plants to the site that may encourage the return of insect and animal life to the area, similar to that found in other parts of Eaton Canyon and Eaton Wash.

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? (x)*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** There are no State Natural Community Preservation Plans within the City or Federal Habitat Preservation Plans. The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements maps the natural plant communities within the City's boundaries. These communities are primarily in the surrounding hillsides and within the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Canyon Washes. The Project is located near the Eaton Canyon Wash. The Project site is currently vacant and has been used for the storage of boxed trees by a nursery for the past several years.

No trees are proposed for removal. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and

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

tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project is located in a developed urban area. There is no known naturally occurring wetland habitat on or near the Project site.

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** Though the Project would result in increased human presence at the site, the Project site is located in a developed urban area and will not involve the dispersal of wildlife, nor will it result in a barrier to migration or movement of wildlife species. See response to 15b.

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

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

**WHY?** The Project site does not contain any onsite trees. Directly to the west of the Project site, there are approximately 15 trees protected by the Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance" as detailed in the table listed below. The tree survey shows native trees such as *Quercus agrifolia* (Live Oak), and *Sambucus mexicanum* (Elderberry) present along the west edge of the site.

No trees are proposed for removal. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

These reviews will encourage landscaping that is aesthetically pleasing, well maintained, compliments the overall design of the site, and compatible with the site and surrounding area and that will include the conservation and protection of the remaining native trees located on the site and new landscaping and trees

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

throughout the Project site. Any negative impacts caused by the proposed destruction of trees will be reduced to a level of insignificance by conditions imposed during this review to preserve recognized aesthetic natural features.

The Project is not in the Hillside Development Overlay District or the Lower Arroyo.

A trees inventory field check for the Eaton Wash Park Master Plan was reviewed and approved by a certified arborist on the Public Works Department staff on July 10, 2003 in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance:

#	Genus & Species (Inventory Reference)	Map	Common Name	Diameter (inches)	To Remain	To be Removed	Protected	Below min. dia.
	<b>Trees</b>							
1	Quercus Agrifolia (T-23)		Coast Live Oak	14				
2	Quercus Agrifolia (T-24)		Coast Live Oak	18				
3	Quercus Agrifolia (T-25)		Coast Live Oak	18				
4	Quercus Agrifolia (T-26)		Coast Live Oak	24				
5	Quercus Agrifolia (T-27)		Coast Live Oak	20				
6	Quercus Agrifolia (T-28)		Coast Live Oak	12				
7	Quercus Agrifolia (T-29)		Coast Live Oak	20				
8	Quercus Agrifolia (T-30)		Coast Live Oak	16				
9	Quercus Agrifolia (T-31)		Coast Live Oak	14				
10	Quercus Agrifolia (T-32)		Coast Live Oak	12				
11	Quercus Agrifolia (T-33)		Coast Live Oak	10				
12	Quercus Agrifolia (T-34)		Coast Live Oak	20				
13	Quercus Agrifolia (T-35)		Coast Live Oak	24				
14	Quercus Agrifolia (T-36)		Coast Live Oak	10				
15	Quercus Agrifolia (T-37)		Coast Live Oak	20				
16	Quercus Agrifolia (T-38)		Coast Live Oak	26				
17	Quercus Agrifolia (T-39)		Coast Live Oak	24				
18	Quercus Agrifolia (T-40)		Coast Live Oak	16				
19	Quercus Agrifolia (T-41)		Coast Live Oak	24				
20	Quercus Agrifolia (T-42)		Coast Live Oak	12				
21	Quercus Agrifolia (T-43)		Coast Live Oak	26				
22	Quercus Agrifolia (T-44)		Coast Live Oak	10				
23	Hicoria (T-45)		Pecan Tree	8				
24	Washington Robusta (T-46)		Washington Fan Palm	12				
25	Quercus Agrifolia (T-47)		Coast Live Oak	9				
26	Quercus Agrifolia (T-48)		Coast Live Oak	12				
27	Quercus Agrifolia (T-49)		Coast Live Oak	10				
	<b>Dead Trees</b>							
1	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-3)		Coast Live Oak	12				
2	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-4)		Coast Live Oak	14				
3	Quercus Agrifolia (DT-5)		Coast Live Oak	10				

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

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? (x)

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

**WHY?** As of June 2003, there were no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There were also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The Project is located in a developed urban area adjacent to the concrete-lined portion of Eaton Wash. The closest natural habitats to the Project site are the coastal sage scrub, chaparral and riparian communities that exist approximately one mile upstream from the site, in the natural-bottom portions of Eaton Canyon and Eaton Wash to the north. See also response to 6.b.

**7. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the Project:

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

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

**WHY?** The Project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and there are no known buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or similar objects on the site having a significant historic value to the City which are to be demolished, relocated, removed, or significantly altered by the Project.

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

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

**WHY?** There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the Project site. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the Project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

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

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

**WHY?** There are no records of any significant paleontological resources in the City of Pasadena. Therefore, there are no known paleontological resources that will be affected by the Project. If any such sites are encountered during grading or construction of the Project, all grading or construction efforts, which would disturb these sites, shall cease. An archaeologist shall be notified and provisions for recording and excavating the site shall be made in compliance with Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY?** There are no known human remains on the site. If any remains are encountered during Project implementation, the Los Angeles County Coroner will be contacted. If there are remains determined to be Native American, the Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council will be contacted at (626) 286-1632 or by e-mail at <http://www.tongva.com/>.

**8. ENERGY.** Would the proposal:

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

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

**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). Measures to meet these performance standards may 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 on new construction.

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

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

**Why? (Oil-based products)** 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. Consumption of gasoline by project-generated vehicles will be reduced by adherence to the Trip Reduction Ordinance to a level that is not significant.

**(Energy)** 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 result in an insignificant increase in the consumption of natural gas. This consumption will be lessened by adherence to the performance standards of California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code Title 24.

As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building plans for review and approval to the Building Official, Water and Power Department and the Public Works Division. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards and there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project and any potential increased consumption will be reduced to an insignificant level by meeting the above referenced energy standards. The energy conservation measures will be prepared by the City and shown on the building plan. Installation of energy-

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

saving features will be inspected by a City Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. If found during the course of project review, the City is responsible for any improvements to the existing infrastructure.

**(Water)** As a condition of approval for the Project, the City must submit plans to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval through the City's Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) and CUP processes and determine if the existing infrastructure can serve the Project. If it is found that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City is responsible for providing infrastructure upgrades for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permits. Consumption of water and energy resources generated by the proposed Project will adhere to local and state regulations to a level that is not significant. In addition, any potential negative impact will be mitigated during drought periods by the City adhering to the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance, which restricts water consumption to 90% of expected consumption during each billing period. Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Division Code Enforcement Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

The 1994 FEIR for the Land Use and Mobility Elements shows Eaton Canyon Wash to be an area continuing mineral deposits of sand and gravel used in making asphalt, and sand used to make concrete. The Project will not result in any soil or gravel being removed from these areas.

**9. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the Project:

- a. *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
  - i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (x)*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

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

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

The closest major active faults that could affect the Project site include the Sierra Madre (0.8 miles north of Project site), Raymond (1.3 miles south of Project site). The San Andreas Fault is the largest active fault in California and is approximately 26 miles northeast of the Project site. The 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan considers the Sierra Madre Fault to be in a Fault Hazard Management Zone and the Raymond Fault to be in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Within the southwest of the City, the Eagle Rock Fault is considered potentially active.

A geotechnical investigation and a seismic hazard evaluation were prepared for the Project (dated September 1, 2003) by Leighton Consulting, Inc. The program FRISKSP suggests that the surface Projection of the

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

rupture area may be less than 0.1 miles from the site. There is evidence that at least eight surface-rupturing events have occurred along this fault in the last 36,000 years. No known active or potentially active faults have been mapped across the site. The Project is not near enough to any fault lines to require a study under the Alquist Priolo Act. Based on consideration of the current geology framework, the potential for ground rupture is considered low.

The potential exists for people and property to be exposed to the hazards of seismic activity in most of California. This Project will not increase the potential occurrence of earthquakes. The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because the new structure shall be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and is 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.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** See 9.a.i.

Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. At a minimum the earthquake-resistant design and materials of new Projects must meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the California Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 requirements. 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.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** According to the State of California Seismic Hazard map (Pasadena, Mt. Wilson or Los Angeles Quadrangle official maps released March 25, 1999), the Project site is in an area subject to either liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides. Further, according to the Slope Instability Map of the 2002 adopted Safety Elements of the General Plan on Plate 1 -3, the Project is located in an area of low slope instability.

There is a possibility that liquefaction could occur in the streambed area of Eaton Canyon Wash. The Official Seismic Hazard Map, Mt. Wilson Quadrangle dated March 25, 1999, shows the area adjacent to the Wash from Del Vina to the south, to Altadena in unincorporated Los Angeles County to the north, to be an area of historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions indicating a potential for permanent ground displacement. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building plans for review and approval to the Building Official, Water and Power Department and the Public Works Division. These reviews will ensure that the Project (and construction) meet all code requirements and comply with all required local, regional and federal standards.

The northern portion of the proposed Project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone for potential liquefaction. However, groundwater was not encountered in any of the borings (maximum depth 51.5 feet)

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

conducted by Leighton Consulting, Inc. during their geotechnical investigation. Per the findings of the geotechnical report, the historic high groundwater level for the site is more than 100 feet below the surface of the site. The geotechnical report concludes that the potential of liquefaction of this site is low.

The site is currently vacant and relatively flat. Existing City Municipal Code and Building Code regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact. Due to these codes and inspections there will be no increased exposure to seismic ground failure including liquefaction.

- 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?  
(x)

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

**WHY?** According to the 1999 State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Pasadena Quadrangle, and the Seismic Hazards Map and Slope Instability Map (Plated. 1-3 and 2-4, respectively, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan), the Project is located where slopes have low slope instability. The Project site is not within a "Landslide Hazard Zone" identified on the Plate P-1: Summary of Hazards Map (I) of the Safety Element of the City's General Plan.] According to the same sources, there is not any known historic evidence of landslides on the Project site or adjacent properties. Existing City regulations will control any slope instability; therefore there will be no impact. In addition, the Seismic Hazard map does not show this Project to be located in an area where there is geologic evidence of past landslides.

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

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

**WHY? (Excavating and Grading)** A geotechnical investigation and a soil vapor survey were prepared for the Project (dated September 1, 2003) by Leighton Consulting, Inc. Since yard waste, organic materials and the presence of methane gas was found within the Project site, the construction of the Project may result in a cut and fill and an amount of fill to be exported. The Project will cover approximately 100% of the site. The Tujunga stony loam in Eaton Wash is at least 6 feet deep. It is very porous, has a high water table [this conflicts with Section 3.c (liquefaction) where we state that the groundwater table is expected to occur more than 100 feet below ground surface], low surface runoff, and the erosion hazard is low due to the wash's gravelly surface and low topographic relief in its location away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains. As a condition of approval for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building and grading plans for review and approval to the Building Official and the Public Works Department. The existing building regulations and property site inspections ensure that construction activities do not create unstable earth conditions.

The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by the City's grading ordinance, Appendix Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, other applicable building regulations and standard construction techniques; therefore there will be no impact. The City must have an approved site to receive any exported cut earth.

**(Erosion)** According to the Final Environmental Impact Report certified for the adoption of the 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements, the natural water erosion potential of soils in Pasadena is low, unless these soils are

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

disturbed during the wet season. Both the Ramona and Hanford soils associations, which underlay much of the City, have high permeability, low surface runoff and slight erosion hazard due to the gravelly surface layer and low topographic relief away from the steeper foothill areas of the San Gabriel Mountains.

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 Building Official and the Public Works Department 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. Any project which involves more than 250 cubic yards of cut or fill should have an erosion and sediment transport control plan as part of the City's grading plan. The grading plan must be approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits.

In addition, a construction management plan must be submitted prior to the issuance of any building permit.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**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.

According to Geotechnical Report, any significant settlement in the native soil underlying the fill is not expected. Since the Project site is not considered susceptible to liquefaction or seismically-induced landslides, the potential for lateral spreading and earthquake-induced landslides at the site is considered negligible. The soil is stable enough to support the proposed Project, and the soil compacted per applicable codes.

For location of the Project in relationship to areas prone to landslides or liquefaction see response to 9A iv.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**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. Based on the material encountered during the geotechnical investigation, the onsite soil has a low expansion potential. As a condition of approval for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building and grading plans for review and approval to the Building Official and the Public Works Department. All methane mitigation

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

measures shall be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such mitigation measures .

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** The City of Pasadena allows septic tanks to be used for only specified areas in the hillsides per regulations found in Ordinances 3881 and 4170 and codified in Pasadena Municipal Code. The proposed Project is not in any of these specified areas. New construction must be hooked up to a sewer if it is available. If the sewer is at a higher elevation than the Project, the sewage is to be pumped up to the sewer.

**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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project does involve the use or storage of hazardous substances other than the amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and cleaning agents required for normal maintenance of the structure and landscaping. The proposed Project involves the construction of an ice rink facility containing two ice rinks that will involve the use of refrigerants and/or cooling agents. As a condition of approval, complete building plans must be submitted to Building, Fire, Health and Public Works Departments for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. Review and approval of the plans will ensure that the transportation, storage, use and disposal of refrigerants and/or cooling agents will comply with local, state, EAP, and federal regulations. The Project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances.

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

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** This Project is not a use known to create significant health hazards. The site contains no underground storage tanks, standing ponds of still water or infestations of disease carrying vectors such as rats. However, the former use of the site as a commercial nursery could have resulted in contamination of the site. As part of the site preparation process, soil testing has been conducted to determine if there is any contamination to the site resulting from its former use.

A Summary of the Soil Vapor Survey Report (September 1, 2004) has been prepared by Leighton Consulting, Inc. for this Project. Based on the findings contained in this report, there were no volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that are present in the soil vapor beneath the site. However, the organic fill material under the Project

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

site may produce methane gas as it decomposes. The presence of methane gas was found within the area approximately from the lower portion of the site to portions just north of the center of the site.

To mitigate any potential adverse effects caused by methane vapors, the following methane gas Mitigation Measures for the Project may include cut and fill, vapor barriers, passive or active venting and methane monitoring. As a condition of approval, the City shall submit a grading plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. All methane mitigation measures shall be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such mitigation measures.

The Project does involve the use or storage of hazardous substances. The Project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further, the Project plans must comply with existing Building, Health and Fire Safety Codes (see response to 10a).

For general safety purposes, fencing along the western boundary of the Project will protect individuals from entering the flood control channel. Further, additional fencing, climbing discouragers and posted warning signs (stating electrical hazards) will provide a barrier to prevent access to the Southern California Edison's towers.

The occupation and use of the proposed Project is not a significant threat to public health. 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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project does not emit hazardous emissions and is within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the Pasadena City College Community (PCC) Education Center located southeast of the Project site. However, the Project does handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste. The Project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances. Further, the Project plans must comply with existing Building, Health and Fire Safety Codes (see response to 10a).

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? (x)*

                                                                

**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).

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? (x)*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY?** The Project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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? ( )

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

**WHY?** The Project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There are no private airstrips in the City of Pasadena.

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

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

**WHY?** The Project is located within an urban area and will not change the logistical nature of the area. To ensure compliance with zoning, building and fire codes, the architect and engineer contracted by the City of Pasadena will be 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.

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 Fire Marshall maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Marshall 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. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan, the Project site is not within any of these dam inundation areas.

There are no areas in the City designated as eligible for flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA).

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? (x)

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

**WHY?** According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element as shown on Plate 4-2, Wildfire Hazard Map, the Project site is in an area of low fire hazard.

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

**11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the Project:

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Project must comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations.

There are no bodies of water near the Project, whose surface waters would receive any discharge from the Project. However, if there is water runoff from the site, this runoff may be discharged via the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channels in Eaton Wash and then into the San Pedro Bay. The Project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water.

The Project will be subject to the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to help implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Based on the requirements for these plans and adherence to all standards of the SUSMP and NPDES there will be no significant impacts to water quality or waste discharge as a result of the Project.

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)? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer system provided by the Public Works Department. Any irrigation may incrementally add water to the Raymond Ground water basin. Therefore, there will be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters. Moreover, there is no known aquifer condition in the Project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the Project.

As a condition of approval for the Project, the City must submit plans to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval through the City's Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) and CUP processes and determine if the existing infrastructure can serve the Project. If it is found that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City is responsible for providing infrastructure upgrades for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

During drought conditions, the Project must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code), the Project shall only consume 90% of expected consumption. To ensure compliance with this ordinance, the City shall submit a water conservation plan limiting the Project's water consumption to 90% of expected consumption. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City's Water and Power Department and the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The City's irrigation and plumbing plans shall comply with the approved water conservation plan.

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

As part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the City of Pasadena and the State Water Conservation Coalition in 1991, the City through its Department of Water and Power has agreed to implement certain water conservation measures known as "Best Management Practices" (BMP).

In the 1994 adopted Land Use Element, Policy 9.5 Stewardship of Natural Environment requires water conservation through encouragement of native, water conserving and regionally appropriate landscaping. This will be done through review and approval of the Project's landscape plan.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project will cover 100% of the site as compared to the present use. Storm and other water runoff will therefore decrease. Increased paving or building footprint will reduce water percolating into the soil to replenish the water table and will increase storm and irrigation water flowing into storm drain facilities. The drainage of surface water from the Project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. The City shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan, there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena Comprehensive General Plan, most properties in the City are not normally subject to the flooding. The subject site is currently vacant, and is located in an urban area. Drainage and run-off from the site must comply with all applicable regulations including SUSMP and there are no streams or rivers near the site that will be affected by run-off or erosion.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** See response 11c. The City of Pasadena contains two streams, the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek. The Project is located near the Eaton Creek stream. The Project site does not include any discernable drainage features. The concrete-lined Eaton Canyon flood control channel is located just west of the Project site. The proposed Project would not alter the bed, bank, or flows of this channel.

According to the Flood and Fire Hazard Map of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the Project is located in the Eaton Dam ten-minute inundation area, however water is not usually stored behind the dam. The Project will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site.

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? (x)*

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY?** As discussed in Section 11.c above, the Project would decrease the permeability of the Project site. The City may be required to complete drainage and hydrology studies and shall submit a drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan, the Project would not significantly affect the amount of surface water in any body of water including the Eaton Wash Flood Control Channel.

In addition, the Public Works and Water Departments will review the proposed Project through the City's PPR and CUP processes and determine if existing infrastructure can adequately serve the Project. If the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City will be responsible for upgrading the infrastructure for the Project prior to the issuance of the building permit.

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

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

**WHY?** The Project will not substantially degrade water quality during construction or operation. Runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. The Project will be connected to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems so there will be no direct impact on groundwater quality. This Project would not affect the current pattern of discharging surface runoff via the Los Angeles County Flood Control Channels in Eaton Wash and then into the San Pedro Bay. There is a potential for the proposed action to adversely impact surface water quality from storm water runoff from the site.

To mitigate any potential impacts on water quality, and in accordance with Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, Mitigation Measures will require the Project to comply with the NPDES and the corresponding Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Plans to ensure compliance with these regulations must be submitted to and approved by the Public Works Department. Compliance with these requirements will ensure the Project would not significantly impact water quality.

However, there are known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. During the geotechnical investigation, decomposed yard waste and organic material was found within and outside the subject site. The City shall submit a grading plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. All methane mitigation measures should be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such mitigation measures.

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, in the Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the Project is located in the Eaton Dam ten-minute inundation area, however, water is not stored behind the dam. The Project would not affect the current pattern

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

of discharging storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities. The City is not within any 100-year flood hazard zone. Further, the proposed Project consists of an Ice Rink Facility with a small retail shop and a small restaurant – there is no housing proposed for the site. See also response to 11.h.

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

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

**WHY?** The entire City of Pasadena is in Flood Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map Community Number 065050. In Flood Zone D, the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations. See responses to 9 Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides and b soil erosion and the response to 11i below.

*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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project site does not include any discernable drainage features. The concrete-lined Eaton Canyon flood control channel is located just west of the Project site. However, the proposed Project would not alter the bed, bank, or flows of this channel. The Project is not located near any significant standing body of fresh or marine water. According to the Dam Failure Inundation Map, Plate 3-1, in the Technical Background Report of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the Project is located in the Eaton Dam ten-minute inundation area. However, water is not stored behind the dam. The Project would not affect the current pattern of discharging storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. An on-site drainage system will convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

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

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

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

**12. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the Project:

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

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

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

**WHY?** The Project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The subject site is presently vacant and is located in a fully urbanized area. The construction of the proposed Project will not alter the development pattern of the surrounding area.

*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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a major nonresidential development of more than 25,000 square feet and a CUP to establish a commercial recreational use in Open Space Zoning District is required for the Project.

The Project is also consistent with the Open Space General Plan Land Use Designation in the adopted 1994 Land Use Element, and its designation as dedicated parkland. The General Plan Land Use Designation Objective 9, calls for preserving and acquiring open space in Pasadena in order to enhance the quality of Pasadena life. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy 17.3 by promoting the equitable distribution of public and private recreation facilities throughout the City, as a function of population distribution. In addition, the proposed project is consistent with Open Space Objective 2 by increasing recreational resources by multi-purpose uses of existing open spaces. Furthermore, the proposed project is consistent with Cultural and Recreational Element Objective 1.3 by encouraging the expanded use of private resources and resources owned or controlled by public entities other than the City which are suitable for recreational purposes, and Policy 401.0 by actively seeking the cooperation of private and other public entities in order to maximize and improve the recreational opportunities which are available to the public. Landscaping of the site includes preservation of the site's native oaks, and planting of additional native trees and shrubs. The Project also supports Objective 17 by increasing recreation opportunities for residents of the City.

The Project is also consistent with the Final Environmental Impact Report, certified in 1994 for the Land Use and Mobility Elements of City's General Plan, and the regional growth forecast for Pasadena identified in Southern California 2020 - A Preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview (Working Draft May 1995).

Signage plans for the Project have not yet been developed at this time. Any signage will be required to obtain a building permit and will be reviewed by Zoning for consistency with the City's Sign Ordinance.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** As of February 2004, there were no Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in Pasadena.

**13. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the Project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**WHY?** The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel, and stone in Eaton Wash and Devil's Gate Reservoir. The Project site is located within the Eaton Canyon Wash, an area where there are significant mineral deposits of sand and gravel used in making asphalt and sand used to make concrete. The Project will result in soil or gravel being removed from the Project area. However, the soil, gravel and sand will be replaced and will have no impact on any valuable mineral resources in the State and region.

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** There are no locally important mineral-resource recovery sites delineated by the City of Pasadena Land Use Element of the Comprehensive General Plan. The 1994 certified final EIR for this element states that there are two areas within Pasadena which contain aggregate for making Portland cement, one in the Arroyo Seco, the other in Eaton Canyon. These areas are zoned for Open Space uses and are not currently being mined. There are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan. The 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology shows no aggregate resources with the City of Pasadena.

**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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Noise generated by construction activities may have a short-term impact and noise from air conditioning and heating systems may increase the existing level of ambient noise after construction. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. 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). Regulations in the Municipal Code regarding ambient noise levels apply to stationary noise sources. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance does not regulate traffic noise.

The impact from construction noise will be short-term and limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday in or within 500 feet of a residential area) in accordance with City regulations. A construction related traffic plan would be 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 Public Works and Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

The Project must comply with the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A). Construction generated noise could potentially impact neighboring properties if it occurs during nighttime and /or early morning hours. All equipment shall be maintained in accordance with manufacturer specifications and shall be equipped with mufflers or other sound control devices as needed.

According to the Noise Restrictions Ordinance, the allowed ambient noise level is 50 dBA during the day (6a.m.-11 p.m.) and 40 dBA at night (11 p.m. to 6 a.m.). Noise generated by construction equipment shall be 85 dBA or less within a 100 foot radius of the equipment. Construction hours are limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.

The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. According to Figure 1, Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use, of this element this Ice Rink Facility Project is located in an area with a normally acceptable ambient noise range of 40-50 dBA. Land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive include but are not limited to: residences, hotels, single room occupancy buildings, group care and convalescent homes, schools, churches, libraries, performance halls, parks and hospitals.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The Metro Gold Line operates along the median of the 210 San Bernardino Freeway located west and south of the Project site, more than 1,000 feet away. The Project will be constructed to meet or exceed all applicable building code requirements, which will limit the exposure of people to excessive vibration or groundborne noise level.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** See response to 14.a. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The Project will not increase ambient noise levels at the subject site. The site is currently vacant and within a developed urban area, and the proposed use of an Ice Rink Facility will not increase the ambient noise levels at the subject site.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** Construction of the Project may cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise. Hours of construction and level of construction equipment noise are controlled by the Noise Restriction Ordinance (PMC) Chapter 9.36. A Mitigation Measure requiring a Construction Related Noise Plan and a Construction

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

Staging Plan for the Project is included in this analysis, and these plans will be made conditions of approval for the Project. With the mitigation measures, the impacts from operation and construction of the Project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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? (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** As of July 2003, there were no airports or airport land use plans within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank.

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? (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project is not within the vicinity of the Police Heliport or the Fire Camp in the Arroyo Seco.

**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)? (5, 23)

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. If the Project were to result in necessary improvements to connect the Project to the existing infrastructure, it will be the responsibility of the City. Since the Project is subject to the review and conditions of approval of the PPR and CUP processes for the Project, any potential gain in population growth will not be significant.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project does not involve the demolition of housing units or the construction of new housing units .

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people. The site is currently vacant and within a developed urban area and the implementation of this Project will result in a slight change over the existing population base and housing conditions. See response to 15.b.

**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?* (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project site is located in a low fire hazard area according to the Wildfire Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The Project is located approximately 0.5 miles from the nearest fire station (Fire Station 37 located at 3430 East Foothill Boulevard). As a condition of approval for the Project, the City must submit plans to the Water and Power Department and Building Official for review and approval through the City's Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) and CUP processes and determine if the existing infrastructure can serve the Project. If it is found that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City is responsible for providing infrastructure upgrades for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

b. *Libraries?* (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project is located approximately 0.39 miles from the nearest branch library (the Hastings Branch Library located at 3325 East Orange Grove Boulevard). The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (Library) System.

c. *Parks?* (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project is located on dedicated parkland immediately south of the proposed Eaton Wash Park and Off-Leash Dog Park. The Project increases the City's park inventory and recreational opportunities, particularly in East Pasadena. The proposed Project will provide an active, all season commercial recreational facility for residents. According to Parks and Natural Resources staff, the City as a whole had 1.6 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents in May 2002. The state standard in the Quimby Act is 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

d. *Police Protection?* (x)

                                                                

**WHY?** The proposed site is in an area that has reported low crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The project will not increase the need for police protection and the Project can be served by

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

existing police personnel. However, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility.

e. *Schools? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project will not result in school development impact fees and no local ordinance exists to require the same. The Project will not result in the need for new schools since there is only a slight increase in population from the number of employees generated by the Project.

f. *Other public facilities? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. Any costs associated with the Project's development, maintenance and operation is the City's responsibility.

**17. RECREATION**

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

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

**WHY?** The proposed Project includes new construction of an ice rink facility with a surface parking area of approximately 143 parking spaces. Also, the Project will increase the City's park inventory and recreational opportunities, particularly in East Pasadena. The Project site is located on dedicated parkland immediately south of the proposed Eaton Wash Park and Off-Leash Dog Park. The Project will provide recreational opportunities (year round) for the citizens. There are no residential units proposed as a result of the Project that may increase the demand for neighborhood parks and other recreation services. Also, see response to 15c.

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The Project involves the relocation of the existing Pasadena Ice Rink Facility in the Pasadena Downtown/Civic Center to the Project site. The existing Facility, Pasadena Ice Skating Center, has only one rink. The Project involves the construction of a new ice rink facility that will contain two (2) ice rinks and will expand the recreational facilities available to the City's residents year round.

There are no residential units proposed as a result of the Project that may increase the demand for neighborhood parks and other recreation services.

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

**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)? (x)*

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project site is located north of Foothill Boulevard, a thoroughfare identified as a Minor Arterial and a Principal Multimodal Corridor according to the approved 2003 Mobility Element of the City's General Plan. Sierra Madre Villa is a north-south route within the vicinity of the project area to the east, and is designated as a Minor Arterial and a Principal Multimodal Corridor according to the approved 2003 Mobility Element of the City's General Plan.

A Traffic Impact Study was required by the Public Works and Transportation Departments in accordance with the City's Traffic Impact Report Preparation Guidelines. The Study was prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers (July 30, 2004) for the Project (see Exhibit x) and six study intersections were analyzed for potential impacts related to the proposed Project. The traffic study finds the proposed Project is not expected to create significant traffic impacts at any of the six study intersections, particularly along Foothill Boulevard and Maple Street.

The Project would generate a net increase of 60 vehicle trips (27 inbound and 33 outbound) during the weekday PM peak commuter hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a net increase of 630 weekday daily trip ends (approximately 315 inbound and 315 outbound).

The Project is expected to generate a net increase of 192 vehicle trips (147 inbound and 45 outbound) during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate a maximum net increase of 868 weekend daily trip ends assuming a sold out performance and a hockey tournament (approximately 434 inbound and 434 outbound). This condition is only anticipated to occur once or twice a year during a weekend.

According to the Transportation Department this increase will not be significant based on the fact it will not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at nearby local intersections. Because there are no significant traffic impacts, the traffic study finds that no traffic mitigation measures are required at any of the study intersections.

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

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

**WHY?** The regional Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or the local City sets the Level of Service Threshold (LOS). The adopted 2002 Congestion Management Program prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Agency lists LOS E as acceptable for the highway and road system. The CMP defines the 2002 Highway and Roadway System in Exhibit 2-3. The Project does not impact this roadway system.

The adopted 1994 Mobility Element the City of Pasadena lists LOS E as acceptable for the City of Pasadena roadway system not covered by the CMP. The revised Mobility Element, which was approved in concept by the City Council April 7, 2003, does not list the lowest acceptable LOS (as of October 2003). The "Traffic Impact Report Preparation Guidelines" approved by the Transportation Advisory Committee 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

A traffic study prepared for this Project, reviewed and accepted by the Transportation Department, states that the nominal amount of net new vehicular trips associated with the Project is not expected to exceed the City of Pasadena significance thresholds at nearby local intersections and that there will be no significant impacts to the level service threshold for designated County roads and highways.

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?* (x)

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

**WHY?** The Project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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

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

**WHY?** Access to the proposed Ice Rink Facility is via an existing driveway on Foothill Boulevard which currently serves the PCC Community Education Center (located southeast of the Project site). Access to the proposed ice rink parking area would be through the existing PCC parking areas (located south and east of the Project site). The Project/PCC driveway and Foothill Boulevard intersection is planned to be signalized as part of the Project in order to accommodate left-turn and right-turn ingress and egress turning movements and to provide safer movements at the intersection. The proposed signal at the Project/PCC driveway and Foothill Boulevard intersection would be coordinated with the future signal at the Titley Avenue and Foothill Boulevard intersection.

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

The Project has been evaluated by the Transportation Department 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. The perimeter of the Project site will be fenced and gated.

There may be a temporary increase in traffic hazards to motorists, bicyclists or pedestrians during construction. This will be mitigated to a level of insignificance through compliance with the construction staging plan and the Noise Ordinance. The construction plan contains approved transportation routes for materials that are deemed to be the least disruptive by the Public Works Department. The Noise Ordinance limits the hours of construction primarily to daytime hours to control the level of noise. There will not be significant Project-related impacts on traffic hazards to motorists, bicyclists or pedestrians based on the Project's compliance with all applicable codes and regulations which will be reviewed by the Public Works and Transportation Departments.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Transportation Department and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. An additional emergency access entrance is located at Alameda Street and through the parking area of the proposed Eaton Wash Park located north of subject site. The Project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, the Building Division and the Fire Department.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** Due to the increased intensity of land use, there will be an increased demand for parking. The Project will comply with the conditions under the CUP for approval which will determine the number of required parking and loading spaces. According to the Zoning Code, the Project requires approximately 143 parking spaces. Vehicular access to the Project will be from Foothill Boulevard. A condition of approval for the CUP will state that if the Project is approved after the new code is adopted, the plans must be revised to include the required number of parking spaces.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** The Project will not result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation system. The Project is near several principal mobility corridors according to the 1994 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. The Project is located near bus routes on Orange Grove, Foothill and Sierra Madre Villa, and near the light rail Gold Line Station (located at Sierra Madre Villa and Foothill Blvd) from Downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena. The project will include provisions for the use of bicycles.

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

The Project is subject to the Trip Reduction Ordinance (Ordinance No. 6172) and through conditions of approval for the CUP to reduce its parking requirements through implementation of a Transportation Systems Management Program Plan to reduce vehicular trips generated by the Project.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the Project:

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

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual Projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the Project is hooked up to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are not unusual wastes in the Project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by L.A. County Sanitation District.

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?* (x)

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater, individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. The Water and Power Department will review the Project through the PPR and CUP processes and will determine if any new infrastructure is required. If the Project were to result in necessary improvements to connect the Project to the existing infrastructure or result in new construction of facilities, it will be the responsibility of the City.

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?* (x)

                        
 
                         
 
                         

**WHY?** The Project will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The Project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. The Project development will not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system. Further, the Project must have an on-site drainage plan approved by the Building Official and the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any on-site improvements needed to provide drainage or to connect the Project with the existing City drainage system are the responsibility of the City.

The Project does meet a standard for review of drainage plans for compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) Ordinance. If the Project meets a standard for review, drainage plans will be reviewed by the Building Division of the Planning and Development Department by Public Works Department.

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

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** 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 adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. If it is found that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient, the City is responsible for providing infrastructure upgrades for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

However, this Project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance during periods of drought, thereby reducing monthly water consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. The impact will be reduced to a level that is not significant. Further, the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department has reviewed this Project and determined that the City can serve it. The Project does not affect any of the local groundwater recharge spreading grounds.

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? (x)*

                                                                

**WHY?** See responses to 19 a. and b.

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

                                                                

**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 as of July 2003 has a 22-year capacity, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The Project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The Project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal.

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

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

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

**WHY?** The Project will comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The City may be required to submit a program to the Public Works Department's Solid Waste Division for recycling solid waste. This program must be approved by the Solid Waste Division prior to the issuance of any building permits. The program must contain recycling for office paper, corrugated cardboard, mixed glass and green waste.

In addition, prior to construction and in accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code), the City must submit a Construction Waste Management Plan and the Project will comply with all Federal, State and local regulations related to solid waste.

**20. 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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** The proposed Project is located on a vacant site within a fully developed urbanized area. There are no sensitive plant or wildlife species on the site, and the proposal does not involve the removal of any protected trees. As a condition of approval for the Project and in accordance with the Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete landscape, irrigation and tree protection plans for review and approval by the Zoning Administrator, Design Commission, and Urban Forestry Advisory Committee (UFAC), and grading plans to the Building Official and the Public Works Department for review and approval. If found during the course of project review and site layout that a tree must be removed, the City must follow the regulations set forth in the Ordinance, which includes review and approval by UFAC for each tree proposed for relocation or removal. Based on the fact that all the requirements of the Ordinance must be met, there will be no significant impacts caused by the proposed Project.

The proposed Project does not have the potential to impact important examples of a major period of California history (See response to question 7 Cultural Resources.).

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? (x)*

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

**WHY?** According to the City of Pasadena listing of Projects of Community-wide Significance, dated January 1, 2004, there are three (3) Projects of community-wide significance within 1/2 mile of the proposed Project. The

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

probability of cumulative impacts is minimal. In addition, the Project is only required to mitigate its' own impacts or contribute its fair share towards alleviating potentially significant cumulative impacts.

See response 21c below.

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

                                                                

**WHY?** During project construction, additional short-term air quality impact may result from worker travel, construction equipment emissions, and dust from excavation activities. In addition, construction activities may result in adverse noise, traffic, pedestrian and parking effects. As a condition of approval for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building, grading, construction staging, for review and approval to the Building Division and the Public Works and Transportation Departments.

It is anticipated that there may be short-term impacts from noise as a result of the Project. A Mitigation Measure requiring a Construction Related Noise Plan and a Construction Staging Plan for the Project is included in this analysis, and these plans will be made conditions of approval for the Project. Further, the Project must comply with the Noise Ordinance. With Mitigation Measures, the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Due to the significant amount of yard waste and organic material found within the Project site and the Project potentially involving a large amount of grading, as a condition of approval for the Project and prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City must submit complete building and grading plans for review and approval to the Building Official and the Public Works Department. All methane mitigation measures should be designed by and constructed under the observation of a State of California Registered Civil Engineer (RCE) familiar with such mitigation measures. With Mitigation Measures, the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

As a condition of approval, complete building plans must be submitted to Building, Fire, Health and Public Works Departments for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. Review and approval of the plans will ensure that the transportation, storage, use and disposal of refrigerants and/or cooling agents will comply with local, state, EAP, and federal regulations. The Project must adhere to applicable zoning and fire regulations regarding the use and storage of any hazardous substances.

There are no situations or components of the Project that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, and that cannot be mitigated to a level that is not significant by the measures outlined in this study. Some areas of potential impact will be subject to a mitigation-monitoring program.